



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

GEF ID:	5551		
Country/Region:	Kiribati		
Project Title:	R2R Resilient Islands, Resilient Communities		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; LD-3; IW-3; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,720,030
Co-financing:	\$12,250,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,120,030
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Gavin Wall

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 <b>country eligible</b> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Kiribati accessed the CBD on 1994-08-16.</li> <li>- The UNCCD became effective on December 07 1998 (date of Ratification: September 08 1998).</li> <li>- Climate Change Convention: Date of signature: 13 June 1992; Date of ratification: 07 February 1995; Date of entry into force: 08 May 1995</li> </ul>	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	<p>There is a letter dated April 5, 2013 endorsing the programme R2R and a national project. However, the title of the project is not mentioned. Please, clarify.</p> <p>September 3, 2013 Thanks for the clarification.</p>	

\*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		A letter with the right project name and the willingness to use the flexibility scheme will indeed be welcome.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	BD: \$1,552,869; CC: \$1,850,602; LD: \$295,990.  - Please note that the fees are 9 percent for this program, or \$424,803 (and not \$422,165 as mentioned in the page 1 of the PIF). - Table D: the sum of the project grant + fees for biodiversity = \$1,584,816 (and not \$1,552,869). - The total grant resources (last cell of the table D) = \$5,144,833 (and not \$5,112,885). Please correct.  September 3, 2013 Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA  - The SFM incentive is triggered, asking for \$1,244,747 (fees included).  - The project also targets IW resources (\$168,678): Please make sure that activities are included in the PIF on the Small IW increment, consistent with IW	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Objective 3 under GEF 5. Further ensure, that these activities will support actions towards facilitating adoption of integrated approaches with water-related outcomes through harnessing results and lessons learned from national and local multifocal area activities. Furthermore, please do ensure that these results and lessons learned will be shared with the regional project "Testing the integration of Water, Land Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood's in Pacific Island Countries".</p> <p>September 3, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
<p><b>Strategic Alignment</b></p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please refer to the Aichi targets that the project will help to achieve with the BD allocations.</li> <li>-For climate change mitigation, the project aims to contribute towards CCM-5 Objective. However, project activities to support such an objective are not evident in the project framework or description. Please see section 7.</li> <li>- There is no difficulty to see that the project is aligned with the BD, LD, and SFM result framework.</li> </ul> <p>September 3, 2013 Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>The project is compatible with the NBSAP and the Program of Work on Protected Areas and the NAP (UNCCD). It is also aligned with the country's climate change policy.</p> <p>Please elaborate on the elements of the National Communication (UNFCCC) that the project will address and please be specific regarding how the project will address low emission development goals of the country.</p> <p>September 3, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>No. The problems and the associated baseline projects are described in general. Rapid urbanization and settlements along with sand mining, are noted as the causes for mangrove deforestation. The issue of fuelwood is mentioned for South Tarawa and Kiritimati.</p> <p>However, in explaining the root causes the project does not identify the connection or relevance of climate change mitigation. Please clarify barriers related with climate change mitigation.</p> <p>September 3, 2013 The reasoning has been revised and simplified. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>No. The project framework is in the draft form. More concrete comments can only be given once the framework has been finalized along with suitable indicators.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- The project objective is missing in the table B.</p> <p>The main elements provided in the project framework are clear and somehow appropriate for the component 1 (biodiversity), the component 2 (integrated landscape management), the component 4 (KM) and the management costs. Some elements of clarification are however expected:</p> <p>- Under the component 2, the nature of activities related to CC, SFM, and LD need some clarification. Please integrate climate change mitigation issues while prioritizing the mangrove systems and specify component activities that will ensure reduction of CO2 emissions or increase sequestration. It is not clear if the work on the field will only focus on mangroves. Please design and specify activities as they relate to the identified drivers.</p> <p>- The idea to identify appropriate land management practices for revival is welcome. However, please clarify what mechanism would be used to ensure that the plans will be implemented.</p> <p>- Confirm the GEF reasoning to include landscape level management plans for two main urban areas.</p> <p>We have more difficulties with the component 3:</p> <p>- This component was not included in the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project brief included in the PFD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This kind of outreach and communication activities need more justification, as they seem baseline activities and should be taken by the cofinancing. Please justify the reasoning. Please confirm the sustainability of these activities.</li> </ul> <p>Component 4: revise the formulation in the table B. The outcome "4.1 project implementation based on result based management" should be taken into account in the management costs.</p> <p>September 3, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elements are provided p 10 and 11. However, these elements stay very general and need to be improved.</li> <li>- The increase of Protected Area coverage is acceptable from a BD point of view. The benefits from a IW point of view are also welcome.</li> <li>- The justification of multiple environmental benefits is interesting and appropriate, but need more details and/or metrics: can you elaborate on what you mean by "sustaining flows of ecosystem services? Can you roughly estimate the number of ha of mangroves that will be protected and rehabilitated?</li> <li>-Based on the project activities, at PIF stage at least preliminary estimation of CO2e emissions reduced need to be presented. More concrete and site based estimates are expected at CEO endorsement stage.</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>September 3, 2013  Addressed. Please, reinforce the information related to the GEB during PPG (ha of mangroves restored, ha of mangroves protected, flows of ecosystem services).</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>In the PPG, please include an analysis of stakeholders, and notably the local communities. Include also gender issues that are not mentioned in the PIF.</p> <p>September 3, 2013  The point is taken and will be checked at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes. During the PPG, please include a comprehensive risk analysis.</p> <p>September 3, 2013  The point is taken and will be checked at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes. This project is part of the ambitious R2R program. The project fits with national strategies.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p>	<p>The project is innovative for Kiribati because this integrated approach will change the usual sectoral way.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>- Sustainability aspects: Please refer to the STAP review and check the comment related to the risk of post-project failure (problem of sustainability) taken from the terminal evaluation of the IWCAM project (#1254).</p> <p>- In term of innovative partners, see during the PPG how to involve regional, national, and local scientific partners (University of the South Pacific for instance).</p> <p>- In the PPG, clarify the strategy for assisting the country in planning such R2R approach (see notably the GEF/CBD publication on Marine Spatial Planning to maximize the potential of ICM/IWRM approaches to resolve unsustainable trajectories for BD, land and water use within the coastal zones and related catchments).</p> <p>September 3, 2013 The point is taken and will be checked at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-	- The use of BD resources is clear to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>reinforce the PA network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We welcome that the operational component on the ground will use more than half of the project budget. We will invite the Agency to explore the ways to increase this component 2 and increase the visible results on the ground.</li> <li>- For the time being, we are not convinced by the component 3 and the use of \$600,000 of GEF resources for awareness and communication. If the cofinancing reaches \$2,660,000 on these activities, it might be wiser to use these resources for the component 2. Please, justify or correct.</li> </ul> <p>September 3, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role?</p> <p><u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	Addressed.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Less than 5 percent.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	A PPG of \$150,000 is requested. The amount is acceptable for a \$4.7 million project.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.  September 3, 2013 All comments have been responded and addressed or will be improved at CEO endorsement. The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- In the PPG, develop the socio-economic aspects, including gender issues. - Please include an analysis of stakeholders, including of course the local communities and the traditional authorities. - Include a comprehensive risk analysis. - Detail the M&E plan. - Clarify the strategy for assisting the country in planning such R2R approach	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		(see notably the GEF/CBD publication on Marine Spatial Planning to maximize the potential of ICM/IWRM approaches to resolve unsustainable trajectories for BD, land and water use within the coastal zones and related catchments). - In term of innovative partners, see how to involve regional, national, and local scientific partners (University of the South Pacific for instance). - During the PPG, include metrics to track progress (ha of mangroves restored and carbon gains, if feasible).	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	August 21, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 03, 2013	
	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.**