



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5414		
Country/Region:	Kiribati		
Project Title:	Enhancing National Food Security in the Context of Global Climate Change		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4863 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$4,446,210
Co-financing:	\$8,390,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,956,210
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Bonizella Biagini	Agency Contact Person:	Keti Chachibaia

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Kiribati is a LDC and is eligible to receive resources from the LDCF.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A letter of endorsement is on file from the operational focal point.	
Resource Availability	3. 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	The resources are available under the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagova Protocol Investment		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes. The project is aligned with the LDCF results framework and strategic objectives.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	The project is consistent the Kiribati NAPA. The project will support the following NAPA priorities, 1. Strengthening Environmental, Climate Change Information and Monitoring and 2 Coral Reef Restoration, monitoring and stock enhancement.	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	The baseline project is sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	The components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework are clear, sound and appropriately detailed	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning</p>	The adaptation benefits are identified and the project the additional reasoning is sound and appropriate.	

	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes, the role of public participation including CSO is identified.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	The project takes into account potential risks.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	The project responds to priorities identified in the NAPA for Kiribati. For Kiribati the focus of the project on linking improved marine ecosystem resilience and productivity in the context of climate change will be innovative. The projects is linking issues of food security and climate change and can be easily replicated in other islands in the Pacific.	

	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The GEF-funding and co-financing is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	The cofinancing is adequate, but is further clarification is required on the cofinance to be provided by bilateral agencies. Recommended Action.- By CEO Endorsement please provide confirmation of cofinancing.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The level of funding for project management is appropriate.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	A PPG is requested. The amount requested is in line with the project design needs.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	N/A	

Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The PIF is recommended for approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.