



Climate Resilient Urban Development in the Pacific

Basic Information

GEF ID

10173

Countries

Regional (Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu)

Project Title

Climate Resilient Urban Development in the Pacific

GEF Agency(ies)

ADB

Agency ID**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Climate Change

Program Manager

Fareeha Iqbal

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/4/2019:
Cleared.

FI, 4/8/2019:

Corrections are requested.

The Program is aligned with LDCF strategic objective 1 (outcome 1.1) and strategic objective 2 (outcome 2.1).

However, please correct the following three issues:

- i) Part I, "Program Information" section: Please correct the Program commitment deadline to 12/14/2020;
- ii) Part I, "Program Information" section: Please change response to "YES" for "Other Program" category;
- iii) Table D: Please adjust Kiribati Agency Fee so that it is within 9.00% (it is currently \$607 over, or 9.01%).

Agency Response

- i) Part I, "Program Information" section: Field has been updated to 12/14/2020
- ii) Part I, "Program Information" section: Field has been updated and ticked other program box
- iii) Table D: Figures for Kiribati has been adjusted to 9% agency fee and correct figures has been reflected to other relevant tables

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/2/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/11/2019:

Further information is requested.

Table B outlines two components of the Program; the first will facilitate climate-resilient planning and development and the other will focus on needed investments to enhance the climate resilience of urban services in Port Villa (in Vanuatu), Funafuti (in Tuvalu), Honiara (Solomon Islands) and South Tarawa (Kiribati).

The PFD as well as child project concepts for each of the four countries provide further information on how the program will achieve its objectives, including alignment with the identified core adaptation indicators.

However, the agency is requested to kindly include, in each of the two components shown in Table B, indicative activities for the four LDCs.

Agency Response

Examples of the activities to be implemented have been inserted into Table B of the PFD document

However, due to space limitations in Table B, for full details the reader is referred to section 1.a.4 and to the relevant child project PIFS.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was

identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 5/2/2019:

Yes. Indicative co-financing is \$145.7 million, of which \$139.3 million has been identified as investment mobilized.

FI, 4/8/2019:

Yes. Indicative co-financing is \$145.7 million, of which \$119.3 million has been identified as investment mobilized.

Agency Response**GEF Resource Availability**

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/8/2019:

Yes. The LDCF request for each country is within its allocation. The allocations for PMC and agency fee are in line with GEF Policy.

Agency Response**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response**The focal area allocation?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

Agency Response**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 4/8/2019:

Yes. The funding request from Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu is \$5 million each, and from Vanuatu \$2.5 million.

Agency Response**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/8/2019:

Cleared. PPG has not been requested.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/2/2019:

Cleared. Information on both the Core Indicators and Metadata has been submitted.

FI, 4/8/2019:

Further information is requested.

Values for the Core Indicators of the LDCF have been provided. The project is expected to benefit 250,000 people, of whom half will be female; it will mainstream climate change adaptation in 3 development policies/plans; and it will enhance capacity of 400 people to identify climate risks and/or engage in adaptation, of whom 65% will be female.

The agency is requested to provide relevant meta-data information for the project.

Agency Response The CCA Core Indicators and Metadata sheet (excel) has been completed and attached to the Portal re-submission. Where relevant, data has been included in the PFD.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/2/2019:

Cleared. The CCM Rio Marker has been removed.

FI, 4/8/2019:

Further information is requested.

Relevant keywords have been tagged, and the value "2" (highly relevant) has been selected for the Rio Marker pertaining to climate change adaptation.

However, the value "2" (highly relevant) also been selected for the Rio Marker pertaining to climate change mitigation (CCM). For a CCM Rio Marker of "2", climate change mitigation needs to be an explicit objective of the project. If the agency feels that the project will yield significant CCM benefits despite it not being a stated objective, we request that the CCM Rio Marker "1" is selected and an explanatory text included in the submission that offers an explanation of why it was selected.

Agency Response This was an administrative error. The value '2' is selected for climate change adaptation. This project is not designed to contribute to climate change mitigation. Table G has been modified accordingly

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/11/2019:

Yes. Pacific SIDS are among the world's most vulnerable countries to adverse impacts of climate change. Sea level rise is contributing to coastal erosion and salt-water intrusion, a grave threat for many low-lying islands. Tropical cyclones are intensifying with climate change, climatic averages, such as duration and timing of rainfall, are also changing. Key aspects of the already-fragile economies of Pacific SIDS are profoundly affected – such as the fisheries, tourism and infrastructure sectors, as well as people's livelihoods and health. Urban areas tend to be on the coast and thus particularly exposed to climatic hazards, with population growth hindering traditional coping mechanisms and contributing new stresses – socio-economic and environmental – that increase vulnerability.

Some of the major adverse impacts of climate change on urban areas include damage water and sewage infrastructure (pipes, pumping stations, treatment plants); energy systems, roads and ports; inundation of land and intrusion in groundwater; and damage to disaster defenses.

Climate change will exacerbate many existing stresses and introduce additional ones. Barriers in the context of resilient urban development include lack of knowledge of cost-effective and innovative technologies; inadequate and aging infrastructure; lack of empowerment of communities to work in partnership to overcome challenges; limited capacity to design and set up sustainable urban management systems; and limited capacity to establish sustainable systems for operations and maintenance.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/2/2019:

Cleared. Thank you for the additional information.

FI, 4/12/2019:

Further information is requested.

Overall, the baseline scenario and projects are well-described. The ADB, along with other development partners, is providing technical, institutional, strategy, hardware and infrastructure support to these highly vulnerable Pacific SIDS that are also LDCs. Much of the ADB's support in the urban sector focuses on the water and sanitation sectors; however, given the high vulnerability of these sectors to adverse

impacts of climate change, adaptation considerations much be factored into the policy, capacity and investments measures in order to yield sustainable and effective solutions that meet the needs of a large, growing and vulnerable urban populations. The agency has provided information on its active urban development portfolio, including baseline projects, in each of the four target cities of the proposed project.

The PFD states that GCF projects in Kiribati and Solomon Islands have been factored into the baseline project situation. The agency is requested to clarify, in the context of the support being provided through the ADB and GCF, why LDCF resources are necessary, and why the proposed actions for LDCF support could not have been achieved through the baseline resources and initiatives.

In addition, linked to 'Coordination', the agency is requested to discuss how the proposed project will coordinate with GCF adaptation projects approved in 2016 in Vanuatu and Tuvalu (as well as efforts supported by other donors)

Agency Response

With regards to the need for LDCF to complement baseline (GCF and ADB) in order to ensure climate change adaptation, more information has been provided in section 1.a.5 (four new paragraphs at end of the section). This additional information explains how most baseline funding focusses on sustainable development and therefore LDCF is necessary to ensure climate change adaptation. This additional information also explains how LDCF and GCF will complement and synergize to achieve optimal climate change adaptation in Kiribati and potentially Solomon Islands (see notably the new sub-section headed 'Synergies with GCF').

With regards to the 'Coordination', the narrative has been expanded in the PFD document.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/2/2019:

Cleared. Thank you for the additional information.

FI, 4/11/2019:

Not yet.

Component 1 will focus on outcomes such as enhanced capacity to understand and plan for climate change in the water and sanitation sector, including modifications to standards and norms; improved awareness of climate change in the health and hygiene sectors; and advancing incentives to include climate change and disaster risk management considerations in the urban sector.

Component 2 will focus on enhancing the climate resilience of urban services in the water, sanitation and disaster management sectors.

Examples include:

Kiribati: climate-resilient water supply to schools, providing awareness on health and climate change issues, and rainwater capture technology;

Solomon Islands: watershed management measures and provision of water access technologies (such as rainwater harvesting) for communities that will not be on the expanded water network and need to rely on increasingly unsuitable groundwater;

Tuvalu: assessment of the impacts of climate change on the waste sector, and measures to reduce the exposure of the waste management system to threats posed by climate change.

Vanuatu: decentralization efforts that will bring urban services closer to communities, building local level planning and implementation skills, strengthening partnerships across stakeholders, and planning and implementing smallscale investments.

Further information is requested:

(i) We note that Vanuatu has a lower LDCF request (\$2.3M) than other participating countries of the program. However, it appears that all the adaptation investments will be supported by co-financing, and not the LDCF resources. We aim at a high percentage of LDCF resources providing on-the-ground investment to deliver adaptation benefits, in-country. Would it be possible to please ensure that a significant proportion of the LDCF request for Vanuatu is supporting on-the-ground adaptation investments?

(ii) Please comment on the innovative value of providing rainwater harvesting technology. We understand its need. However, is it possible to provide additional, more innovative (and less season-dependent) adaptation solutions at scale to water-scarce communities to address water shortage?

Agency Response

(i) LDCF resources in Vanuatu are primarily to finance on-the-ground adaptation investments, such as small-scale emergency shelters, small-scale flood protection works and drainage, flood-proof sanitation and coastal protection. This was not sufficiently clear in the previously submitted version. This has now been clarified in revised section 1.a.3 (see Component 2, Vanuatu sub-heading, final bullet point) and in the table in 1.a.5. More information is provided in the Child project PIF.

(ii) innovation and rainwater harvesting: A box has been included (within section 1.a.3) clarifying that innovative approaches to rain harvesting, as part of a multi-source, adaptive response strategy, remain a key strategy for ensuring climate resilient water supplies in the Pacific.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/8/2019:

Yes, it is aligned with the GEF's climate change adaptation strategy for the period 2018-2022.

Agency Response**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 5/2/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/12/2019:

Not yet.

The agency has provided indicative adaptation actions that would be supported by the LDCF, and the costing seems reasonable. However, the agency is requested to please respond to comment (i) of review question (3), pertaining to Vanuatu.

Agency Response This has been covered under comment (i) of review question (3).

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 4/12/2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/2/2019:

Cleared. Innovative aspects of the proposed LDCF support have been discussed, as has its value-addition.

FI, 4/12/2019:

Sustainability: The child projects will build the operational, financial, technical and coordination capacity of relevant government agencies to sustainably manage efforts to consider climate resilience benefits in urban service provision. In addition, the project will build capacity for operations and maintenance. If needed, regulatory measures will be explored. During project preparation, a plan will be developed on how to engage stakeholders in project implementation and monitoring.

Replication: Yes. Several Pacific SIDS share similar threats from climate change to their urban services and infrastructure.

Innovation: Further information is requested.

(i) In the PFD, some of the innovative elements identified pertain to the baseline (ADB or GCF) actions. We understand that in some cases the LDCF will be blended in to this support; however, would it be possible to provide information on innovative aspects of the proposed LDCF-supported activities?

(ii) Please clarify whether LDCF resources are providing the best possible value addition in the context of baseline efforts. LDCF resources have the potential to demo 'win-win' technologies that can be scaled up while meeting the needs of the most vulnerable, and should not be used to simply plug gaps.

Agency Response

(i) the section on innovation has been revised in the PFD to highlight the innovative aspects supported by LDCF.

(ii) Further information is provided in a new section at the end of the 'innovation' section in the PFD. Whereas it is recognised that this LDCF regional program covers the incremental costs of climate change adaptation in the urban services sector across the region, in addition,

where possible, LDCF- financed activities also pilot or demonstrate technologies and target a strategic influence. Through the approaches in this program, LDCF achieves significant leverage and its impacts are to be multiplied.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/8/2019:

Yes, approximate coordinates have been provided for the Program's four project areas.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/10/2019:

Yes. Civil society organizations, indigenous and local communities, and private sector entities were consulted during the program identification phase. The agency plans to engage in a broad and thorough consultation process during child project preparation, of which an output will be a detailed plan for stakeholder participation during project implementation and monitoring.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/8/2019:

Yes. The context has been articulated; women in the proposed project SIDS are typically more vulnerable to climate change impacts and have less adaptive capacity. In order to be succeed, the project will require the full and meaningful participation of women. Measures will be taken to ensure women's full involvement. Project- and sector-specific gender analyses will be undertaken for each child project. On their basis, a *Gender Action Plan* will be prepared for each during Project implementation. The Program will include sex-disaggregated indicators.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/10/2019:

Yes. There are significant opportunities for engaging the private sector. in this program, such as investment in water supply utilities. The agency proposes to explore such opportunities during program and project implementation. In addition, the ADB is supporting a strategic

process to facilitate the entry of market based principles and private sector stakeholders in each country.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/10/2019:

Yes. Risks pertaining to human and technical capacity, institutional coordination, political commitment and uncertainties in climate projections for some of the islands have been flagged and mitigation measures identified.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/2/2019:
Cleared.

FI, 4/10/2019:
Not yet.

ADB will coordinate the program regionally. At the country level, the executing agencies (EAs) for the projects for Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and Vanuatu will be the Ministry of Infrastructure and Sustainable Energy, Ministry of Finance and Treasury, Ministry of Public Utilities and Infrastructure, and Ministry of Finance and Economic Management, respectively. Each EA will establish a Project Management Unit (PMU) and a Steering Committee or Task Force, the latter comprising relevant government agencies and responsible for policy guidance as well as project preparation and implementation. Monitoring will occur at both program and project level, and preliminary institutional arrangements have been identified.

Additional information is requested:

- i) Information on executing partners is missing from Part I (Program information) of the PFD entry in the Portal. The agency is requested to kindly enter it;
and
- ii) Annex B tables (b) and (c) show relevant approved and pipeline ADB projects in the Pacific. Please also briefly discuss, in the 'Coordination' section, potential coordination with other ongoing or planned relevant initiatives in the countries and region, including GEF, GCF and other. Please identify such initiatives. How will coordination with them be assured during program/project design, and along which elements?

Agency Response

(i) Information on national GEF Executing Partners has been included in Part I of the PFD.

ii) Coordination {note this also responds to the comment raised in the section above under Part II (Project justification), Comment 2 (Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?)}

The section on coordination has been greatly strengthened in order to clarify the approaches to coordination and to establish the aims of coordination, including coordination with other LDCF and GCF projects. However, it is noted that the most important coordination takes place at the country level and is therefore country specific – this will mostly be achieved through consultations during the development of the detailed Requests for CEO Endorsement.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/10/2019:

Yes. At a regional level the Program is aligned with the *Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific -- An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (2017-2030)*. The country child project concepts are aligned with their respective NAPA-identified priorities.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/12/2019:

Yes for PIF stage.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/8/2019:

Yes. Endorsement letters have been submitted by the current OFP of each of the four countries participating in this Program.

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/4/2019:

Yes.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

By CEO Endorsement, please provide:

1. Specific information on project sites and actions to be supported by the LDCF, as well as coordination with related in-country initiatives;
2. A detailed knowledge management plan, including how successes, best practice and failures can be shared and learned from, for various stakeholders, across each country and across the region;
3. Detailed information on how the private sector will be engaged;
4. Detailed information on stakeholder consultations and plans for continued engagement;
5. The Gender Action Plan;
6. The CEO Endorsement stage CCA indicators for each child project.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/17/2019	4/29/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/4/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

