GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9041**		
Country/Region:	**Kiribati**		
Project Title:	**Enhancing "whole of islands" approach to strengthen community resilience to climate and disaster risks in Kiribati**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5447 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$8,925,000**
Co-financing:	**$45,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$53,925,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Fareeha Iqbal**	Agency Contact Person:	**Shoko Takemoto**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	Yes, it is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	FI, March 16, 2015: More information is requested. The project is consistent with priorities laid out in Kiribati's NAPA relating to water resources management, coastal zone management, agriculture, and coastal defense. It is also consistent	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		with Kiribati's 'National Framework for Climate Change and Climate Change Adaptation', the Kiribati Integrated Environment Policy, and the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for DRM and CCA. The project also supports the NAP process by building on and strengthening existing initiatives and capacities. The GEF has made significant adaptation-relevant investments in Kiribati through previous projects, but the PIF does not clarify how the proposed project will build upon the capacities built and investments made. Recommended action: Please briefly outline how the current project will build upon the previously-financed adaptation-relevant measures that the GEF and other donors have supported. Update, FI, April 15, 2015: Yes for PIF stage. The project will (i) address gaps and lessons learned through previously-financed GEF projects in Kiribati; and (ii) review, enhance or scale-up methodologies and tools developed by previous and ongoing GEF investments.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		By CEO Endorsement: Please provide specifics/details on how gains achieved through previously-financed GEF investments are being built upon through this project.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	FI, March 16, 2015: More information is requested on sustainability and scale-up. Sustainability: The project includes strong capacity building elements and, in seeking to embed climate change adaptation considerations at the policy level, will contribute to sustained and resilient long-term planning. However, more information is requested on how the LDCF investments will be sustained and maintained after 5 years, when the project closes. Scale-up: The project is being implemented on a pilot basis in selected areas of specific islands. Please discuss whether it will be feasible to scale up these approaches on other islands of Kiribati and the Pacific region generally. Innovation: Yes for PIF stage. The 'Whole of Island' (WoI) approach to	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation is innovative, as it targets the island ecosystem, communities and governance structures. Update, FI, April 15, 2015: Yes, comments on potential for sustainability and scale-up have been adequately addressed for PIF stage. Sustainability: The project proposes, together with support from another LDCF project, to build capacity of the Office of Te Beretitenti (OB) for climate change adaptation activity oversight. It also seeks to translate climate change adaptation policies into legal frameworks. Scale-up: There is strong national and local commitment for adopting the WoI approach to climate resilience in Kiribati as well as other PICs. The project seeks to demonstrate some of the technical, political and financial synergies that will be needed for this to happen. By CEO Endorsement: Several LDCF projects provide adaptation benefits at the ecosystem, community and governance levels. Please discuss how the LDCF contribution to the 'Whole of Island' adaptation approach in Kiribati is	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		particularly innovative. Also, please provide information on the adaptation-friendly legal frameworks developed/enhanced as a result of support from this project. Please discuss, in the Risks section, some of the potential constraints to scale-up or adoption of the WoI approach across Kiribati (and in other PICs), and how these might be addressed.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes. Kiribati is highly vulnerable to adverse impacts of climate change in myriad ways, spanning exacerbation of extreme events (coastal storms, droughts, floods), salt-water inundation, pests and disease, and consequent impacts on food security, infrastructure, and other sectors. The proposed project aims at supporting development that is climate-resilient, by strengthening capacity across multiple stakeholder groups (communities, including women and youth groups; national government; island councils) on climate change adaptation, and supporting investments in climate resilience (climate-resilient crop varieties, adaptive land use and farming techniques, enhancement of	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		water storage and use efficiency, protection of freshwater aquifers, etc.).	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	FI, March 16, 2015: Further information is requested. 1) Component 2 includes the revision or development of island and community vulnerability and adaptation assessments. LDCF resources are generally not intended for this purpose; is it possible to seek resources for the assessments elsewhere instead? 2) This PIF request is for overall LDCF financing of almost $10 million. Yet the UNDP is contributing only $50,000 in grant co-financing, and all remaining co-financing from other sources is in-kind. Please explain the Agency's decision to contribute exceedingly low resources in co-financing for this otherwise ambitious project. Update, FI, April 15, 2015: Yes. Comment (1) provided on March 16 has been adequately addressed; the Government of Kiribati is keen to see adaptation policies be more evidence-based, thus revisions and development of V&A is considered important for this project. However, the Agency will seek to obtain	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		alternate/supplementary resources for this activity. Comment (2) has also been satisfactorily addressed for PIF stage. UNDP currently has limited programming budget for the Pacific, but is seeking to expand resources for this initiative. By CEO endorsement: a) Please specify which islands in Kiribati the LDCF resources will support resilience measures on. If there are parallel adaptation efforts ongoing on these islands, how can we track adaptation benefits being provided through the LDCF? b) Component 3 will support shoreline protection measures. Please consider keeping infrastructure design sufficiently flexible to allow for further adjustment, as sea level and shoreline continue to change over future years. Please also provide information on all the investments that will be made in climate-resilient agriculture and water supply. c) Please consider greater Agency commitment to this project through increased co-financing support (currently $50,000).	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements,	Yes for PIF stage. A broad range of stakeholder groups has been	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	identified, and relevant gender concerns have been broadly mentioned. By CEO Endorsement: Please provide more information on how vulnerable community groups will be consulted and engaged during project design and implementation.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes. Update, FI, April 15, 2015: Yes, however please see comment for Item 8 below.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	FI, March 16, 2015: Not yet. Please address comments for Items 2, 3 and 5. Update, FI, April 15, 2015: Yes, the project is recommended for approval. However, it will not be processed for Council review and approval until adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		For consideration at CEO Endorsement: Items 2, 3, 5 and 6.	
Review Date	Review	March 16, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 15, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation	recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		