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

GEF ID:	**5049**		
Country/Region:	**Vanuatu**		
Project Title:	**Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**4866 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$250,000**	Project Grant:	**$8,030,000**
Co-financing:	**$30,897,253**	Total Project Cost:	**$39,177,253**
PIF Approval:	**November 20, 2012**	Council Approval/Expected:	**February 07, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Rawleston Moore**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jose Frezo Padilla**

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. Vanuatu is an LDC and it has completed its NAPA.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, a signed letter is attached to the project, as OFP endorsement.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Not clearly. UNDP does not have a comparative advantage on large-scale investment projects on climate-proofing public infrastructure in Vanuatu, which is the largest project component. Recommended Action: Please clarify UNDP's comparative advantage on large-scale infrastructure investments, or re-visit Component 1 to focus on the	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged.

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		agency's comparative advantage. Update 12 November 2012 The clarifications which have been provided are acceptable. Discussions with UNDP, have noted that UNDP through the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change project (PACC) is involved in the climate proofing of some infrastructure.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	UNDP has sufficient staff capacity in the Pacific region and is implementing several projects in Vanuatu. The updated UNDAF for the Pacific region states that in Vanuatu, the UNDP will aim to strengthen the capacity at national, local, and community level to effectively plan and implement climate change adaptation and DRR.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes. Vanuatu has already accessed $3 Million from LDCF, for a World Bank implemented project. Another project to be implemented by ADB ($6.2M) is also currently under review. Update November 12th 2012 Yes. Vanuatu has already accessed $	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		5,580,000 from LDCF, for a World Bank implemented project. Another project to be implemented by ADB ($6.2M) is also currently under review.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, the project is aligned with LDCF results framework.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Not clear. The project will address CC-A objectives 1, 2, and 3. However, Expected Outputs that will contribute towards CCA-3 are not clear. Recommended Action: Please clarify which outputs will contribute towards CCA-3. Update November 12 2012. Activities related to CCA-3 have been removed Table A.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	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?	Yes. The project is consistent with three of Vanuatu's NAPA priorities. It is also consistent with the overarching development framework for Vanuatu's Priority Action Agenda (PAA). The project is also aligned with the implementation of National Integrated Coastal Management Framework (NICME).	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged.

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?	Not clearly. The project plans to build capacity of key national and provincial government agencies, as well as communities, in order to enhance CC governance under Component 3, and support activities of dissemination of information and early warning systems under Component 2. However, linkages between capacity building activities and other project activities that would contribute to the project sustainability are unclear. Recommended Action: Please clarify how the capacities developed in this project will contribute to other activities through the project and ultimately to the project's sustainability. Please see also comment for section 19, for coordination issues that need to be addressed to ensure sustainability. Update November 12 2012. Clarifications have been provided on the capacity building activities. By CEO Endorsement please provide detailed information on the capacity buiilding activities and how they will be sustained during and after the project, given the capacity constraints prevelant in Vanuatu.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. The project will assist in mainstreaming adaptation approaches to building resilience into existing government policies and practices, including through capacity building at the local, regional and national levels, in particular at the Area Council level. In addition, Component 1 will integrate climate risks into existing outer island development planning frameworks, hence contributing to the overall sustainability of project outcomes.
	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	Not clear. The project lists as primary baseline, the Vanuatu Transport Sector Strengthening Programme (VTSSP) started in 2009. It is however unclear if this co-financing will materialize	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. Baseline projects are clearly described and are based on sound assumptions.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?	considering that the baseline phase I will end in December 2012. Therefore, the financial viability of such baseline is questionable. More importantly, as stated in the proposal VTSSP already implements adaptation approaches and climate-proofing of coastal infrastructure. The other baseline project is a UNDP-UNICEF-FAO project that covers 12 communities, some of which are covered by this proposal. However, this project also incorporates climate change into its interventions, therefore, it is not clear how this project will act as baseline and in which capacity does it build into this project. Recommended Action: Please reconsider the choice of baseline projects such that the role of LDCF funds is clear. Finally, please clarify if the contribution listed in Component 2 by JICA: $300,000 is also counted as a baseline. If so, please explain how the proposed project will build on JICA's project in terms of monitoring and early warning systems. Update November 12th 2012. Clarification has been provided that VTSSP Phase 2 will be a baseline project and that the VTSSP Phase 2 will start in 2013. The role of the JICA project is clarified, with the JICA project purchasing and installing early	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		warning equipment to monitor seismological hazards.	
	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?		DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. The project will utilize a range of locally developed adaptation tools that are tailored to local conditions, ranging from pig farming to erosion control and disaster risk management and planning. The government's Decentralization Act Amendment 2013 furthermore introduces cost-efficient mechanisms and approaches for delivery of government funds to local administrations, which this project will strengthen and build upon. In addition, the project will employ local field staff in project sites as opposed to flying staff in from Port Vila for short periods of time.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	Not clear. Given that the description of baseline project is unclear, it is not possible to determine the additional benefits of LDCF funds. Recommended Action: Please see section 11 and also provide adequate and appropriate information to support the additional cost reasoning. Update November 12th 2012 The clarifications provided are sufficient. The activities which will be finanaced by the LDCF are based on additional reasoning.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. Activities financed as part of this project are based on additional reasoning.
	14. Is the project framework sound and	Not entirely. Component 1 does not	DS, August 10, 2014:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sufficiently clear?	describe specific actions envisioned for the "hard" and "soft" measures for Output 1.2.2. It is also unclear how ecosystem interventions will build on the baseline and how these will be integrated into the project. On Component 2 explanations on the methods that would be undertaken to improve coverage and forecasts need to be provided. The proposal also needs to expand the explanations of the activities to be undertaken by Components 3 and 4. Recommended Action: Please elaborate on the activities that would be undertaken through the proposed project to clearly support the added adaptation value of the project. Please elaborate on the activities that will comprise the hard and soft measures on Component 1. Please also expand on the activities undertaken by Components 2, 3, and 4. Please revise Output 1.2.1; to link the soft measures to be supported through the project to the baseline project. Finally, please restructure and revise the components as necessary to address comment for section 3. Update November 12 2012. The clarifications provided are sufficient. The soft adaptation measures will include re-vegetation of the coastal zone. The capacity buiilding activities	Yes. The project framework is sound and clear. As recommended at PIF stage, further information on soft adaptation measures has been provided, including on the rehabilitation of coastal ecosystems and resources such as mangroves, coral reefs and fisheries, through measures ranging from Crown-of-Thorn Seastar removal to upland management and dissemination of erosion control plant species to reduce sediment run-off into marine systems. An integrated "Ridge to Reef" approach will ensure that adaptation to climate change will occur in a holistic fashion.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		will target national and provincial agencies. By CEO endorsement further details on the soft adaptation measures to be supported should be provided.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	No. See section 11, on comments regarding baseline. Without the clarifications on the baseline, it is difficult to assess a good methodology. Update November 12 2012 With the clarifications provided the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the additional benefits are sound and appropriate.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	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?	Yes. Some of the benefits associated with the project are: reduction of costs for damaged infrastructure, socio-economic benefits related to the restoration of coastal ecosystems on which livelihoods are dependent, gender equality on planning and execution, and potential reduction of loss of lives during CC related natural disasters, enhance food and livelihood security. However, at CEO Endorsement stage, it would be necessary to expand on this section and clarify what specific benefits are expected.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. The project document includes a clear description of socio-economic benefits including gender dimensions. In particular, the project will actively encourage the participation of women in community and policy-oriented activities to address the different vulnerabilities according to gender, culture and other characteristics that impact people's capacity to prepare for and respond to climate change and related disasters. During the project design phase, 719 women, youth and other marginalized persons were consulted across all six provinces so as to assess gender and age differential impacts of climate change due to socially ascribed responsibilities. The project has been designed based on these consultations.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Not clearly. The project plans to engage indigenous communities in activities that require human resource manpower, as well as including women in the planning of activities undertaken in Components 1, 2, and 4. Finally, the Vanuatu Association of NGOs (VANGO) is providing in-kind cofinancing, however its role in the current proposal is not specified. Recommended Action: Kindly clarify what the role of VANGO will be while implementing the proposal's activities. Update November 12 2012 The clarification provided is sufficient. VANGO will be engaged in the selection of NGOs/CBOs/CSOs that will implement community level activities. Further information on the oversight activities of VANGO should at the CEO Endorsement stage.	DS, August 10, 2014: Partly. The CEO Endorsement Request includes detailed information on public participation, including civil society. However, while it is clear that the Vanuatu Association of NGOs (VANGO) will be represented on the National Advisory Board for Climate Change, will participate in workshops and meetings, and will represent the link to the Small Grants Program in the country, it seems unclear what oversight activities are foreseen for VANGO in the project implementation. Recommended action: Please provide more details on the oversight activities of VANGO in project implementation. DS, September 13, 2014: The designated oversight activities of VANGO in project implementation has been clarified. Comment cleared.
	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)	Not clearly. The proposal as it currently stands faces high risks due to lack of coordination and possible duplication of activities with other projects on the ground. This risk is not reflected in this proposal. Recommended Action: Please address the risk of duplication and overlap of interventions with ongoing activities on the ground, and please state which actions will be elaborate on the mechanisms that would be undertaken	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		by the UNDP taken by UNDP to mitigate such risk. Update November 12 2012 The NACCC has now been replaced by the NAB in the project. The clarifications provided are sufficient .	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Not clearly. The World Bank is currently implementing a LDCF project "Increasing Resilience to Climate Change and Natural Hazards in Vanuatu" the country. It is unclear how the proposal will build on the WB project. Another UNDP project "Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC)" is also under implementation in the country. It is unclear how PACC will inform the current proposal, especially concerning hard measures. Moreover, an ADB project "Climate Proofing Development in the Pacific" is currently under review. Finally regarding MESCAL project, please clarify how this proposal will not overlap on governance activities. Recommended Action: Please review the current proposal to build upon the adaptation measures already on-going in the country and to coordinate with the possible future ones. Update November 12 2012.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. The project is consistent and coordinated with a number of relevant GEF-financed initiatives as well as other relevant interventions.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		The clarifications provided are sufficient. Given the activities which are being financed by the GEF, by CEO endorsement please establish a coordination mechanism with the other GEF Agencies to ensure there is a no overlap with the activities. Please also include a matrix, in the final project document, identifying where each agency has its project activities in Vanuatu.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, however detailed information on these arrangements will be needed at CEO endorsement.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. Detailed information on project implementation/execution arrangements has been provided.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. Justifications for changes have sufficiently been provided.
	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?	Yes. PMC is less than 5% of the total requested LDCF grant.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Not entirely. There are some concepts regarding the baseline and related co-financing that needs to be clarified. See Section 11. Indicative co-financing from local government is not stated. Recommended Action: Please clarify the concepts regarding baseline on Section 11 and state the cofinancing amount coming from the local government.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. Funding and co-financing is appropriate.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update November 12 2012. Additional information on the co-financing has been provided. The cofinancing will need to be confirmed at CEO Endorsement.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	See Section 24.	DS, August 10, 2014: Partly. Co-financing has been confirmed for $15,000,000 by Public Works Department. However, all other co-financing sources have yet to be confirmed. Recommended action: Please provide letters confirming co-financing from remaining sources listed in Table C. DS, September 22, 2014: Yes. Comment cleared.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. UNDP is contributing in-kind co-financing from the UNDP-UNICEF components of the UNDP-UNICEF-FAO project.	DS, August 10, 2014: Yes, unchanged. However, co-financing should be confirmed as noted in Question 25. Recommended action: Please provide letters confirming co-financing from remaining sources listed in Table C. DS, September 22, 2014: Yes. Comment cleared.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. AMAT has been included.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		DS, August 10, 2014: Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. Comments have been addressed.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	No. Please clarify issues raised in Sections: 3, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, and 24. Update November 12 2012 (RM) Discussion have been held with UNDP on the project. The clarifications and explanations provided are sufficient. The project is recommended for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	There are several items for consideration at CEO Endorsement. 1- Please provide detailed information on the capacity buiilding activities and how they will be sustained during and after the project, given the capacity constraints prevelant in Vanuatu. 2-Further details on the soft adaptation measures to be supported should be provided.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3-Further information on the oversight activities of VANGO should at the CEO Endorsement stage. 4-Please establish a coordination mechanism with the other GEF Agencies to ensure there is a no overlap with the activities. Please also include a matrix, in the final project document, identifying where each agency has its project activities in Vanuatu, so that there is no overlap.	
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?		DS, August 10, 2014: Yes. Progress of PPG including information on resources spent to date and resources committed has been included.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		DS, August 10, 2014: Not yet. Please address comments pertaining to Questions 17, 25 and 26. DS, September 13, 2014: Not yet. Please address comments pertaining to Questions 25 and 26. DS, September 22, 2014: Yes. Comments cleared.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 28, 2012	August 10, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		September 22, 2014
	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?	Update November 1st 2012- RM The proposed activities for the project preparation are appropriate. The activities include preliminary technical assessments for the project sites, stakeholder dialogues and capacity assessments, along with detailed project planning preparation to finalize results frameworks and project coordination arrangements
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The itemized budget is justified
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	Not at this stage. The PPG cannot be recommended until the PIF is recommended for approval. Update November 1st 2012-RM The PPG is recommended for approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 28, 2012
	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.