



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

GEF ID:	<b>5130</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Kiribati</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Integrating Global Environmental Priorities into National Policies and Programmes</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4936 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CD-2; CD-5; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$24,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$500,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$530,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,054,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 08, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Tom Twining-Ward, UNDP Green-LECDRS</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Kiribati ratified the CBD on 8/16/1994, the UNFCCC in 7/02/1995 and the UNCCD in 8/09/1998. Cleared 9/20/2012.	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, with letter dated 8/21/2012. Cleared 9/20/2012	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. Cleared 9/20/2012	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the	Yes. However, a better explanation of all the UNDP staff who will be involved	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	country?	and their roles is requested. Additional information is requested. 9/20/2012  Provided. Cleared 02/21/2013	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	N/A
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. It's in the Cross Cutting Capacity Development Allocation. Cleared 9/20/2012.	Yes. GEF-5's CCCD. Cleared 8/12/2014
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	N/A
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	N/A
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. It's consistent with the CCCD Framework. Cleared 9/20/2012	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. Cleared. 9/20/2012	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014
	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 seems to be consistent with the Kiribati Development Plan and the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA). However, please provide the NCSA as we have not received it at the GEF. Additional information is requested. 9/20/2012  Provided. Cleared 02/21/2013	July 31, 2014  Yes, and the consistency is adequately described.  Cleared
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Not provided. There's also no clear explanation of how many staff will be positively influenced by the project. Additional information is requested.	July 31, 2014  Yes, the institutional context for capacity development (specifically the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>9/20/2012</p> <p>Provided. Additional details about staff that will be positively affected and sustainability will be provided during PPG phase. Cleared 02/21/2013</p>	<p>Environment and Conservation Division) clearly demonstrates potential for sustainability of outcomes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Project Design	<p>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>	<p>Somewhat. However, no illustrative data is provided. Please elaborate more on the current status of capacity development (CD) in Kiribati. What is the structure at the government for managing issues related to the environmental conventions, particularly in terms of data management?What would be the scenario without GEF's support? More information is requested. 9/20/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 02/21/2013</p>	<p>July 31, 2014</p> <p>Yes, the baseline sufficiently described.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>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>		<p>July 31, 2014</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>To some extent. However more information is requested in terms of the causes of the problems and how the proposed components will address those causes. Also please provide information on current investments in data collection and monitoring and how the GEF investments are incremental to these. More information is requested. 9/20/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 02/21/2013</p>	<p>July 31, 2014</p> <p>Yes, the country-drivenness and overall institutional context presents a timely opportunity for the GEF increment to make a difference.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Yes. However, we suggest to move the current FA outcome d) under CD2 as an output and combine with output c) (The mechanism is more an output than an outcome).</p> <p>It is also not clear what will be contribution of the government to CM since it is the prime responsibility of the Government. Additional information is requested 9/20/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 02/21/2013</p>	<p>July 31, 2014</p> <p>Yes, the framework is simple and straightforward with only two mutually reinforcing components.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 9/20/2012	Yes. Appropriate and sound. Cleared 8/12/2014
	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>To some extent. However the gender dimension should not only refer to the direct female staff who will be trained in the project, but on a wider scope, how the project will positively affect women in Kiribati. Socio-economic benefits should be also more clearly defined. Additional information requested. 9/20/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 02/21/2013</p>	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Somewhat. There's mention of NGOs and CSOs taking part in the project but no specific role is identified for them. Additional information is requested. 9/20/2012</p> <p>Provided. Specific roles for CSOs will be determined the PPG Phase. Cleared 02/21/2013</p>	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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)	Yes. Cleared 9/20/2012	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Cleared 9/20/2012	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	No. This information is not provided. Additional information requested. 9/20/2012  Provided. Cleared 02/21/2013	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes. Kiribati has formulated new plans which imply an updated baseline. The project will link to these plans..  Cleared 8/12/2014
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Somewhat too high. Should be in area of 9%. Please revise. 9/20/2012  Clarified. Cleared 02/21/2013	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Adequate to some degree. However, since beneficiary of the project does not provide any in cash co-financing, with this also demonstrating commitment to the project. So, the GEF amount should be decreased and made equal to grant from beneficiary. Please revise project document. 9/20/2012  Explanation provided and co-financing increased. Additional co-financing will	Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>be explored during PPG Phase. However, total co-financing in table C differs from that of tables A and B. Please revise the tables so the total amounts are consistent. 02/21/2013.</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 03/25/2013</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>Higher cash co-financing is requested. Additional information is requested. 9/20/2012</p> <p>Explanation provided and co-financing increased. Additional co-financing will be explored during PPG Phase. However, total co-financing in table C differs from that of tables A and B. Please revise the tables so the total amounts are consistent 02/21/2013</p> <p>Revised. Cleared 03/25/2013</p>	<p>Co- financing letters have been provided.</p> <p>Cleared 8/12/2014</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>The Agency's cash co-financing should be significantly increased and in-kind contribution should be estimated and provided. Additional revisions requested. 9/20/2012</p> <p>Explanation provided and co-financing increased. Additional co-financing will be explored during PPG Phase. However, total co-financing in table C differs from that of tables A and B. Please revise the tables so the total amounts are consistent 02/21/2013</p>	<p>Yes. Although the agency is not providing any cash co-financing. Given the size of the project and the fact that Kiribati is a SIDS as well as the significant commitment from the government, this has been accepted. It's expected that the Agency will provide significant technical and management support during the project's implementation.</p> <p>Cleared 8/12/2014</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014</p>
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors</p>		<p>Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>Not yet but could be if necessary changes/clarification is provided. Additional information and changes are requested. 9/20/2012</p> <p>Not yet. Please address the issue of the inconsistency in the co-financing figure in Tables A,B and C. In addition, please revise the Agency fee to reflect the new policy of a maximum of 9.5% of GEF contribution. 02/21/2013</p> <p>Yes. The PIF is technically cleared and recommended. 03/25/2013</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>The following issues will be determined in more detail:</p> <p>1) Specific roles for CSOs in the project at PPG phase</p> <p>2) Additional details about staff that will be positively affected and sustainability of outcomes during the PPG phase.</p> <p>3) Additional co-financing will be explored during PPG phase</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of		Yes. Cleared 8/12/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Yes. CEO approval is recommended. 8/12/2014
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 20, 2012	August 12, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 21, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 25, 2013	
	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?	Yes to some degree. Capacity indicators should be used to provide baseline for endorsement document. Revisions are requested 9/20/2012
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes to some degree. international consultant work term should be decreased to 3 weeks. Revisions are requested. 9/20/2012
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet, pending clarification for the PIF. 9/20/2012 Once the PIF is approved. 02/21/2013.  Yes. The PPG is recommended. 03/25/2013
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 27, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 25, 2013

\* 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.