



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: LDCF

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Effective and responsive island-level governance to secure and diversify climate resilient marine-based coastal livelihoods and enhance climate hazard response capacity			
Country(ies):	Tuvalu	GEF Project ID: ¹	4714
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4571
Other Executing Partner(s):	N/A	Submission Date:	April 16, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Programme (if applicable):	N/A	Agency Fee (\$):	420,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCA-1	Outcome 1.1. Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Output 1.1.1. Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks	LDCF	550,000	8,132,668
CCA-1	Outcome 1.3. Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas	Output 1.3.1. Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability	LDCF	2,100,000	2,289,897
CCA-2	Outcome 2.1. Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Output 2.1.2. Systems in place to disseminate timely risk information	LDCF	1,550,000	9,416,315

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

(select)			(select)		
(select)			(select)		
(select)			(select)		
(select)			(select)		
(select)			(select)		
Total project costs				4,200,000	19,838,880

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Resilience of island communities to climate change variability and risks is strengthened through participatory island-level planning, budgeting and execution and community-led investments						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Implementation of community-based climate resilient livelihood options to reduce vulnerability to future climate change	INV	1. Marine based coastal livelihoods of Tuvaluan outer islands made resilient to declining productivity induced by climate variability and change	<p>1.1. Climate-resilient marine-based livelihood techniques are implemented benefiting at least 50% of the population</p> <p>1.2. Capacity of local administrations, CSOs, communities and Community Fisheries Centers enhanced to integrate climate risks in the community-based management of Marine Management Areas (MMAs) / Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) including zoning guidance, marine resource stock surveys, and monitoring and enforcement</p> <p>1.3. Awareness enhanced for at least 2000 people including island Kaupules, central government staff, CSOs, and community members to understand and respond to the impacts of climate induced risks on marine based coastal livelihoods</p>	LDCF	2,000,000	2,239,897

2. Enhanced communication of climate risks to increase the preparedness of outer islands to intensifying storms	INV	2. Capacity of outer islands enhanced to respond to increasing/intensifying climate induced hydro-meteorological risks	2.1. Each island is equipped with robust communication facilities and early warning system facilities 2.2. Raised awareness and preparedness of outer island communities for climate-induced extreme events	LDCF	1,500,000	8,966,315
3. Inclusive local planning, budgeting and budget execution for strengthened climate resilience	TA	3. Enhanced capacity of communities to access internal/external financing for community-based climate change adaptation through existing participatory development planning processes	3.1. All outer Island Strategic Plans integrate island-specific climate risks through existing gender-sensitive, participatory processes 3.2. Capacity of Kaupules, Falekaupules and community members for monitoring adaptation investments strengthened 3.3. National and outer island capacity to leverage, sequence and combine domestic resource for climate change adaptation investments strengthened	LDCF	500,000	7,632,668
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal					4,000,000	18,838,880
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				LDCF	200,000	1,000,000
Total project costs					4,200,000	19,838,880

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade, Tourism, Environment & Labour	Grant	14,330,018
National Government	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade, Tourism, Environment & Labour	In-kind	167,188
Others	Falekaupule Trust Fund	Grant	1,243,524
CSO	Tuvalu Red Cross	Grant	207,500
Bilateral Aid Agency	New Zealand Aid Programme	Grant	1,000,000

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Other Multilateral Agency	Secretariat of the Pacific Community	Grant	1,979,460
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	911,190
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			19,838,880

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	LDCF	Climate Change	Tuvalu	4,200,000	420,000	4,620,000
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				4,200,000	420,000	4,620,000

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	1,122,294		1,122,294
National/Local Consultants	395,600		395,600

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(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 PIF⁴

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

⁴ 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

Update Reports, etc. N/A

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

In the PIF, GEF focal area strategies relevant for this project were reported as CCA-1 Outcome 1.3 / Output 1.3.1 and CCA-2 Outcome 2.2 / Output 2.2.1. However, in this CEO endorsement form, it is proposed that GEF focal area strategies be changed to CCA-1 Outcome 1.1 / Output 1.1.1, Outcome 1.3 / Output 1.3.1, and Outcome 2.1 / Output 2.1.2. Originally, Component 1 and 3 of the project were under the GEF FA Outcome 1.3, but it was agreed that FA Outcome 1.1 would provide better alignment with Component 3 of the project. Similarly, Project Outcome 2 was originally considered most aligned with FA Outcome 2.2. However after detailed assessments of ongoing relevant initiatives, especially those related to DRM policy enhancement in Tuvalu, which will be carried out by the SPC SOPAC Division, it was agreed that FA Outcome 2.1 supports most closely with the scope of the new Project Outcome 2.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

At the time of the PIF submission, it was based on the assumption that the SLG project will be continued in the new UNDAF cycle 2013-2017. However, it was agreed between UNDP and the Government of Tuvalu that the support for local administrations will be nationalized and the SLG project will come to an end by the end of 2013 (Phase II was scheduled to end in 2012. However an agreement between UNDP and GoT for the extension of the SLG project for an additional year was made. This is primarily to ensure that the capacity within the SLG team and specific knowledge is transferred to the new LDCF project team). Despite this change, however, fundamentally, the comparative advantage of UNDP in assisting this project remains unchanged. UNDP is the only GEF agency with a resident staff supporting implementation of project activities. The support from UNDP throughout the implementation of this project will be operationally, administratively and technically ensured through a four-layered structure: the resident Country Development Manager in Tuvalu provides the first point of interface with the Government of Tuvalu, which is supported, operationally, administratively and technically by the Fiji Multi Country Office. Regional advisory capacity based in the UNDP Asia Pacific Regional Centre in Bangkok, with dedicated Regional Technical Advisers focusing on supporting adaptation programming and implementation, will provide additional layer of support. UNDP has a track record of assisting the Government of Tuvalu and, in particular, the Department of Environment. The support from UNDP to DoE includes support for meeting Multilateral Environmental Agreements such as NCSA, NBSAP, NAPA formulation, First and Second National Communications, and the implementation of the first LDCF project. As detailed in the project document, a close collaboration between the first and second LDCF projects is critical, and by UNDP acting as the Executing Agency, this collaboration can be maximized.

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

There are several enhancements to that have occurred to the project design during the PPG phase. However, the fundamental assumption and principle of the baseline project and how additionality considerations are applied remain unchanged. The changes observed are summarized as below:

(a) Downward revision of the amount of co-financing from the Government of Tuvalu public expenditure on outer islands and Falekaupule Trust Fund

At the time of the PIF writing, the expected amount of co-financing from the public expenditure on outer island development (i.e. Special Development Expenditure and core revenues) and Falekaupule Trust Fund distribution to outer islands were estimated based on the available recent records of these sources. Specifically, the SDE and FTF allocations from years 2009 (actual), 2010 (actual) and 2011 (estimated) were used to estimate the likely inflow over the four-year project time period starting in 2013. However, from 2011 onwards, due to the global economic crisis, donor budget support and

income gains from managing the FTF were reduced significantly. As a result, the total likely volume of these resources was adjusted downwards from \$9,828,649 at the PIF stage to \$7,139,897.

(b) Upward revision of the amount of co-financing from the UNDP-financed SLG project

As described earlier, GoT and UNDP agreed to extend the SLG project by additional 12 months primarily to ensure overlap and smooth transition from the baseline SLG project to the LDCF project. This resulted in additional financial commitment from UNDP that brought co-financing from \$766,586 to \$911,190.

(c) Inclusion of additional baseline projects: SOPAC Division of the SPC's baseline activity on disaster risk management; Tuvalu Red Cross ongoing initiatives on awareness raising for disaster risk reduction; and NZAP's fisheries capacity building programme

Detailed assessments and consultations with wider stakeholders identified additional baseline development projects that LDCF project will be built on. SPC/SOPAC is rolling out a new regional programme, covering Tuvalu, to improve disaster response institutional mechanisms. \$794,460 is earmarked for Tuvalu. Discussions with SOPAC and GoT during the PPG phase resulted in an arrangement and focus of the respective projects that aim at ensuring complementarity and avoiding overlaps. In particular, it was agreed that the LDCF project will primarily focus on improving the communications facilities while SOPAC will support improvement of the existing National Disaster Management Plan including specific protocols at the time of disaster. Specific communications facilities or infrastructures that will be newly introduced with the LDCF funding, such as SMS-based communications system, backup generators, and portable radio consoles, will be reflected in the revised Management Plan. In addition, awareness raising activities that will be supported with the LDCF financing will also reflect the revised Management Plan.

Tuvalu Red Cross and the Disaster Management Office, in collaboration with Island Disaster Committees, are currently undertaking a number of awareness raising training and events to enhance community preparedness to weather and non-weather related disasters. This includes training of emergency response teams and volunteers for disaster management and response, logistical training to manage relief stocks, issuing brochures on cyclone preparedness and mock drill exercises on the International Day for Disaster Risk Reduction. However, outreach of these programmes is severely hampered by logistical challenges. Most of them are conducted only via media (radio) programmes and distribution of brochures, and rarely do island communities and Island Disaster Committee members participate in face-to-face training or drills. When staff from Funafuti visit outer islands on a scheduled boat, they usually have only an hour or two to carry out such activities due to the constraints of the vessel schedule. While distribution of brochures is an inexpensive option, the effectiveness of these measures is questionable as the lack of funding within DMO or Red Cross prevents translating existing materials produced by other regional agencies, such as the SPC, into Tuvaluan and they often use English-based materials. The LDCF project, especially under Output 2.2, will directly build on the awareness raising activities that have been developed by Tuvalu Red Cross. The existing training materials and methodologies will be enhanced by integrating the protocols of the new communications facilities or revised National Disaster Management Plan (which will be supported by SPC/SOPAC) into the training materials.

New Zealand Aid Programme (NZAP) has recently started a new programme in which a fisheries advisor is placed in Tuvalu Fisheries Department to strengthen their fisheries management capacity and increase revenues for Tuvalu. This builds on the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) Institutional Strengthening Scoping Study Report: Activity Feasibility Study of 2010. The FFA study took into account the National Development Strategy 2008-2015 (TK-II) and the National Master Plan for Fisheries Development 2008-2011 that identified enhanced oceanic and coastal fisheries management as one of their priorities. The advisor is expected to facilitate better coordination of donor-assisted programmes in the country to reap the maximum benefits from ongoing initiatives.

This advisor is likely to be invited to the Project Board (to be confirmed during the inception phase of the project) and through engaging the advisor in climate resilient marine-based livelihood activities envisaged under Output 1.1, it is expected that the capacity building support from this programme will fully integrate climate change concerns into the business-as-usual capacity building processes.

(d) Exclusion of the UNDP-funded MDG project

The new UNDAF and Sub-regional programme for 2013-2017 resulted in discontinuation of the MDG project. This project was originally included in the baseline as the “know-hows [the MDG project] has accumulated over years in ‘mainstreaming MDGs’ into national planning and budgeting provides valuable baseline on which the LDCF project can build as the country moves on to ‘mainstreaming climate change’ (PIF). Despite the discontinuation of the MDG project, however, the Ministry of Home Affairs and Rural Development, as a Responsible Party for Component 3 of the proposed LDCF project, will engage staff from the Ministry of Finance (Department of Budget and Planning), which was the host agency of the MDG project, in training of trainers events for mainstreaming climate change concerns into the ISPs. These fora will present the primary opportunity for lessons learned from the MDG project to be shared and reflected into the design of the climate change mainstreaming toolkit and processes supported by the LDCF project.

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: N/A

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:

Most of risks identified during the PIF stage are still valid. However, after detailed assessments of stakeholder capacity, baseline stakeholder assessment, a review of past and ongoing development projects in Tuvalu resulted in a refined set of risks.

<i>Risk</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure</i>
Exclusive reliance on government scheduled boat and chartered boat to outer islands limit the delivery of Outcomes in a timely manner and ultimately interests of community members	Medium	The project will purchase a dedicated boat for project purposes. After considering all alternative options, it was concluded that a purchase of a dedicated boat is the only option available to deliver proposed Outcomes of the project. Other options considered was the exclusive reliance of scheduled boat and chartered boat available in country and leasing of a boat. The first option was precluded on the basis of the experience from the first LDCF implementation. An irregular schedule of the government boat and unavailability of chartered boat make it impossible to visit outer islands in a timely manner. Leasing of boat for duration of 4 years is usually not available. As per the agreement with the Government of Tuvalu, UNDP will carry out the procurement of this item. At the end of the four project, according to the IPSAS rule, the value of the asset will depreciate to zero. Hence, at the final project board meeting, the PB will collectively agree on the future use of the boat (e.g. retaining it as government property or sell it in a market).
Ineffective coordination across IP and Responsible Parties for project activities	Low	The risk will be mitigated by the Memorandum of Understanding that has been signed between DoE and DoF and DoE and DRD, in which DoF and DRD agreed to appoint a dedicated project focal point from a Director-level (with an alternate). This will ensure that the interface of the project remains constant throughout the project implementation and continuity of technical inputs from these departments. Moreover, the project will recruit a total of four officers who will be outposted to DoF and DRD to undertake project-related activities under their respective components. They will provide an additional interface with the PMU. Technical meetings among these officers and PMU staff, including the Chief Technical Advisor, will take place on an ad hoc basis but at least once a month.

Bureaucratic process within DoE hampers timely approval of the project budget and implementation of project activities	Medium	Within the Government of Tuvalu, the Permanent Secretary (PS) of the Ministry is the Chief Executive Officer who can authorize spending of the Ministry, including donor-financed spending. For this reason, as described in the Management Arrangements section of the main document, the PS of the MoFATTEL will be assigned as the National Project Director so that the approval of Annual Workplan in the Project Board meeting, which is chaired by the PS, will act as the official clearance of the project budget for the year. Thereafter, the PS will be consulted for approval of spending only when the expenditure from the project budget is beyond the tolerance level of the PMU, which will be agreed on in the inception phase of the project.
Disaster Management Office is unable to participate in project activities in an effective manner	Medium	As it is described in the Capacity Assessment in Annex 7, severe capacity constraints in DMO is fully recognized and the project was formulated in such a way to mitigate this risk to the extent possible. First, the DoE will be fully responsible for the delivery of this Outcome, as a custodian of SNAP; Second, NGOs will be engaged to carry out activities related to awareness raising under Component 2. Given the future projection of extreme weather events in Tuvalu under a changing climate – that cyclones will be less frequent but more intense – it becomes all the more important that awareness remains high for less frequent but more severe events, and NGOs are well positioned to support communities in this regard. Close involvement of NGOs, therefore, will not only mitigate the risk of lack of capacity within DMO, but also build much needed capacity within the NGO sector for disaster risk preparedness.
Community members unwilling to allocate their discretionary budgets (SDE, FTF and core revenues) for climate resilient investments	Low	Risk mitigation measures for this started during the PPG phase where a team of consultants visited all outer islands, except one, and introduced the concept of the project. As indicated in the Baseline Survey, 96% of the 196 people interviewed were positive about using SDE or FTF for maintenance of the equipment/assets introduced by the LDCF project. Furthermore, a project implementation schedule was developed in such a way that technical equipment, especially under Component 2, will be installed in Y1 of the project so that communities have sufficient time to observe the benefits of the equipment. The project places a considerable emphasis on demonstrating the adaptation impacts from the project through Creel Survey, mock drills, annual event on canoe designs and food preservation techniques, so that willingness of the community members on using their resources for future climate investment is maximized.
Working arrangement in which SPC/SOPAC will work on improving institutional arrangement for disaster risk management creates dependency which the LDCF project has limited control	Low to medium	In order to minimize the potential of overlap, close working relationships will be established between the LDCF and SPC/SOPAC activities. The coordination with SPC/SOPAC in aligning their work on improving institutional arrangement and in turn reflecting the work of the LDCF into the revised arrangement will be supplemented by the Fiji-based UNDP Multi-Country Office. Their physical proximity enables face-to-face meetings, as needed. More over, the progress from each project will be shared on a timely and continuous basis to ensure coordination across the course of project implementation. The SOPAC-assisted project is expected to begin in mid 2013, which is sufficiently aligned with the estimated commencement of the LDCF project.
Extreme climate events such as cyclones or severe droughts will affect the progress of project	Low to medium	The annual probability of severe cyclones affecting the country is relatively low. However, as was observed in 2010, a severe drought resulted in a national emergency and many government agencies, including DoE, were engaged in early response and recovery activities which caused delays in the implementation of the first LDCF project. While such emergency situations are unavoidable and, once they occur, impacts on project implementation inevitable, the current LDCF project proposal was developed with a significant focus on the existing capacity gaps within the implementing partner and responsible parties. This is reflected in project funded full-time staff being located in the Department of Fisheries and Department of Rural Development, so that emergency situations that stretch the capacity of existing government staff would have minimal impact on the project.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives N/A

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

The stakeholder baseline analysis was wide-ranging and placed a significant emphasis on identifying/validating key stakeholder needs – particularly within the target communities in outer islands.

This analysis provides the solid foundation on which the LDCF proposal is built.

During extensive consultations that took place between June 2012 and January 2013, assumptions presented in the PIF were revisited, capacity of stakeholders who will have an active role in the project implementation was assessed, and feasibility and willingness of communities in engaging in proposed project activities were investigated. Apart from the consultations with stakeholders at the main island of Funafuti, the preparatory phase consultations placed a considerable emphasis and efforts in visiting outer islands and discussing the proposed project. This is based on lessons learned from past numerous initiatives in Tuvalu that failed to engage effectively outer island communities early in the design stage, for logistical or financial reasons, and subsequently suffered from lack of active engagement and ownership, confusion and frustration among community members. A summary of stakeholder consultations held during the project preparation phase is shown in Annex 4.

The PPG team, which undertook the consultation process, was led by the Department of Environment, and comprised of an international project development consultant as a team leader, a national marine ecosystem specialist and an international climate finance/governance specialist. The PPG team received additional support from USAID ADAPT Asia-Pacific programme through two international experts on coastal ecosystem and disaster risk management. Cognizant of the importance of involving CROP agencies which have long-standing relationship with the Government of Tuvalu, the DoE and UNDP also received in-kind assistance, through a coastal fisheries expert, from the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC).

The methodologies used for stakeholder baseline analysis were:

- A National inception workshop to commence the PPG phase held in Funafuti, 19th June 2012 attended by 23 key stakeholders. The Inception Workshop Report is shown in Annex 6.
- Bilateral consultations with numerous stakeholders from national government agencies, subnational government agencies, target group representatives, local organisations, development partners, INGOs and NGOs (see Annex 4). These consultations were facilitated by four in-country visits in June, August and October in 2012 and January 2013.
- Extensive outer island consultations through an extensive Baseline Survey. A total of 214 community members were surveyed (55% male: 45% female) through 77 one-on-one or group interviews. People from all of Tuvalu's islands, except Niulakita (which was accessed through Niutao with which it is affiliated) were interviewed. Importantly, the interviews also ensured input from a very wide range of organisations with which people are affiliated by island, a total of 50 across the survey. These included Women's and Youth Groups, fishers, Kaplue, Falekapule and NGOs. The detailed results of the Baseline Stakeholder Consultation Survey are provided in Annex 5.
- Consultations with donors, CROP agencies and other groups based in Fiji throughout the PPG phase.

In combination, these in-depth consultations have provided the foundation for understanding the current conditions prevailing in Tuvalu that are leading to a deepening of the risks associated with climate change impacts. These risks include current approaches to securing livelihoods, disaster preparedness and the mechanisms for governance and securing finance for on-going adaptations after completion of the project. They have also provided a forum for testing the types of interventions that Tuvaluans will be

willing to engage in. In addition, the Baseline Survey methodology was developed and applied through a capacity-building process with the DoF, including in-kind support from DoF in contributing to the costs of transport to outer islands and in providing staff to assist in undertaking the Survey. As such, the Baseline Survey can be replicated during the project to provide critical data to support Monitoring and Evaluation.

STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR ROLES DURING THE PPG

Category	Institution / Stakeholder Group	Cooperation during PPG Phase
National government institutions	MoFATTEL: Department of Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead agency of PPG phase • Data and information about ongoing CC projects • Identify and guide the overall alignment and conformity with TK-II, Tuvalu Climate Change Policy and SNAP. • Participation in meetings and workshops • Organize workshops and outer island trips • Liaise with DRD, DoF, Ministry of Finance for management and operational arrangement • Information about NAPA-I project • National Communication on CC • Other environment issues
	MNR: Department of Fisheries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-kind contributions (through fisheries officers) for outer-island baseline survey • Data and information about donor-assisted initiatives in the fisheries sector, MMA/MPA management • Liaise with NZAP for co-financing and arrangement • Participation in workshops and meetings • Inputs for management arrangement
	MoHARD: Department of Rural Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaise with outer island Kaupules to facilitate the Baseline Survey • Information about SLG and CLGF initiatives • Participation in workshops and meetings • Inputs for management arrangement
	Ministry of Finance:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inputs to the financial arrangement under the proposed implementation modality
	Tuvalu Met Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about available climate change projections • Data on the baseline communication equipment, gaps and capacities • Participation in workshops and meetings
	Disaster Management Office:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the existing disaster management arrangement • Participation in workshops and meetings • Inputs for management arrangement
	Department of Tuvalu Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the baseline (communications facilities, Radio Tuvalu) and capacities to undertake specific activities related to Outcome 2 • Participation in workshops and meetings
	Department of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the existing climate/environment-related curriculum • Inputs for potential development of climate/disaster management related school curriculum
Local government, community representatives	Kaupules and Falekaupules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation of assumptions made in the PIF especially adaptation needs of communities • Feedback on the proposed activities and guidance • Participation in the Baseline Survey
	Island representatives resident in Funafuti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation of assumptions made in the PIF especially adaptation needs of communities • Feedback on the proposed activities and guidance • Liaise with their respective Kaupules • Participation in workshops and meetings
	Island-level Disaster Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation of the existing disaster management arrangement • Information

	Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the Baseline Survey
	Community groups (Island-level fisher's associations; women's groups; youth groups; Red Cross volunteers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the Baseline Survey • Information
NGOs and other national organization	Falekaupule Trust Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in workshops and meetings • Co-financing discussion
	Tuvalu Association of NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in workshops and meetings • Information
	Tuvalu Red Cross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in workshops and meetings • Data on existing disaster preparedness/response facilities • Information
Donors	SPC Coastal/Oceanic Fisheries Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-kind co-finance for PPG activities • Technical inputs for development of project proposal • Potential collaboration and cooperation for project implementation • Participation in workshops and meetings
	SPC SOPAC Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in tripartite discussions with GoT and UNDP on co-financing for disaster risk management activities • Information
	EU, NZAP, JICA, GTZ, Government of Taiwan, CLGF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information • Data • Potential for collaboration, cooperation and funding support

These consultations during the PPG phase resulted in the following list of key stakeholders. Key stakeholders to be engaged include a range of government line ministries to implement and support the project implementation, NGOs, island-specific Kaupules and Falekaupules and local communities including some of their interest/community groups.

Each component of the project has its own stakeholder groups:

- Component 1 will be delivered through the Department of Fisheries who will host all Component 1 activities, deploy staff in the various activities during project implementation and report on activities and expenditure with assistance from the two project-funded Fisheries Officers, Project Coordinator and Chief Technical Advisor. The Project Team will closely work with SPC's Oceanic/Coastal Fisheries Division and NZAP's Fisheries Advisor, both of which are providing co-financing to the project. Kaupule and Fisher's association in each island will be the main interface for the project staff at the subnational level; Fishers, women and youth will be the main direct beneficiaries on the outer islands, although the project is expected to permeate all segments of the communities.
- Component 2 will be delivered by the Department of Environment with close collaboration with the Disaster Management Office, Meteorological Services, and Radio Tuvalu on Funafuti. These agencies are all central to embedding the project's interventions into existing communications and early warning systems. The Project Team will work closely with the SPC SOPAC Division, which is co-financing the LDCF project, especially on integrating new procedures for the new communication capacity enhancement measures, financed by the LDCF resources, into the revised National Disaster Management Plan. On the outer islands, the main stakeholders include the communities themselves, the island Disaster management Committees (DMC) and relevant NGOs which will act as a service provider related to awareness raising Output of the Component.
- Component 3 will work closely with MHARD and the Falekaupule Trust Fund in Funafuti. On the outer islands, the project will work closely with Kaupules to enhance their strategic planning

and budgeting processes to ensure adaptation can be built into island-level planning. This will necessarily include regular consultations with communities through community meetings to seek views and ensure clear dialogue.

Informal stakeholder engagement may take place at any time and any location within the operational terms and guidelines set out by the project at start of implementation.

All activities on the outer islands will be carried out through the assistance of the Ministry of Home Affairs and Development (MHARD) and the island representatives on Funafuti. These are the official conduits for all outer islands activities and working through these channels will ensure smooth implementation and cooperation from island leaders. On the outer islands themselves the Kaupule staff are the executives of each island's Falekaupule (governing council) and will be integral to all interventions. The Kaupule will need to give approval for all activities, use of land, funding arrangements and involvement. The communities, and particularly the local community groups of fishers, women, youth and elders will be involved in all decision-making through regular meetings in the community hall (maneapa). The project intends to run regular meetings incorporating educational videos, the outcomes of the participatory monitoring videos (under Component 3) and other mechanisms to stimulate discussions and derive steering for the project. This will ensure that the interventions remain in touch with community stakeholder aspirations at all stages of the project that will be enhanced through the scheduled outer island visits (see Annex 13). In addition, events that are designed to promote information sharing about the adaptation effectiveness of investments in Component 1 and 2, such as annual events to demonstrate traditional canoe designs and food preservation techniques and mock drills on the National Disaster Risk Reduction Day, are expected to provide additional stakeholder engagement benefits.

In Tuvalu, due to its unique geographical circumstances, workshops and training activities in outer islands (or in Funafuti that bring outer island communities to the capital) are a vital opportunity not only for the sake of capacity building, but also for exchanging information across islands and maintaining the engagement throughout the course of the project. Those workshops and training activities that will be undertaken through the project lifetime are shown below in Table below. Inevitably, due to the logistical challenge, some of the workshops/trainings will be jointly organized with multiple objectives covering different elements of the three Components.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT WORKSHOPS AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Component / Outputs	Title	Timing	Objective	Location	Target Participants
All	Initial formal meeting with Kaupule and community	Year 1 (Inception for the following 6 months)	Establishing the presence of the project on the island; Signing of an MoU with timelines about scheduled visits	Outer islands	All community, especially Kaupules
1.1	FAD discussions workshops	Year 1	Identify the best type of FAD design and management needs	Outer islands	Fishers Fisheries officers Kapule
1.1	Improved canoe design, traditional fishing, postharvest, and sea safety trainings	Year 1-2	Knowledge sharing and training on resilient livelihood options	Outer islands	Fishers Kaupules Women's groups Youth Fisheries officers International consultants
1.2	Initial discussion on	Year 1	Collect and synthesize	Outer	Kaupules

	MMA/MPA		information about existing management of MMAs/MPAs	islands	Falekaupules Fisheries officers Fishers
1.2	Finalization of MMA/MPA	Year 2-3	Finalize locations of new/expanded MMAs/MPAs	Outer islands	Kaupules Falekaupules Fisheries officers Fishers
1.2	Training / awareness raising on MMA/MPA	Year 2-3	Training on fisheries monitoring	Outer islands	Kaupules Falekaupules Fisheries officers Fishers
2.1	Technical training sessions	Year 1 and 3	Installation, use and maintenance of communication equipment	Funafuti	Tuvalu Meteorological Department and Radio Tuvalu Media Department International consultant
2.1	Technical monitoring visits	Year 3	Technical monitoring of communications equipment	Outer islands	Tuvalu Meteorological Department and Radio Tuvalu Media Department PMU
2.1	NDMP integration workshop	Year 2/3	Revising operational procedures reflecting new communications equipment	Funafuti	DoE DMO SPC SOPAC PMU DMC
2.2	Mock drills	Year 3 and 4	Testing of all communications equipment and new NDMO	Funafuti and outer islands	[Funafuti] DoE DMO PMU [Outer islands] All community members Island DMC
3.1	Training of trainers to mainstream climate risks into ISPs	Year 1	Train island-level focal points to initiate the mainstreaming process	Funafuti	Selected members of Kaupules, Falekaupules and women's group DRD staff MoF staff Public Works Dept NGO staff ISP Officer Community Support Officer
3.1	Mainstreaming climate risks into ISPs	Year 1-4	Enhance the skills of outer island administrations for identifying specific adaptation priority actions, in line with the ISP, prioritizing and budgeting	Outer islands	Kaupules and Falekaupules Women's group Youth groups Fisher's associations Island DMC ISP Officer Community Support Officer
3.1/3.2	Final ISP workshop	Year 4	Presentation of the revised ISP (with climate change integrated)	Funafuti	DRD elected members of Kaupules, Falekaupules and

			Presentation of performance on annual budgeting, monitoring and execution		women's group DRD staff MoF staff NGO staff ISP Officer Community Support Officer
3.2	Participatory video Training of Trainers	Year 2	Training in the technique of participatory video	Funafuti	Interest groups such as women, youth, disaster management committee, fisher's association, and NGOs International consultant
3.2	Community awareness workshops	Year 2/3	Awareness raising about monitoring of ISP execution and the use of community scorecards	Outer islands	Interest groups such as women and youth Kaupules Community Support Officer
3.3	Adaptation priority plans forum	Annual	Presentation of adaptation actions in ISPs to line ministries	Funafuti	DRD and other line ministries ISP Officer NGOs
3.3	Community workshops		Presentation of the results from the climate financing expenditure review	Outer islands	All community members and representative groups ISP Officer
All	Annual Event as part of National Tuvalu Day (1st October)	Years 1-4	Awareness raising and community engagement on all aspects of the project	Funafuti	DoE, DRD, DoF Representatives from communities

NGOs, under the TANGO umbrella, and donor projects such as the NZAP Fisheries Institutional Strengthening Project will be incorporated as collaborators in selected parts of the project to ensure there is no duplication of effort and stability to the gains made by the LDCF project.

The Project will be implemented in close cooperation with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, including headquarters in Noumea and SPC/SOPAC Division in Fiji to assist with Components 1 & 2. SPC will provide educational materials and assistance with regional expertise throughout the project ensuring the best, most up-to-date approaches to resilient livelihoods and disaster risk management are implemented as the project progresses.

During the PPG phase, the design team consulted with numerous government officials, NGOs and individuals to obtain their views on the requirements for meeting project objectives, while at the same time informing them of the need for and approach to the problem (see Annex 4-6). This was complemented with a detailed survey on outer islands and in Funafuti with 77 interviews (reaching 214 individuals) of key informants and focus groups (see Annex 5). The survey ensured a good balance of gender and interest groups, specifically targeting local government, women, youth and fishers. The survey consultations also acted to inform people of the approach to the project, to which the response was overwhelmingly positive.

All project activities will be closely monitored by the individual implementers (who will vary by topic),

the Project Coordinator assisted by the Chief Technical Adviser, and the Department of Environment. This will include detailed records of stakeholder involvement, the decisions made by communities and Kaupules and written and photographic/video records of the interventions themselves. Towards the end of the project, the CTA with assistance from Fisheries staff will modify the baseline survey to measure outcomes as perceptions in the community.

Effective stakeholder involvement of island communities requires an understanding that Tuvalu's clan-based social structure, and communal traditions are the key building blocks of Tuvaluan society. While these structures have traditionally sought to promote egalitarianism, it is recognised that women have taken a limited role in traditional community meetings in the past, their voices were usually heard through representation by the head of the household in village meetings. Even where those arrangements still exist, the project will use combinations of contact strategies in both outer islands and in Funafuti: with the now generally-accepted practice of calling specific meetings with women's and youth groups, the project will reach these segments of the community to ensure targeting of the specific needs for different community groups. In addition, special attention will be paid to ensure that potentially marginalized groups, such as the disabled and religious minorities, are integrated into all aspects of the project. These measures recognise the particular challenges of ensuring effective engagement with all segments of outer island communities with respect to climate change, and ensuring inclusion from the increasing numbers of people living in the informal settlements highlighted by the UN Special Rapporteur⁵.

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):

Tuvalu is one of the most vulnerable countries in the world to climate change impacts. A half of its population lives in outer islands where access to the capital, let alone the rest of the world, is markedly poor, information is limited, and are largely dependent on subsistence output for their survival. Adaptive activities envisaged under Component 1 will produce measurable economic benefits largely in the form of sustainable harvests of marine resources. Pressures on marine resources from overfishing, loss of habitats and gradual increase of ocean acidity and surface temperatures have resulted in extra economic costs in maintaining the constant level of fish catch and increased vulnerability. Moreover, periodic occurrence of extreme weather events has historically caused significant damages to livelihood and communal assets. The CCA measures to be implemented with LDCF resources will deliver significant financial and economic benefits to target communities, benefitting 50% of the entire population in Tuvalu, by enhancing the natural regeneration capacity of marine resources, building capacity of communities in reaping benefits from more resilient pelagic resources, and enhancing community preparedness for extreme weather events.

The specific concerns and needs of women and minority groups have been fully taken into considerations of the project design through extensive stakeholder consultations in all outer islands and through key informants interviews and individual interviews. 45% of the respondents were women. Within the context of climate change impacts on marine resources, women's particular vulnerability was highlighted due to their distinct role in households in collecting reef resources such as shellfish and invertebrates, and it is these resources that are most likely to be significantly affected by the combined impacts of increasing

⁵ Press Statement by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque - Mission to Tuvalu (19 July 2012)
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=12372&LangID=E>

ocean temperature increase, coral bleaching, and increasing intensity of tropical cyclones. Hence, in establishing and strengthening the climate-resilient management framework of Local Marine Managed Areas and Marine Protected Areas, women's participation in the design of by-laws, monitoring and enforcement will be encouraged. Postharvest processing of fishery products is an extremely important mechanism for adapting the use of the available resources to climate change impacts and is primarily carried out by women in Tuvalu. The project will reinstitute and expand on existing practices that have been in decline since the introduction of refrigeration and imported foods. During periods of (increasing) bad weather, storms and climate-related disasters power for refrigeration, fuel and shipping services are being increasingly disrupted. Increasingly, food security will have to come from the ability to store for later use locally caught resources. The project will work to re-establish more resilient food traditions, usually reliant on women, from within Tuvalu and elsewhere.

By nature of intervention, disaster risk management-related activities under Component 2 will target every individual in the country, ensuring that the measurable socio-economic benefits from the LDCF resources, in the form of avoided loss of human lives and livelihood assets, are delivered equally. However, cognizant that there is strong evidence internationally that women are more likely than men to fall victim of natural disasters, awareness and outreach activities under this Component will ensure women and children's participation. For example, gender disaggregated participation in mock drill exercise will be recorded so that not only their participation will continue to improve throughout the course of the project, but also the information about participation gives additional insights into underlying causes of biased participation, if any, and corrective adaptive management can be exercised.

Activities under Component 3 will build on the UNDP-assisted SLG project, in which one of the major achievements of the project was legislating women's participation in the revised Falekaupule Act within the context of island-level development planning process. The climate-smart island development process which will be supported with the LDCF resources will ensure women's group, youth group and religious minorities are fully involved (with disaggregated data to report the progress in this regard and to raise awareness). Moreover, it is envisaged that under Output 3.2, women's groups will play a particular role in monitoring and reporting of adaptation investments through their participation in the participatory video and community scorecard exercises.

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

The proposed project is based on the promotion and dissemination of community-based, low-cost adaptation options suitable for Outer Island communities in Tuvalu, focusing on community-based fisheries livelihoods, community risk reduction and climate financing. Significant cost effectiveness is expected as a result of the proposed approach of promoting community-based adaptation with accompanying capacity building support for outer island administrations and community members. To achieve the intended Objective and Outcomes of the project, the following alternative options were considered:

1. Promoting climate change adaptation through the conventional sectoral support approach

The first alternative considered was to adopt the traditional support approach in which line ministries based in Funafuti continue to provide the necessary adaptation services in outer islands based on centrally-planned activities and budgeting. This approach was deemed less cost-effective for three reasons. First, given the significant capacity constraints in central ministries, it is highly likely that the current trends of significant public service delivery shortfall will continue in the future. To achieve the same level of adaptation impacts from an intervention, the central government would be required to strengthen the staffing in line ministries and undertake continuous visits to outer islands to execute adaptation activities. In reality, it is more likely that the central government will do best within their available budget which is simply suboptimal to bring resilience of outer islands to a desired level. Second, this centrally-led approach would imply that relatively large financial resources made available to each outer island (approximately \$100,000 per year per island including SDE, FTF distribution and core revenues, based on the

indicative co-financing for the project cycle) will continue to be budgeted and expended based on business-as-usual considerations. These are significant opportunity costs that would have been used in a more resilient manner. Third, this approach bears a significant risk that community awareness about climate risks and ownership of adaptation investments remain underdeveloped, which will undermine the sustainability of investments in the medium- to long-run. For these reasons, this approach was considered less cost-effective in achieving resilience of outer island communities.

2. Promoting wholesale relocation of outer island communities to Funafuti

Another possibility, in theory, is to fund relocation of communities to Funafuti. This would enable communities to be closer to technical assistance, early disaster warnings and external support while Tuvaluans continue to engage in business-as-usual extraction of marine resources to maintain their current level of dependence on them. This option is not considered for multiple reasons. First, to maintain a similar level of marine resource dependence under a changing climate while supporting the entire population of Tuvalu in one island, it is expected that a significant level of resource extraction pressure needs to be exerted on pelagic fisheries resources, and current infrastructure (such as motorized boats) in Funafuti, which is more tailored for fishing in the lagoon, needs to be strengthened significantly. Second, potential social, environmental and infrastructural implications of increased population density in Funafuti, which is already overpopulated (1891 persons per sq km in 2011), and the additional investment needed to accommodate additional 50% of the population, is likely to be high. Thirdly, and most importantly, the option to relocate outer island communities runs counter to the fundamental aspiration embedded in TK-II, which is to strengthen the outer island governance and preserve unique cultures.

Thus, after considering these alternatives to achieve the same objective, it was concluded that the approach proposed in this proposal is most cost-effective as it integrates the following elements in an integrated manner within the same project framework:

- 1) Placing Kaupules and outer island communities at the center of the process in which to identify locally specific climate risks;
- 2) Integrating climate risks into their strategic plans and budgeting process;
- 3) Building capacities of Kaupules to identify, combine and sequence available adaptation resources, from existing SDE, FTF and core revenues, or new external resources;
- 4) Executing, with technical support from central ministries, adaptation actions that are simple, and maintainable, which ultimately enhance the sustainability and ownership of such investments.

Considerations for value-for-money are also reflected in specific adaptation actions within respective Components proposed in the project. For example, building resilience of marine-based livelihoods in outer islands can also be achieved by providing fishers access to motor vessels so that they can more easily exploit relatively more abundant and resilient pelagic fisheries resources. However, not only will this option be more costly in terms of initial investments required, the sustainability of such an option is highly questionable with increasing fuel price and requirements for maintenance. In terms of DRM related activities in Component 2, Annex 3 demonstrated that, based on historical data (and in the absence of climate change) tropical cyclones will potentially cause annual impacts of 0.2% of GDP and that cyclones with a 40% chance of occurring in the next fifty years (100-year mean return period) could cause damages of 4.4% of GDP. While it is recognised that the focus on Component 2 on the project is to ensure that through reliable and early warnings, there will be a reduction in the loss of human life, there will also likely be flow-on effects to assist in the reduction of infrastructure damage through the enhanced ability of outer island communities to prepare. The alternative to this approach employed by the project is to continue to place emphasis on “recovery” and humanitarian relief after extreme weather events, which are likely to be more costly than building preparedness.

In addition, the PPG process has identified technical specifications of various equipment and materials

that are proposed to be purchased in the project (See Annex 11 and 12). The specifications are based on expert's opinion based on the experience tested in the Pacific region, and such information will allow international procurement processes to be undertaken cost-effectively and competitively.

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. The M&E framework set out in the Project Results Framework in Part III of this project document is aligned with the AMAT and UNDP M&E frameworks.

Project start:

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 3 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 programme 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** should address a number of key issues including:

- Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis-à-vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- Based on the project results framework and the LDCF related AMAT set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document, and finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- 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.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule PB meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PB meeting should be held within the first 12 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.

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:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR

Periodic Monitoring through site visits:

UNDP CO and the UNDP GEF region based staff 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 less 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 at the mid-point of project implementation expected to be in May 2015. The Mid-Term Review 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, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The LDFC/SCCF AMAT as set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document) will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project:

An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PB meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP-GEF guidance. The terminal evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term review, if any such correction took place). The terminal 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 LDFC/SCCF AMAT as set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document) will also be completed during the terminal evaluation cycle. 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 Center (ERC).

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 through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. There will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Audit:

The Project will be audited in accordance with UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Coordinator ▪ PMU ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: \$5,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members ▪ PMU 	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 <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by Project Coordinator ▪ PMU ▪ Implementation teams 	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project coordinator ▪ PMU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project coordinator and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project coordinator ▪ PMU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: \$38,500 Remuneration: Travel cost:	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Terminal Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Coordinator ▪ PMU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : \$38,500	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Project Coordinator ▪ PMU 	Indicative cost per year: \$3,000 (\$12,000 total)	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly for UNDP CO; as required by UNDP RCU
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 94,000 (+/- 5% of total budget)	

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 also 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.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.


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)
Mataio Tekinene	Director of Department of Environment; GEF OFP	MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE, ENVIRONMENT AND LABOR	11/03/2011

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
Adriana Dinu Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator UNDP/GEF		April 16, 2013	Yusuke Taishi, Regional Technical Specialist – LECRDS, UNDP	+66819493997	yusuke.taishi@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective⁶ Resilience of island communities to climate change variability and risks is strengthened through participatory island-level planning, budgeting and execution and community-led investments	Take up of climate resilient marine-based livelihood options	Traditional techniques that are resilient to changes in marine ecosystems have been lost or are not passed down by old people while access to new techniques, materials and information from off island and overseas is poor. These are limiting options for pursuing resilient, appropriate and safe low-cost livelihoods.	By the end of the Project at least 40% of the targeted households adopted at least one form of traditional resilient marine livelihood methods (including canoe building, traditional fishing methods, postharvest fish processing, or aquaculture) (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)	Project terminal evaluation report Project surveys and technical assessment reports	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tangible socio-economic benefits are generated for and recognized by the project beneficiaries • Project activities are fully participatory • Project team has access to a dedicated vessel to meet expectations of communities and timely delivery of project activities • Sufficient political commitment from key stakeholder governments are ensured throughout the life cycle of the project • The government is able to attract high-quality project staff Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient ownership by communities for greater impact and sustainability • Local capacity constrains for implementation • Logistics of working in outer island
	Percentage of the Tuvaluan population covered by the 24/7 early warning system	The existing communications systems are inadequate to send early warning message in a timely manner	95% of Tuvaluan receives early warning in a timely manner using one of the multiple communication lines (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)	Mock drills	
	Outer island communities able to access climate/development funds using climate-mainstreamed ISPs	No climate resilience investments made using the ISPs as a guiding tool	By the end of the project at least eight adaptation priority actions (one in each island) at the island level, outlined in ISPs, are financed by either domestic or external resources and executed.	Assessments of annual budget reports from outer islands Mid-term and terminal evaluation	

⁶ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-December 2012.doc

				reports	
<p>Outcome 1⁷</p> <p>Marine based coastal livelihoods of Tuvaluan outer islands made resilient to declining productivity induced by climate variability and change</p> <p>Scores (from 1 to 5) in this section are "Households having access to secure access to marine livelihood assets" assigned based on the results of the Baseline survey as per the AMAT framework. Scores are: 1. No access to marine livelihood assets; 2. Poor access to ...; 3. Moderate access to ...; 4. Secure access to...; 5. Very secure access to ...</p>	<p>1.1 Households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets – disaggregated by gender [AMAT 1.3.1]</p> <p>1.2 The area of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) or Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) managed in a climate-resilient manner</p> <p>1.3 The level of awareness about links between improved marine ecosystem management and sustainability and resilience of</p>	<p>Few households have access to traditional and resilient livelihood assets and methods (Score=2)</p> <p>Currently 76 km² of island reef areas is under marine management (includes Funafuti Conservation Area at 33km²) but currently no systematic management arrangement or resource monitoring framework is in place</p> <p>Current understanding of the links between marine resource monitoring, management and livelihoods is low.</p>	<p>Score improved to 4: By the end of the project at least 50% of targeted outer islands households have access to climate resilient marine-based livelihood methods introduced/strengthened in the project (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)</p> <p>The area of MPA/MMAs is clarified and some form of management applied to at least a quarter of the reef area on each outer island (area to be calculated) with a corresponding climate-resilient community management plan or Kaupule by-law.</p> <p>Capacity to undertake creel surveys and maintain the database developed among community-based MPA/MMA management groups.</p> <p>At least 50% of Fisheries staff, Kaupule, women, youth and fishers interviewed confirm a clear link between resource management and resilience of livelihoods (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)</p>	<p>Questionnaires (repeated and modified for survey of key informants, women, youth and fishers) Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports</p> <p>Records of marine managed areas and presence of by-laws or management plan Creel survey results linked to management responses.</p> <p>Questionnaires (repeated and modified for survey of key informants, women, youth and fishers) Mid-term and</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People on outer islands see traditional and resilient methods as desirable given development imperatives and lifestyle preferences. • People on outer islands see managed areas as a common resource, not just for VIP visitors <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shipping schedules and weather impede transmission of trainers and materials. • People fail to carry out creel surveys systematically • Unexpected increase in shipping schedules and costs makes it too difficult to run annual events. • Uptake of knowledge is low and resilience not significantly improved.

⁷ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

	subsistence marine-based livelihoods			terminal evaluation reports	
Outputs supporting Outcome 1					
1.1. Climate-resilient marine-based livelihood techniques are implemented benefiting at least 50% of the population					
1.2. Capacity of local administrations, CSOs, communities and Community Fisheries Centers enhanced to integrate climate risks in the community-based management of MMA/MPA including zoning guidance, marine resource stock surveys, and monitoring and enforcement					
1.3. Awareness enhanced for at least 2000 people including island Kaupules, central government staff, CSOs, and community members to understand and respond to the impacts of climate induced risks on marine based coastal livelihoods					
Outcome 2 Capacity of outer islands enhanced to respond to increasing/intensifying climate induced hydro-meteorological risks	2.1. Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders [AMAT 2.1.1.]	The existing warning/communication system with triple-backup system (satellite phone, landline and electricity-powered radio) is inadequate to warn communities within a reasonable time due to deficiencies in power systems for telephone systems in the outer islands.	By the end of the project at least 95% of populations are able to receive and respond to early warnings and take the appropriate actions following the warning (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)	Observations and reports from the annual mock drills Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AM Radio infrastructure, which is the primary baseline project for covering 100% of population continues to operate under extreme conditions Disaster Management Arrangement Bill is revised in a timely manner to planned to be revised with assistance from SOPAC There is sufficient technical capacity and human resources for installation of communication equipment Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High turn-over among key stakeholders in the government and NGO sector during the project implementation results in loss of knowledge and experience Bureaucratic process causes delays in the revision of the Disaster Management Arrangement Bill
Outputs supporting Outcome 2					
2.1. Each island is equipped with robust communication facilities and early warning system facilities					
2.2. Raised awareness and preparedness of outer island communities for climate-induced extreme events					

Outcome 3 Enhanced capacity of communities to access internal/external financing for community-based climate change adaptation through existing participatory development planning processes	3.1 Climate risks are integrated into the island-level strategic plans	Only two islands have some reference to ISPs. Annual budgeting exercise has been undertaken only in one island.	By the end of the project, all outer islands have their ISPs revised to integrate climate risks Annual budgeting process building on the ISP is in place	BTOR from the periodic monitoring visits Presence of the revised ISP and annual budget documents Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the commencement of the project, all remaining islands complete ISPs • There is high level commitment and buy-ins from officials in the central and outer island government to revise their ISPs and use domestic resources for adaptation purposes • Communities are prepared to set aside time and funds for monitoring of available resources and execution of adaptive investments • There is compliance of the Falekaupule Act by Kaupules • Available domestic resources to outer islands (SDE, FTF and core revenues) remain viable sources Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreements are not made among communities on the adaptation priority actions financed by domestic resources • Limited capacity within technical agencies to support the execution of island-level priority actions • Disruptions in periodic visits result in non-completion of annual budgets
	3.2 Adaptation actions implemented from island level plans (no. and type) [AMAT 1.1.1]	No adaptation action has been implemented based on Island Strategic Plans	By the end of the project at least eight adaptation priority actions (one in each island) at the island level, outlined in ISPs, are financed by either domestic or external resources and executed.	Audited Island accounts Compiled report produced by the ISP officer on the consolidated island-level budgets and use	
Outputs supporting Outcome 3					
3.1. All outer Island Strategic Plans integrate island-specific climate risks through existing gender-sensitive, participatory processes					
3.2. Capacity of Kaupules, Falekaupules and community members for monitoring adaptation investments strengthened					
3.3. National and outer island capacity to leverage, sequence and combine domestic resource for climate change adaptation investments strengthened					

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

At the Council Approval of the PIF stage the following comment was provided by GEF Secretariat to be resolved by CEO endorsement stage, as follows:

Project Design, Review Question 19

By CEO Endorsement coordination arrangements with the PACC project should be put in place

It should be noted that the Tuvalu component of the PACC project is exclusively focused on adaptation measures in the water sector and their operation is largely in the main island of Funafuti only. Thus, thematically and geographically, the need for coordination between the proposed LDCF project and the PACC project is not as extensive as the one between the first and second LDCF projects. That said, the PACC project has undertaken a water sector/use assessment in Funafuti in 2010 (http://www.sprep.org/attachments/Climate_Change/PACC_Newsletter_Q3_2010.pdf) and lessons learned from this assessment will be integrated when past vulnerability assessments are consolidated as part of climate change mainstreaming activities under Output 3.1. This is reflected in the description of Output 3.1 as well as in the stakeholder engagement plan.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁸

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

A concern that was validated during the project design phase was the limited capacity within the government, which is explicitly described in Risk 2 and 4 in Annex 8. Apart from their capacity constraints, many staff working in the government are project-funded and/or have multiple responsibilities some of which require them to travel abroad for an extended period of time. Persistent capacity constraints are one of the reasons why Tuvalu remains an LDC and the design of the project reflected these challenges to the extent possible. Recruitment of four dedicated officers sitting in the two responsible party entities (Department of Fisheries and Department of Rural Development), co-financing with the New Zealand Aid Programme focusing on capacity building of the Department of Fisheries, and financing an International Chief Technical Advisor, are expected to minimize the impact of the capacity constraints within the government on the project implementation while explicitly recognizing the capacity building benefits.

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 125,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Technical definition and capacity needs assessment	60,000	61,477.04	
Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	25,000	25,615.42	
Stakeholder consultations	34,000	34,836.99	519.55
Financial planning and cofinancing	6,000	2,551	
PPG Management	0		
Total	125,000	124,480.45	519.55

⁸ 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)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A