(a) request FOR CEO Endorsement

PROJECT TYPE: FULL SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: LDCF

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Enhancing national food security in the context of global climate change			
Country(ies):	Kiribati	GEF Project ID:[1]	5414
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4570
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD), Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD),	Submission Date:	Dec. 18, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	LDCF	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➢ For SFM/REDD+ ☐ ➢ For SGP ☐	N/A	Agency Fee ($):	422,390

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK[2]

Focal Area Objective	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount ($)	Co-financing ($)
CCA-1: Reducing Vulnerability: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level	Outcome 1.2: Reduced vulnerability to climate change in development sectors.	Output 1.2.1: Vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability.	LDCF	1,110,000	1,782,507
CCA-2: Increased Adaptive Capacity: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level	Outcome 2.2: Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses.	Output 2.2.1: Adaptive capacity of national and regional centers and networks strengthened to rapidly respond to extreme events.	LDCF	3,336,210	5,357,493
		Total Project Costs		**4,446,210**	**7,140,000**

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To build the adaptive capacity of vulnerable Kiribati communities to ensure food security under conditions of climate change

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (4)	Confirmed Co-financing ($)
Institutional capacity development	TA	*National and local institutions in the fisheries, agriculture,*	*1.1 National Program for Informed Decision Making* through:	LDCF	1,000,000	1,605,862

[1] Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
[2] Refer to the Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework when completing Table A.

to reduce vulnerability to climate change-induced food shortages		*trade and commerce, health and culture sectors with enhanced knowledge and capacities on climate risk and enabled to assess, forecast and plan for food and nutritional security, measured by:* • Production of vulnerability assessments in key sectors and integrated land use plans for at least three atolls • Systems in place nationwide to disseminate climate risk information *Improved national policy and planning framework for maintenance of food security through adaptation to climate change in place, measured by:* • New national agriculture and fisheries legislation and guidelines in place • Regular application of the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) • 12,000 Hectares of coastal zone fishing management areas regulated through zoning system as a result of national regulatory tool adopted by GoK.	(i) establishing and trialling the implementation of a national adaptation monitoring and assessment tool (AMAT); (ii) generating information of conservation of coastal zone fisheries, sustainable land management and human health/nutrition; and (iii) enhancing meteorological early warning system through building the capacity of the National Meteorological Service to conduct extended meteorological and hydrological observations; and (iv) use of state radio and TV for dissemination of climate risk information, seasonal forecasts related to food production, and warning of extreme events. *1.2 National Guidelines for Ecosystem-based Adaptation Management* consisting of: (i) the creation of model by-laws, (ii) national level capacity building and assessment initiatives establishing baseline of understanding, (iii) training of officials and community groups in the Tarawa Atoll and three outer islands to use climate risk information to undertake vulnerability assessments, integrated land/marine resource-planning taking into account climate risks, development of management framework for inshore/lagoonal ecosystems under changing climate, prioritization for fisheries and food security, and (iv) providing Island Councils with easily adopted templates for the implementation of community and ecosystem-based planning approaches to reduce climate change vulnerability. *1.3. National Coastal Zone Fisheries Monitoring and Conservation Awareness Program* consisting of: (i) building the capacity of the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources to support coastal zone fisheries monitoring, (ii) raising awareness and assisting with national and island prioritization of adaptation actions for fisheries and food security. *1.4. National Coastal Zone Fisheries Conservation Regulations* shifting open access to improved community-managed regimes. *1.5. Extension Officer Training* consisting of (i) assessing current			

			capacity and training regime, (ii) developing and implementing training program curriculum and in-service training, and (iii) increasing extension officer numbers and equipping officers in pilot sites.			
Implementation of community adaptation measures to increase food security	TA	*Enhanced food security measured by:* • 100% of households and communities of targeted islands (Nonouti, Abenama and Maiana) have stable and/or increased levels of food security in the face of climate change *Enhanced ecosystem management protecting key ecosystem services threatened by climate change, measured by* ▪ Stable or increasing population of Bonefish (*Albula glossodonta*) at four pilot sites ▪ 12,000 ha of fish recovery zones established in the coastal areas of Nonouti, Abemana and Maiana islands	*2.1 Vulnerability Assessment and Monitoring Tool Operational* assisting communities to accurately assess climate change vulnerability as it relates to general ecosystem integrity and food security. *2.2. Ecosystem-based Adaptation Management Operational* through implementation of national guidelines for ecosystem-based adaptation. *2.3. Island and Coastal Zone Strategic Natural Resource Planning Implemented* through the development and implementation of island and coastal zone plans. Implementation of plans to be supported through provision of grants. *2.4. Island-based Coastal Zone Fisheries Monitoring and Conservation Awareness* *2.5. Coastal Zone Fisheries Conservation By-laws adopted*, including measures for conserving lagoon fisheries. *2.6. Climate Resilient Fisheries Management Practices Demonstrated* through establishment of Fisheries Conservation Field Schools and design and implementation of island-based conservation strategy and management plans. Technical and financial (grants) assistance provided to support implementation of improved fisheries production strategies. *2.7. Models for Community-based Tourism Management Demonstrated* through development of sport-fishing business enterprises.	LDCF	3,226,210	5,180,848
				Subtotal		4,226,210	6,786,710
				Project Management Costs		220,000	353,290
				Total project costs		**4,446,210**	**7,140,000**

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME ($)

Sources of Co-Financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount ($)
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	140,000
National Government	Government of Kiribati	In-kind	7,000,000
Total Co-financing			**7,140,000**

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY[1]

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name	Grant Amount	Agency Fee	Total
UNDP	LDCF	Climate Change	Kiribati	4,446,210	422,390	4,868,600

[1] In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.
[2] Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)	Project Total ($)
International Consultants	763,000	0	763,000
National/Local Consultants	296,000	0	296,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? N/A

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF[3]

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.:

N/A (no changes)

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities:

N/A (no changes)

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

N/A (no changes)

A.4.The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The PIF called for 7 outer islands to be included within the project umbrella. This approach is untenable given the logistical and capacity challenges of Kiribati. Travel costs alone would have severely limited the ability to deliver intended results. In the end, the project is designed to focus upon three key outer islands and the capital atoll of Tarawa. This approach will insure that the project delivers effective demonstrations. The project is designed to guarantee that lessons learned and capacities built at pilot site islands will be ready for national up-scale using government resources prior to project close.

The basic issues and analysis presented in the PIF remain accurate. However, the final project design takes a slightly more staged approach to the investment in hard goods such as "building artificial reefs" and "constructing storage and processing facilities where needed." Rather than presuming these investments are necessary, the project is designed to first generate the enabling environment required to improve informed decision-making capacity. As explained in the cost-effectiveness section below, this approach helps to make certain investments in hard goods strategically support precise long-term climate change adaptation needs.

Following is a brief summary of findings. The attached Project Document at Part 1 provides substantially more detailed analysis.

General Context:
The nation is composed of 33 islands arranged in three groups: The Line, Phoenix, and Gilbert islands. There are 21 inhabited islands. The nation has very little land and a very large exclusive economic zone (EEZ). Kiribati's EEZ is 3.5 million km^2 or roughly the size of Australia. The total land area is 771 km^2. Kiribati's 21 inhabited islands are ecologically connected via the larger Pacific Ocean, but generally disenfranchised from each other by great distances. Reaching the remote islands from the capital of Tarawa requires substantial effort and cost. Communications services, although improving, are still very sporadic and unreliable. These issues make direct national government oversight of natural resource management and planning nearly impossible.

Most immediate natural resource management decisions occur on the island level. Local Island Councils are responsible for setting and implementing island policies. Twenty islands in Kiribati have Island Councils. The Councils are generally composed of representatives from villages located on the island. Individual members then work at the behest of the village's chief and/or group of elders. According to the Local Government Act, the Island Council has direct jurisdiction over natural resource use. This includes land use, agriculture, and all fisheries located within 5.5 kilometres of the island.

Food security and ecological integrity are highly entwined. The existence of most rural I-Kiribati is almost entirely dependent upon the resources that can be found within the boundary of the surrounding reef. Subsistence fishing is the primary food source for nearly all of rural Kiribati. The nation has the highest per capita fish consumption for all Pacific

[3] For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question

Island nations. On average, each person consumes 115 kg fish annually. Very few fishing families have access to motorized craft. The government estimates that less than 5% of the total fishing families in Kiribati own a motorboat.

Threats:
Three main threats were identified: Overexploitation, primarily of fisheries resources; Habitat degradation, primarily from non-point source pollution; and, climate change. Most coastal zones appear to be ecologically intact. Lagoon fisheries have historically provided amply and fishing methods have tended to be fairly sustainable. However, ecological integrity is highly vulnerable due to "open access" exploitation regimes. Increased population, shifting economic demands, and environmental degradation are all converging to deplete lagoon fisheries. This situation, when combined with the impacts of climate change, poses a very high risk to both food security.

Monitoring of coastal zone fisheries status and use is very thin. Very little rigorous data exists to substantiate the current status of resources. However, strong anecdotal exists. Local community members, leaders and government representatives, and fisheries experts all state that once ample coastal fish stocks are diminishing. The IUCN red list roughly estimates that Kiribati bonefish stocks have likely been depleted by at least 30% over the past fifteen-year period due to overharvest. Stakeholders observe that both the number and size (age) of these fish is dropping. Easily harvested species such as sea cucumber and bonefish are particularly hard-hit. If trends continue, these island systems will collapse due to overexploitation, habitat loss, and climate change.

The Kiribati National Fisheries Policy (2013 – 2025) provides guidance and priorities for fisheries management and investment by donors. The policy recognizes that the challenges to long-term food security are based upon fisheries health. The policy notes that lagoon and coastal fisheries currently provide sufficient protein for most I-Kiribati. These fisheries are under strain from population pressures compounded with climate change. The policy notes that the response to increasing lagoon fisheries pressure should be the management of overfishing in order to maintain sustainable levels. Once ecological integrity and associated climate change resilience is lost, residents will be faced with very serious food security issues.

Solution:
This project seeks to contribute to the long-term solution of ensuring food security within the context of global climate change. Generating island-based management responses designed to maintain the ecological integrity of each system is paramount to achieving the desired solution. The approach must be predicted upon community-based initiatives that benefit from national level guidance, technical support, and scrutiny. This will require setting in place a comprehensive management regime that individual islands can use to monitor and regulate the use of coastal zone resources. Communities must have incentives for improved management and reasonable alternatives to compensate for any food insecurity that may result from the loss direct resource consumption. This can be modified in part through more scientifically rigorous management regimes that help generate more balanced resource access and use. However, communities will also need economic alternatives such as tourism, value added approaches, and/or more creative fiscal policies to compensate for potential loss of resource access. This system of safeguards (monitoring, improved management, and alternative valuation) should all be directed to building and maintaining climate change resilience.

Although the solution is apparent, reaching this solution requires having the capacity to implement necessary resource management safeguards at the individual island level. Although there are nuanced differences between various islands, the basic management regime and story are the same. There are no comprehensive regulatory, planning, and/or monitoring frameworks in place to conserve terrestrial and/or near-shore natural resources. Both lagoon and terrestrial resources are essentially managed under an open access regime. The current open resource management regime is very much the primary driver of ecosystem degradation.

Without basic management tools, resource access remains exposed to continuous and nearly unlimited use. This creates a very risky situation. Under this open resource access regime, all community members may maximize resource use as they see fit. Loss of ecosystem integrity is the root cause of Kiribati's climate change resilience and food security challenges. Only limited access to financing constrains the wholesale exploitation of island resources, e.g., a general lack of motorboats, expense of nets and other equipment, and the challenges of reaching a distant market. As greater donor investment, increased remittances, tourism development and other capital in-flows expand, the existing monetary constraints to resource extraction will slowly erode. A rapidly growing population will compound this situation and impacts. Unless action is taken, the current pathway will lead to a continuing and every more decline in ecosystem integrity. This will result will be increased climate change vulnerability and, ultimately, degraded food security.

Barriers:
Under the baseline, two barriers inhibit the ability to address the threats and reach the desired solution:

Barrier 1: Limited institutional and individual capacity to plan and implement actions to reduce the impacts of climate change-induced impacts on food and nutrition security.

Kiribati does not have a national system of coordinated monitoring, management, and reporting to guide informed decision-making. There is no national tool in place to monitor and assess climate change and associated impacts to ecosystem integrity and food security. There is not a central location and/or process to receive data and information from outer islands, make certain data generation is consistent, professionally collate and assess this information, and disperse this information to inform islands regarding threats analysis and recommended adaptation measures. The country has a pronounced lack of knowledge and awareness regarding coastal zone fisheries. Kiribati does not have a comprehensive and effective coastal zone fisheries research and monitoring program. At the same time, there is no national fisheries conservation campaign in place to build awareness regarding the status and conservation needs of fisheries and associated ecosystems. Kiribati does not have a national framework to support sustainable resource use and build climate change resilience. The national enabling environment for the conservation of coastal zone fisheries is very weak. Extension officers representing national agencies are the primary conduit for capacity building, monitoring, and enforcement on each island. Although Kiribati's extension officers represent the front-line of understanding climate change threats and devising community-based approaches, they have relatively low support to increase both their capacity and effectiveness. There is a very strong need to develop the skills sets necessary for extension officers to engage with island communities to help them understand and generate management objectives, options, and implementation skills.

Barrier 2: Limited support for community-based adaptation measures necessary to increase human, natural and productive livelihood capital in affected communities.

This barrier revolves around the need to build Island Level capacity to shift "open-access" regimes to community-based adaptation approaches. Island Councils do not have the capacity and experience required to utilize their authority to engage in comprehensive and strategic resource management. There are no formal training programs to build this capacity. Island Councils at not exposed to basic integrated conservation approaches and practices. Stakeholders living on the Outer Islands of Kiribati have very little capacity to monitor resource use and status. There is an urgent need for communities to benefit from models for resource inventory and improved understanding of how best to maintain ecosystem integrity for both coastal and terrestrial resources. Without this capacity, there is little opportunity for informed decision-making and/or complete understanding regarding the implications of various management decisions. There is an urgent need to create community-wide awareness programs to serve as a conduit for delivering awareness, monitoring, and resource use skills designed to enhance ecosystem integrity and food security. Communities do not have experience with the design of comprehensive natural resource management and planning. Again, this applies to both terrestrial and coastal zone resources. There are no operational models of Island Councils empowered to comprehensively identify conservation challenges, prioritize climate change vulnerabilities, and adopt improved management practices. Communities do not have experience with successful demonstrations showing how non-consumptive uses of island resources can contribute to the protection of coastal areas, improve climate change resilience and increase food security. Kiribati does not benefit from the active demonstration of community-based alternatives to reduce pressures on fisheries, the mainstay of Kiribati food security. There are no working examples of comprehensive by-laws designed to address food security threats. "Open-access" management approaches pose a serious hindrance to ecosystem integrity and food security.

A. 5.Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The project objective is to build the adaptive capacity of vulnerable Kiribati communities to ensure food security under conditions of climate change.

Baseline (without LDCF intervention)

Food security is an emerging issue for Kiribati's rural poor. The issue of food security in rural Kiribati cannot be separated from the issue of natural resource management, particularly the conservation of critical ecosystem services. Current investment and activity is not adequate to address the level of challenges faced by Kiribati. The current enabling environment is not sufficient to support informed-decision making regarding food security and climate change

adaptation. Substantial work is required to establish a platform to make certain the tools and skills exist to maintain the ecosystem integrity required to bolster climate change adaptation capacity.

The country would very much like to develop a national program to support climate change adaptation that is both community and ecosystem-based. There is a strong desire, but few resources to achieve this benchmark. Kiribati does not have the full financial and technical capacity required to design, draft and launch the implementation of a comprehensive management regime for the conservation and sustainable use of island and coastal zone resources. Under the baseline, the nation does not have the capacity to strategically monitor, plan, and regulate the use of coastal zone resources. The nation is challenged to complete a shift from "open access" resource management to more sustainable community-based management. The tenacious capacity gap exposes ecosystem resilience and corresponding food security to the emerging impacts of climate change.

There is relatively little investment being made on the ground to set in place the safeguards required to make certain the natural resources upon which island dwellers depend remain intact. There is limited baseline information regarding the full status and use of critical resources such as fisheries, freshwater, and agriculture. Nearly all stakeholders acknowledge that these vital resources are in decline, the rate of decline is increasing and that current trends will result in greater vulnerability and food security constraints.

Capacities to generate and implement effective resource conservation measures on the island level are extremely limited. The current approaches will not address the root causes related to a dearth of improved awareness, monitoring, and island-based management regimes. Under business as usual scenario, the work on promoting food security through community based agriculture and fisheries management will continue at a small scale. Degradation will continue to advance at a pace and scale beyond current island capacities. Climate change impacts will accelerate the rate of degradation. There is little chance that required safeguards will be set-in place without project investment.

Adaptation Alternative

The project will support national institutions to set in place capacities to strategically plan, monitor and regulate natural resource use to create the safeguards necessary to insure food security. This improved business model will help insure that ecosystem integrity is maintained at levels required to promote climate change resilience.

Reaching this alternative requires setting in place national programming that helps guide island level management improvements. Logistics, costs, and cultural norms dictate that approaches must be island-based. The project will assist the national government to serve as a central point for administering, guiding and monitoring resource use. The national government will be well positioned to provide broad-oversight, strategic planning, and guidance. The national government will serve as a repository for information generated on the island level. Information will then be used to better understand challenges, inform decision-making, collate lessons learned, and encourage replication of best practices.

The project will assist the government to substantially enhance the capacities of extension officers. These extension officers will increase their ability to support island-level resource management improvements and become a communication conduit between island and national level decision-makers.

The project will support the establishment of national level monitoring to assess the nexus of food security, ecosystem-integrity and climate change adaptation. The project will enhance national institutions to be better able to forecast climate change trends and impacts. A climate change adaptation early warning system linked to a more complete understanding of meteorological events, natural resource use, and ecosystem status will be set in place.

The project will create a national enabling environment required to help shift open resource access to more community-managed approaches. The project will assist national agencies to generate improved guidelines, models, and regulations for island-based approaches to address climate change vulnerability, food security, and the long-term maintenance of ecological integrity. The result will be a national level program to support the generation and implementation of safeguards required to sustainably manage the resources upon which I-Kiribati depend for food security.

The project will support a shift from open access to more community-based coastal ecosystem management framework. This will increase the resilience of coral reefs, sea grass beds and mangroves for increased food production and to strengthen additional ecosystem services (such as buffering from storms) to aid community and ecosystem resilience in context of climate variability and change.

The project will assist select pilot sites to develop models for improved management. Communities will have the tools required to make more informed decisions. With the support of government extension agents, Island Councils and other decision-makers will be tracking and monitoring resource use. They will be able to gauge the positive and negative impacts of various policy decisions upon long-term food security and ecosystem integrity objectives and indicators. These island-based monitoring approaches will be feeding into national monitoring programs to enhance more efficient and cost-effective approaches. Communities will have greatly increased levels of awareness regarding best international management principles and practices. Opportunities to value coastal zone resources through non-consumptive uses will be operationalized. Island communities will have adopted model by-laws designed to generate more sustainable and coordinated use of natural resources.

Each of the tools set in place during project implementation should result in substantially improved capacities for island stakeholders to improve climate change resilience and reduce any emerging challenges to food security and ecological integrity. This will create the fundamental safeguards required to make certain island communities are able to better cope with emerging climate change challenges.

The project's immediate result will be the ability of pilot site communities to demonstrate improved nutritional security by stabilizing ecological integrity and building climate change resilience. The project's long-term result will be setting in place the conditions necessary to upscale and replicate successes nationally. Ultimately, Kiribati's rural communities and government agencies charged with stewarding improved management and will be enabled to understand and strategically implement ecosystem-based adaptation actions far into the future.

SECTION I, PART II Strategy (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC more fully details the full suite of project outcomes, outputs and activities.
The table below summarises and provides a rational for changes made to PIF components, outputs, and co-financing.

Category	PIF	GEF CEO ER	Rationale
Component	Institutional capacity development to reduce vulnerability to climate change-induced food shortages	No Change	
	Implementation of community adaptation measures to increase food security	No Change	
Output	1.1 Development of Climate Early Warning and Information System, and the capacity to use the system nationally including: (i) Extended meteorological and hydrological observations by National Meteorological Service; (ii) identification of critical areas for agro-ecological, hydrological and coastal services in relation to livelihoods, and overlay of likely climate change impacts under modeling scenarios; (iii) development of coastal fisheries spatial database and GIS including predicted impacts of climate on species population and distribution; and (iv) Use of state radio and TV for dissemination of climate risk information, seasonal forecasts related to food production, and warning of extreme events.	*1.1 National Program for Informed Decision Making* through: (i) establishing and trialling the implementation of a national adaptation monitoring and assessment tool (AMAT); (ii) generating information of conservation of coastal zone fisheries, sustainable land management and human health/nutrition; and (iii) enhancing meteorological early warning system through building the capacity of the National Meteorological Service to conduct extended meteorological and hydrological observations; and (iv) use of state radio and TV for dissemination of climate risk information, seasonal forecasts related to food production, and warning of extreme events.	Emphasis is place on decision-making rather than on the establishment of information system in order to encourage practical usage of system. The development of a national adaptation monitoring and assessment tool (AMAT) also highlighted as a cost-effective monitoring that will be specifically adapted to the Kiribati context and environment and it is believed will result in more meaningful information and resultant decisions made rather than investing in modelling scenarios. The final project design adheres to the general vision of the PIF. The final project design builds upon this vision by articulating an integrated, national approach to the generation of information and the application of this information to improve decision-making. Information flowing from islands to the national node

			and then back to the islands will create a learning loop to build long-term capacity to identify and respond to climate change adaptation needs. As explained in the project document, the process will generate comparable data sets allowing the AMAT to serve as a mechanism to inform decision-making and resource allocation on both the national and island level. This will result in much more informed and effective national and island-based decision-making.
	1.2 National policy and planning framework and capacities emplaced to integrate decision making tools to increase adaptation to changed climatic conditions and preparedness for extreme events, and to deploy funds and human resources as needed, including: (i) Training of officials and community groups in the Tarawa Atoll and seven main outer islands to use climate risk information to undertake vulnerability assessments, integrated land/ marine resource-use planning taking into account climate risks, (ii) development of management framework for inshore/lagoonal ecosystems under changing climate, prioritization of adaptation actions for fisheries and food security; and (iii) Review and amendment of fisheries legislation and guidelines to implement measures that enhance resilience to climate impacts, including draft community protocols or by-laws for community-sanctioned set-asides to protect refugia and recruitment areas.	*[The total number of islands was reduced from 8 to 4. The pilot sites include three outer islands (Nonouti, Abemama, and Maiana) and the capital atoll of South Tarawa.]* *1.2 National Guidelines for Ecosystem-based Adaptation Management* consisting of: (i) the creation of model by-laws, (ii) national level capacity building and assessment initiatives establishing baseline of understanding, (iii) training of officials and community groups in the Tarawa Atoll and three outer islands to use climate risk information to undertake vulnerability assessments, integrated land/marine resource-planning taking into account climate risks, development of management framework for inshore/lagoonal ecosystems under changing climate, prioritization for fisheries and food security, and (iv) providing Island Councils with easily adopted templates for the implementation of community and ecosystem-based planning approaches to reduce climate change vulnerability. *1.3. National Coastal Zone Fisheries Monitoring and Conservation Awareness Program* consisting of: (i) building the capacity of the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources to support coastal zone fisheries monitoring, (ii) raising awareness and assisting with national and island prioritization of adaptation actions for fisheries and food security.	*[The logistical costs and capacity challenges in Kiribati made 8 islands untenable. If cost-effective alternatives become feasible, the project may add additional islands to the portfolio. The project compensated by creating a much stronger replication framework, including provisions to help insure that project emplaced capacities attain national coverage before or near to project completion.]* The different components of the output of the PIF has been broken down into logical steps and each has been developed into an output in the CEO ER. The final project design expands upon the preliminary findings of the PIF. The final design maintains and builds from the core elements envisioned in the PIF; e.g., national and local training, lagoon management framework, and amendment of fisheries national legislation and island bylaws. However, the final design substantially strengthens the approach by nesting this within a coherent, national system of ecosystem-based adaptation guidelines and coastal zone fisheries regulations

		1.4. National Coastal Zone Fisheries Conservation Regulations shifting open access to improved community-managed regimes. *1.5. Extension Officer Training* consisting of (i) assessing current capacity and training regime, (ii) developing and implementing training program curriculum and in-service training, and (iii) increasing extension officer numbers and equipping officers in pilot sites	
	2.1 Demonstration of climate resilient fishery practices, including: i) public works to restore vegetative cover in degraded coastal areas to reduce erosion and siltation of coral reefs under changing climate conditions, and monitoring of coral reef siltation levels in pilot sites; (iii) building artificial coral reefs in pilot sites; (v) training community members to participate in monitoring lagoon and coastal ecosystems	The project no longer presumes that erosion based siltation is harming reefs and/or that building artificial reefs is necessary at outer islands. These issues were not found to be evident food security threats during PPG field assessments.	The project is designed to base generation of interventions upon an improved knowledge base. The project will first emplace improved island-based monitoring and awareness. Interventions will be predicated upon this knowledge base and project emplaced strategic climate change adaptation planning. Funded interventions will likely be focused upon conservation of lagoon fisheries and implementation of spatial/temporal conservation approaches. Funding will be released not as "public works" but through a granting mechanism designed to build capacity to implement community-based climate change adaptation interventions that support implementation of the informed planning and management process.
	2.2 Increasing effective processing and storage to act as food buffer during times of shortages at community level because of drought or disruption of transport by storms, including: (i) constructing storage and processing facilities where needed on the seven main outer islands; (ii) feeding information from the Climate Early Warning and Information System into the surplus food collection and distribution system; and (iii) undertaking extension work with communities to promote	Food storage is no longer a fundamental project platform. This was substituted with a much higher emphasis upon conserving ecosystem services.	Findings during the project preparation phase showed that food storage is not a primary concern for island residents. Islands residents are well-aware of and utilize highly effective traditional drying and storage methods. There have been several substantial attempts by donors to finance the construction of food storage and processing facilities. This includes the purchase of freezers for storage, training, and buying motor boats to increase fish take. The objective is not to enhance island food security but create a better commercial fish market in Tarawa. As explained in the project document, these investments have failed. Local

	traditional local preservation methods		communities stated repeatedly that: the operational costs were much higher than economic returns; pushing commercialization of island fisheries poses a risk to island food security since necessary regulatory safeguards are not in place; and, food security does not depend upon storage but upon the availability of lagoon fish stocks which are being depleted by open-access consumption.
		2.1 Vulnerability Assessment and Monitoring Tool Operational assisting communities to accurately assess climate change vulnerability as it relates to general ecosystem integrity and food security. *2.2. Ecosystem-based Adaptation Management Operational* through implementation of national guidelines for ecosystem-based adaptation. *2.3. Island and Coastal Zone Strategic Natural Resource Planning Implemented* through the development and implementation of island and coastal zone plans. Implementation of plans to be supported through provision of grants. *2.4. Island-based Coastal Zone Fisheries Monitoring and Conservation Awareness* *2.5. Coastal Zone Fisheries Conservation By-laws adopted*, including measures for conserving lagoon fisheries. *2.6. Climate Resilient Fisheries Management Practices Demonstrated* through establishment of Fisheries Conservation Field Schools and design and implementation of island-based conservation strategy and management plans. Technical and financial (grants) assistance provided to support implementation of improved fisheries production strategies. *2.7. Models for Community-based Tourism Management Demonstrated* through	The outputs of Component 2 have been reorganised in order to have maximum effect. Some of the elements of the outputs of the PIF were removed for reasons explained above. The revised outputs in the CEO ER respond to some of the elements of the outputs of the PIF: Output 2.1 responds to (i) "feeding information from the Climate Early Warning and Information System into surplus food collection and distribution system" although the emphasis is place on community monitoring to accurately assess ecosystem integrity and food security; (ii) training community members to participate in monitoring lagoon and coastal ecosystems". The rationale of the outputs is discussed above and in detail in the Project Document. The approach adopted in the final project design will greatly increase the investment's impact and sustainability. Island communities will be addressing the root cause of the climate change induced problem. Communities will move from a current regime of unsustainable "open-access" to "community-based management" that will likely be much more climate change resilient. The project will help to improve the ability of coastal zone fisheries to supply adequate food resources for proximate communities for the long-term.

		development of sport-fishing business enterprises.	
Co-financing	*Government of Kiribati – US$ 7,000,000 grant* *To-be-confirmed Bilateral Agencies – US$1,250,000 grant*	Government of Kiribati – US$ 7,000,000 in-kind No co-financing	The Government of Kiribati's co-financing letter stated in-kind co-financing rather than grant, as the Government will be implementing parallel investment rather than direct investment into the project, and felt it more appropriate to label such co-financing in-kind. The project preparation team was unable to secure the PIF-stated amount of indicative co-financing from bilateral agencies of US$1,250,000. The project team and UNDP will during project implementation undertake efforts to secure additional co-financing and will report on results during the project mid-term and terminal evaluations.

The Project Strategic Results Framework is appended in ANNEX A of the GEF CEO ER.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved and measures that address these risks:

Risk/Assumptions	Impact High: 5 Low: 1	Likelihood High: 5 Low: 1	Risk Assessment	Mitigation Measure
FINANCIAL Kiribati will not allocate adequate funds to continue support of project emplaced successes.	4	3		This is a very serious risk was well considered during project design. Kiribati is not a wealthy country. The nation depends largely upon donor aid and income generated from EEZ tuna fishing. The project is designed to set in place improved practices that require substantial up-front costs to develop (e.g., policies, monitoring, community-based management, awareness programs, etc.). However, once emplaced, these practices should require limited funding to support and replicate nationally. The issues that this project is designed to address are ecologically and socially important. This should serve as a further incentive for government to allocate necessary continuation support. The project is designed to assist Island Councils generate the limited funding required to support continuation of island emplaced improvements such as monitoring and permitting. The project has integrated comprehensive "hand-over" plans for all key activities to make certain that before project close the human and financial resources required for continuation are identified and secured at both the island and national level.
INSTITUTIONAL Historically unsustainable implementation practices will stymie long-term project	3	3		Kiribati does not have a strong reputation for integrating and carrying forward project investments. Maintenance, monitoring, and accountability issues have challenged many recent investments, e.g., fish centres, FAD's, etc. The history of paying sitting fees at all levels (national to local) leads to unsustainable

Risk/Assumptions	Impact High: 5 Low: 1	Likelihood High: 5 Low: 1	Risk Assessment	Mitigation Measure
impacts.				participation. The project will work to establish community-based regimes. Individuals will be responsible for maintaining equipment at the bequest of their fellow community members and under the supervision of agency extension officers. The project will not pay sitting fees, but instead provides financial incentives such as grants for community groups that successfully participate in project activities. The project has been scaled to better match the absorptive capacity of Kiribati's institutions at both the national and island levels.
INSTITUTIONAL Low implementation capacities will slow project progress	4	2		The project will help build management and implementation capacities both at government level and at community level. Increasingly complex activities will be implemented only after capacity building comes on line. The project is designed specifically to build capacity incrementally throughout the implementation period and to make certain capacities required to sustain project success are emplaced prior to project completion.
INSTITUTIONAL Uptake of adaptation measures may require extra efforts or inputs by local communities	3	2		The project is designed to address the immediate needs of islanders as expressed by islanders. These persons understand the urgency required to reduce fishery pressures and set in place sustainable management designed to deliver long-term benefits. Where additional costs or inputs are required by the communities, the project has integrated ways to offset such costs. This includes bridging financing in the forms of grants to assist communities with the heavy lifting of moving from activities that reduce resilience to activities that enhance resilience. Where additional information is required to enhance community involvement, the project will build the skills of extension officers to engage with and motivate community-based natural resource management improvements. The project will provide community members with rigorous evidence of the impact of various resource management decisions. The project will apply proven methods (e.g., Rare Pride Campaign) to build community awareness of the urgency of being proactive to improve their capacity to address climate change impacts. This combination of approaches will help make certain of community input.
ENVIRONMENTAL Climatic variations may affect project progress, including community ability to participate, rapid loss of ecosystem integrity, etc.	2	2		The project is designed to build adaptation strength and resilience. The probability of short-term climatic events impacting project progress is low. Kiribati is not generally exposed to extreme weather events (e.g., Kiribati does not have a typhoon or monsoon season). Most climate related impacts in Kiribati are expected to take place gradually (e.g., changes to ocean level and temperature).

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

Project design reflects current GEF initiatives in Kiribati. The proposed project is the only active GEF initiative focused primarily upon conservation of coastal zone fisheries. The "Resilient Islands, Resilient Communities" project is under

design through FAO. The UNDP Country Office is aware of this project and has opened discussions with Government and FAO to be certain the programs are complimentary. Following is a list of current GEF projects.

- Increasing Resilience to Climate Variability and Hazards." (KAP III) World Bank/GEF - KAP III US$ 9.5 million. 2011 - 2016. The projects aims to strengthen the capacity of communities to manage water resources and infrastructure; increase the availability and quality of water at the community level; and, protect targeted coastal areas from storm waves and flooding.
- "PAS: Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA)." UNEP. US$ 890,000. 2011 - 2015. The project will advance implementation of the PIPA Management Plan.
- "R2R Resilient Islands, Resilient Communities." Multi-Focal Area. FAO. US$ 4.7 million. 2015 - 2020. The project will strengthen protected areas and mangrove conservation. The project will review and improve management planning.
- "Support to Alignment of Kiribati's National Action Programme to the UNCCD Ten-Year Strategy and Reporting Process." Land Degradation. UNEP. US$ 136,000. 2014 - 2016. This land degradation project will build capacity of Kiribati to align the NAP with the 10-year UNCCD Strategy and prepare the national report for UNCCD.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation:

This will be achieved through the project steering committee (board) that enjoys representation from all major stakeholder organizations.

The number of stakeholders is very broad for a country with approximately 100,000 residents. This is evidenced by the long list of stakeholders identified in the stakeholder analysis at Section 1.5 of the Project Document. Stakeholder involvement is critical to the effective achievement of all both project outcomes. The project will rely upon a number of tools to make certain stakeholders are fully engaged. The project steering committee (board) will be responsible for making certain that a broad range of national stakeholders are aware of and engaged with project implementation efforts. This will include regular reporting by project management and technical staff regarding the status of project implementation activities and updates regarding challenges, opportunities, and lessons learned. National engagement will be further facilitated through project activities such as training programs and other capacity building efforts designed to incorporate representation from variety of stakeholders and stakeholder organizations.

The project will also benefit from a number of island level based consultative groups to encourage and facilitate more broad-based stakeholder involvement with decision-making. The Island Councils will be the primary mechanism for stakeholder engagement. This will be augmented by project activities designed to include a cross-section of island inhabitants, including training programs, planning operations, and field work. The project is designed specifically to facilitate broad-based participation by island inhabitants in project activities.

Island Councils and village leaders will be critical stakeholders involved in a number of primary activities such as the discussion and adoption of strategic planning, island by-laws, resource monitoring, and implementation of community-based fisheries improvements. Awareness building and training programs will draw upon and integrate a wide-base of community members. A major emphasis of this project is building the capacity of extension officers to improve their stakeholder involvement skills. The process of generating this capacity will help improve overall stakeholder engagement with project implementation.

There are several development and conservation investments that share objectives with the proposed project. The project will utilize a number of approaches to make certain that the proposed project from inception to completion is identifying opportunities and fully engaging with related investments. As part of the stakeholder engagement plan, it will be incumbent upon the project steering committee and management unit to make certain these opportunities are maximized. As noted, government and donor partner stakeholders will be invited to participate in a round-table discussion at the immediate start of this project. Participants will be invited to work cooperatively to seek out ways to make certain implementation is mutually beneficial and synergistic with the existing and emerging investment environment. This will include identifying points of common interest and pathways to make certain implemented activities are leverages to amplify impact. As noted, government and donor partners will be convened annually during project implementation and invited to share updates regarding progress and lessons learned. These stakeholders will also be provided with regular electronic updates, including progress reports and results from on-going and completed activities.

B.2 DESCRIBE the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project will help make certain current and future generations of I-Kiribati benefit from improved delivery of ecosystem services and enhanced food security. This is a significant national and local benefit.

As noted, food security in Kiribati is linked directly to the ability of the ecosystem to sustain residents. Residents have three primary pathways to food security: grow, buy or catch. The ability to purchase food is limited, particularly in the rural islands. The country is one of the poorest in world. Remittances, funds generated by offshore tuna fisheries, donor activities, and government jobs support most of the country's economy. The ability to grow substantial quantities of food is limited on all islands and extremely limited on most islands. The country has very little fresh water and low soil fertility. The nation's historically rich coastal zone fisheries are by far the most important source of nutrition. The nation has the highest per capita fish consumption for all Pacific Island nations. On average, each person consumes 115 kg fish annually. Very few fishing families have access to motorized craft. Less than 5% of Kiribati fishing families own a motorboat.

If the survival of Kiribati depends upon artisanal fishing, food security relies upon the status of each island's ecosystem integrity. Unfortunately, the integrity of island ecosystems is being degraded by over-fishing, non-point source pollution, and the emerging impacts of climate change. The degradation trend is particularly acute on islands and locations with close economic ties with Tarawa. This analysis tracks precisely with the findings of Kiribati's key policies. The project will reverse this trend by setting in place community-based management improvements enhanced by national level support mechanisms. These improvements will generate natural resource management approaches designed to build, rather than degrade, the resilience of ecosystems and subsequently support the realization of long-term food security needs. In this way, the project will provide substantial national/local socioeconomic benefits and tangible adaptation benefits.

The project will also assist I-Kiribati to realize alternative revenue streams via sustainable tourism. This climate change adaptation device will help island communities improve resilience by generating economic benefits from the non-consumptive use of island resources. Sport fishing on Kiritimati (Christmas Island) is very important to Kiribati. The government often refers to Kiritimati as a potential model for decreasing pressures on coastal zone fisheries. The island has approximately 7,500 inhabitants. Fly-fishing at Kiritimati Island generates a maximum gross of US$ 4,500,000/year. Other islands have been slow to generate similar initiatives, largely due to the lack of a proper enabling environment to protect the quality of the fishing experience and operationalize community support for tourism. Without this framework, there is limited incentive for international outfitters to invest in remote atolls. The risks are too great that the communities will deplete the resource and the quality of service will be sub-standard. By demonstrating community-based sport fishing on at least one pilot site, the project will establish a pathway for the realization of substantial socioeconomic benefits while increasing climate change resilience.

This project has several innovative approaches to make certain issues of gender are well-integrated and reflected project implementation. The project will be implemented with the support of several NGOs, CBOs, and church groups that are focused upon gender. The project will pursue a gender-sensitive approach whereby women's participation in training workshops, demonstration activities and management committees will be strongly promoted. Gender and other social inclusion issues will be considered in all stages of project development and implementation.

The community-based management model by-laws and other implementation guidelines will contain specific sections and references to issues of gender. The extension programs implemented through this project will have components designed especially for women and women cohorts. The project's monitoring efforts will be disaggregated by gender to be certain women, women headed households, and women led economic and subsistence issues are well understood and part of the project's overall monitoring framework. Gender balance will be sought and achieved for all project governance. During project inception, the final management and decision-making framework will make certain that issues of gender are well incorporated.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

During project design, several alternative scenarios were considered from the point of view of cost-effectiveness. Many stakeholders recommended that the project focus upon physical interventions such as the purchase of freezer equipment,

artificial reef restoration, sea-wall construction, placement of fish aggregating devices (FAD's), and creation of fishponds. Some or all of these physical investments might have provided short-term impacts. However, these were not considered cost-effective investments. Building these structures is very expensive and their effectiveness as a tool to enhance ecosystem integrity and food security is unproven. In spite of efforts conducted during the project design phase, there is still no firm knowledge platform upon which to base decision-making. Rigorous data does not exist showing the status of coastal zone waters and the precise causes of potential degradation. Without this information, there is no way of accurately predicting whether these investments would actually generate positive food security impacts. In addition, Monitoring tools are not in place to determine the positive and negative impacts of infrastructure investments once they are made. There is no regulatory framework mandating responsibilities for the upkeep and maintenance of such investments. There is no regulatory framework in place to make certain well-reasoned and strategic approaches are taken once information and understanding of impacts exist.

These issues were deliberated extensively during the project design process. After carefully considering conservation priorities, stakeholders abandoned these costly options and decided on an approach that is designed to incrementally build the capacity required to make more informed decisions effectively address the open access regimes that are the root cause of resource vulnerabilities. Rather than rush to make investments in physical demonstrations that may or may not support achievement of the project objective, the project will take an incremental approach to implementation.

Initial project investments will first build the framework necessary to make informed decisions on the national and island level. The project will support the generation of information stakeholders require to understand resource trends and prioritize interventions, e.g., adaptation monitoring and assessment tool and fisheries conservation awareness campaign. The project will next build the enabling framework. This will commence with the ecosystem-adaptation management tool, progress to the island-based resource management plan, and culminate in a national regulation and island by-laws for fisheries conservation.

While the framework for informed decision-making is being built, the project will simultaneously construct the capacity of extension officers to effectively support island-based implementation of improved monitoring, oversight, and demonstration of best practices related to ecosystem integrity and food security.

Investments in the demonstration of improved management approaches will occur only after the awareness, monitoring and decision-making frameworks are in place. This will insure that demonstrations are predicated upon a more complete accounting of challenges and are targeted to precisely address those challenges. In this way, demonstrations will respond more accurately to the needs of stakeholders with improved knowledge regarding best international principles and practices. For instance, the interventions to be modeled under Output 2.6 will only be designed/implemented after the pilot sites have established a strategic planning framework and adopted resource management by-laws. This approach will greatly enhance cost-effectiveness. Demonstration investments nested within an improved enabling environment will be better poised to be ecologically, socially, and financially sustainable.

On a broader level, project investments will create capacity and decision-making pathways that enable local governments to make pro-conservation investments rather than ill-advised and unsustainable short-term investments. This framework for informed decision-making will deliver returns well beyond the initial investment period.

The project is designed to do the heavy lifting of evincing improved understanding, decision-making, and results oriented management practices at a few distinct locations. However, the project will set in place from the beginning the institutional and policy enabling environment required to capture best practices and replicate these practices nationally. The project's pilot sites will be centres of excellence, offering models for other islands to follow. The monitoring, planning, regulatory and demonstration activities at each pilot site will be designed so that they can easily be uplifted, transferred, and mimicked by other Island Councils and stakeholders. National institutions, including those responsible for agriculture and fisheries, will have extension programs in place to facilitate this transfer of success for very little overhead. The heavy investment costs of supplying technical expertise and capacity building are carried upfront. This means that investments made over the project's lifespan will not only catalyse a substantial course change at the pilot site level, those improvements will be amplified post-project to cover a much larger geographic area. Ultimately, the same best practices will be modified and adopted by each of Kiribati's inhabited islands. This will help insure national level ecosystem integrity and food security.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

Project start: A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and program advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including: (a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. (b) Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. (c) Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. (d) The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed. (e) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks. (f) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled. (g) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit. (h) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organization structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 2 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Project Implementation Work Plan: Immediately following the inception workshop, the project will be tasked with generating a strategic work plan. The work plan will outline the general timeframe for completion of key project outputs and achievement of outcomes. The work plan will map and help guide project activity from inception to completion. To ensure smooth transition between project design and inception, the inception workshop and work planning process will benefit from the input of parties responsible for the design of the original project, including as appropriate relevant technical advisors.

Quarterly: Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical). Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot. Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually (Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR)): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following: (a) Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes – each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative); (b) Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual); (c) Lesson learned/good practice; (d) AWP and other expenditure reports; (e) Risk and adaptive management; (f) ATLAS QPR; (g) Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits: UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no more than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term of project cycle: The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation during mid-point of project implementation (project months 28 – 29). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated

as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization and terms of reference of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The international evaluator/team leader will be recruited directly by the Regional Coordinating Unit of UNDP-GEF. This independent expert will be recruited at least six months prior to the planned commencement of the mid-term evaluation. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project: An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and knowledge sharing: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and visibility requirements: Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at http://intra.undp.org/ coa/branding.shtml, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: http://intra.undp.org/branding/ useOfLogo.html. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP logo can be accessed at http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml.

Full compliance is required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/ documents/C.40.08 Branding the GEF%20final 0.pdf. Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

M&E Work Plan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	**Responsible Parties**	**Budget US$** *Excluding project team staff time*	**Time frame**
Inception Workshop and Report	Project Manager UNDP CO, UNDP GEF GEF operational / political focal points	Indicative cost: $50,000	Within first two months of project start up

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ *Excluding project team staff time*	Time frame
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on *output and implementation*	Oversight by Project Manager Project team	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP EEG GEF operational focal point	$ 10,000	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	Project manager and team	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) GEF operational focal point	Indicative cost: $50,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) GEF operational focal point	Indicative cost: $50,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	Project manager and team UNDP CO Local consultant GEF operational focal point	None	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	UNDP CO Project manager and team	Indicative cost –per year: $5,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives GEF operational focal point	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST *Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses*		US$ 185,000	

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE *(MM/DD/YYYY)*
Mrs Nenenteiti Teariki-Ruatu	GEF OFP	Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development	04/05/2013

B. GEF AGENCY (IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date *(Month, day, year)*	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adrian Dinu, UNDP - GEF Executive Coordinator,		Dec 18, 2014	Johan Robinson, Regional Technical Advisor, EBD, UNDP	+66-2-304-9100 Ext. 5102	johan.robinson@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Project Objective: To build the adaptive capacity of vulnerable Kiribati communities to ensure food security under conditions of climate change.	Percentage of households and communities that have stable or increased food security in the face of climate change	Current trajectory of resource use signify increased future food insecurity (actual household food security will be defined during Year 1 of project and presented as gender-disaggregated data)	By the end of the project 100% of men, women and children of targeted islands (Nonouti, Abemama, Maiana) have stable and/or increased levels of food security increasing their resilience against climate change	The project will design and implement a survey to be administered by health clinics at each pilot site to determine levels of food security.	High-level ownership by primary government stakeholders to apply reforms continues Substantial buy-in from island stakeholders is sustained and expanded Rate of capacity building can match pace of required changes.
	Number of bonefish (*Albula glossodonta*) increasing and/or stable. * Bonefish are the main protein source for I-Kiribati and an indicator of over-all coastal zone fishery health.	<u>Nonouti</u> Estimated number of bonefish: TBD <u>Abemama</u> Estimated number of bonefish: TBD <u>Maiana</u> Estimated number of bonefish: TBD <u>South Tarawa</u> Estimated number of bonefish: TBD	<u>Nonouti</u> Estimated number of bonefish: Stable or increasing compared to baseline <u>Abemama</u> Estimated number of bonefish: Stable or increasing compared to baseline <u>Maiana</u> Estimated number of bonefish: Stable or increasing compared to baseline <u>South Tarawa</u> Estimated number of bonefish: Stable or increasing compared to baseline	The project will support the design and implementation of a coastal zone fisheries monitoring program. The monitoring program will be designed under Component 1 and implemented through Component 2. This will include rigorous reporting on bonefish catch rates and fisheries health.	
	Percentage of Kiribati population covered by the enhanced early warning system	The existing communication systems are inadequate to send	95% of Kiribati population receives early warning in a timely manner using one of	Radio and Television Reports	

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
		early warning message in timely manner	the multiple communication lines		
Outcome 1 Institutional capacity development to reduce vulnerability to climate change-induced food shortages	**Outputs:** 1.1 National program for informed decision-making. 1.2 National Guidelines for Ecosystem-based Adaptation Management 1.3 National Coastal Zone Fisheries Monitoring and Conservation Awareness Program 1.4 National Coastal Zone Fisheries Conservation Regulation 1.5 Extension Officer Training				
	GoK provides annual financial support to maintain of national adaptation and monitoring tool.	GoK annual support for AMAT: 0	GoK annual support for AMAT: US$ 25,000	Project reports and documents. National AMAT delivered. National guidelines delivered. Results of training programs. Reports from island based extension officers.	High-level ownership by primary government stakeholders to apply reforms continues Rate of capacity building can match pace of required changes
	Total hectares of island territory managed according to land use plans developed using national guidelines for ecosystem-based adaptation management	<u>Nonouti</u> Area with EBA land use plan: 0 ha <u>Abemama</u> Area with EBA land use plan: 0 ha Maiana Area with EBA land use plan: 0 ha	<u>Nonouti</u> Area with EBA land use plan: 2,000 ha <u>Abemam</u> Area with EBA land use plan: 2,700 ha Maiana Area with EBA land use plan: 2,700 ha		
	Hectares of coastal zone fishing management areas regulated through zoning system as a result of national regulatory tool adopted by GoK.	<u>Nonouti</u> Regulated fishing area: 0 ha <u>Abemama</u> Regulated fishing area: 0 ha <u>Maiana</u> Regulated fishing area: 0 ha	<u>Nonouti</u> Regulated fishing area: 40,000 ha <u>Abemama</u> Regulated fishing area: 15,000 ha <u>Maiana</u> Regulated fishing area: 0 ha		

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Coastal Zone Fisheries Regulation adopted based upon increased level of national awareness about links between improved coastal ecosystem management and sustainability and resilience of subsistence coastal fisheries livelihoods.	0: National Coastal Zone Fishing Regulation adopted	1: National Coastal Zone Fishing Regulation adopted		
	Cohort of ten extension officers increase capacity score as a result of project training program based upon GEF Capacity Result 2 (Capacities to generate, access and use information knowledge).	Cohort of eight agriculture extension officers CR2 capacity score: 3 Cohort of eight fisheries extension officers CR2 capacity score: 3 * Score range: 0 - 15	Cohort of eight agriculture extension officers CR2 capacity score: 15 Cohort of eight fisheries extension officers CR2 capacity score: 15 * Score range: 0 - 15		
Outcome 2 Implementation of community adaptation measures to increase food security	**Outputs:** 2.1 Ecosystem-based Adaptation Management Operational 2.2 Vulnerability Assessment and Monitoring Tool Operational 2.3 Island and Coastal Zone Strategic Natural Resource Planning Implemented 2.4 Island-based Coastal Zone Fisheries Monitoring and Conservation Awareness Program 2.5 Coastal Zone Fisheries Conservation By-laws Adopted 2.6 Climate Resilient Fisheries Management Practices Demonstrated 2.7 Models for Sustainable Tourism Demonstrated				
	Increase in total hectares of coastal zone protected (fish recovery zones) for fisheries developed using national guidelines for ecosystem-based adaptation management.	Nonouti Fish recovery zones: 0 ha Abemama Fish recovery zones: 0 ha Maiana Fish recovery zones: 0 ha	Nonouti Fish recovery zones: 4,000 ha Abemama Fish recovery zones: 4,000 ha Maiana Fish recovery zones: 4,000 ha	Project monitoring reports Results of island monitoring activities Reports from Island Councils to AMAT Evaluation mission reports	Substantial buy-in from island stakeholders is sustained and expanded Rate of capacity building can match pace of required changes Project resources are not overextended in an attempt to pilot interventions at more locations than feasible

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Increase in hectares of mangrove habitat as reported annually by Island Councils using the national adaptation and monitoring tool (AMAT).	Nonouti Mangrove (ha): TBD Abemama Mangrove (ha): TBD Maiana Mangrove (ha): 273	Nonouti Mangrove (ha): 10% increase compared to baseline Abemama Mangrove (ha): 10% increase compared to baseline Maiana Mangrove (ha): 300+		
	Number of existing commercial fishing operators with permits allocated and monitored based upon implementation of coastal zone fisheries conservation by-laws.	Nonouti Commercial Permits: 0 Abemama Commercial Permits: 0 Maiana Commercial Permits: 0	Nonouti Commercial Permits: 5 Abemama Commercial Permits: 5 Maiana Commercial Permits: 5		
	Capacity score of Fisheries Conservation Field School participants increases based upon GEF Capacity Result 2 (Capacities to generate, access and use information knowledge).	Nonouti FCFS Scorecard CR2: 1 Abemama FCFS Scorecard CR2: 1 Maiana Scorecard CR2: 1 * Score range: 0 - 15	Nonouti FCFS Scorecard CR2: 15 Abemama FCFS Scorecard CR2: 15 Maiana Scorecard CR2: 15 * Score range: 0 - 15		

PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES	INDICATOR	BASELINE	END OF PROJECT TARGETS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
	Amount of revenue generated annually by Island Councils from the use of coastal zone resources to support fisheries conservation.	Nonouti AU$ 0 Abemama AU$ 0 Maiana AU$ 0	Nonouti AU$ 15,000 Abemama AU$ 5,000 Maiana AU$ 5,000		

)

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

Comments	Response	Reference in documents
Comments by Germany		
Germany welcomes that the proposed project is in line the priorities identified in Kiribati's NAPA and that it is well coordinated with other larger Pacific Islands initiatives, such as the GEF Ridge to Reef Programme. However, Germany kindly suggests some improvements to the PIF. Some of the described expected outcomes and outputs do not seem to be related. For instance, the described outcomes "Improved system in place in at least eight islands for storage of surplus food" of component 1 and the outcome "Increase in aquaculture production of climate resilient fish species" of component two lack of corresponding outputs or, at least, the link is not adequately shown. In addition, Germany recommends that concrete activities for the two components are outlined in more detail along the whole proposal.	This comment was fully incorporated in the final project design. The project takes a much more strategic approach to the identification and prioritization of specific interventions. This includes first setting in place the enabling and decision-making environment required to determine specific investments. For instance, during the project design phase, it was determined that aquaculture is not necessarily the best course of action. The outer islands all have ample wild fisheries. The issue is how best to conserve and utilize these wild fisheries in light of pending climate change challenges. Further, findings during the project preparation phase showed that food storage is not a primary concern for island residents. Islands residents are well-aware of and utilize highly effective traditional drying and storage methods. There have been several substantial attempts by donors to finance the construction of food storage and processing facilities. This includes the purchase of freezers for storage, training, and buying motor boats to increase fish take. The objective is not to enhance island food security but create a better commercial fish market in Tarawa. As explained in the project document, these investments have failed. Local communities stated repeatedly that: the operational costs were much higher than economic returns; pushing commercialization of island fisheries poses a risk to island food security since necessary regulatory safeguards are not in place; and, food security does not depend upon storage but upon the availability of lagoon fish stocks which are being depleted by open-access consumption.	N/A
Regarding the output "New national agriculture and fisheries legislation and guidelines in place" Germany recommends to explain in detail the entry point of the corresponding activities as well as to describe the mandate of the project to be involved in such activities. This should ensure that the planned activities are accepted and welcomed by the local authorities as well as they enjoy the ownership of all involved stakeholders.	This is fully taken on board. The project through both Component 1 and Component 2 generate a much more full analysis of regulatory needs and establish a well-reasoned approach for addressing these needs. For instance, the immediate priority as described by national and local stakeholders is the creation of a regulatory framework to shift current open access use of coastal zone fisheries to a more sustainable community-based approach. This is reflected in the final project design. As the request came from stakeholders, including national and local government, buy-in and commitment have been ensured for the necessary legislative changes.	Please see Project Document PART II: STRATEGY, Section 2.4. Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities
Germany welcomes that the proposed project includes the training of officials and community groups to undertake vulnerability assessments (output 1.2 (i)). However, Germany recommends explaining in more detail what kind of insights these assessments should deliver and for which planning processes or other purposes the results of the	The final project design addresses the concern/comment. The project will establish national guidelines for the completion of vulnerability assessments and on-going monitoring. These guidelines will specify the insights to be included in the assessments and the purposes to which the results will be put. The project will build national and local level capacity to both complete assessments and make	Please see Project Document PART II: STRATEGY, Section 2.4. Project Objective,

assessments will be used. This is important in order to determine the actual exposure units, the necessary informational input as well as ensure stakeholder' acceptance of the assessment results.	the assessment process organic and linked very closely to a continuing process of decision-making that will become increasingly sophisticated as capacity is generated.	Outcomes and Outputs/Activities, especially Output 1.2 "National Guidelines for Ecosystem-based Adaptation Management" and Output 2.1 "Vulnerability Assessment and Monitoring Operational".
Germany further recommends that the full proposal should refer its design towards the *Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries* to link the projects aim of improved fisheries policies to a globally valid and proven foundation. Targets to improve fisheries management should not disregard the industrial fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) as linkages between near- and offshore fisheries are excessive and industrial fishery in the EEZ is substantial for the economy of Kiribati. This should be done in cooperation with the EU as Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPAs) between the EU and Kiribati are currently in place. Trainings for local fishers to diversify near shore catches should be taken into account to increase the adaptive capacity and income as well as nutrition diversity.	This concern was shared during project design. The Australian Government and SPC are investing substantially in improving the regulatory framework for the EEZ. The impacts to the EEZ come from large, industrial and primarily international fishing operations targeting the lucrative tuna trade. Local fishing communities do very little fishing within the EEZ. They have almost no means to reach beyond the coastal zone fishery, e.g., less than 5% own a motorboat and these boats are generally not capable of open sea fishing. Although there is certainly an ecological link between coastal zone fisheries and the EEZ, most of the fish that local communities rely upon for their food security are not pelagic. However, while it is true that the project deals with inshore fisheries, it is dealing with the national policy realm and under Output 1.4 "National Coastal Fisheries Conservation Regulation" the project will support the adoption of a National Coastal Zone Fisheries Conservation Regulation designed to fill the current gaps within the National Fisheries Act (which focuses mainly on the EEZ), the linkages will be made within a unified policy framework. Further, work was done during the PPG to align the project to the ongoing "Fisheries Sector Policy Development" Project of the European Union which is assisting MFMRD to promote responsible fishing in Kiribati deep-waters (tuna) and support the achievement of FAO's code of conduct for responsible fisheries. Under Output 2.6. "Climate Resilient Fisheries Management Practices Demonstrated", the project will establish and demonstrate climate resilient fisheries management practices at each of the three island pilot sites (Abemama, Nonouti and Maiana). This will include the establishment of Fisheries Conservation Field Schools and through these schools demonstrate fisheries related activities that would promote sustainable development. In line with the comment on trainings of local fishers to diversify near shore catches, the training/capacity building and demonstration under this output will include sustainable harvest programs for non-finfish; enhanced opportunities for sustainable take of near-	Please see Project Document PART II: STRATEGY, Section 2.4. Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities, in particular Output 1.4. "National Coastal Fisheries Conservation Regulation", Output 2.6. "Climate Resilient Fisheries Management Practices Demonstrated" and Project Document, paragraph 101

	island pelagic fish stocks, and sustainable product diversification (e.g. seaweed harvest).	
Germany embraces the idea to implement protected areas but it should be considered to not only have temporary protected areas according to spawning season but all year round marine protected areas (MPAs) as these have proven to be more effective and increase biomass significantly.	The project reflects this. The project will utilize methodologies for coastal zone fisheries conservation proven through programs such as Rare/Fish Forever. Based upon a much more enhanced monitoring program, including the generation of currently absent baseline data regarding fishery health, the project will work with local island communities to generate spatial and temporal coastal zone fisheries management plans/approaches. This will include a combination of both temporary and year round MPA's to serve as centres for refugia.	Please see Project Document PART II: STRATEGY, Section 2.4. Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities, in particular Output 2.3. "Island and Coastal Zone Strategic Natural Resource Planning Implemented"
Aquaculture is an appreciated and expedient method to enhance food security and the availability of fish. As land areas in Kiribati are small the project should not only focus on enhancing pond aquaculture but also verify the possibility of near shore cage cultures of salt water tolerant species. Additionally it should be examined whether aquaculture can be introduced into existing agricultural areas as integrated aquaculture increases income and food security due to diversification.	This will be considered during project implementation based upon the results of monitoring and conservation programs emplaced. Preliminary examination shows that currently the coastal zone fisheries of all islands - but for extremely over-populated South Tarawa - provide adequate fish to support inhabitant's needs. The first priority is to secure the long-term conservation of these coastal zone fisheries. If this is shown to not be adequate to support food security, then more intensive aquaculture may be considered.	N/A
Approaches towards the GIZ project *"Management of marine and coastal biodiversity of Pacific Islands and atoll states"* should be made as the topic is similar and synergies to gain for both projects.	This was considered and principles/practices incorporated within the project design. The project will enhance this during implementation. GIZ is supporting a "whole island" approach project at Abaiang. During project implementation and starting with inception, the project will sponsor a series of annual workshops to make certain that GIZ lessons and success are fully incorporated and reflected.	N/A
Comments from the United States		
Whether the project proposes to build an entirely new Climate Early Warning and Information System (EWS) or whether the proposed project will expand on an existing EWS to design and build in a component specifically related to food production	As noted in the project document, the project will build upon and improve the existing system. The following is stated in the Project Document that addressed this comment: *The AMAT will inform and be informed by an <u>enhanced MET early warning system</u>. <u>This will make use of existing meteorological stations</u>. The project will build the capacity of the National Meteorological Service to conduct extended meteorological and hydrological observations. As necessary, the project will support the enhancement of these capacities by providing up-to-date information gathering and distribution systems on each of the pilot sites. This will include the establishment of equipment required and the use of state radio and TV for dissemination of climate risk information, seasonal forecasts related to food production, and warning of extreme events".*	Please see Project Document PART II: STRATEGY, Section 2.4. Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities, Output 1.1 "National Program for Informed Decision-making", paragraph 127.

How users will be involved both in the design of the EWS and in deciding what information is produced from the EWS as well as how information will be disseminated. Better results can be achieved by ensuring that climate information and early warning system products are user-driven and communicated to users through various innovative channels.	As explained above, the EWS will be linked with AMAT. This will all be informed and driven by Island Councils which have ultimate authority and responsibility for island resources. This will insure that the process has full stakeholder engagement.	Please see Project Document PART II: STRATEGY, Section 2.4. Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities, Output 2.1 "Vulnerability Assessment and Monitoring Tool Operational".
How the two project Components will be linked. Component 1 outlines the development of an EWS specifically related to food production and Component 2 proposes conducting participatory vulnerability assessments integrating anticipated climate risks. Will the vulnerability assessments in Component 2 use information produced by the EWS developed in Component 1?	Yes. The project designers took full conservation of this comment. Components 1 and 2 are now very closely linked to build synergies between national capacity development (Component 1) and island based capacity development (Component 2). The project is designed to increase communication flow between national agencies and island stakeholders, creating a much more comprehensive and informed web to support decision-making.	As above.
Clarify how it will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project	This is fully incorporated with mechanisms to capture lessons at all levels and disseminate those lessons broadly. The project has been improved to create a much more integrated approach that will create demonstrations of improved climate change resilience that can be replicated through national level programming to outer islands.	As above.
Expand on how it will ensure the sustainability of climate change adaptation education for community groups and farmers as mentioned on page 9 under Component 2	The project will work to enhance extension for both fisheries and agriculture. National extension training will be augmented with on-the-ground training in the form of field schools. These will be used to enhance knowledge/awareness of user groups and also build the capacity of extension officers to replicate similar programming nationally. Extension officers are generally the only full-time representatives of national level natural resource management agencies located on each atoll. A training program's curriculum and complimentary in-service training will be designed. This National Extension Training Program will ideally be a local Kiribati organization tasked with developing and implementing the training. The curriculum will be of use after project closure for on-going training. Further, the project will augment the current 'single officer" approach by funding a second officer. It is envisioned that by project close, the two officer system will either adopted formally by government with all costs covered, the second officer with enhanced capacities may be relocated to another island that was not part of the original pilot sites; and/or the second officer may return to Tarawa to work within the ministry to help generate greater extension support capacity at the national level. At least one year prior to project close, the project's technical staff working with relevant government agencies and trained extension officers will re-visit the initial project extension assessment. At this point, a comprehensive hand-over strategy will be designed.	Please see Project Document PART II: STRATEGY, Section 2.4. Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities, Output 1.5 "Extension Officer Training" and Output 2.6 "Climate Resilient Fisheries Management Practices Demonstrated".

	The strategy will detail how established extension officer capacity improvement efforts will be sustained beyond project close. Regarding the Fisheries Conservation Field Schools (FCFS), the sustainability of this approach will be ensured through the involvement and support of the Extension Officers. A curriculum will also be developed for FCFS that will integrate community based management and climate change adaptation principles and practices that can be used by extension officers after project close to conduct training. Prior to project close, lessons learnt from FCFS activity will be captured for national dissemination.	
Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women and indigenous groups, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project	Kiribati is a country with only 100,000 inhabitants. The project development process was very inclusive. Government agencies from across the board were involved with and commented on program development. The project development team included representatives from nearly a dozen agencies. The project development team that participated in field work included three men and six women. Field work was conducted at pilot sites with two team members canvassing communities. The effort involved women team members specifically soliciting the opinions of women stakeholder cohorts to make certain their viewpoints were open and unbiased. This same sensitivity to issues of gender will be carried forward during project implementation.	Please see CEO Endorsement Request PART II SECTION B2.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS[4]

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

N/A

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)		
	Budgetd Amount	Amount Spent to date	Amount Committed
Component A: Technical Review	45,000.00	37,763.63	7,236.38
Component B: Institutional Arrangement, Monitoring and Evaluation	25,000.00	20,979.79	4,020.21
Component C: Financial Planning and Co-financing Investments	15,000.00	12,587.88	2,412.13
Component D: Validation Workshop	20,000.00	16,783.83	3,216.17
Component E: Completion of Final Documentation	15,000.00	12,587.88	2,412.13
Total	120,000.00	100,703.00	19,297.00

[4] If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

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

N/A