



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

GEF ID:	9512		
Country/Region:	Tuvalu		
Project Title:	Climate Resilience in the Outer Islands of Tuvalu		
GEF Agency:	ADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$500,000
Co-financing:	\$13,510,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,010,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Katy Kuang-Idba	Agency Contact Person:	Shigehiko Muramoto

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		YES. Tuvalu is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the project was endorsed by Tuvalu's Operational Focal Point, Nessim Ahmad for \$500,000.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		Yes. The ADB possesses strong regional expertise relevant to the proposed intervention.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
 FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		7/6/2016 - More clarification requested. Recommended Action As the ADB does not have a country office in Tuvalu, please clarify what ADB's in country program and staff capacity in Tuvalu is and elaborate on implementation arrangements.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		NA
	• the focal area allocation?		NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		Yes. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		Yes. The project is well aligned with the GEF-5 LDCF results framework.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		Yes. The proposed project would contribute towards achieving GEF-5 strategic objective CCA-1, Reducing the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change, Outcome 1.2 - reduced vulnerability to climate change in development sectors.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>		<p>7/7/2016 - More clarification requested. While the submission is in line with an ongoing in country activities financed with LDCF funds related to increasing resilience of coastal areas and settlements to climate change, more clarification is requested in how this project corresponds to the priority activities articulated in the NAPA.</p> <p>Recommended action Please briefly clarify in further detail in section B.1 how the project ties into or corresponds to the criteria for selecting priority activities as set forth on page 37 of Tuvalu's NAPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The degree of severity of climate change adverse effects on sector concerned; _ - Feasibility and technical suitability to local conditions; _ - The perception that the adaptation activity will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o enhance stakeholders' livelihood; o to be in line with other multilateral environmental agreements and plans; and o to be is sustainable in the long-term. _ - Poverty reduction and enhancement of income generation of individuals and community; - Accessibility to good quality Water; _ - Enhancement of capacity building on adaptive capacity for communities; _ - Complementary to other national plans and multi-lateral environmental agreements;

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		<p>_ - Cost-effectiveness</p> <p>7/7/2016 - Not quite. While the 'learning by doing' approach utilized by the project will ensure that there is a high level of participation from government agencies and local experts, there is very little information regarding concrete measures to ensure how project achievements and capacities developed will be utilized to ensure sustainability.</p> <p>Recommended action Please briefly articulate specific measures for ensuring that capacities gained are retained in country to sustain this intervention or to support scaling up.</p>
	Project Design	11. 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?	
12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?			<p>7/7/2013 - No.</p> <p>Recommended Action Please demonstrate how the project design is cost effective in comparison with alternative approaches.</p>
13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?			<p>Yes. The details provided regarding the additional reasoning is sufficient for the PFD stage.</p>
14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?			<p>7/7/2016 - More clarification requested.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Project structure is currently unclear - there is only one Component listed, but outputs seem to indicate additional components.</p> <p>Recommended action Please clarify how this project will be structured and provide a brief description clarifying the outcomes and outputs of each component, and please clarify whether M&E and KM will be undertaken as part of Component 1 or as separate components, in Table B and throughout the document.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>		<p>7/7/2016 - More clarification requested. The overall benefits of the project are listed as (i) safer travel; (ii) improved emergency services; (iii) improved socio-economic conditions; and (iv) improved economic activities and access to markets. The specific adaptation benefits of the LDCF-financed activities are related to the construction of a transit shed and safe and resilient cargo lifting activities, with adaptation benefits described very briefly in section 1.5</p> <p>Recommended action Please articulate how the activities financed under this project will directly relate to LDCF Objective CCA-1, Outcome 1.2. For example, will funded activities result in: mitigating economic losses through effective climate resilient infrastructure?; lives saved through an integrated disaster response to extreme climate events? Please</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			clarify and provide a connection between the climate resilient infrastructure and increased resiliency of island and coastal communities.
	16. 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?		7/7/2016 - More clarification requested. Recommended action In line with the GEF's policy on gender mainstreaming policy, it would be appreciated if the specific needs and roles of both women and men, as appropriate for this specific intervention, were further analyzed and addressed. For example, how specifically will this intervention benefit the daily lives of women and men on Nukulaelae island?
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		7/7/2016 - Not quite. Further clarification requested. Local leadership will be consulted as part of the design phase of the project, but it is not clear how public participation will be ensured. Recommended action Please briefly articulate the plan for ensuring public participation by local communities in Section A3.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)		Yes. The risk matrix for this document and the PFD are sufficiently developed.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		7/7/2016 - No. No information of ongoing GEF-financed initiatives is provided.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Recommended action Please refer to the 4 ongoing GEF-financed in country climate change projects and 9 regional projects and provide a brief explanation of how this project and the larger program will seek coordination with them.</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		Yes. The project will be overseen by the same PMU as the baseline project.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>7/7/2016 No. The scope of the project has changed, but justifications have been provided in relation to the 2015 Tropical Cyclone Pam, which shifted national priorities from policy work and capacity building to increasing the resiliency of physical assets and infrastructure. Justifications have been provided in Section A, but the project structure is unclear - please refer to Item 14.</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		7/7/2016 - Please clarify - No project management costs have been listed.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		Yes. Signed letters confirming \$13,510,000 in co-financing are included.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		Yes. ADB is bringing \$13.5m to the project which is in line with its role as an implementing agency.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes. An M&E plan is included in section C.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• Council comments?		NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not at this time. Please refer to items 3,6,9,10,11,12,14,15,16,17,19,23,24
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.