



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	9197		
Country/Region:	Vanuatu		
Project Title:	Protecting Urban Areas Against the Impacts of Climate Change in Vanuatu		
GEF Agency:	ADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$5,650,000
Co-financing:	\$47,330,000	Total Project Cost:	\$52,980,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Stephen Blaik

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. As an LDC party to the UNFCCC, Vanuatu is eligible for LDCF resources. Also, the project is a child project under the regional program, "Climate Proofing Development in the Pacific" (GEF ID: 5037).
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		YES. See parent program (GEF ID: 5037).
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		

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

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		YES. See parent program (GEF ID: 5037).
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, resources for Vanuatu were already secured under the parent program (GEF ID: 5037).
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		Yes. See parent program (GEF ID: 5037). FI, 10/5/15: Since Agency has provided tracking tools for GEF6, it is requested to also ensure that CCA objectives in Table A correspond to those for GEF6. These are currently aligned with GEF5 CCA objectives. FI, 10/7/15: Yes, Agency has adjusted Table A to reflect CCA objectives for GEF6.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		YES, the project is aligned with CCA objectives 1 and 2.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and		YES. See parent program (GEF ID: 5037).

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		YES, the project aims to build resilience in Vanuatu's urban infrastructure; in particular, to ensure that roads and drainage systems are able to withstand high levels of run-off during flash floods (which are common on the island). These activities will require strong engagement of stakeholders, and in particular community members. For instance, the project is taking on a number of capacity building activities that will support improved decision making and knowledge development, therefore allowing for active monitoring of project activities and overall project sustainability.
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>The project identifies an ADB-led "Port Vila Urban Development Project" and the "Emergency Assistance Project" as the main baseline initiatives. Rehabilitation activities will take place on approximately 22km of road (as well as select drainage systems in flood prone watersheds). Emphasis is placed on roads that connect to the Efate Ring Road which was badly damaged by Tropical Cyclone Pam.</p> <p>However, kindly address/provide clarity on the following:</p> <p>1) For PVUDP, it is difficult to decipher</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>the scale rehabilitation activities from the map provided in Figure 3 (see CEO Endorsement Request) - the map resolution is not clear. Also, in line with component 2, please provide information on how monitoring and maintenance of infrastructure will be organized, particularly at the community level. For example, approximately how many community members are expected to be trained (general estimates suffice)? And, what will be the process to ensure strong community engagement for systematic monitoring and repair of infrastructure?</p> <p>2) It is noted that the Emergency Assistance Project will focus on the recovery of the Efate's transport sector based on the principle of "building back better". Please provide some description (or examples) of possible rehabilitation activities along the Efate Ring Road; and also, how these investments do not take into consideration future climate change impacts?</p> <p>Recommended action: 1) Replace map in Figure 3 with higher resolution, 2) describe the process for monitoring and repairing of infrastructure, and 3) describe rehabilitation efforts in Efate, including, how investments do not consider future CC impacts.</p> <p>FI, 10/5/15: Yes, Agency has adequately responded</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			to the above.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>Table. 5. (CEO Endorsement Request) provides estimates for "without CC" and "with CC" design scenarios. Costs associated with additional climate-proofing are estimated at \$1.37 million.</p> <p>However, to further justify the cost-effectiveness, also describe additional cost savings from the additional \$1.37 investment from an economic or social perspective. For example, future damage costs saved, or expected increases in income for urban communities etc.</p> <p>Recommended action: Include additional analysis of cost-effectiveness from an economic or social perspective.</p> <p>FI, 10/5/15: Yes, Agency response is adequate.</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>Please address comments in 11 before additional cost reasoning can be fully assessed.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please address comments in 11.</p> <p>FI, 10/5/15: Yes, concerns for Item 11 have been addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		<p>YES, the elements of the project framework are clear and properly described in section A.1.3.</p> <p>However also address comments in 11.</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>Please address comments in 11.</p> <p>In addition, please clarify how this project will integrate "green" solutions (alongside hard infrastructure or "grey" solutions) as these are highly cost-effective, generally win-win, and can help provide an additional buffer against extremes in climatic variability. Without much elaboration, tree planting is only mentioned as a possible option for community engagement on p.22 (CEO Endorsement Request).</p> <p>Recommended action: 1) Please address comments in 11, and 2) clarify how the project will adopt green solutions alongside infrastructure ones to increase infiltration.</p> <p>FI, 10/5/15: Yes, Agency has responded adequately to the above.</p>
	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?		<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>By improving the design of road, drainage and sanitation systems in Port Vila, the project will achieve benefits across a number of socioeconomic indicators, such as the number of road</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>accidents, probability of annual flooding, incidence of diarrhea etc. (listed on pg. 31, CEO Endorsement Request).</p> <p>The project also promotes engagement of women. In particular, the project aims to set up women's groups, training programs for women, and make-use of sex-disaggregated indicators during monitoring.</p> <p>However, as customs and laws in Vanuatu continue to discriminate against women, this may affect their ability to meaningfully participate in the project design and implementation, and ultimately benefit from the project. From the project text, it is difficult to discern how information from the initial gender analysis and consultation activities (conducted during project preparation) were integrated in the project design. For instance:</p> <p>(a) the section on root causes (page 10-11, CEO Endorsement Request) talks about community empowerment and community based approaches, but does not mention specific issues related to gender inequities or that women and girls are disadvantaged in significant ways in Vanuatu;</p> <p>(b) the section on adaptation benefits (page 25, CEO Endorsement) does not elaborate on the distribution of benefits</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>among different stakeholders; and</p> <p>(c) issues around the project's sustainability (page 25, CEO Endorsement) outline a community approach with no elaboration on the gender considerations/understanding.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please address items a, b and c above.</p> <p>FI, 10/5/15: Further information is requested. The Gender Action Plan in the Annex stresses that a high proportion of women will be engaged as project laborers and maintenance workers. Please clarify if this is due to a specific preference for these activities expressed by women during consultation (as opposed to a general request for increased income, for example). Issues raised for item 16 in an earlier review have been addressed.</p> <p>FI, 10/7/15: Yes, Agency has adequately responded to the issues raised above.</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		<p>YES. The project is partnering with a wide-range of stakeholders, including government agencies, CSOs (incl. church groups), and urban communities. A detailed list of partners and their possible engagements are listed in Annex H.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)		<p>NOT YET CLEAR</p> <p>1) Maintenance: The project mentions plans to engage with communities on road maintenance and repair (outputs 3 and 4). Various studies show that road deterioration and damage can often be avoided by regular maintenance. Considering that insufficient road maintenance and management could be a risk to the project, please also describe how regular maintenance of infrastructure will be budgeted and therefore ensured over the project lifetime.</p> <p>2) Alignment with Urban Development Plans: The project's mention of Vanuatu's limited capacity for urban planning and management (page 11) could be a risk to the project. Therefore, in the absence of such plans, can the project demonstrate alignment with local development priorities and planned/or existing sectoral investments? If so, how?</p> <p>Recommended action: Please clarify 1) how maintenance will be budgeted and insured over the project lifetime, and 2) how will the project align with local development priorities and sectoral investments, given the limited capacity in urban planning.</p> <p>FI, 10/5/15: Yes, Agency has responded adequately</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			to the above. Maintenance has been budgeted, and efforts have been made to align with local development priorities.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		YES, the project is consistent with various transport sector projects in Vanuatu, including the "Vanuatu Climate Resilient Standards Project" (CRRS) and the Vanuatu Transport Sector Support Program, both funded by the Australian government,
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		YES. Implementation arrangements are detailed in the project document.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		YES.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		YES.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	NOT CLEAR. Please address comments in 11, and adjust co-financing if needed. Recommended action: Please address comments in 11, and adjust co-financing if needed.	YES.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FI, 10/5/15: Further information is requested. When will the DRF amounts (currently "for approval" in Table C) be confirmed?</p> <p>FI, 10/7/15: Further information is requested. The DFR amounts in Table C have been confirmed, but Agency is requested to provide documentation of the ADF co-financing stated in Table C.</p> <p>FI, 10/8/15: Yes, additional documentation confirming the ADF co-financing has been provided. (It should be noted that the documents show a higher amount of co-financing than is stated in Table C, as only a portion of the co-financing was deemed relevant for the LDCF activities).</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		YES.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>Please include tracking tool with submission. See updated tool here: https://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF</p> <p>Recommended action: Please include tracking tool with submission.</p> <p>FI, 10/5/15: Yes. The GEF6 LDCF tracking tools have been provided.</p>

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?		YES. These are detailed in the project document.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		n/a
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		NOT YET. Please address comments in 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18 and 27 10/8/15: Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review*		August 17, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		October 05, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

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

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.