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# PART I - PROJECT

# A Project Summary

## **A.1 Project Rationale**

1. Environment has emerged as a Key Policy Area (KPA) of the Kiribati Development Plan (KDP) – the overarching national development plan - since 2008. A review of the 2008-2011 KDP stated, “*Kiribati is one of the most vulnerable countries in the world to the impacts of global climate change, yet the nation’s contribution to global warming is quite minimal. Emissions per capita are less than one tenth of the world average, and have not risen significantly in decades. Kiribati is a strong advocate for emissions reductions in international climate change conventions and treaties, and has chosen to follow a low-carbon development path as part of its overall commitment to a sustainable future*”.
2. Protecting the environment became one of the six key policy areas in the KDP 2012-2015. It is part of the national development priority that is to facilitate sustainable development by responding and mitigating the effects of global climate change and through approaches that protect island biodiversity and supports the reduction of environmental degradation.
3. In order to implement this national development plan, the government of Kiribati has been developing/strengthening its environmental governance framework. In 2013, Cabinet approved the *Kiribati Integrated Environment Policy (KIEP)*. It is intended to contribute to the review and revised targets and activities under the environmental key policy area of the KDP 2012-2015 and to set the direction towards building and enhancing the resilience of Kiribati, its local communities and people to respond to the impacts of global climate change. Among the strategic objectives of this policy, several of them are related to the current proposed project. They include: (i) to improve knowledge, information and national adaptive capacity for responding and adapting to climate change (as listed in the climate change theme); (ii) to enhance the storage, protection and dissemination of knowledge, and information to the general public on the conservation, sustainable use, and management of island biodiversity (as listed in the island biodiversity conservation and management theme); and (iii) to improve monitoring and management of data for MEAs and state of the environment reporting and make this available for national development policy and planning processes (as listed in the environmental governance theme).
4. Currently, the government of Kiribati is also finalizing its *Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KJIP)*. It is part of the commitments Kiribati made under the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change, the Regional Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Management endorsed by the Pacific Leaders in 2005 and the Pacific Islands Meteorological Strategy approved in 2012. The goal of the soon-to-be approved KJIP is to increase resilience through sustainable climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction using a whole of country approach; it will be achieved through 12 strategies. Similar to the KIEP, this plan is also linked to this project. Under its second strategy that is *Improving knowledge and information generation, management and sharing*, three results are anticipated: (i) An integrated and up-to-date national database providing all relevant information for resilient development is available and accessible for all; (ii) Capacities to communicate science and best practices are strengthened by developing and disseminating effective and relevant information, communication and awareness products for decision-making and awareness raising across sectors and at all levels; and (iii) Capacities for data collection, assessment, analysis, interpretation, monitoring and reporting are strengthened across sectors.
5. As a GEF eligible country, Kiribati obtained an UNDP-GEF grant to conduct its National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA), which started in 2007 and was concluded in 2011. Through this process, stakeholders were able to review environmental issues, take stock of progress in addressing these issues as guided by the Conventions, identify gaps in implementation and meeting of obligations, identified causes of these gaps and determined actions to enhance capacity and address the gaps at three levels: systemic, institutional and individual. On the basis of identified environmental issues and cross-cutting capacity issues, the process was concluded with the development of a national capacity development strategy to address these prioritized capacity issues.
6. This proposed project is part of this national capacity development strategy. It is focusing on the second prioritized cross-cutting capacity issue that is “*Limited availability of data and information related to the three Rio Conventions and their thematic areas*”. The NCSA process identified that there was a lack of environment technical database and information on the three Rio Conventions and more generally on the three thematic areas in Kiribati: climate change, biodiversity and land degradation. It was recognized that the collection and dissemination of information on these areas to the public, including at the grassroots level, has always been a problem due to the scattered nature of islands in Kiribati; any environment community outreach programme has always been costly and time consuming.
7. This particular project is in line with the GEF-5 CCCD Programme Frameworks two (2) and five (5), which calls for countries (2) to generate, access and use information and knowledge and (5) to enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends. Through a learning-by-doing process, this project will harmonize existing information systems, and integrating internationally accepted measurement standards and methodologies, as well as consistent reporting on the global environment. It will target the development of capacities at the individual and organizational level, strengthening technical skills to collect data and transform information into knowledge. The project will also target a more holistic construct of monitoring and evaluation systems through strengthening the institutionalization of these systems as a means to feed lessons learned and best practices from projects and interventions.

## **A.2 Project Strategy**

1. This project is a direct response to a national priority. Its goal is to target the critical need for new and improved environmental data and environmental analysis to strengthen the foundations of Kiribati's policy and planning frameworks to meet Rio Convention commitments. Using a holistic approach and integrating the Rio Conventions principles, the project will support the development of an institutionalized sustainable environment management information system to underpin more complex policy and decision-making processes designed to frame and direct the management and the protection of the environment within the context of global climate change.
2. The project’s objective is to improve information management and compliance monitoring in order to achieve global environmental benefits. This objective will be achieved through two components/outcomes:
3. ***The development of an operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information***: Under this outcome, project resources will be used to develop a comprehensive Environmental Management Information System (EMIS) at ECD that serves to create new and improved environmental data and information. This EMIS will be developed through active collaboration and coordination with work programmes of key stakeholder agencies, research institutions, and other non-government organizations as appropriate to ensure the generation, collection, exchange and distribution of the required data and information. The EMIS will also be accompanied by improved capacities to generate and use new and improved data and information for policy and planning purposes and training will be provided to strengthen institutional and staff capacities to use best practice methodologies in data collection and analysis for environmental mainstreaming and environmental protection and management in the face of global climate change.
4. ***The development of a compliance monitoring system (CMS) tracking key environmental indicators***: The project will support the development of a compliance monitoring system (CMS). It will include the identification of a set of environmental indicators that will provide information on the state of the environment in Kiribati, including the drafting of national reports to international conventions. The CMS would be used as part of the learning and re-tooling (i.e., adaptive collaborative management) of programmes and plans to ensure that their implementation proceed as planned to deliver the agreed-upon objectives and expected outcomes. Under this outcome, the project will support the development of capacities to monitor and report on progress made towards achieving Rio Conventions commitments, and to feed that information to planners and decision-makers.
5. The project will take an adaptive collaborative management (ACM) approach to implementation, which calls for stakeholders to take an early and proactive role in the mainstreaming exercises, as well as to help identify and solve unexpected implementation barriers and challenges. By taking an ACM approach, project activities and outputs can be more legitimately modified and adapted to maintain timely and cost-effective project performance and delivery.

## **A.3 Key Indicators, Assumptions, and Risks**

1. A set of indicators was identified to measure progress against the objective and outcomes. It includes the summary result of the capacity development scorecard as one indicator used to measure progress in the development of capacities at the objective level. Three other indicators were identified at this level, mostly measuring the quality of the products delivered with the support of the project that is an operational EMIS and a CMS. A total of 15 indicators were identified to measure progress at the objective and outcomes level. For each indicator, a baseline was set as well as a target at the end of the project.
2. Risks were identified and their review indicates that they are manageable through the project’s learn-by-doing approach. The fact that this proposed project is a direct response to national priorities contributed to a strong government ownership and willingness to succeed, hence low risks that key stakeholders will not participate in the project and lack of political will.

# B Country ownership

## **B.1 Country Eligibility**

1. Kiribati is eligible to receive technical assistance from UNDP, and is thus eligible for support under the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Kiribati ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on August 16, 1994 and the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) on May 8, 1995, and acceded to the Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought on September 8, 1998. Kiribati ratified important protocols under the Rio Conventions in later years, namely:
	1. It acceded to the Cartagena Protocol on Biological Safety on September 7, 2000 and ratified it on July 19, 2004 to protect biodiversity from the potential risks posed by genetically modified organisms that are the product of biotechnology.
	2. It acceded to the Kyoto Protocol on September 7, 2000, committing to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions for the period 2008-2012 at the 1990 level.
	3. Kiribati is currently considering the ratification of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress on remedial measures arising from damages caused by the transboundary movement of living modified organisms.
2. Other global conventions signed or ratified by Kiribati and related to the environment include:
	1. International Whaling Commission (IWC) (Adherence December 28, 2004)
	2. Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean (1982)
	3. Pacific Tuna Fisheries (2008)
	4. World Heritage Convention (WHC) (Acceptance May 12, 2000)
	5. Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer (January 7, 1993)
	6. Montreal Protocol to the Vienna Convention (Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer) (January 7, 1993) and its Amendments (April 8, 2004)
	7. Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) (September 7, 2004)
	8. Basel Convention on the Control of Trans-boundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and their Disposal (September 7, 2000)
	9. Waigani Convention (June 28, 2001)
	10. London Convention (July 12, 1979)
	11. International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea, 1996: Marine Pollution: UNCLOS (Chapters 1 & 12) – A
	12. MARPOL (International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as modified by the Protocol of 1978 relating thereto) Annexes I, II, III, IV, V and VI
	13. CLC Protocol 92 (entered into force on February 5, 2008)
	14. Fund Protocol 92 (February 5, 2007)
	15. Bunkers Convention 2001
	16. Anti Fouling Convention 2001
	17. Ballast Water Management Convention 2004
	18. SPREP Pollution Emergency (Protocol concerning Cooperation in Combating Pollution Emergencies in the South Pacific Region) (1986)
	19. SPREP Dumping Protocol (1986)
	20. Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (Acceded on April 30, 2013)
3. Kiribati is also part of several regional planning frameworks to support its work in managing the environment. It includes:
	1. The Pacific Plan
	2. SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015
	3. Solid Waste Management Strategy for the Pacific Region 2010 – 2015
	4. Regional Asbestos Strategy 2011
	5. Regional E-waste Strategy 2012
	6. Regional Health Care Waste Management Strategy 2013
	7. Pacific Ocean Pollution Prevention Programme Strategy (PACPOL) Strategy
	8. Pacific Islands Regional Marine Spill Contingency Plan (PACPLAN)
	9. The Pacific Islands Framework of Action to Combat Climate Change 2006 -2015
	10. The Pacific Action Strategy for the Conservation of Nature 2008 – 2012
	11. The Pacific Islands Regional HCFC Phase-Out Management Plan

## **B.2 Country Drivenness**

1. The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the Pacific Sub-Region is a five-year strategic programme framework that outlines the collective response of the UN system to development challenges and national priorities in the 14 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) for the period 2013-2017. Its overarching ambition is to promote sustainable development and inclusive economic growth to address the social, economic and environmental vulnerabilities affecting society at all levels and to ensure human security in the Pacific, with a focus on the most vulnerable groups.
2. The framework was developed around a number of development challenges identified in a Common Multi-Country Analysis developed by the UN Country Teams based in Fiji and Samoa in consultation with national and regional stakeholders and partners. Among these challenges, the analysis highlighted physical isolation, small economies of scale, limited governance structures, small populations and markets, limited natural resources (in most cases), uneven infrastructure, the impact and variability of climate change, natural hazard risks, and the vulnerability to economic shocks. There are significant gaps with regard to service delivery capacity and gender equality, including limited political participation by women. Nearly a fifth of the region’s total population is young, which is both a challenge and an opportunity for governments to ensure access to quality education and health services, employment and the types of support services that will guide their transition to productive adulthood. Cultural heritage and diversity is at risk due to increasing urbanization and, in some countries, significant outmigration.
3. Based on this analysis, the UN system in the Pacific focuses its programming and advocacy efforts on five inter-related outcome areas:
	1. Environmental management, climate change and disaster risk management, in support of an integrated approach to environmental sustainability and efforts by PICT governments and communities to adapt to climate change and reduce and manage disaster risk.
	2. Gender Equality, with the aim of fostering gender equality, women’s political and economic empowerment and participation, and enhance safety for women and children across the Pacific.
	3. Poverty reduction and inclusive economic growth, where the UN system will promote the capacity to stimulate equitable growth, create economic opportunities and decent work especially for the youth, and promote sustainable livelihoods and social protection systems.
	4. Basic services (Health & Education). The UN system aims to building capacity throughout society to improve the quality of and access to basic services in health, education, and protection; and strengthening the accountability of duty bearers.
	5. Governance and human rights, where the aim is to improve the quality of governance, including the inclusion of vulnerable groups in decision-making processes in the political and economic spheres and advance compliance with international human rights norms and standards.
4. Within this framework, UNDP developed a sub-regional programme document for the region and for the same period as the UNDAF 2013-2017. This programme states that protection and conservation of the environment are ever more important because of the effects of climate change – such as rising sea levels – and ocean acidification, as well as large-scale forest logging, commercial agriculture and associated land clearing, which threaten the sustainability of natural resources. The marine environment is under threat despite the implementation of coastal management strategies. Up to 50 per cent of the biodiversity of the sub-region is at risk, and there is concern about the sustainability of the Pacific fisheries due to the difficulty of controlling the operations of foreign fishing fleets, which severely affect the livelihoods of the island communities.
5. One of the areas of this programme is “*environmental management, climate change and disaster risk management*”. Under this area, UNDP support will bolster the resilience of communities in the region to cope with climate change, and will implement strategies that integrate environmental management, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and disaster risk reduction. It will facilitate transition to ‘green’, low-carbon development through the mainstreaming of climate change into sectoral planning and national strategic development strategies, and through public expenditure and institutional reviews, as appropriate.
6. The project will contribute to strengthening the management of the environment by developing the capacity of national key stakeholders involved in this area. By strengthening the national capacity to collect, store, manage and disseminate environmental data, the project will provide better environmental information to stakeholders to make better decisions and to better monitor the environment. Simultaneously, through better environment information, the general public will be better informed on environment facts thus environment communication, education and public awareness will also be enhanced. Furthermore, the project will also contribute to enhance environment data that would feed into the timely development of the State of the Kiribati National Environment Report on an annual and four year basis.

### B.2.a National Capacity Self-Assessment

1. The aim of the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) projects - funded by the GEF - was for countries that are Parties to the UNCBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC, to assess their own capacities and capacity development needs to address the requirements of the three conventions and identify measures to address these needs.
2. As a GEF eligible country, Kiribati obtained a UNDP-GEF grant to conduct its NCSA, which started in 2007 and was concluded in 2011. It was able to (1) review its capacity needs to address priority national and global environmental issues mainly in relation to climate change, conservation and management of biodiversity and land degradation, (2) determine what actions are needed to strengthen management of these issues and (3) prepare a national capacity development strategy and plan of actions. The focus was on the identification of cross‐cutting issues, identification of opportunities for synergies and strengthening integrated and coordinated approach to environment management and sustainable development.
3. The approach taken by Kiribati in implementing the NCSA project followed closely the guidance given in the NCSA Guide, which included the following main stages:
4. Inception;
5. Stock-take and gap analysis;
6. Thematic assessments (identify causes of gaps, capacity needs and capacity development actions within the scope of each of the three Conventions);
7. Cross-cutting assessment (identification of cross-cutting issues and potentials for synergies); and
8. Development of a Final Report and a Capacity Development Action Plan.
9. The NCSA was also conducted with an extensive stakeholder consultation process with the participation of many stakeholders ensuring also the representation from key government agencies and NGOs. The NCSA Pacific Regional Support Mechanism that was coordinated by SPREP and the NCSA Global Support Programme overseen by UNDP and UNEP and based in New York supported the NCSA process.
10. Through the NCSA, stakeholders were able to review environmental issues, take stock of progress in addressing these issues as guided by the Conventions, identify gaps in implementation and meeting of obligations, identified causes of these gaps and determined actions to enhance capacity and address the gaps. Capacity building activities undertaken during past GEF‐funded Enabling Activities and the International Waters Project were also taken into account. Finally, the assessment of gaps in implementation and capacity needs was undertaken and capacity development actions were recommended at the following three levels:
11. Systemic capacity – the enabling environment including policies, regulations and coordination mechanisms;
12. Institutional capacity – institutional mandates, strategies, resources, operational procedures; and
13. Individual capacity – human resource development.
14. As a result, the NCSA outputs in Kiribati included:
15. A Stock-take Report identifying previous and current activities relating to capacity building (such as enabling activities) for each of the three sectors.
16. An account (report) of the process by which the NCSA was prepared, including stakeholder participation.
17. A description (inventory) of capacity building needs in the three sectors with prioritization to the extent possible, and other related capacity needs.
18. An identification of cross cutting issues and synergies.
19. A plan of action to meet prioritized needs and a mechanism for monitoring and evaluating progress made in meeting those needs.
20. Under the thematic assessments (3), the main environmental issues were identified; these included:

***Climate change:***

* Extreme vulnerability of underground water;
* Poor design of private and community wells;
* Limited awareness of the adverse effects of constructing poorly designed causeways;
* Insufficient data and information on Climate Change for Kiribati;
* Lack of collaboration between government institutions, NGOs and grassroots people;
* Absence of well equipped Observatory Station;
* Limited agricultural skill in producing exotic and local food crop;
* Decreased abundance of fish stock and culturally significant plants and trees;
* Poor design for causeway constructions; and
* Less participation at regional and international forums on Climate Change.

***Land degradation:***

* Inadequate policies covering issues of land degradation;
* Increasing population pressure on land and sea environment;
* Increasing rate of coastal erosion due to the effects of wave action and currents;
* Improper disposal of waste and pollutants;
* Uncontrolled mining of beach sand and aggregates;
* Legislative and regulatory framework;
* Land clearing for development; and
* Rubbish burning and bush fires.

***Biodiversity conservation:***

* Lack of appropriate legal instruments to support designated conservation areas for the environment and biodiversity;
* Limited scientific research and studies being undertaken on the biodiversity in Kiribati;
* Insufficient incentives for local communities to rehabilitate land replanting programs;
* Scatter and isolation of islands coupled with high cost of travel and communication;
* Insufficient support and motivation by responsible officers and ministries;
* Weak enforcement of environment act and policing/control of activities that have adverse impacts on the environment;
* Inadequate capacity building in managing protected areas;
* Low priority status in the current National Development Strategy; and
* Inadequate capacity in resource mobilization, project management and report writing.
1. In addition to these thematic environmental issues, several cross-cutting environmental issues were also identified; these included:
* Vulnerability to climate change due to Kiribati’s very low lying islands and very high dependence on the quality and quantity of underground water lens and rainfall;
* Unsustainable coastal zone management, including all low lying islands and atolls and their surrounding lagoons and fringing reefs;
* Water in-security due to rising threats to water resources;
* Loss of habitats and biodiversity (terrestrial and marine) species supporting food security and livelihoods;
* Land degradation;
* Decline in traditional knowledge; and
* Increasing populations with limited alternative livelihood opportunities.
1. Based on these assessments, the NCSA process in Kiribati identified nine (9) cross-cutting capacity issues, these include:
* Low collaboration and integration by government ministries, institutions, local communities and private sectors whose mandates and work programmes are related to the three Rio Conventions;
* Limited availability of data and information related to the three Rio Conventions and their thematic areas;
* Continuous constraints on financial resources;
* Insufficient communication, education and public awareness programme;
* Inadequate strengthening and enforcement of policies and legal framework;
* Limited training opportunities and opportunities for on‐the‐job training;
* Limited mainstreaming of environment issues into national plans;
* Limited utilization of traditional conservation practices and transfer of technology; and
* Untimely submission of reports and other documents required under the Convention.
1. Finally, on the basis of all these environmental issues and cross-cutting capacity issues, the process was concluded with the development of a National Capacity Development Strategy. This strategy proposed (i) a revised institutional arrangement; (ii) a monitoring and evaluation approach; (iii) the mobilization of resources to fund activities; and (iv) a capacity development action plan matrix listing proposed activities to address prioritized cross-cutting and thematic capacity issues.
2. This proposed project is part of this national capacity development strategy. It is focusing on the second prioritized cross-cutting capacity issue presented above that is “*Limited availability of data and information related to the three Rio Conventions and their thematic areas*”. The NCSA process identified that there was a lack of environment technical database and information on the three Rio Conventions and more generally on these three thematic areas in Kiribati. It was recognized that the collection and dissemination of information on these areas to the public, including at the grassroots level, has always been a problem due to the scattered nature of islands in Kiribati; any environment community outreach programme has always been costly and time consuming.
3. The project should also contribute in addressing the last priority that is the “*untimely submission of reports and other documents required under the Conventions*”. By having access to better set information, the submission of reports to Conventions as well as national reports should be improved over time.

### B.2.b Sustainable Development Context

1. Kiribati was part of the former British colony of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands and gained its independence in 1979. Straddling the equator in the Pacific, this oceanic nation comprises 33 atolls spread out across a vast Economic Exclusive Zone area of 3.5 million square kilometers (13th largest in the world) with a total land area of just only 800 sq km.
2. The Kiribati 2010 census determined that the total population was 103,058, of whom 50.7% were female and 49.3% male. In all, 48.7% of the population lives in the capital of South Tarawa (in the Gilbert Islands), which has a population density of 3,173 people per square kilometer. The mean age of the I-Kiribati population is 24.9 years and 15.9% of the population is aged five years or younger, reflecting the high birth rate of 31,3 per 1,000 people per year.
3. The public sector dominates Kiribati’s economy. It provides two-thirds of all formal sector employment and accounts for almost 50% of gross domestic product. Kiribati is highly exposed to external economic shocks, particularly surges in food and fuel commodity prices, due to its limited revenue base and high dependency on imports.
4. The country is divided into three groups of atolls namely; the Gilberts, Line and Phoenix. Across the atolls the very small strips of land are a few kilometers at its widest sections and, on average are less than two meters at its highest point above sea level. Climate variability and weather continue to influence natural systems and socio‐economic activities in Kiribati. Most of the country experiences modest levels of rainfall of up to 3,000mm per annum in the Southern Gilberts, however certain parts of the country such as central and southern Gilbert Islands, most of Phoenix islands and Kiritimati are drier and prone to periods of drought.
5. Land in Kiribati is an extremely precious resource given their very limited area and the critical ecosystem services they provide in sustaining the environment, people and economy of the country. The very thin soils of Kiribati are derived from coral limestone, coarse textured and deficient in most essential nutrients. The average depth of the soil layer is 25 centimeters with a relatively high pH of between six and ten. Their porous nature provides for very good drainage but if not enriched with organic matter will retain its high pH levels, be susceptible to high levels of leaching and generally not suitable for cultivation of many types of food crops. In terms of land space and potential for taking some pressure off South Tarawa, the island of Kiritimati (Christmas) has been targeted due to its relatively bigger area of land and small population. It is said to be the largest atoll in the world and contains more than half of the total land area of the country.
6. Kiribati is blessed with rich marine resources that has sustained its people since time immemorial and has influenced its culture, traditions and way of life. The inshore fisheries continue to be a main source of food and livelihood while oceanic fisheries, particularly tuna resources, provide the country with much needed revenue from fishing licenses and catch sales. Land and in-shore marine ecosystems and resources are intimately linked and also very vulnerable to disturbances from human activities, climate variability and climate change. Small disturbances do not take long to have knock-on effects resulting in degradation in habitats and ecosystem services that people and species rely heavily on.

*Biodiversity*

1. With its large ocean territory, Kiribati has a rich marine biodiversity. The Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA) – with over 400,000 square km2 and comprising all islands in the Phoenix Islands Group of Kiribati - is the largest marine park in the world. It represents almost 12% of the Kiribati EEZ and about 17% of the global area of MPAs designated worldwide. In 2010, it was added to the list of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage sites. There are two submerged reef systems in this protected area, the greater part of which is comprised of ocean floor with a water column averaging more than 4,000 meters deep and reaching a maximum at 6,147 meters. It is home to a number of predatory fish, sea turtles, sea birds, corals, giant clams and coconut crabs, most of which have been depleted elsewhere in the region. The relatively rich variety of marine fauna (consisting of approximately 300 to 400 species) continues to provide the people of Kiribati with their main source of protein – fish.
2. In contrast, the indigenous land-based flora and fauna of Kiribati are among the poorest on earth and there are few, if any, endemic species. Despite the limitations of land, soil and freshwater resources, the people of Kiribati have developed sophisticated subsistence agricultural systems based mainly on coconut, breadfruit, pandanus and swamp taro.
3. However, Kiritimati in the Line Group is the largest atoll in the world and holds a diversity of avifauna that is of both regional and international significance. The atoll provides nesting, roosting, feeding and migration sites for over 40 bird species.
4. As per the Kiribati Biodiversity Area Report published in 2013, Kiribati is part of the Polynesia-Micronesia Biodiversity Hotspot, one of 34 regions of the world where extraordinary levels of biodiversity and endemism (species unique to a known and defined area) are coupled with extremely high levels of threat. Although 90 species found in Kiribati are listed as globally threatened on the currently available 2010 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, the true number of threatened species in Kiribati is significantly higher than this.
5. The primary threats to Kiribati biodiversity are i) habitat alteration caused by unplanned or poorly planned development (especially causeway construction), ii) over harvesting of resources (over-fishing, gleaning, harvesting of mangroves), iii) waste and pollution, iv) modern agricultural methods and v) the spread of invasive species.

*Climate variability*

1. The climate of Kiribati, especially rainfall, is highly variable from year to year. Tarawa, for example, receives more than 4,000 mm of rainfall in the wettest years, but only 150 mm in the driest. This huge range is similar in Kiritimati and has enormous impacts on water availability and quality, crop production and health.
2. The main reason for this variability is the El Niño–Southern Oscillation. Many Kiribati islands lie within the equatorial waters that warm significantly during an El Niño event and cool during a La Niña event. As a result rainfall is much higher than normal during an El Niño and much lower during a La Niña. Maximum air temperatures tend to be higher than normal during El Niño years, driven by the warmer oceans surrounding the islands, while in the dry season minimum air temperatures in El Niño years are below normal. At Kiritimati, El Niño events also bring wetter conditions in both seasons and La Niña events bring drought.
3. El Niño is generally associated with above-normal rainfall and strong westerly winds, while La Niña is associated with below-normal rainfall and the risk of drought.
4. According to the Kiribati Climate Change website of the Office of the President, Republic of Kiribati, annual and seasonal maximum temperatures have increased in Tarawa since 1950. Maximum temperatures have increased at a rate of 0.18 degrees Celsius per decade, which is in line with the global pattern of warming. Furthermore, data since 1951 for Kirimati shows a clear increasing trend in annual and wet season rainfall, but no trend in the dry season. Over this period, there have been substantial variations in rainfall from year to year. Finally, satellite data indicate that the sea level has risen across Kiribati by 1 to 4mm per year since 1993, compared to the global average of 2.8 – 3.6 mm per year; given that sea level rise naturally fluctuates from year to year and decade to decade as a result of phenomena such as the El Nino-Southern Oscillation.

*Development Challenges - Vulnerabilities*

1. The country’s very vulnerable situation, given its geographic characteristics and setting, is exacerbated by the increasing human population pressure on natural resources and the rising threat of extreme weather conditions due to the impacts of climate change. In terms of human impacts the main area of concern is South Tarawa, the hub of government and commercial activities, where the population has risen from 1,671 in 1947 to 40,311 in 2005 and is expected to double in fourteen years time. The rise in population has been attributed to high fertility rates and increasing influx of people from the outer islands seeking employment, livelihood opportunities and basic services. This is placing extreme pressures on the limited land with beach mining and uncontrolled removal of coastal vegetation causing coastal erosion and loss of land. The high level of pollution from human activities is affecting the quality of the surrounding marine environment and underground water resources and posing serious risks to human health.
2. Another dimension of Kiribati’s vulnerability is its relatively high diseconomies of scale and exposure to world market fluctuations. The narrow production base renders the national economy susceptible to external shocks. The majority of its national income is derived from offshore investments, fishing license fees and remittances from seafarers that make up the majority of i‐Kiribati people working overseas. The public service is the biggest employer and there is a marked income disparity between South Tarawa and outer islands with limited reach of government services in remote areas. There is an increasing reliance on imports with rice being a major staple and cost item in family budgets.
3. Kiribati is extremely vulnerable to the predicted negative impacts of climate change. Rising sea levels and extreme events such as storm surges and king tides are a real threat to terrestrial biodiversity, quality of underground water resources and peoples very survival given the very low lying nature of the atolls and islands. There are already cases of flooding due to storm surges and king tides, attributed to gradual increases in sea level. Salinization of the underground water is also a growing problem. Increases in the intensity of storm surges coupled with mining of beach aggregate and removal of coastal vegetation is causing accelerated erosion of coastlines.

*Environmental Challenges*

1. The island atolls of Kiribati support a rich culture that relies heavily on a diverse and healthy marine environment for its survival. As self-contained systems, islands are living laboratories for evolution– each one holds an irreplaceable piece of Kiribati’s natural inheritance. Because of their isolation, these islands support more rare and endangered species per capita, especially in remote and uninhabited islands in the Line and Phoenix Groups in particular, than most other places in the world. Kiribati’s ocean waters are amongst the most productive and least polluted on earth, it has one of the largest stocks of tuna and related pelagic species that underpin its national economy.
2. Since it was first settled, the people of Kiribati have relied on their natural resources for survival. They still do with an estimated 80% of the population primarily living a subsistence life style. The marine environment sustains them and they depend on it for food, transport, traditional practices and economic opportunity. On atolls the terrestrial environment is more limited but it is essential for culture, water, food and shelter.
3. The transition from a traditional subsistence lifestyle to a contemporary market-based economy has brought with it key environmental challenges. These challenges are most apparent in the heavily populated urban centers of Betio, South Tarawa and to a certain extent Kiritimati Island. South Tarawa is also, where over 50% of the population lives.
4. Kiribati is one of the countries’ most vulnerable to global climate change and addressing the impacts of global climate change dominates the national environment and development agenda. However Kiribati needs to address climate change in an integrated and holistic manner considering other key areas of biodiversity conservation, waste and pollution management and sustainable use of natural resources in particular marine and water resources. Ecosystem based approaches need to be adopted to ensure that development aspirations are sustained by natural systems. It includes the need for behavioral change to address environmental problems, in particular waste management and the critical need for pollution control in South Tarawa as the capital island heavily populated.

*Kiribati Development Plan (KDP)*

1. Since independence Kiribati has managed its development through a 4-year development planning cycle. The 2008-2011 Kiribati Development Plan (KDP) had for the first time Environment as one of its Key Policy Areas (KPA 4) amongst its 6 Key Policy Areas. In the review of this planning cycle (2008-2011), it was stated “*Kiribati is one of the most vulnerable countries in the world to the impacts of global climate change, yet the nation’s contribution to global warming is quite minimal. Emissions per capita are less than one tenth of the world average, and have not risen significantly in decades. Kiribati is a strong advocate for emissions reductions in international climate change conventions and treaties, and has chosen to follow a low-carbon development path as part of its overall commitment to a sustainable future*”. In 2011, stakeholder consultations took place throughout the islands to identify national issues and to formulate development strategies for the next KDP 2012-2015.
2. The Kiribati Development Plan (KDP) 2012–2015 is the overarching national development plan detailing national priorities. It is linked to the Millennium Development Goals, the Pacific Plan and the Mauritius Strategy for Small Island Developing States (BPoA+10). It has six key policy areas including the environment. Under this area, several expected outcomes were identified:
* Improved national capacity to adapt and respond to the existing and future adverse impacts of Climate Change
* Reduced threats to island biodiversity resources from unsustainable use; impacts of invasive species; and other human induced phenomena (pollution, CC)
* Improved food security
* Improved water quality
* Improved human health and environment through effective and sound management of waste and chemicals
* Improved quality of the environment in urban areas
1. As per this KDP 2012-2015, the national development priority is to facilitate sustainable development by responding and mitigating the effects of global climate change and through approaches that protect island biodiversity and supports the reduction of environmental degradation by the year 2015 through the deployment of strategies described in the plan. As a country, Kiribati has an advanced level of awareness of the impact of climate change and climate-related hazards, and a well-developed policy framework. It has embarked in the process of mainstreaming climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction in its development processes through a series of legislative, policy and program initiatives. With very little fossil fuel use and high susceptibility to climate change effects, Kiribati is much more focused on adapting to rather than mitigating climate change. However, nationally mitigation actions supported from development partners were recognized to have added value to domestic sustainable development efforts.
2. Under this plan, program initiatives include the need to develop a national integrated environment policy, coastal protection and management through hard and soft options (e.g. hard options such as the building of seawalls and soft options such as mangrove and coastal vegetation conservation and management), “green revolution” (an agricultural project to encourage replanting of food crops to address food security issues), water and sanitation projects, and introduction of renewable energy. The development of other policies and plans: Kiribati National Biodiversity Strategies and Actions Plan (NBSAP), Kiribati National Invasive Alien Species Strategic Action Plans for the Gilberts and Kiritimati and Line Islands Group, the Phoenix Islands Management Plan (PIPA) for the Phoenix Islands Protected Area, waste management strategies are also part of these initiatives. Other measures are currently being considered. Water management is a particular area of concern given the strong effect of the El-Nino Southern Oscillations on water shortages and salt-water intrusion.

### B.2.c Policy and Legislative Context

1. Environment has emerged as a Key Policy Area (KPA) of the KDP since 2008. Protecting the environment became one of the six key policy areas and six expected outcomes were identified under this key policy area in the KDP 2012-2015 (*see above*). In order to implement this plan, the government of Kiribati has been developing two main policy instruments addressing environmental challenges: the Kiribati Integrated Environment Policy (KIEP) and the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KJIP).

*Kiribati Integrated Environment Policy (KIEP)*

1. Following the formulation of the National Environment Management Strategy in 1993, the KIEP bridges the gap in fulfilling and advancing the objectives of this strategy. Due to the evolution of various key environment thematic area plans and action strategies, including the development of the KDP, there was a need to better coordinate the various environmental activities. As a result the KIEP was developed. It is intended to contribute to the review and revised targets and activities under the environmental key policy area of the KDP 2012-2015. It also sets the direction towards long term preparations and planning towards building and enhancing the resilience of Kiribati, its local communities and people to respond to the impacts of global climate change.
2. It addresses the need to improve the collaboration between the Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development (MELAD), other government ministries and civil society to enhance their collective impact and effectiveness in addressing current and emergent environmental problems and issues in a holistic manner.
3. The KIEP has been endorsed at the Cabinet level in July 2013. It is structured in a way that reflect the important roles of other Line Ministries outside MELAD that have direct or indirect roles in supporting environment protection and management from their respective portfolios. It provides a comprehensive roadmap towards addressing national priority problems that affect the overall health of the environment as well as affecting the environment protection and management at the national level. The KIEP also serves as a guide to the Environment & Conservation Division (ECD) of MELAD as the Environment Authority in Kiribati.
4. The formulation of this policy was guided by four (4) key principles: leadership and good governance; collective responsibility for the environment; indigenous knowledge, practices and innovations; and integration of the environment and development. It includes a Strategic Environmental Plan for 2012-2015. It sets a policy goal and strategic policy objectives as well as targets for each of the five environment themes: climate change, island biodiversity conservation and management, waste management and pollution control, resource management, and environmental governance.
5. It is important to note that among these strategic policy objectives, several of them are related to the current proposed project. They include: (i) to improve knowledge, information and national adaptive capacity for responding and adapting to climate change (as listed in the climate change theme); (ii) to enhance the storage, protection and dissemination of knowledge, and information to the general public on the conservation, sustainable use, and management of island biodiversity (as listed in the island biodiversity conservation and management theme); and (iii) to improve monitoring and management of data for MEAs and state of the environment reporting and make this available for national development policy and planning processes (as listed in the environmental governance theme).

*Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KJIP)*

1. The draft Kiribati Joint National Action Plan on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KJIP) is part of the commitments Kiribati made under the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change, the Regional Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Management endorsed by the Pacific Leaders in 2005 and the Pacific Islands Meteorological Strategy approved in 2012. The KJIP is yet to be endorsed at the Cabinet level. However, once endorsed, the KJIP will be consistent with these three inter-related regional frameworks, specifically in terms of the national priorities for actions. It is also timely as the region moves towards an integrated regional framework - the Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific - by 2016. The Government sees the KJIP as its National Action Plan on climate change. It is currently at the Cabinet level for final approval to become an official plan of the government.
2. Following consultations with regional technical organizations, the government initiated the process of developing this KJIP in 2011. This plan is designed to complement the National Disaster Risk Management Plan (NDRMP) and the National Framework for Climate Change and Climate Change Adaptation (NFCCCCA). It will guide the implementation of these complementary policies in an integrated approach by identifying tangible, on-the-ground actions for resilience and measures to be implemented by the Government.
3. The KJIP will contribute to the objective of the key policy area on the environment under the KDP 2012-2015 that is to facilitate sustainable development by mitigating the effects of climate change through approaches that protect biodiversity and support the reduction of environmental degradation by the year 2015. The Government of Kiribati sees the KJIP as a means to prioritize actions on climate change and related disaster risks that are highlighted in national communications and sector policies and action strategies impacted by climate change and disaster risks.
4. The goal of the KJIP is to increase resilience through sustainable climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction using a whole of country approach. It will be achieved through 12 strategies:
5. Strengthening good governance, policies, strategies and legislation;
6. Improving knowledge and information generation, management and sharing;
7. Strengthening and greening the private sector, including small-scale business;
8. Increasing water and food security with integrated and sector-specific approaches and promoting healthy and resilient ecosystems;
9. Strengthening health service delivery to address climate change impacts;
10. Promoting sound and reliable infrastructure development and land management;
11. Delivering appropriate education, training and awareness programs;
12. Increasing effectiveness and efficiency of early warnings and disaster and emergency management;
13. Promoting the use of sustainable, renewable sources of energy and energy efficiency;
14. Strengthening capacity to access finance, monitor expenditures and maintain strong partnerships;
15. Maintaining the existing sovereignty and unique identity of Kiribati; and
16. Enhancing the participation and resilience of vulnerable groups.
17. The KJIP formalizes the role of the newly established Kiribati National Expert Group on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (KNEG) to become the main advisory body and coordination mechanism as well as the entry point for climate change and disaster risk management initiatives in Kiribati. Furthermore, it is intended that a KJIP Secretariat will be established under the guidance of the Development Coordinating Committee with the main following roles: (i) facilitating KNEG meetings; (ii) reviewing and monitoring KJIP implementation together with responsible lead agencies; and (iii) communicating with the general public, Parliament, Cabinet, development partners and the international community.
18. Related to this proposed project, a strong link to the KJIP was noted with its “*Strategy 2: Improving knowledge and information generation, management and sharing*”. Under this strategy, three anticipated results were identified: (i) An integrated and up-to-date national database providing all relevant information for resilient development is available and accessible for all; (ii) Capacities to communicate science and best practices are strengthened by developing and disseminating effective and relevant information, communication and awareness products for decision-making and awareness raising across sectors and at all levels; and (iii) Capacities for data collection, assessment, analysis, interpretation, monitoring and reporting are strengthened across sectors.
19. In addition to these two policy instruments, Kiribati also developed other environmental policy and strategy instruments, including several ones to address its obligations under the MEAs signed/ratified by the country. The key ones related to this project include:
* Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) Strategy – 2005;
* National Framework for Climate Change and Climate Change Adaptation (NFCCA) – 2010;
* National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) 2007;
* First National Communication to the UNFCCC – 2004;
* Second National Communication to the UNFCCC – 2013;
* KAP II report on Mangrove Rehabilitation – 2010;
* Kiribati National Biodiversity Strategic Actions Plan (Kiribati NBSAP) – 2007;
* Fourth National Report to the CBD – 2010;
* National Invasive Strategic Action Plans (2007 & 2008) for the Gilberts Group and Kiritimati & Line Islands Group;
* Fifth National Report to the CBD – 2013;
* Kiribati Biodiversity Area Report for Implementing the CBD Program of Work on Protected Areas – 2013;
* Phoenix Islands Protected Areas Management Plan;
* National Marine Pollution Contingency Plan;
* National Programme of Action (NPA) to protect the marine environment from land based pollution activities;
* Kiribati National Fisheries Policy, 2013-2025 Tarawa Water Master Plan;
* National Water Resources Policy 2008;
* National Action Plan (NAP) to address Land Degradation and Droughts 2007;
* Tarawa Lagoon Management Plan;
* National Action Program to address Land Degradation 2007;
* National Profile of Chemicals Management Infrastructure – 2007;
* Kiribati National Energy Policy 2009;
* National Water Resource Policy and National Water Resource Implementation Plan 2008; and
* National Sanitation Policy and National Sanitation Implementation Plan 2008.
1. In addition to these policy instruments described above and as listed above, Kiribati developed a *National Framework for Climate Change and Climate Change Adaptation (NFCCCCA)*. This framework recognizes that the impacts of climate change are already being felt and that the science is saying that these impacts will continue to occur for a long time yet. It also recognizes Kiribati’s limited ability to meet these impacts and that Kiribati needs to factor in the decisions taken today to prepare for the inevitable long term climate change impacts on the nation and its people. This framework identified six key areas to be undertaken in order to establish a firm foundation for future adaptation and mitigation actions against climate change. These six areas are:
2. *Mitigation*: mostly based on the national energy policy;
3. *Integration into national planning capacity*: mostly through mainstreaming planning for climate change throughout the development planning process such as sector plans, multi-year budget frameworks, and ministerial operational plans;
4. *External Finance and Technical Assistance;*
5. *Population*: monitor population pressure on all atolls and adequacy with the carrying capacity of Kiribati’s atoll systems;
6. *Governance and Services;* and
7. *Survivability and Self – reliance.*
8. On the legislation front, the 2007 amendment to the Environment Act of 1999 provides an overarching legal framework, governing the environment and natural resources in Kiribati. It provides a comprehensive tool toward environmental assessments, prevention and pollution control, and the protection and conservation of natural resources and ecosystems. A number of regulations have also been developed in the context of the Environment Act 1999 (as amended in 2007), including the Phoenix Island Protected Area (PIPA) Regulation, which was endorsed in 2008; the Protected Areas Regulation (in draft); and the Protected Species Regulation (in draft) to name a few. Several other pieces of legislation include:
* Wildlife Ordnance 1977;
* Quarantine Ordnance 1977;
* State lands Act 2001;
* Lands Ordinance 1977;
* Native Land Ordnance 1977;
* Foreshore and Land Reclamation Ordnance 1977;
* Land Planning Ordnance 1977;
* National Disaster Act 1993;
* Recreation Reserves Act 1996;
* Minerals Development Licensing 1998 CAP 58;
* Public Utilities Act 1999;
* Squatters Act 2005;
* Fisheries Act 2010; and
* Bio-security Bill 2011.
1. Through the assessments conducted under the NCSA, an extensive review of the environmental legislation related to the three Rio Conventions in place in Kiribati was conducted and concluded with the identification of several recommendations to improve the environmental legislative framework. These proposed measures include drafting and finalizing of regulations and policies to support the enforcement of the Environment Act; review the legislation on the control and eradication of alien invasive species and biosecurity policy; complete new laws and legislation for the protection of natural environment and resources; and enforce the legislation for Marine Protected Areas.

### B.2.d Institutional Context

1. The Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD), through its Environment and Conservation Division (ECD), is the national environment authority in Kiribati. ECD is mandated under the Environment Act 1999 (amended in 2007) as the responsible authority for the implementation of the KIEP.
2. In 1992, the Government of Kiribati established an Environment Unit for the first time within the then Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Development. In 1999, this unit was upgraded into the Environment and Conservation Division (ECD) of the Ministry of Environment and Social Development. In 2003, as a result of a ministerial reshuffle, the main powers, roles and responsibilities of the ECD are now under the Environment Act 1999 and its amendment of 2007. The Division is part of MELAD. In March 2013, the staff of ECD met in a retreat over 4 days to review all environment projects, finalize the KIEP and bring all these objectives and expected outcomes in the ECD national programme. It was noted that among the strategies to be adopted by ECD was the setting up of an Environmental Data and Information Centre incorporating climate change information.
3. MELAD plays a critical role in the approval for the implementation of the KIEP at national, outer islands and village levels. The Secretary of MELAD is the Senior Responsible Officer for the environment portfolio of MELAD and he/she is also the national focal point for all MEAs to which Kiribati is Party to. The Minister of MELAD is the political focal point for the environment at national level in Kiribati.
4. Due to the cross-sectoral nature of the environment sector, a number of other government agencies play instrumental role in providing appropriate sectoral supports to ECD in sectoral areas that are directly relevant to fulfilling the overall environment portfolio of MELAD. It includes the following thematic areas:
* *Climate Change*: Science of climate change; Global climate change impacts on the overall health of the environment; Climate Change Policy Response and Coordination;
* *Biodiversity*: Marine Biodiversity; Terrestrial Biodiversity; Phoenix Islands Protected Area; Recreational Areas; Invasive alien species;
* *Wastes and Chemicals*: Waste & Pollution; Marine pollution; Awareness raising, regulation and enforcement; Waste collection and management; Landfill operation and management; Sewerage management; Hazardous waste; Recycling; Ozone Depleting Substances;
* *Resource Management*: SLM, awareness, gravel extraction and coordination; Land issues; Water conservation and management; Deep sea minerals; Sustainable Agriculture; Coastal; and
* *Environment Governance*: Prosecution; Mainstreaming.
1. A list of key government ministries providing sectoral support to ECD is presented in the table below:

**Table 1: Key ministries providing sectoral support to environment management in Kiribati**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Office of Te Beretitenti (OB) | Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD) |
| Ministry of Communication, Transport and Tourism Development (MCTTD) | Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Immigration (MFAI) |
| Ministry of Commerce Industry and Cooperatives (MCIC) | Ministry of Health and Medical Services (MHMS) |
| Ministry of Women, Youth and Social Affairs (MWYSA) | Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) |
| Ministry of Education (MoE) | Ministry of Public Works and Utilities (MPWU) |
| Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD) | Ministry of Labour and Human Resources Development (MLHRD) |
| Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MFED) | Ministry of Line & Phoenix Islands Development (MLPID) |

1. In addition to government entities, civil society groups and organizations have also an instrumental role and responsibilities in environmental management in Kiribati; particularly in enhancing involvement of local communities and participation at national, island and village levels. It includes
* Island Councils
* NGOs such as University of the South Pacific (USP) and Kiribati Association of Non-Government Organizations (KANGO)
* Registered Churches
* Island, Village and Church Leaders/communities
* National Women’s Organizations
* Kiribati Boy Scout and Girl Guide Organizations
* National and ChurchYouth Federation
* Island Associations of Old Men (Unimwane)
* Private Sector, including Fishermen Corporations
1. Within this context, the institutional set up for managing the environment has been reviewed recently to ensure better coordination and coherence in the implementation of the various environmental programmes. As per the KIEP, the government of Kiribati plans to add specialist positions in climate change planning, waste management, biodiversity conservation, monitoring and evaluation. Under this policy, MELAD plans also to expand on several fronts undertaking initiatives that promote participatory approaches and engagement of the general public in environment protection and management, including the involvement of volunteers in wetlands improvement, coastal zone management, and increasing food security among others.
2. Finally, in addition to all these entities involved in managing the environment, it is worth noting that there are several technical committees under each thematic area that are spearheaded and coordinated by ECD-MELAD. These committees were set up to ensure a more effective implementation of environmental programmes, including the provision of mechanisms for consultation and coordination between ECD and stakeholders. They include:
* Climate Change Study Team / National Adaptation Steering Committee
* National Biodiversity Planning Committee
* National Chemical Coordination Committee
* National Waste Management Committee
* Environment Joint Enforcement Team
* National Marine Pollution Advisory Committee
* National Ozone Committee
* Kiribati Refrigeration & Air Conditioning Technician Association
* National Organic Waste Committee
* Health-Care Waste Management Committee
* National E-waste Committee
* Central Land Planning Board/ Sustainable Land Management Planning Team
* National Water and Sanitation Steering Committee
* Foreshore Management Committee
* National Food Security Committee
* National Water Quality Monitoring Committee
* Environment Advisory Committee
* KDP Environment policy drafting committee
* Environment Enforcement Advisory Group
* KDP Environment Sector Group
* Environment Youth Club
1. The project will be executed by ECD at MELAD. It will benefit from the key role of ECD in environmental management and particularly its role in facilitating the functioning of these committees. It will provide a necessary communication and coordination mechanism for implementing project activities.

### B.2.e Barriers to Achieving Global Environmental Objectives

1. As described in section B.2.a, Kiribati conducted a NCSA assessing capacity issues, capacity needs and finally capacity priorities in the environmental area particularly in areas related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD). The process started in 2007 and the final report was published in 2011. It is still a key document and the findings from these assessments are still much valid today. No further assessments have been conducted since, the NCSA findings are still the basis for the development of environmental policies such as KIEP and the soon-to-be approved KJIP.
2. This extensive assessment identified thematic environmental issues (*see section B.2.a*). These thematic issues were then reviewed together across the three thematic areas and crosscutting capacity constraints were identified as well as ways to address these constraints and effectively promote linkages and synergies across the conventions and meet their respective requirements obligated by the Parties.
3. A list of 10 main capacity constraints was identified through this process. Then for each of these 10 constraints, a review was conducted to assess the constraints at the individual, institutional, and systemic levels. The results are presented in the table below:

**Table 2: Summary of Crosscutting Capacity Constraints Identified Through the NCSA**

| **Crosscutting Capacity Constraints.** | **Individual Level** | **Institutional Level** | **Systemic Level** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Limited collaboration between executing agent and government institutions, NGOs and other recognized organizations. | High cost of communication prevent access to the outer island |  Unreliable flight and shipping schedule |  Lack of budgetary allocation |
| **2. Unavailability of data and information** | **Lack of in-depth research and studies undertaken in Kiribati.** |  **Insufficient management of information and data.**  |  **Absence of control over the collection and storage of data and information** |
| 3. Human and Financial constraints | Lack of skillful human resources to undertake responsibilities under conventions. | Limited specific training opportunities for those working under the convention.  | Belated receipt of project funds from donors. |
| 4. Inadequate education and public awareness program. |  Less understanding the importance of public awareness | Lack of skillful personnel in producing public awareness material | Limited opportunities for public awareness training.  |
| 5. Inadequate strengthening and enforcement of policies and legal framework. | Unaware of the existing legislation and policies. | Insufficient enforcement of legislation and policies. | Less involvement of communities in enforcement of policies and legislations. |
| 6. Limited training opportunities and less development of on-a-job training. | Drop learning practices at primary and secondary level of education. | Increased numbers of temporary employees |  Unavailability of employment opportunities |
| 7. Major objectives of the 3 Rio Conventions are not included in the National Development Strategies | Minimal involvement in drafting work plans. | Unaware of the importance of having the main objectives of conventions included in the NDS. | Inclusion of convention objectives in the National Development Strategy are not well presented |
| 8. Limited utilization of traditional practices and transfer of technology. | Reluctance to share skills and knowledge by individual. | Unwillingness to use traditional technology | Absence of legal protection of intellectual property. |
| **9.Untimely submission of Reports and other required documents** | **Inadequate skills of writing report, monitoring and evaluation process.** | **Do not realize importance of prompt submission of report.** | **Late submission of report causes delayed release of project fund by the donor.** |
| 10. Steady increase of population. | Negative impacts of increased population are not well understood and application of some Family Planning methods are not appreciated. | Lack support to Family Planning campaign | Insufficient financial support to Family Planning programs. |

*Source: Crosscutting Report, NCSA, Kiribati, ECD - MELAD*

1. Of particular interests among these constraints for this project are the second constraint “*Unavailability of data and information*” and the ninth constraint “*Untimely submission of Reports and other required documents*”. These two constraints will particularly be addressed by this project.
2. As per the above table, the second constraint is about the lack of in-depth research and studies undertaken in Kiribati, the insufficient management of environmental information and data, and the absence of control over the collection, storage and access of data and information. The ninth constraint includes the inadequate skills for writing reports – including monitoring and evaluation reports, institutions that do not realize the importance of prompt submission of national reports and the consequences of these late submissions, which often translate into delayed release of project fund by donors.

# C. Programme and policy conformity

## **C.1** **GEF Programme Designation and Conformity**

1. The GEF strategy for Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) projects serves to provide resources for reducing, if not eliminating, the institutional bottlenecks and barriers to the synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions. This particular project is in line with the GEF-5 CCCD Programme Frameworks two (2) and five (5), which calls for countries (2) to generate, access and use information and knowledge and (5) to enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends. Through a learning-by-doing process, this project will harmonize existing information systems, and integrating internationally accepted measurement standards and methodologies, as well as consistent reporting on the global environment. It will target the development of capacities at the individual and organizational level, strengthening technical skills to collect data and transform information into knowledge. The project will also target a more holistic construct of monitoring and evaluation systems through strengthening the institutionalization of these systems as a means to feed lessons learned and best practices from projects and interventions.
2. The project has two outcomes that are (1) to develop an environmental information management system within the Environmental and Conservation Division (ECD) of MELAD and (2) to strengthen the environmental monitoring system in place in Kiribati. The project will develop skills and knowledge of staff at ECD to research, acquire and apply information collective actions. Through the provision of better environmental information, the project will also increase the capacity of national and local levels’ stakeholders and counterparts to diagnose and understand complex dynamic nature of global environmental problems and develop local solutions. Through workshops and training activities, the project will raise the awareness of decision-makers on environmental matters and the need for strengthening the environmental governance system in place in Kiribati.
3. The project will also enhance the mechanisms within ECD and the skills of the staff to improve the monitoring and evaluating the performance of the environment. As a result, it is expected that the staff will have a greater capacity to monitor and evaluate programs and projects and also to better report on the state of the environment, including the national reports to the MEAs.
4. At the same time, the project will not support the financing of national campaign for raising environmental awareness. It will also not support the strengthening of policy making in the environmental area and more generally will not support the strengthening of the national decision-making process for matters related to the environment.
5. As part of the GEF CCCD programme, it does not lend itself readily to programme indicators, such as reduction of greenhouse gas emissions over a baseline average for the years 1990 to 1995, or percentage increase of protected areas containing endangered endemic species. Instead, CCCD projects are measured by output, process, and performance indicators that are proxies to the framework indicators of improved capacities for the global environment. To this end, CCCD projects – this one included - look to strengthen crosscutting capacities in the five major areas of stakeholder engagement, information and knowledge, policy and legislation development, management and implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. In order to help GEF funded projects to monitor the development of capacities in the environment, UNDP, UNEP and GEF developed a scorecard to measure the development of capacities. It is a tool that attempts to quantify a qualitative process of capacity change through the use of appropriate indicators and their corresponding ratings. This tool is recommended to be used at three stages in a project life: design, mid-term and at end of project life. This scorecard was completed for this project at this stage (design) to establish a baseline (*see Annex 1*).
6. As detailed in the Results Framework presented in Annex 2, a set of indicators was identified to measure progress against the objective and outcomes. The results of the scorecard discussed in the previous paragraph are one indicator used to measure progress at the objective level. Three other indicators were identified at this level, mostly measuring the quality of the products delivered with the support of the project that is an operational EMIS and a CMS. A total of 15 indicators were identified to measure progress at the objective and outcomes level. For each indicator, a baseline was set as well as a target at the end of the project.
7. This project is a direct response to the national capacity self-assessment (NCSA) conducted in Kiribati during the period 2007 – 2011. It will address two main crosscutting capacity issues identified during the NCSA process. As a result of better measuring the implementation of MEAs in Kiribati and having access to better environmental information, the project will strengthen the synergies in implementing these conventions and more generally strengthen the broader global environmental agenda implemented in Kiribati.
8. This project will implement capacity development activities through an adaptive collaborative management approach to engage stakeholders as collaborators in the design and implementation of project activities that take into account unintended consequences arising from policy interventions.
9. The project is also consistent with the programmatic objectives of the three GEF thematic focal areas of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation, the achievement and sustainability of which is dependent on the critical development of capacities (individual, organizational and systemic). The implementation of this project will leverage individual, institutional and systemic capacities to improving environment knowledge and information generation, management and sharing at the national and local levels with all key environment stakeholders. As a result, Kiribati - and particularly the ECD at MELAD - will have a greater capacity to monitor the environment but also to collect, store, and provide access to environmental information for decision-makers to make better policies taking into account environmental risks and potential impacts and to the public at large. More quality environmental information will also improve the quality of national reports to MEAs.
10. Through the successful implementation of this project, the 11 operational principles of capacity development identified in the GEF Strategic Approach to Capacity Building will be implemented in Kiribati. Table 2 below summarizes the project's conformity with these operational principles.

**Table 3: Conformity with GEF Capacity Development Operational Principles**

| **Capacity Development Operational Principle** | **Project Conformity** |
| --- | --- |
| Ensure national ownership and leadership | Climate change impacts on the environment and more generally on the biodiversity based livelihoods of people in Kiribati is now a key priority for the government and also for the donors. Furthermore, the lack of environmental information for good decision-making is a critical issue. The KDP 2012-2015 and the KIEP, both key planning government instruments highlighted the need to improve the knowledge in the environmental area for improving decision-making. The timing of this project is excellent; it comes at a time when national leaders are looking for support in this area. Hence, the project enjoys already a good national ownership with an excellent leadership from the ECD and MELAD. |
| Ensure multi-stakeholder consultations and decision-making | The project will use multi-stakeholder and expert consultative reviews or analyses towards the development of an EMIS based at MELAD-ECD. Project implementation will take an adaptive collaborative management approach, which includes stakeholder representatives in the project decision-making structures. As described in section B.2.d, many institutions will be involved in the project. Through a steering committee and the technical team established under this project, stakeholders at the national and local levels will be engaged and consulted to oversee the implementation of the project.  |
| Base capacity building efforts in self-needs assessment | Communication, education, public awareness and environmental monitoring were identified as top crosscutting capacity priorities in the NCSA for Kiribati as well as findings from the various analyses under the UNCCD, UNCBD and UNFCCC Enabling activities. The project will include further self-analysis of capacity building needs for specific measures pertaining to design and use of the EMIS and of the environmental monitoring system (EMS) according to the national level needs and in alignment to national, regional and international needs, where the State of the Environment Reporting requirements, are concerned. |
| Adopt a holistic approach to capacity building | In order to develop an environmental information management system and to strengthen the environmental monitoring system in place in Kiribati, the strategy of the project will be to focus on the main agency mandated for managing the environment in Kiribati: ECD under MELAD. Project activities will also include other agencies involved in sectoral environmental areas such as water monitoring, environmental health, etc. The overall approach to develop this capacity will be holistic. It will proceed based on a review of capacity gaps and then will address these gaps at all levels: individual, institutional and systemic level. Necessary training will be provided but mechanisms within institutions and across institutions will be reviewed and improved as necessary and finally the enabling environment will also be reviewed to ensure it provides adequate policy and legislation frameworks for these two systems to work. |
| Integrate capacity building in wider sustainable development efforts | By strengthening the process of collecting, storing and reporting on the state of the environment in Kiribati, ECD will provide better environmental information to decision-makers. At the same tine, as this information will be mainstreamed within the policy making process, the project will contribute to mainstreaming capacity development activities with the sustainable development agenda of Kiribati. |
| Promote partnerships | By its very nature, this project requires collaboration and coordination among Kiribati’s government ministries and agencies and also among civil society organizations. Partnering with all stakeholders will be a critical success factor of the project and will be promoted as needed. |
| Accommodate the dynamic nature of capacity building | The project's management arrangements include a multi-disciplinary and multi-sectorial steering committee and a technical support team (members drawn from the broad based steering committee) to guide and oversee the implementation of the project. Members will be drawn from key public, private and civil society sectors. Additionally, the management team will use adaptive management as a management tool to provide flexibility in the implementation of the project. It is well recognized that this type of projects need to be flexible and to adapt as needed when national context/realities change. This project will be implemented with the recognition that capacity development is a dynamic process. |
| Adopt a learning-by-doing approach | The core of project’s capacity development activities is via a learning-by-doing approach. Government representatives and other stakeholders will be involved in the collaborative review, analysis for the formulation of recommendations for the various sectoral analyses and the implementation of project activities. |
| Combine programmatic and project-based approaches | This project takes a bottom-up and top-down approach to Rio Convention mainstreaming. This project effectively began with the NCSA, which was a bottom-up approach to develop a National Capacity Development Strategy. Using the Rio Convention provisions as the analytic framework for the sectoral analyses, recommendations were made to strengthen an environmental information management system and an environmental monitoring system in Kiribati as key area to strengthen environmental management in Kiribati and which by extension would provide global environmental benefits. In addition to being part of the NCSA process, it is also very much part of national policies and plans. The project is part of an approach that started in 2007; it is a combination of programmes and projects strongly rooted in national policies and plans such as the KIEP. |
| Combine process as well as product-based approaches | The project strategy is to support a change to reach two main expected results; the development of an Environmental Management Information System (EMIS) and the strengthening of an Environmental Monitoring System. These two results will be the main products that will be developed with the support of the project. In order to achieve these results, most of activities that will be supported by the project will be process-based but they will also be combined with the delivery of products such as computer equipment, training syllabuses and a nationally adopted list of environmental indicators. |
| Promote regional approaches | The project will also partner with a similar regional project implemented by SPREP and funded by GEF: “*Building national and regional capacity to implement MEAs by strengthening planning, and state of environment assessment and reporting in the Pacific Islands*”. It will provide opportunities for Kiribati to showcase the project results at the regional level and also benefit from other countries’ lessons learned and best practices. The project will also partner with related upcoming GEF projects implemented at national level, where MELAD-ECD is also the national executing agency. |

### C.1.a Guidance from the Rio Conventions

1. Kiribati is fully committed to meet its obligations under the MEAs that it is a Party to. Among these obligations, there are capacity development needs that are required for Parties to be able to implement the Rio Conventions nationally and contribute to global environmental benefits. A summary of these capacity development requirements is presented in the table below.
2. The proposed project is intended to facilitate an important step towards developing the capacities for an effective national environmental management framework by focusing on developing the national capacity to better manage environmental information in Kiribati and also to improve the monitoring of the environment. It will address several shared obligations under the three Rio Conventions, which call for countries to strengthen their national capacities for effective national environmental management systems. It will particularly address a set of Rio Convention articles that call for improved information management and knowledge and for improved monitoring and evaluation to address global environmental issues (*see second and fifth types of capacity in table below*). Specifically, the project will strengthen a national environmental management information management system and an environmental management system. It will improve the environmental knowledge available in Kiribati.

**Table 4: Capacity Development Requirements of the Rio Conventions**

| **Type of Capacity** | **Convention Requirements** | **FCCC** | **CBD** | **CCD** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Stakeholder Engagement*** | Capacities of relevant individuals and organizations (resource users, owners, consumers, community and political leaders, private and public sector managers and experts) to engage proactively and constructively with one another to manage a global environmental issue. | Article 4 Article 6  | Article 10 Article 13  | Article 5 Article 9 Article 10 Article 19  |
| ***Information Management and Knowledge*** | Capacities of individuals and organizations to research, acquire, communicate, educate and make use of pertinent information to be able to diagnose and understand global environmental problems and potential solutions. | Article 4 Article 5  | Article 12Article 14Article 17Article 26 | Article 9 Article 10Article 16 |
| ***Environmental Governance***  | Capacities of individuals and organizations to enact environmental policies or regulatory decisions, as well as plan and execute relevant sustainable global environmental management actions and solutions.  | Article 4  | Article 6 Article 14 Article 19 Article 22  | Article 4 Article 5 Article 8 Article 9 Article 10 |
| ***Organizational Capacities***  | Capacities of individuals and organizations to plan and develop effective environmental policy and legislation, related strategies, and plans based on informed decision-making processes for global environmental management.  | Article 4 Article 6 | Article 8 Article 9 Article 16 Article 17 | Article 4 Article 5 Article 13 Article 17 Article 18 Article 19  |
| ***Monitoring and Evaluation*** | Capacities in individuals and organizations to effectively monitor and evaluate project and/or programme achievements against expected results and to provide feedback for learning, adaptive management and suggesting adjustments to the course of action if necessary to conserve and preserve the global environment. | Article 6 | Article 7 |  |

1. As a project focusing on crosscutting issues, the implementation process will also contribute to the development of other capacities in addition to the information management and knowledge and monitoring and evaluation. The project will contribute to improve stakeholder engagement through a participative approach to implement the project; environmental governance through the support of the policy-making process with the provision of better environmental information; and organizational capacities to better monitor the environment and use this knowledge to better report to international agreements and produce more data-based state of the environment at regular intervals. As per the table above, this project will contribute to the development of these five types of capacities and increase the capacity of Kiribati in meeting its obligations under the MEAs that it is a Party to.

## **C.2** **Project Design**

### C.2.a GEF Alternative

C.2.a.1 Project Rationale

1. This project takes an incremental approach from a GEF construct towards strengthening Kiribati’s environmental information management and knowledge to meet Rio Convention objectives. In the absence of this project, the necessary capacity building to address the environment data needs of MELAD-ECD will remain an outstanding need at the national level in Kiribati. It would prevent Kiribati to achieve global environmental benefits through better environmental information. Government staff would remain insufficiently equipped and knowledgeable about how to develop, maintain and sustain an environmental management information system (EMIS) and a compliance monitoring system. More generally, they would also remain insufficiently knowledgeable to fully understand the implications of global environmental directives under the conferences of the parties on national environmental and development policies, and how these directives can be strategically implemented and supported through existing national information systems. Barriers to achieve global environmental objectives in Kiribati were identified through the NCSA process and discussed in section B.2.e above.
2. More specifically, as both a SIDS and a LDC, Kiribati has many limitations including the small office with limited number of staff members in place who work at MELAD-ECD. At the same time, environment data are widely scattered and fragmented and the generation of environment data is also ad hoc at the country level; responding to reporting needs and not conducted on a regular basis. In most cases, environment data are produced when there are opportunities through externally funded projects.
3. Under the GEF Alternative, the external resources will allow Kiribati to address this long outstanding environmental information need within MELAD-ECD. This GEF support is crucial to assist the Government of Kiribati in this important area at the country level. Barriers identified through the NCSA process will be thoroughly re-assessed and effective and efficient solutions to address those related to the availability of environmental information will be detailed and implemented with the support of the project.
4. The project will build on the existing baseline, seeking to improve the mechanisms and procedures in institutions responsible for environmental information management and to develop the capacity of the staff in these institutions in Kiribati.
5. It is the Government of Kiribati’s intent to strengthen its EMIS, which is a perfect opportunity/entry point to mainstream global environment issues in the national development framework through better environmental information, hence for GEF to step in and complement the baseline. The allocation of the GEF increment and the government co-financing of project activities, demonstrate the proposed partnership. It will complement the baseline and strengthen the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Kiribati. The project will develop Kiribati’s EMIS and CMS to strengthen their potential for producing more reliable data, better information and information products, such as spatial information maps that can be used for environmental management and sustainable development planning efforts.
6. Considering the issues that were determined during the NCSA process, the nature of this project is the logical way to go forward and address these main issues. A weak environmental monitoring system and the lack of available environmental information are critical barriers to good environmental decision-making and policy development in Kiribati. The NCSA process included consultations with a broad group of stakeholders whom participated actively. The results pointed clearly to the need for improving environmental monitoring and environmental information management. It was viewed as a critical barrier for a better holistic environmental management approach in Kiribati and also to address the global environmental management commitments.
7. From an external funding point of view, the objectives pursued by the current project alternative will not be attained in the baseline at this point in time and no other projects will address this issue on their own. Other current funded activities funded by the GEF and other donors are more focused on the implementation of a particular convention such as the National Communication for UNFCCC or a particular issue such as addressing the problems related to the management of the national marine park or coastal management. Most of these projects are not really addressing cross-sectoral issues (also called horizontal issues) such as environmental information management and monitoring of the environment.
8. Addressing this horizontal issue needs reforming procedures, protocols and technologies for environmental information management and developing the capacity of individuals and institutions to perform their duties in this area. The government has limited resources and has currently other top priorities such as battling with economical hardships to ensure a minimum level of human livelihood or addressing pressing needs to environmental issues such as the pollution of the water resources. Support of an international partner such as GEF to undertake this major reform in a timely fashion is urgently needed and especially in light of the global climate change issue.
9. The expected global environmental result of the current project proposal is that Kiribati's decision-making to meet Rio Convention objectives will be greatly improved by having more complete, relevant and updated environmental data and information. The project will be implemented through the participation of stakeholders in environmental information management and the sustainability of project achievements will be greatly enhanced by the strong support of key stakeholder groups and their representatives at the appropriate Government level.

C.2.a.2 Project Goal and Objectives

1. Collection, storage, maintenance, sustaining, archiving, generation and utilization of environmental data are major issues within ECD because of its limited institutional capacity. Some data/information is readily available within the various Units of ECD. Yet proper information collection, storage, maintenance, sustaining, archiving, generation, utilization and collation is not undertaken because of human and institutional capacities limitations. There is also a lack of technical capacity within ECD to develop, maintain, sustain and operate this environment information management system for national, regional and international reporting on the state of the environment in Kiribati.
2. This project will address this critical need to provide better environmental information in Kiribati. This is a timely response to address this national priority, particularly when considering the emerging issues due to global climate change. The possibility to monitor and record environmental data will be useful to respond to threats including negative impacts of global climate change on the local environment, which is the basis of livelihoods, human health and economy in Kiribati.
3. ***The goal of this project is to target the critical need for new and improved environmental data and environmental analysis to strengthen the foundations of Kiribati's policy and planning frameworks to meet Rio Convention commitments***. Using a holistic approach and integrating the Rio Conventions principles, the project will support the development of an institutionalized sustainable environment management information system to underpin more complex policy and decision-making processes designed to frame and direct the management and the protection of the environment within the context of global climate change. By developing a comprehensive and robust environmental management information system (EMIS), this project will greatly improve Kiribati's ability to integrate important global environmental concerns and priorities into the national environment legislative and policy frameworks, as well as national programming frameworks. The project will also support the development of an effective compliance monitoring system (CMS). This will feed analysis and information directly to planners and other decision-makers as to whether environmental objectives are being achieved, as well as determining the state of the environment reporting, and as to whether environmental management efforts are sufficient at the country level. All these will also feed into reporting to the global conventions.
4. The ***project’s objective is to improve information management and compliance monitoring in order to achieve global environmental benefits***. This project will develop an environmental management and information system (EMIS) and a compliance monitoring system (CMS) that will be appropriately embedded within Kiribati's institutional framework governing the management and the protection of the environment within the context of global climate change. This strategy is in line with the GEF-5 CCCD strategy, particularly its programme framework #2 “*to generate, access and use information and knowledge*” and #5 “*to enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends*”.

C.2.a.3 Expected Outcomes and Outputs

1. The expected achievements of this project are a set of improved capacities to meet and sustain Rio Convention objectives. This project will have strengthened and helped institutionalize commitments under the Rio Conventions by redesigning the existent national Environmental Management Information System that can support decision-making on sound natural resources management for sustainable development and coordinating the institutional network that provides and uses the resulting environmental information, among others for reporting progress on the implementation of the Rio conventions and other MEAs. The Strategic Results Framework on which the intervention logic is based is outlined in Annex 2 of this project document. This Framework also outlines the indicators, sources of verification and risks and assumptions pertaining to the project objective and outcomes.
2. This project will be implemented in 2 linked components:
	1. Development of an Environmental Management Information System (EMIS)
	2. Identification of Environmental Indicators and development of a Compliance Monitoring System (CMS)

*Component 1: Environmental Management Information System (EMIS)*

**Outcome 1: An operational Environmental Management Information System (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information.**

1. Under this outcome, project resources will be used to develop a comprehensive Environmental Management Information System (EMIS) at ECD that serves to create new and improved environmental data and information. This EMIS will be developed through active collaboration and coordination with work programmes of key stakeholder agencies, research institutions, and other non-government organizations as appropriate to ensure the generation, collection, exchange and distribution of the required data and information. The EMIS will also be accompanied by improved capacities to generate and use new and improved data and information for policy and planning purposes and training will be provided to strengthen institutional and staff capacities to use best practice methodologies in data collection and analysis for environmental mainstreaming and environmental protection and management in the face of global climate change.

**Output 1.1: An environmental data repository with standards, norms and protocols to collect, analyze, store and make available accurate, and reliable environmental information related to all three Rio Conventions, and of direct use by decision-makers.**

1. A mechanism will be developed for identifying and generating environment data that will be useful in reporting on the state of the environment in Kiribati; including the fulfilling of the MEAs reporting obligations. Project resources will be used to identify and test new data and information needs and harmonize data collection methodologies and protocols, measurement standards and reporting norms that are practical and affordable to the Government of Kiribati at the country level.

***Main Activities:***

1.1.1: Review existing databases and management information systems in place in Kiribati and conduct SWOT and Gap analyses of these systems.

1.1.2: Identify environmental information needs for national development and also information requirements from the MEAs’ reporting obligations.

1.1.3: Design and develop an environmental data repository, including database structure to store environmental data. It will include a simple conceptual data model to normalize various data sets composed of subject areas such as biodiversity conservation, marine protection, climate change mitigation, climate change adaptation, etc.

1.1.4: Design a mechanism for the collection, quality control and validation of produced data and information.

1.1.5: Establish protocol for the provision of data and information

1.1.6: Establish and set benchmarks that will be central to generating data that is required for the national state of environment reports and subsequently contributing to the national environment outlook on annual and every three years basis and also required for the national communications and reports to the MEAs.

1.1.7: Train staff on the new data architecture, the tools, standards, norms and protocols to collect, input, store and provide access to environmental information for all levels of society in Kiribati.

**Output 1.2: An information technology architecture in place to store, manage and provide public access to environmental information.**

1. Technologies will be procured by the project to support the implementation of the EMIS. It will include computer equipment, software to store data, networking equipment to share information, communication equipment to provide remote access to this information and the necessary training of staff to manage, administer and maintain the system. The expected output is an EMIS that is store in a server with full uploading, backup, data sharing and data access procedures in place and functioning.

***Main Activities:***

1.2.1: Assess existing technologies in use, including analysis of specifications.

1.2.2: Identify technology needs/requirements to support the EMIS such as computer/server equipment, software, networking and communication equipment, backup system, power surge protection, etc.

1.2.3: Procure the required equipment and software following UNDP and government of Kiribati procurement guidelines.

1.2.4: Install this equipment and set up the EMIS following the data architecture identified under output 1.1.

1.2.5: Train staff in using this equipment, including backup procedures, power surge protection,

**Output 1.3: Environmental information available and disseminated to stakeholders.**

1. The project will support activities to make this environmental information accessible by the public and by extension to raise the awareness of the public on the existence of this information. Data sharing will be addressed through collaboration/data sharing protocols among ministries and agencies. The project will also support activities to disseminate this quality environmental information to decision-makers and policy-makers as a tool to strengthen policies, legislation, programmes and plans to meet and sustain Rio Convention commitments

***Main Activities:***

1.3.1: Elaborate directives for data interpretation and thematic reporting linked to the conventions.

1.3.2: Implement a communication strategy for the efficient diffusion of information addressing the information needs identified in 1.1.2.

1.3.3: Conduct communication, education and public awareness campaigns – particularly targeting decision-makers and policy-makers - on the EMIS, its value/importance, its content, its access and its reporting capabilities.

1.3.4: Formalize collaboration protocols among ministries and agencies for coordination of collection, sharing, quality control and validation of data across the 3 Rio Conventions.

1.3.5: Network in the region with similar environmental management information system to share and exchange environmental information.

1.3.6: Conduct a Training Needs Analysis (TNA) related to environmental information and environmental monitoring and particularly in thematic areas related to the Rio Conventions.

1.3.7: Develop training curricula addressing priorities identified in the TNA in collaboration with existing professional training institutions to institutionalize this courses over the long-term.

1.3.8: Conduct training activities targeting key technical staff within relevant Government Ministries decision-makers and policy-makers on the existence of this quality environmental information and its use in policy, programme and plan development. A particular focus will be on mainstreaming biodiversity, climate change and land degradation objectives into their regular work activities related to development planning, implementation and evaluation.

*Component 2: Environmental Indicators and Compliance Monitoring System (CMS)*

**Outcome 2: A Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) developed and tracking key environmental indicators**

1. The project will support the development of a compliance monitoring system (CMS). It will include the identification of a set of environmental indicators that will provide information on the state of the environment in Kiribati, including the drafting of national reports to international conventions. The CMS would be used as part of the learning and re-tooling (i.e., adaptive collaborative management) of programmes and plans to ensure that their implementation proceed as planned to deliver the agreed-upon objectives and expected outcomes. Under this outcome, the project will support the development of capacities to monitor and report on progress made towards achieving Rio Conventions commitments, and to feed that information to planners and decision-makers.

**Output 2.1: An institutionalized set of environmental indicators.**

1. Under this expected output, the project will support activities to develop environmental indicators of progress, performance, output, impact, and outcomes, both quantitative and qualitative. These indicators will be developed through a multi-stakeholder and expert consultation process, and peer-reviewed to ensure their relevancy, validity, and legitimacy. The indicators will be integrated within the M&E procedures of key stakeholder agencies and organizations. These indicators will particularly focus on measuring how Kiribati is meeting its global environmental obligations contained in the MEAs that Kirbiati is a Party to.

***Main Activities:***

2.1.1: Review existing indicators that are monitored on a regular basis in Kiribati, including the protocols in place for data collection, data storing and data interpretation/reporting.

2.1.2: Review international/regional best practices for compliance monitoring and identify those affordable practices that could be implemented in Kiribati

2.1.3: Identify environmental monitoring indicators to address the information needs identified in activity 1.1.2, including the information needs to produce state of environment reports and national reports/communications to the Rio Conventions.

2.1.4: Formalize the list of environmental indicators and integrate these indicators in the respective M&E procedures of relevant key agencies and organizations.

**Output 2.2: An operational compliance monitoring system.**

1. Project resources will be used to develop a compliance monitoring system (CMS) to track information collected on the basis of the indicators identified. It will ensure that data is collected and processed and be interpreted to provide environmental information and compliance monitoring on the management of the environment in Kiribati. It will be an effective system to measure, report and verify progress to meeting and sustaining Rio Convention commitments, based on consistent and manageable indicators and protocols, standards and norms to collect this data, store it and disseminate it to the public. The CMS will be developed through consultation with key stakeholder organizations, to be approved at the secretaries and Cabinet levels. Training will be provided to use the indicators as part of M&E procedures, with a particular attention to evolving good practices to measure, report and verify the cost-effectiveness of donor funds to meet Rio Convention obligations. As part of the EMIS, the CMS would be a networking of existing M&E software systems that will use technology that allow them to communicate with one another.

***Main Activities:***

2.2.1: Review existing protocols, standards, norms and procedures in place to monitor the environment – particularly data collection - with a focus on thematic areas related to the Rio Conventions.

2.2.2: Develop the required protocols, standards, norms and procedures in line with internationally recognized environmental monitoring guidelines to monitor the indicators identified under output 2.1.

2.2.3: Procure and install the necessary software and other information technologies needed to operationalize the CMS, including features to automate upload of monitoring data collected in the EMIS.

2.1.4: Develop and conduct training activities on environmental monitoring – as much as possible through in-service training institutions - focusing on the formalized indicators and on the new protocols, standards, norms and procedures in place to monitor the environment.

## **C.3** **Sustainability and Replicability**

### C.3.a Sustainability

1. The project will contribute directly to the development of ECD’s capacity to collect, store and provide access to accurate, updated and timely environmental information as well as its capacity to better monitor the environment. This information will be accessible by the public and will also be used by decision makers for the development of policies. In the long run, project results will contribute to the socio-economic development of Kiribati by providing accurate, updated and timely information on the state of the environment.
2. Through better policies taking better into account the state of the environment, the project will help overcome environmental degradation. Additionally, the project implementation team will also make every effort to be inclusive, including involving a large number of women in its activities. As much as possible, training activities will include an equal number of men and women. When developing the environmental management information system (outcome 1) and the monitoring system (outcome 2), the project will ensure that collecting data will be gender disaggregated and that reporting environment information will also be gender disaggregated. This approach will facilitate a focus on gender-based environmental issues and gender-based solutions.
3. The nature, implementation strategy and the approach of the project are such that sustainability of project achievements should be ensured over the long-term. It includes several features that are forming the sustainability strategy of the project:
4. The project will build upon existing strategies of the government. The need for better environmental information is well detailed in key policies, plans and programmes of the government. The project is a full response to these needs and will be part of the proposed actions to address this need, which is well articulated in the cabinet endorsed KIEP and the soon-to-be approved KJIP. As a result, the project will become part of the government strategy to address this need, providing good opportunities to institutionalize results along the implementation of the project; hence contributing to the long-term sustainability of project achievements.
5. The project will be implemented by the MELAD-ECD itself; therefore, facilitating the institutionalization of project achievements. ECD is the division and is the national environment authority that is mandated by the government to manage, monitor and report on the state of the environment. The main focus of the project is to develop the capacity of ECD to provide more accurate and timely information on the state of the environment in Kiribati. Through the implementation process done within ECD, the capacity of the Division will be developed and at the same time, results/achievements will be institutionalized almost automatically. This approach will contribute to the long-term sustainability of project’s achievements.
6. The approach to implement the project will be as much as possible holistic; that is to focus on developing the overall capacity of ECD to be able to provide to the public and decision makers better environmental information. Capacity development activities will be implemented through an adaptive collaborative management approach to engage stakeholders as collaborators in the design and implementation of project activities that take into account environmental information needs. In addition to a focus on the main agency of the government (ECD), the project will also include other agencies involved in sectoral environmental areas such as water monitoring, environmental health, etc. The overall approach to develop this capacity will be holistic. It will proceed based on a review of capacity gaps and then will address these gaps at all levels: individual, institutional and systemic level. Necessary training will be provided, mechanisms within institutions and across institutions will be reviewed and improved as necessary and finally the enabling environment will also be reviewed to ensure it provides adequate policy and legislation frameworks for these two systems to work. This approach will ensure that staff at ECD and in other relevant agencies/ministries will have the necessary skills and knowledge needed to sustain project achievements but also that the mechanisms and procedures in these organizations are adequate to support these achievements over the long-term within a policy and legislation environment that are supportive of these results.
7. Another important feature of this project’s strategy to sustain its achievements is the learn-by-doing approach. Each project activity will seek the active participation of key stakeholders that are involved in the process that will be addressed by the project. This participation will lead to a calibration of activities towards user-friendliness of existing and new information instruments, which will contribute to the rapid uptake of these information instruments in the policy making and reporting processes. The rationale being that government and other stakeholders responsible for environmental planning, decision-making, monitoring and enforcement are the stakeholders that need more accurate and timely environmental information. Having a government agency to execute this project directly also builds capacities for the implementation of appropriate project activities, and will contribute to the institutionalization of results. It is assumed that mistakes will occur and implementation will not always be smooth, but these problems should still be seen as opportunities for learning better practices.
8. Sustainability will also be strengthened by the project’s attention to resource mobilization. Notwithstanding that a high level of commitment, championship, and strong baseline, the sustainability of project outcomes will require a certain amount of new and additional resources that is currently not available outside of the project’s construct, which is why this project is being supporting through an external grant. The mobilization of project resources will explore the kind of resources needed to sustain project outcomes, and identify realistic sources from both the Kiribati government, and through official development assistance as appropriate. Importantly, the resource mobilization strategy will seek an improvement of the government’s allocation of resources directed to implementing the Rio Conventions through national environmental legislation.
9. Finally, the project will support the development of capacities and will establish information systems. These capacities and these systems will be much institutionalized and should continue to operate after the project is completed. They will be used to (i) ensure coordinated and effective environmental data/information management; and (ii) mainstream the global environment into policy and planning processes in Kiribati. The training, the information, the awareness, the demand-oriented nature of these systems will all contribute to ensuring that project outputs are sustainable.

### C.3.b Replicability and Lessons Learned

1. The project will directly address a national priority that was identified through the NCSA process; it is not about piloting or demonstrating a new approach or a new system. The need for better environmental information is now a priority capacity need in two key policy/programme documents: KIEP and the soon-to-be endorsed KJIP. Therefore, the project will support the development of a public good that will be used by the public and in particular by decision-makers / policy-makers. It will address an issue that has been clearly identified and that needs to be addressed.
2. As discussed in the previous section, project’s achievements should be sustained after the project end, as it is a national need. With the support of the project, Kiribati should have access to more accurate and timely environmental information.
3. One area that should need up-scaling should be environmental monitoring. The project will support the development of a monitoring system with the identification of environmental indicators. However, as much as possible a system to collect information on these indicators will be implemented but more capacity development will be needed after this project to support the development of capacity at the local level to collect and transmit environmental information. It is too early to decide which local actors will/could be involved in data collection but the local Councils would become a major conduit for these tasks.
4. It is anticipated that the project will provide resources to transfer knowledge such as dissemination of lessons, training workshops, information exchange, national forums, etc. As a result, it should ensure its sustainability but also its up-scaling in the outer islands of Kiribati. At the same time, the project should also benefit from lessons learned in the region but also in other parts of the world, particularly when the monitoring system will be designed/developed.
5. Finally, as part of the PIC region, Kiribati will also be part of another UNEP-GEF funded project that will also look into “*building the national and regional capacity to implement MEAs by strengthening planning, and state of environment assessment and reporting in the Pacific Islands*”. The development of the capacity of Kiribati in monitoring, collecting, storing and managing environmental data will also have the opportunity to up-scale these results in using this information for improving planning and reporting to MEAs - an obligations of Parties to these conventions - and hopefully to disseminate lessons learned to other countries in the region through this regional project but also through other regional mechanisms.
6. Nevertheless, as a medium-size project, this intervention will also have certain limitations such as the capacity of the project to develop skills and knowledge of all actors involved in environmental management and monitoring nationally. This project will serve as a catalyst of a longer-term approach to Rio Convention implementation by developing a monitoring system and an information system to constitute an environmental data repository and an environmental clearinghouse mechanism in Kiribati to make this information available.
7. Part of the catalytic role of the project will be to demonstrate the value of the achievements. Therefore, it will also be important that the project prepares a timely exit. An exit strategy will be prepared 6 months before the end of the project to detail the withdrawal of the project and provide a set of recommendations to the government to ensure the long-term sustainability and the up-scaling of project achievements to other parts of Kiribati.

### C.3.c Risks and Assumptions

1. For each expected results at the objective, outcomes and outputs levels, risks and assumptions were identified (*see Annex 2*) during the preparation of this project. There are presented below:

| Risks | Assumptions |
| --- | --- |
| * Political will to provide ECD with the necessary resources to sustain the EMIS and the CMS
 | * MELAD will support ECD and provide it with necessary resources
 |
| * New information is not used and stays stored in computers at ECD
 | * Better environmental information is readily available and actively utilized and used
 |
| * Communications and national reports are not submitted on time
 | * Communications/ reports are submitted on time and include information stored in the EMIS
 |
| * Project activities and resources do not translate in increasing the capacity of ECD to provide better environmental information
 | * The project is effective in developing the capacity in the area of information management
 |
| * Lack of relevant expertise in local market may result in delay of required outputs and distortion of targeted deadlines
 | * Implementation of project activities and recruitment of relevant national expertise is monitored and actions will be identified if the lack of expertise is affecting the timely implementation of the project
 |
| * Acquire inadequate hardware within the ECD context and the EMIS hardware requirements
 | * Specification requirements will be done carefully to identify the adequate hardware, communication and network equipment
 |
| * Political will to accept sharing data among government institutions
 | * Government will see the benefit of sharing data through cabinet support
 |
| * No interest from decision-makers to use better environmental information
 | * The benefit of using better environmental information will encourage decision-makers to use it
* Cabinet support is in place
 |
| * There is no regional commitment to share environmental information
 | * Regional organizations will lead the sharing of environmental information
 |
| * The government does not fulfill its international obligations; including those from the 3 Rio Conventions
 | * The government continues to fulfill its international commitments
 |
| * Socio-economic pressures do not de-value environmental attitudes and concern
 | * Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions’ implementation for decision-makers
 |
| * New indicators are adopted but they require additional resources to be monitored; which might not be available
 | * The government pursues its budget support to integrate the 3 Rio Conventions obligations into the Kiribati information management approach and monitoring system
 |
| * New standards, norms and procedures are identified but might not be adopted by the Government
 | * The government pursues its policies to integrate the 3 Rio Conventions obligations into the Kiribati information management approach and monitoring system
 |
| * The in-service training system for public servants might not be interested in integrating into its catalogue the training curricula developed with the support of the project
 | * The related in-service training institution(s) will be contacted early on to establish a partnership with the project and involved them in designing and delivering the course
 |
| * No interest in better integrating environmental information in government decision-making
 | * There is sufficient commitment from decision-makers to maintain long-term support to public servant training in the environmental area, including MEAs implementation in Kiribati
 |

1. The review of these risks indicates that these risks are manageable through the project’s learn-by-doing approach. This proposed project is a direct response to national priorities identified through the NCSA process; as a result, there is a strong government ownership and willingness to succeed, hence low risks that key stakeholders will not participate in the project and lack of political will.
2. The fact that the project will also be housed at MELAD-ECD will contribute to managing any operational risks. The project will be tightly integrated to the operation of the Division, ensuring that the development of the EMIS and CMS and the provision of information technology equipment will be done in close collaboration with the Direction of ECD through the support of the MELAD administration. It will also contribute to a better prospect for long-term sustainability of project results.
3. Notwithstanding, this also assumes that project activities will be successful, and that the commitment to implement project activities through adaptive collaborative management remains intact. To this end, staff needs and motivation will be important considerations to reduce the risk of high staff turnover. The project will help minimize this risk by instituting a training programme to better understand and apply global environmental issues into national environmental management.

## **C.4****Stakeholder Involvement**

1. This project was developed on the basis of consultations with stakeholder representatives, most of whom will benefit directly from this project. An international consultant was recruited during the PPG phase of this project to consult with key stakeholder representatives, to review the institutional set up as well as the policy and legislation frameworks related to this project and to consolidate this information in the current project document.
2. During this project development phase (PPG), key project stakeholders were identified and consulted. Taking an adaptive and collaborative management approach to execution, the project will ensure that key stakeholders are involved early and throughout project execution as partners for development. This includes their participation in the Project Board, review of project outputs such as recommendations for endorsing a set of environmental indicators, protocols to collect environmental data, institutional mechanisms to collect, share and exchange data, etc., as well as participation in monitoring activities.
3. A key feature of this project is its learn-by-doing approach, which is intended to actively engage stakeholders. This approach should result in key stakeholders that will be more likely to validate the analysis and legitimize the recommendations. It is also intended to catalyze the institutionalization of knowledge and experiences, which is critical for ensuring sustainability.
4. Given the project strategy, the key project stakeholders are government ministries and their subsidiary agencies and departments that are mandated with the management of natural resources. These stakeholder representatives will participate in activities to better monitor the environment and provide more accurate and timely environmental information. In addition to these governmental stakeholders, there are also non-governmental stakeholders from academia, the private sector, and civil society organizations. These non-state organizations will also be invited in project activities to share their comparative expertise, but also to undertake selected project activities. Their participation will be determined during project implementation when defining annual work plans.
5. The table below indicates the role of key stakeholders for implementing the project.

**Table 5: Stakeholders Anticipated Roles in Implementing the Project**

| **Stakeholder** | **Anticipated role in the Project** |
| --- | --- |
| Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD) | * Support ECD in providing the necessary and relevant coordination that may be required from time to time, from other key stakeholders
* Make relevant policies’ advices to GOK based on the technical outcomes of this project (produce policy relevant information based on the outcomes of this project implementation at national level)
* Facilitate and coordinate technical inputs and support from other public, private and civil society sectors
* Provide the technical support required to implement the project at all levels of society in Kiribati
* Ensure alignment of the project outcomes to all MEAs to which this project supports, at the MEA level, in accordance to national priority needs
* Undertake and spearhead the communication, education and public awareness on the role of this project and its relevant linkages and alignment to what GOK is also doing in other sectors, on related areas
 |
| Office of Te Beretitenti (OB) | * Support MELAD in providing the necessary and relevant coordination that may be required from time to time, from other key stakeholders
* Provide advice and guidance on the relevant GOK policies
 |
| Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development (MFMRD) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the marine fisheries sector
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the internal affairs sectors
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Ministry of Women, Youths and Social Affairs | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the women, youths and social affairs sectors
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Ministry of Line & Phoenix Islands Development (MLPID) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary from the relevant portfolios of the MLPID
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Ministry of Communication, Transport and Tourism Development (MCTTD) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the MCTTD
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Ministry of Commerce Industry and Cooperatives (MCIC) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the MCIC
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Ministry of Education (MoE) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the education sector
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MFED) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the MFED relevant portfolio
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Immigration (MFAI) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the MFAI relevant portfolio
* Provide technical inputs and supports necessary from the internal affairs sectors
 |
| Ministry of Health and Medical Services (MHMS) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the MHMS relevant portfolio
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Ministry of Public Works and Utilities (MPWU) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the MPWU relevant portfolio
* Provide technical inputs and supports necessary from the internal affairs sectors
 |
| Ministry of Labour and Human Resources Development (MLHRD) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the MLHRD relevant portfolio
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Island Councils | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the Island Councils relevant portfolio and core functions
* Provide technical inputs and supports necessary from the internal affairs sectors
 |
| NGOs | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the relevant NGOs relevant portfolio and core functions/purposes
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Registered Churches | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the relevant registered churches’ relevant portfolio and core purposes/functions
* Provide technical inputs and supports necessary from the internal affairs sectors
 |
| National Women’s Organizations | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the relevant National Women’s Organizations’ relevant portfolio and core functions/purposes
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Kiribati Boy Scout and Girl Guide Organizations | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the relevant portfolio and core functions/purposes
* Provide technical inputs and supports necessary from the internal affairs sectors
 |
| National Youth Federation | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the relevant portfolio and core functions
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |
| Island Associations of Old Men (Unimwane) | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the relevant portfolio and core functions (relevant only in any involved outer islands, where possible)
* Provide technical inputs and supports necessary from the internal affairs sectors
 |
| Private Sector, including Fishermen and local Farmers Corporations | * Provide technical inputs and supports necessary and relevant from the relevant portfolio and core functions/responsibilities and purposes
* Provide advice and guide linkages to any existing marine resources database to the EMIS to be set up through the project’s implementation
 |

## **C.5** **Monitoring and Evaluation**

1. Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. The project team – based at ECD-MELAD and the Kiribati UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) will undertake monitoring and evaluation activities, with support from UNDP-GEF, including independent evaluators for the mid-term and final evaluation. The project results framework matrix in Annex 2 provides a logical structure for monitoring project performance and delivery using SMART indicators during project implementation. The output budget and the work plan in the project document provide additional information for the allocation of funds, both the GEF and co-financing, for expected project deliverables and the timing of project activities to produce these deliverables. Annex 3 provides a breakdown of the total GEF budget by outcome, project management costs, and allocated disbursements on a per year basis. A GEF tracking tool for CCCD will be used as part of monitoring and evaluation activities to assess project delivery (*see Annex 1*). The work plan is provisional, and is to be reviewed during the project inception phase and endorsed by the project board.
2. The following sections outline the principle components of monitoring and evaluation. The project’s monitoring and evaluation approach will be discussed during the project’s inception phase so as to fine-tune indicators and means of verification, as well as an explanation and full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.
3. *A project Inception workshop* will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO, with representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit as appropriate. Non-governmental stakeholders should be represented at this workshop as well.
4. A fundamental objective of this inception workshop will be to further instil and understanding and ownership of the project’s goals and objectives among the project team, government and other stakeholder groups. The workshop will also serve to finalize preparation of the project’s first annual work plan on the basis of the project’s results framework matrix. This will include reviewing the results framework (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalize the Annual Work Plan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance (process and output) indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.
5. The project inception phase, during the first two months of start-up, will begin with an induction training to: (i) introduce project staff to the UNDP-GEF expanded team that will support the project during its implementation, namely the UNDP-CO and responsible Project Management Unit (PMU) staff; (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and PMU staff with respect to the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, with particular emphasis on the combined Annual Project Reports - Project Implementation Reviews (APR/PIRs), Project Board (PB) meetings, as well as final evaluation. The inception phase will also provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project-related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget re-phasing.
6. The project inception workshop will be held at the end of the inception phase to provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to validate the project results framework and discuss the project’s work plan. As well, the workshop will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to agree on their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project’s decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for PMU staff and associated decision-making structures will be discussed again, as needed, in order to clarify for all, each party’s responsibilities during the project’s implementation phase.
7. The inception workshop will present a schedule of M&E-related meetings and reports. The Project Coordinator in consultation with UNDP will develop this schedule, and will include: (i) tentative time frames for PB meetings, and the timing of near-term project activities, such as the in-depth review of literature on natural resource valuation; and (ii) project-related monitoring and evaluation activities. The provisional work plan will be approved in the first meeting of the PB.
8. A *project inception report* will be prepared immediately following the inception workshop. This report will include a detailed First Year Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames as well as detailed activities and performance indicators that will guide project implementation (over the course of the first year). This Work Plan will include the proposed dates for any visits and/or support missions from the UNDP-CO, the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, or consultants, as well as time-frames for meetings of the project decision-making structures (e.g., PB). The report will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the Annual Work Plan, and including any monitoring and evaluation requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months’ time-frame.
9. The inception report will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation, including any unforeseen or newly arisen constraints. When finalized, the report will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in that to respond with comments or queries.
10. Quarterly:
* Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
* Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
* Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
* Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc... The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.
1. *Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress* will be the responsibility of the Project Coordinator based on the project’s Annual Work Plan and its indicators. The Project Coordinator will inform the UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion.
2. The Project Coordinator will fine-tune outputs, main activities and performance indicators in consultation with the full project team at the inception workshop, with support from UNDP-CO and assisted by the UNDP-GEF. Specific targets for the first year implementation performance indicators, together with their means of verification, will be reviewed at the inception workshop. These will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the Annual Work Plan. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the Project Team, and agreed with the PB.
3. *Periodic monitoring of implementation progress* will be undertaken by the UNDP-CO through monitoring discussions and site visits based on quarterly narrative and financial reports from the Project Coordinator. These quarterly progress reports will be prepared following guidelines provided by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU; they are short reports outlining the main updates in project performance.
4. Furthermore, specific meetings may be scheduled between the PMU, the UNDP-CO and other pertinent stakeholders as deemed appropriate and relevant (particularly the PB members). Such meetings will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities.
5. *Annual Monitoring* will occur through the Annual Project Board meeting. This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to PB meetings at least twice per year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve months following the initiation workshop. For each year-end meeting of the PB, the Project Coordinator will prepare harmonized Annual Project Report / Project Implementation Reviews (APR/PIR) and submit it to UNDP-CO, the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Unit, and all PB members at least two weeks prior to the meeting for review and comments.
6. The APR/PIR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the PB year-end meeting. The Project Coordinator will present the APR/PIR to the PB members, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the Committee participants. The Project Coordinator will also inform the participants of any agreement(s) reached by stakeholders during the APR/PIR preparation, on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project output may also be conducted, as necessary. Details regarding the requirements and conduct of the APR and PB meetings are contained with the M&E Information Kit available through UNDP-GEF.
7. The combined *Annual Project Report (APR) and Project Implementation Review (PIR)* is a UNDP requirement and part of UNDP-CO central oversight, monitoring and project management. As a self-assessment report by project management to the CO, the APR/PIR is a key input to the year-end Project Board meetings. The PIR is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. It has become an essential management and monitoring tool for project managers and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from on-going projects. These two reporting requirements are very similar in input, purpose and timing that they have now been amalgamated into a single APR/PIR Report.
8. An APR/PIR is to be prepared on an annual basis by June, but well in advance (at least one month) in order to be considered at the PB meeting. The purpose of the APR/PIR is to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project’s Annual Work Plan and assess performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work. The APR/PIR is discussed by the PB, so that the resultant report represents a document that has been agreed upon by all of the key stakeholders.
9. A standard format/template for the APR/PIR is provided by UNDP-GEF. This includes , but is not limited to, reporting on the following:
* Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
* Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
* Lesson learned/good practice.
* AWP and other expenditure reports
* Risk and adaptive management
* ATLAS QPR
* Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.
1. UNDP will analyze the individual APR/PIRs by focal area, theme and region for common issues/results and lessons. The APR/PIRs are also valuable for the independent evaluators who can utilize them to identify any changes in the project’s structure, indicators, work plan, among others, and view a past history of delivery and assessment.
2. A *mid-term review* may be conducted if needed at the mid-point of the implementation of the project to review the progress of the project and provide recommendations for the remaining implementation phase, including recommendations for ensuring a smooth exit and maximize the sustainability of project achievements.
3. An *independent final evaluation* will take place three months prior to the terminal tripartite review meeting, and will focus on: a) the cost-effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation and performance; b) highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and c) present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this evaluation will be incorporated as lessons learned, and recommendations for improvement addressed to ensure the institutional sustainability of project outputs, particular for the replication of project activities. The final evaluation will also look at project outcomes and their sustainability. The final evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities, as appropriate. The terms of reference for the final evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP-MCO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, in consultation with the PB.
4. During the last three months of the project, the PMU will prepare the *Project Terminal Report*. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements and outputs of the project, lessons learned, the extent to which objectives have been met, structures and mechanisms implemented, capacities developed, among others. Together with the independent final evaluation, the project terminal report is one of two definitive statements of the project’s activities during its lifetime. The project terminal report will also recommend further steps, if necessary, in order to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project outcomes and outputs.
5. *The terminal review meeting* is held by the PB, with invitation to other relevant government stakeholders as necessary, in the last month of project operations. The Project Coordinator is responsible for preparing the terminal review report and submitting it to UNDP-CO, the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, and all participants of the terminal review meeting. The terminal review report will be drafted at least one month in advance of the terminal review meeting, in order to allow for timely review and to serve as the basis for discussion. The terminal review report considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. The report also decides whether any actions remain necessary, particularly in relation to the sustainability of project outputs and outcomes, and acts as a vehicle through that lessons learned can be captured to feed into other projects under implementation or formulation. The terminal review meeting should refer to the independent final evaluation report, conclusions and recommendations as appropriate.
6. The UNDP-CO, in consultation with the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinator and members of the PB, has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met as per delivery rates, and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.
7. The Project Coordinator, in consultation with and clearance from the Project Manager (Director – ECD, MELAD) will provide the UNDP Resident Representative with *certified periodic financial statements* relating to the status of UNDP (including GEF) funds according to the established procedures set out in UNDP’s Programming and Finance manuals. An *audit of the financial statements* will be conducted by the legally recognized auditor of Kiribati UNDP-CO.
8. *Learning and knowledge sharing*: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums at the national, regional and global levels.
9. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.
10. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.
11. *Communications and visibility requirements*: Full compliance is required with UNDP’s Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo>. The UNDP logo can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.
12. Full compliance is also required with the GEF’s Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the “GEF Guidelines”). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf>. Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.
13. Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.
14. Audit on project will follow UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable Audit policies.

**Table 6: Monitoring Work Plan and Budget**

| **Type of M&E activity** | **Responsible Parties** | **Budget US$***Excluding project team staff time* | **Time frame** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Inception Workshop and Report | * Project Coordinator
* UNDP CO, UNDP GEF
 | Indicative cost: 5,000 | Within first two months of project start up  |
| Measurement of Means of Verification of project results. | * UNDP GEF RTA/Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.
 | To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.  | Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required. |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on *output and implementation* | * Oversight by Project Coordinator
* Project team
 | To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.  | Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans  |
| ARR/PIR | * Project Coordinator and team
* UNDP CO
* UNDP RTA
* UNDP EEG
 | None | Annually  |
| Periodic status/ progress reports | * Project Coordinator and team
 | None | Quarterly |
| Mid-term Review (*if needed*) | * Project Coordinator and team
* UNDP CO
* UNDP RCU
* External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)
 | Not Required for MSP project but can be undertaken if it is deemed necessary by the Project Board | At the mid-point of project implementation.  |
| Final Evaluation | * Project Coordinator and team,
* UNDP CO
* UNDP RCU
* External Consultants (i.e., evaluation team)
 | Indicative cost: $14,000  | At least three months before the end of project implementation |
| Project Terminal Report | * Project Coordinator and team
* UNDP CO
* Local consultant
 | 0 | At least three months before the end of the project |
| Audit  | * UNDP CO
* Project Coordinator and team
 | Indicative cost per year for 2 years: $2,000  | Yearly |
| Visits to field sites  | * UNDP CO
* UNDP RCU (as appropriate)
* Government representatives
 | For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget  | Yearly |
| **TOTAL indicative COST** Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses  |  US$ 25,000 (+/- 5% of GEF budget) |  |

# D. Financing

## **D.1** **Financing Plan**

1. The financing of this project will be provided by the GEF (US$ 500,000), with co-financing from the Government of Kiribati (US$ 500,000) and UNDP (US$ 30,000). The GEF leverage thus represents approximately a 1:1 ratio. The allocation of these sources of finances is structured by the two main project components, as described in section C.2.b above. More detailed financial information is provided in Annex 3. The table below gives a summary of the allocation of the budget per component/outcome and the following table gives detailed about the allocation of the budget.

**Table 7: Project Costs (US$)**

| **Total Project Budget by Component** | **GEF ($)** | **Co-Financing ($)** | **Project Total ($)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component 1 | 232,500 | 240,000 | 472,500 |
| Component 2 | 225,028 | 220,000 | 445,028 |
| Project Management | 42,472 | 70,000 | 112,472 |
| Total project costs | **500,000** | **530,000** | **1,030,000** |

**Total Budget and Work Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Award ID/Project ID:**  | **TBC** |   |   |   |   |
| **Award Title:** | **Integrating global environmental priorities into national policies and programmes** |
| **Business Unit:** | **FJI10** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Project Title:** | **Integrating global environmental priorities into national policies and programmes** |
| **PIMS No:** | **4936** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Implementing Partner (Executing Agency):** | **Environment and Conservation Division (ECD), Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD)** |

| **GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity** | **Responsible Party/ Implementing Agent** | **Fund ID** | **Donor Name** | **Atlas Budgetary Account Code** | **ATLAS Budget Description** | **Amount Year 1 (US$)** | **Amount Year 2 (US$)** | **Amount Year 3 (US$)** | **Total (US$)** | **See Budget Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1:Environmental Management Information System (EMIS)** | **ECD-MELAD** | **62000** | **GEF** | 71200 | International Consultant |  |  | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1 |
| 71300 | Local Consultant | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 45,000 | 2 |
| 71400 | Contractual Services - individual | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | 81,000 | 3 |
| 71600 | Travel | 500 | 10,820 | 2,500 | 13,820 | 4 |
| 72200 | Equipment and Furniture | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 7,500 | 5 |
| 72300 | Material and Goods | 10,000 | 10,000 | - | 20,000 | 6 |
| 72500 | Supplies | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 | 7 |
| 75700 | Training, Workshops and Conferences | 19,060 | 19,060 | 19,060 | 57,180 | 8 |
|  | **Total Outcome 1** | **75,060** | **85,380** | **72,060** | **232,500** |  |
| **Component 2:Environmental Indicators And Compliance Monitoring System (CMS)** | **ECD-MELAD** | **62000** | **GEF** | 71200 | International Consultant | - | 15,000 | 5,000 | 20,000 | 9 |
| 71300 | Local Consultant | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 45,000 | 10 |
| 71400 | Contractual Services - individual | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | 81,000 | 11 |
| 71600 | Travel | - | 5,000 | 2,000 | 7,000 | 12 |
| 72200 | Equipment and Furniture | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 7,500 | 13 |
| 72300 | Material and Goods | - | 8,000 | - | 8,000 | 14 |
| 75700 | Training, Workshops and Conferences | 12,500 | 22,014 | 22,014 | 56,528 | 15 |
|  | **Total Outcome 2** | **57,000** | **94,514** | **73,514** | **225,028** |  |
| **Project Management** | **ECD-MELAD/UNDP** | **62000** | **GEF** | 71400 | Contractual Services | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 36,000 | 16 |
| 72500 | Supplies | 500 | 500 | 500 | 1,500 | 17 |
| 74100 | Professional Services |  | 2,000 | 2,000 | 4,000 | 18 |
| 74599 | UNDP Cost-Recovery Charges -Bills |  | 486 | 486 | 972 | 19 |
|   | **Total Project Management** | **12,500** | **14,986** | **14,986** | **42,472** |  |
|  |  |  |  |   | **TOTAL PROJECT** | **144,560** | **194,880** | **160,560** | **500,000** |  |
| *Notes:* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *(1) International consulting days for component 1 (including 50% of final evaluation consulting days)* |  |  |  |
| *(2) National consulting days for component 1* |
| *(3) 50% of the Project Coordinator’s time allocated to Outcome 1, plus one technical professional full time* |
| *(4) Travel budget for consultants* |
| *(5) Budget provision for local transportation* |
| *(6) Budget for information technology equipment such as computer, software, backup system, surge protector and communication/networking equipment for the EMIS* |
| *(7) Office supplies for the EMIS* |
| *(8) Training expenses to conduct training activities* |
| *(9) International consulting days for component 2 (including 50% of final evaluation consulting days)* |
| *(10) National consulting days for component 2* |
| *(11) 50% of the Project Coordinator’s time allocated to Outcome 1, plus one technical professional full time* |
| *(12) Travel budget for consultants* |
| *(13) Budget provision for local transportation* |
| *(14) Additional budget for information technology equipment for the CMS* |
| *(15) Training expenses to conduct training activities* |
| *(16) A full time Project Administrative and Financial Assistant* |
| *(17) Office supplies for the project*  |
| *(18) Audit cost for 2 years* |
| *(19) Direct Project Cost for services rendered by UNDP to the project, as per Letter of Agreement (Annex 8)* |

**Table 8: Estimated Project management budget/cost (for the entire project)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component (\*)** | **Estimated Staff weeks** | **GEF ($)** | **Co-Financing ($)** | **Project Total ($)** |
| Locally recruited personnel: Project Assistant | 156 | 36,000 |  | 36,000 |
| Direct Project Costs |  | 972 |  | 972 |
| Management support |  |  | 37,000 | 37,000 |
| Office supplies and audit |  | 5,500 | 30,000 | 35,500 |
| Travel |  |  | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Total project management cost |  | **42,472** | **70,000** | **112,472** |

*\* Local and international consultants in this table are those who are hired for functions related to the management of project. Please see table below for consultants providing technical assistance for special services.*

1. An internationally recruited consultant will be contracted to undertake the independent final evaluation towards the end of the project. The travel budget includes the costs of DSA, TE and return airfare for the international consultant.
2. No UNDP Implementing Agency services are being charged to the Project Budget. All such costs are being charged to the IA fee. In agreement with the Government of Kiribati UNDP may provide a few implementation services (mostly recruitment of international consultants) under the National Execution Arrangements, these will be charged to the Project Management Budget. A budget of $972 was allocated to these Direct Project Costs (DPCs). Details of such charges are provided in Annex 8.
3. The table below provides details on planned consultancies for implementing this project. One consultancy with one international environmental monitoring expert is planned under outcome 2. The other consultancies are planned to be conducted by local consultants.

**Table 9: Consultants for technical assistance components (estimated for entire project)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Consultants** | **Estimated Staff weeks** | **GEF ($)** | **Co-Financing ($)** | **Project Total ($)** |
| Information System Specialist(s) | 45 | 45,000 |  | 45,000 |
| Environmental Monitoring Specialist(s) | 45 | 45,000 |  | 45,000 |
| International Environmental Monitoring Expert | 6 | 15,000 |  | 15,000 |
| International Evaluator | 4 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 |
| Total |  | **$115,000** |  | **115,000** |

## **D.2** **Cost Effectiveness**

1. An important indicator to consider for analyzing the project cost-effectiveness is the percentage of the total project that is being used for project management services. As per table 10 below, this percentage is 11%, which is reasonable for a project of this size. It is noted that due to the small size of the project budget, this project management cost cannot be lower.
2. Due to a good co-financing of this project, the cost-effectiveness of this project is good. As described in the sections, above, this project is a response to a national need and it will benefit from a significant investment of government staff (decision-makers and planners) to actively participate in project activities. The table below is an estimate of this contribution over the three years of project implementation.
3. The cost-effectiveness of this project is also demonstrated in efficiently allocating and managing the financial resources of this project. The recruitment of consultants will consist mostly of local consultants, reducing the transaction costs associated when contracting international consultants.

**Table 10: Project Costs (%)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Budget Component by Contribution type** | **Contribution (US$)** | **Percentage (%)** |
| Component 1: GEF | 232,500 | 23% |
| Component 1: Co-Financing | 240,000 | 23% |
| Component 2: GEF | 225,028 | 22% |
| Component 2: Co-Financing | 220,000 | 21% |
| Project Management: GEF | 42,472 | 4% |
| Project Management: Co-Financing | 70,000 | 7% |
| **Total** | **$1,030,000** | **100** |

## **D.3** **Co-financing**

1. UNDP will allocate US$ 30,000 directly to this project in cash as part of its commitment to supporting the Government of Kiribati to strengthen its environmental information management and monitoring functions. The Government of Kiribati, through MELAD-ECD is contributing US$ 500,000 in-kind, which includes the human resources and their salaries - to support the project team in the implementation of the project - office furniture and space, telephone and internet connections, electricity and vehicle. The table 11 below presents the co-financing sources for this project. Letters to support this co-financing are presented in Part III of this project document.

**Table 11: Co-financing Sources**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Co-financier** | **Classification** | **Type** | **Amount** |
| **Confirmed (US$)** | **Unconfirmed (US$)** |
| MELAD | Government | In-kind | 320,000 |  |
| MELAD – ICCAI – SPREP Project | Government | In-kind | 30,000 |  |
| MELAD – KAPIII Mangrove Replanting | Government | In-kind | 150,000 |  |
| UNDP | GEF Implementing Agency | In-Kind | 30,000 |  |
| **Total Co-financing** |  |  | **$530,000** |  |

# E. Institutional Coordination and Support

## **E.1** **Core Commitments and Linkages**

### E.1.a Linkages to Other Activities and Programmes

1. This project will also make an important contribution to Kiribati's pursuit of low-emission and climate resilient development (LECRD). Specifically, this project will support the implementation of the Environment Act 1999 (as amended 2007) and the relevant regulations including the Ozone Depletion Substances (ODS) and will add value to existing environment projects that Government of Kiribati is implementing in Kiribati through MELAD-ECD such as the Implementation of Montreal Protocol on ODS, the International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative (ICCAI), the Urban Development Programme Project, the Kiribati National Biodiversity Strategies and Actions Plan, the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, the Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA), to name a few. The ODS project promotes and support low emission in Kiribati while the latter projects simultaneously work to build and support a climate resilient environment in Kiribati.
2. Building and enhancing the resilience of Kiribati to global climate change is critical and this project will add value to. Thus given the centralized nature of the EMIS, the project will build upon the multi-stakeholder consultation and participatory process created under the NCSA, and which embodies the first stage of UNDP's LECRD approach. The second LECRD phase is the preparation of climate change profiles and vulnerability assessments, which are being undertaken as part of Kiribati's SNC, and which also build upon the thematic assessments carried out under the NCSA. The EMIS will help to further institutionalize the data and information that went and goes into the preparation of these assessments and strategies, thereby reducing the transaction costs as well as reinforcing national capacities to develop and implement strategic options to pursue LECRD.

## **E.2** **Implementation and Execution Arrangements**

1. Establishing an effective project management structure is crucial for its success. Every project has a need for direction, management, control and communication, using a structure that differs from line management. As a project is normally cross-functional and involves partnership, its structure needs to be more flexible, and is likely to require a broad base of skills for a specific period of time. The UNDP project management structure consists of roles and responsibilities that bring together the various interests and skills involved in, and required by, the project. It is proposed that the management arrangements illustrated below be discussed and considered for the Kiribati CCCD project:

**Project Management Unit (PMU):**

Project Coordinator, Project Administrative/Finance Assistant

**Kiribati CCCD Project Board**

**Senior Beneficiaries:** Secretaries of relevant key Ministries

**Executive:**

Secretary MELAD (PB Chair)

**Senior Supplier:**

UN Resident Representative

**Steering Committee**

(Chair by the Director of ECD)

**Project Organization Structure**

**Technical support/consultants** (likely to change depending on nature of activities)**:**

1) *Component 1*: Environmental Management Information System (EMIS)

2) *Component 2:* Environmental Indicators and Compliance Monitoring System (CMS)

**Technical Working Groups (TWGs)**

(Ad-hoc TWGs as needed)

***Implementing Partner:*** The Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD) is the designated Implementing Partner for the project. It will execute the project through the Environment and Conservation Division (ECD) on behalf of the Government of Kiribati (GOK) under the National Implementation Modality (NIM) of the UNDP. The Implementing Partner is the entity responsible and accountable for managing a project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outputs, and for the effective use of GEF/UNDP resources. A single implementing partner is designated to manage each UNDP-supported project. The implementing partner may enter into agreements with other organizations or entities to assist in successfully delivering project outputs. Possible implementing partners include government institutions, other eligible UN agencies and inter-governmental organizations, UNDP, and eligible civil society organizations (CSOs). Eligible CSOs are those that are legally registered in the country where they will be operating. The implementing partner was identified based on an assessment of its legal, technical, financial, managerial and administrative capacities that will be needed for the project. In addition, its ability to manage cash was assessed in accordance with the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT). The implementing partner may enter into agreements with other organizations or entities, namely Responsible Parties, to assist in successfully delivering project outputs. The Implementing Partner will assign a Representative and provide its staff and network of experts as support to the Project Management Unit (as part of government co-financing).

1. ***Senior Beneficiary***: The Secretary of MELAD represents the Government of Kiribati and act as the Senior Beneficiary of the Project.
2. ***Executive***: Secretary of MELAD is designated at the Executive for this project. The Executive will also chair the Project Board. She/he will be responsible for management oversight of the project.
3. ***Senior Supplier***: The UNDP Resident Representative, based in Fiji takes the role of the Senior Supplier. UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency for this project, with the UNDP Country Office responsible for transparent practices, appropriate conduct and professional auditing.
4. ***Project Board (PB)***: The three parties above (the Executive, Senior Supplier and Senior Beneficiary) make up the core members of the Project Board of which the main function is to strategically guide the course of the project towards achieving its objective. It is specifically established by the project to provide management oversight of project activities and is to be chaired by the Secretary of MELAD. The PB will review progress and evaluation reports, and approve programmatic modifications to project execution, as appropriate and in accordance to UNDP procedures. Policy recommendations will be discussed and recommended for consideration by the Cabinet of Ministers and Parliament. The PB is also responsible for making by consensus, management decisions for a project when guidance is required by the Project Coordinator, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions. In order to ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, PB decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition.
5. In case a consensus cannot be reached within the PB, final decision shall rest with the UNDP Resident Representative. In addition, the PB plays a critical role in UNDP commissioned project evaluations by quality assuring the evaluation process and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. Project reviews by this group are made at designated decision points during the running of the project, or as necessary when raised by the Project Coordinator. This group is consulted by the Project Coordinator for decisions when Project Coordinator's tolerances (normally in terms of time and budget) have been exceeded (flexibility). Based on the approved annual work plan (AWP), the PB may review and approve project quarterly plans when required and authorizes any major deviation from these agreed quarterly plans. It is the authority that signs off the completion of each quarterly plan as well as authorizes the start of the next quarterly plan. It ensures that required resources are committed and arbitrates on any conflicts within the project or negotiates a solution to any problems between the projects and external bodies. Finally, it approves the appointment and responsibilities of the Project Coordinator and any delegation of its Project Assurance responsibilities.
6. In addition to the three parties above, government membership of the PB may include representatives from the line ministries responsible and their respective state agencies. Non-state stakeholders may also be represented on the PB, namely from the private sector, academic and research institutions, NGOs, and CSOs. Additional members of the PB are reviewed and recommended for approval during the project appraisal committee (PAC) meeting. The PB will meet four (4) times per year and meetings will be co-financed by UNDP. This group contains at least the following representatives:
* ***Senior Beneficiary***: The **Secretaries from other line ministries** (as part of the Development Coordinating Committee (DCC) will represent the beneficiaries of the project.
* ***Senior Supplier***: **UNDP** will represent the interests of the parties, which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project.
* ***Executive***: The **Secretary of MELAD** will represent the interests of managing the project. Its primary function within the *Project Board* is to ensure the realization of project results from the perspective of implementing the project.
1. ***Steering Committee (SC)***: The *steering committee* role supports the *Project Board* by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures that appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed; the *SC* is to be independent of the *Project Coordinator*. The Director of ECD will chair the *SC* while the Project Coordinator will provide the secretariat role to this committee. The *SC* will have a broad membership representing all parties of project stakeholders/beneficiaries. The membership of the *SC* will be established at the start-up of the project, which will include the UNDP Officer in Kiribati.
2. ***Project Management Unit (PMU)***: The *Implementing Partner* will provide an office. It will be located at ECD. The PMU will be administered by a full-time *Project Coordinator* and supported by a full-time *Administrative/Financial Assistant*.
3. ***Project Coordinator***: The *Project Coordinator* has the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the *Implementing Partner* within the constraints laid down by the *Project Board* as well as subcontract specific components of the project to specialized government agencies, research institutions, as well as qualified NGOs. The *Project Coordinator* is responsible for day-to-day management and decision-making for the project. The Project Coordinator’s prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results (outputs) specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The *Implementing Partner* appoints the Project Coordinator, who should be different from the Implementing Partner’s representative in the Board (NPD). Prior to the approval of the project, the Project Developer from UNDP is responsible for project management functions during formulation until the *Project Coordinator* from the *Implementing Partner* is in place.
4. ***Project Administrative/Finance Assistant***: The role provides project administration, management and technical support to the *Project Coordinator* as required by the needs of the individual project or *Project Coordinator*.
5. ***Technical Working Group***: Supports the *PMU* by providing ad-hoc technical advice on specific activities for project components when needed. The establishment of this Technical Working Group will be proposed by the Technical Team through the Project Coordinator and will be determined and endorsed by the Project SC.
6. ***Technical Support/Consultants/cies***: Responsible for undertaking specific activities for project components as needed.
7. ***Capacity Development Activities***: The project will take an adaptive collaborative management approach to implementation. That is, UNDP and ECD will manage project activities in order that stakeholders are involved early and throughout project implementation, providing regular input of the performance of project activities. This will help signal unforeseen risks and contribute to the timely modification and realignment of activities within the boundaries of the project's goal and objectives.
8. ***Stakeholder Engagement***: Project activities will be implemented through the necessary engagement of Stakeholders where needed.
9. ***GEF Visibility***: Visibility of GEF financial support will be ensured by using the global GEF branding in all electronic and printed materials. The GEF logo will appear on all relevant project publications, including amongst others, project hardware and other purchases with GEF funds. Any citation in publications regarding projects funded by GEF will acknowledge the GEF.  Logos of the Implementing Agencies and the Executing Agency will also appear on all publications. Where other agencies and project partners have provided support (through co-financing) their logos may also appear on project publications. Full compliance will be made with the GEF’s Communication and Visibility Guidelines[[1]](#footnote-1).

# F LEGAL CONTEXT

1. This document together with the UNDAF Country Results Matrix (CRM) 2013-2017, and the UNDP SRPD agreed to by the Government and UNDP which is incorporated by reference constitute together a Project Document as referred to in the SBAA and all UNDAF CRM and UNDP SRPD provisions apply to this document. .
2. Consistent with the Article III of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement, the responsibility for the safety and security of the implementing partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP’s property in the implementing partner’s custody, rests with the implementing partner.
3. The implementing partner shall:
4. Put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
5. Assume all risks and liabilities related to the implementing partner’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan.
6. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement.
7. The implementing partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm>. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.
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## **Annex 1: Capacity Development Scorecard**

Project/Programme Name: Integrating global environmental priorities into national policies and programmes

Project/Programme Cycle Phase: Project preparation (PPG) Date: April 2014

| **Capacity Result / Indicator** | **Staged Indicators** | **Rating** | **Score** | **Comments** | **Next Steps** | **Outcome Contribution** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CR 1: Capacities for engagement** |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations | Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined | 0 | **1** | Institutional responsibilities for managing the environment exist but overlaps exist and stakeholders do not know/recognized these responsibilities. |  | No direct contribution from the project to improve this capacity. |
| Institutional responsibilities for environmental management are identified | 1 |
| Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management are partially recognized by stakeholders | 2 |
| Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management recognized by stakeholders | 3 |
| Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms | No co-management mechanisms are in place | 0 | **1** | Only few co-managements exist and more are needed to increase collaboration among agencies. |  | No direct contribution from the project to improve this capacity. |
| Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational | 1 |
| Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc. | 2 |
| Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/functional | 3 |
| Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups | Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in decision-making is poor | 0 | **1** | The participation of stakeholders in decision-making regarding the management of the environment is limited in Kiribati. |  | No direct contribution from the project to improve this capacity. |
| Stakeholders are identified but their participation in decision-making is limited | 1 |
| Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established | 2 |
| Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative decision-making processes | 3 |
| **CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge** |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders | Stakeholders are not aware about global environmental issues and their related possible solutions (MEAs) | 0 | **2** | Stakeholders and the population at large know about global environmental issues, particularly climate change and its impacts on Kiribati. However, last with limited awareness, stakeholders do not know how to participate. | The project will support the development of a data repository providing environmental information access to the public. Additionally, the project will support awareness raising activities, which will seek the engagement of stakeholders in implementation solutions to address global environmental issues.  | 1 - An operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information. |
| Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues but not about the possible solutions (MEAs) | 1 |
| Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate | 2 |
| Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions | 3 |
| Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders | The environmental information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate | 0 | **1** | Some environmental information is collected and stored at ECD and also by other government entities. However the information management infrastructure to support this information is not adequate. There is a limited possibility of data exchange, data sharing happening.  | The project will support the development of an adequate information management infrastructure to adequately collect, store and provide access to environmental data.  | 1 - An operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information. |
| The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate | 1 |
| The environmental information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited | 2 |
| Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure | 3 |
| Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes | No environmental education programmes are in place | 0 | **1** | Some environmental education activities were implemented, often supported by externally funded projects. However, no national environmental education programme is in place in Kiribati.  | The project will support some environmental awareness raising activities, including the promotion of the environmental management information system (EMIS) developed with the support of the project.  | 1 - An operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information. |
| Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered | 1 |
| Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered | 2 |
| Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered | 3 |
| Indicator 7 – Extent of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development | No linkage exist between environmental policy development and science/research strategies and programmes | 0 | **1** | Limited environmental research is being done in Kiribati, due mostly to lack of resources but also limited environmental information available.  | Once the EMIS will exist and that more accurate and timely environmental information will be available, the project will support the promotion of this information, particularly with decision makers and policy makers. | 1 - An operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information. |
| Research needs for environmental policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes | 1 |
|  | Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs | 2 |
|  | Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development | 3 |
| Indicator 8 – Extent of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making | Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes | 0 | **1** | There is a limited collection of traditional knowledge.  | As part of improving the collection of environmental data, appropriate traditional knowledge will be collected, stored and made available. | 1 - An operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information. |
| Traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes | 1 |
|  | Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes | 2 |
|  | Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes | 3 |
| **CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development** |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 9 – Extend of the environmental planning and strategy development process | The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies | 0 | **1** | Kiribati is equipped with a good policy framework including the soon-to-be Cabinet approved of KIEP and KJIP. However, they remain to be funded adequately and implemented. |  | No direct contribution from the project to improve this capacity. |
|  | The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but there are not implemented/used | 1 |
|  | Adequate environmental plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems | 2 |
|  | The environmental planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented | 3 |
| Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks | The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment | 0 | **1** | Kiribati is equipped with a good policy framework including the soon-to-be approved by Cabinet KIEP and KJIP. However, they remain to be funded adequately and implemented. |  | No direct contribution from the project to improve this capacity. |
| Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced | 1 |
| Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them | 2 |
| Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions | 3 |
| Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making | The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking | 0 | **1** | Some environmental information exists but it is not much used by policy makers and decision makers.  | The project will support the development of an environmental data repository that will be accessible by decision makers and policy makers | 1 - An operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information. |
| Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes | 1 |
|  | Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly | 2 |
|  | Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated environmental information to make environmental decisions | 3 |
| **CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation** |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources | The environmental organizations don’t have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed | 0 | **1** | Due to limited government financial resources, ECD’s resource requirements cannot be met and the level of existing resources is low when compared to the resources needed to properly manage the environment in Kiribati. |  | No direct contribution from the project to improve this capacity. |
|  | The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed | 1 |
|  | The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed | 2 |
|  | Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations | 3 |
| Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer | The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified | 0 | **2** | Staff at ECD has a good level of skills and technologies. A lot of it was acquired through externally funded projects.  |  | No direct contribution from the project to improve this capacity. |
| The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources | 1 |
|  | The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources | 2 |
|  | The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies | 3 |
| **CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate** |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process | Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme | 0 | **0** | Project monitoring is seldom made in a participatory way, since project elaboration is often performed in a non-participatory manner. Generally, much of the effort is focused on the project design and implementation, but little effort is made in monitoring and in using lessons learned to improve project implementation. | The project will strengthen monitoring and compliance with environmental laws. It will also create, finalize and secure a high-level commitment of new monitoring and compliance guidelines for environmental laws and MEAs.A working group for monitoring and evaluation of projects will be established. An external independent evaluation team will perform the terminal evaluation ensuring neutrality and objectiveness. | 2: A compliance monitoring system developed and tracking key environmental indicators |
|  | An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted | 1 |
|  | Regular participative monitoring of results in being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team | 2 |
|  | Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action | 3 |
| Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring and evaluation process | None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources | 0 | **1** | The majority of international cooperation funded projects have evaluation plans. These evaluations are mainly performed internally, by the executing agency and by the funding agencies. But the results are not shared, thus lessons-learned cannot be extracted to be used for other projects to achieve improvement. | During the lifetime of the project, activities will be conducted to promote the exchange of information and capture lessons learned that could be replicated within and outside Kiribati. For evaluating the adequacy of project/program monitoring, progress reports will be prepared periodically. Also independent mid-term (optional) and final evaluation reports will be prepared. Based on the new information available, the project will support the preparation Rio Convention national reports and communications to Conventions and also states of environment reports.  | 2: A compliance monitoring system developed and tracking key environmental indicators |
| An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted | 1 |
| Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team | 2 |
| Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team and the Agencies and GEF Staff to correct the course of action if needed and to learn for further planning activities | 3 |
|  | **Total Score:** | **16/45** |  |  |  |

## **Annex 2:** **Project Results Framework**

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in UNDAF:** UNDAF Focus Area 1: Environmental Management, Climate Change and Disaster Risk ManagementRegional UNDAF Outcome 1.1: Improved resilience of PICTs, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environmental management, climate change adaptation/mitigation, and disaster risk management (Strengthen knowledge and information management, risk assessment and reporting capacities in environmental, climate and disaster risk management for greater evidence base in decision-making).Kiribati UNDAF Outcome 1.1: Resilience strengthened at national and community level through integrated sustainable environment management, climate change adaptation/ mitigation and disaster risk management |
| **UNDAF Outcome Indicators:**Outcome 1.1: Number of environmental policies/regulations successfully passed by parliament and translated into environmental protection measures for implementation by government |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):**  |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Focal Area Objectives:****CD-2:** Generate, access and use of information and knowledge.**CD-5:** Enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends. |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:****CD-2:** Institutions and stakeholders trained how to use different tools available to manage information; Stakeholders are better informed via workshops and trainings about global challenges and local actions required; Ability of stakeholders to diagnose, understand and transform information and knowledge into local actions increased and retained in 16 countries; Knowledge platform established to share lessons learned among CBOs and CSOs across SGP participating countries; Public awareness raised through workshops and other activities.**CD-5:** Monitoring systems established; Capacities for monitoring of projects and programs developed; Learning and knowledge management platform established to share lessons learned among CBOs and CSOs across SGP participating countries. |

| **Objectives and Outcomes** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets** **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** To improve information management and compliance monitoring in order to achieve global environmental benefits. | 1. ECD stated as the primary source for environmental information in Kiribati by a significant number of national, regional and international development partners
 | * Capacity of the main stakeholders for translating environmental information from EMIS into decision-making is low and dispersed over many organizations
 | * 50% of stakeholders have benefitted from capacity development activities for better use of this information in decision-making and policy-making
 | * Reference to ECD-EMIS in project documents; national strategies, programmes and plans; national assessments
* State of the environmental reports and communications/national reports sent to Conventions
 | ***Risk***:* Political will to provide ECD with the necessary resources to sustain the EMIS and the CMS

***Assumption***:* MELAD will support ECD and provide it with necessary resources
 |
| 1. Reported availability of better environmental monitoring information
 | * Collection and use of up-to-date environmental management information is ad-hoc and feebly coordinated
 | * Up-to-date environmental information is being used by policy-makers and also by the public
 | * Information products such as newsletters, flyers, articles, etc.
* Policies referring to this new environmental information
 | ***Risk***:* New information is not used and stays stored in computers at ECD

***Assumption***:* Better environmental information is readily available and actively utilized and used
 |
| 1. Quality of monitoring reports and communications to measure implementation progress of the Rio Conventions
 | * Current reports are produced with limited data, weak analysis and weak trend analysis
* There are not fully responding to the national and international requirements.
 | * Reports present adequate disaggregated data at local level, are informative and present environmental trends over time
 | * ECD reports
* Environmental reports such as the State of Environment and Communications to the Conventions
 | ***Risk***:* Communications and national reports are not submitted on time

***Assumption***:* Communications and national reports are submitted on time and include information stored in the EMIS
 |
| 1. Capacity development scorecard rating
 | Capacity for: * Engagement: 3 of 9
* Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 6 of 15
* Policy and legislation development: 3 of 9
* Management and implementation: 3 of 6
* Monitor and evaluate: 1 of 6

(total score: 16/45) | Capacity for: * Engagement: 6 of 9
* Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 10 of 15
* Policy and legislation development: 7 of 9
* Management and implementation: 5 of 6
* Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6

(total targeted score: 32/45) | * Mid-term review and final evaluation reports, including an updated CD scorecard
* Annual PIRs
* Capacity assessment reports
 | ***Risk***:* Project activities and resources do not translate in increasing the capacity of ECD to provide better environmental information

***Assumption***:* The project is effective in developing the capacity in the area of information management
 |
| **COMPONENT 1.0: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (EMIS)** |
| **Outcome 1:** An operational environmental management information system (EMIS) providing accurate and timely information.**Output 1.1:** An environmental data repository with standards, norms and protocols to collect, analyze, store and make available accurate, and reliable environmental information related to all three Rio Conventions, and of direct use by decision-makers.**Output 1.2:** An information technology architecture in place to store, manage and provide public access to environmental information.**Output 1.3:** Environmental information available and disseminated to stakeholders. | 1. An environmental data repository architecture in place
 | * No data architecture is in place to structure environmental information at ECD
 | * Environmental data is stored in a structured way and easily accessible
 | * Technical report
* PIRs
* Web pages
 | ***Risk***:* Lack of relevant expertise in local market may result in delay of required outputs and distortion of targeted deadlines

***Assumption***:* Implementation of project activities and recruitment of relevant national expertise is monitored and actions will be identified if the lack of expertise is affecting the timely implementation of the project
 |
| 1. Information technologies in place to store the data repository
 | * Limited technology is in place to support data management for an EMIS
 | * Hardware, communication and networking equipment is in place to store environmental data and provide easy access to this information
 | * Equipment procured
* PIRs
* Observations
 | ***Risk***:* Acquire inadequate hardware within the ECD context and the EMIS hardware requirements

***Assumption***:* Specification requirements will be done carefully to identify the adequate hardware, communication and network equipment
 |
| 1. Agreements for data sharing in place
 | * Information is shared on an ad-hoc basis among institutions following formal requests made at Secretary level
 | * 3-4 agreements are in place between ECD and 3-4 agencies/institutions to share data on a regular basis
 | * Agreements in place
* Procedures to share data
 | ***Risk***:* Political will to accept sharing data among government institutions

***Assumption***:* Government will see the benefit of sharing data through cabinet support
 |
| 1. Use of this environmental information in decision-making and policy-making
 | * Limited environmental information is used to develop policies and programmes
 | * 3-4 policies, programmes or plans are developed using environmental information from the EMIS
 | * Policy, programme and plan documents
 | ***Risk***:* No interest from decision-makers to use better environmental information

***Assumption***:* The benefit of using better environmental information will encourage decision-makers to use it
* Cabinet support is in place
 |
| 1. Environmental information is shared regionally and internationally
 | * Limited interaction exists at the regional level to share environmental information
 | * 2 regional sharing procedures in place by the end of the project
 | * Regional procedures in place
 | ***Risk***:* There is no regional commitment to share environmental information

***Assumption***:* Regional organizations will lead the sharing of environmental information
 |
| 1. Quality, quantity and timeliness of reports submitted to conventions
 | * Reports are not submitted on time and do not contain much primary collected data
 | * National communications/ reports are submitted on time and contain primary data collected by the EMIS
 | * National communications and reports
 | ***Risk***:* The government does not fulfill its international obligations; including those from the 3 Rio Conventions

***Assumption***:* The government continues to fulfill its international commitments
 |
| 1. Public states higher awareness of environmental information products
 | * Public and decision-makers are not aware about existing environmental information
 | * 50% of Members of Parliament are aware about existence of easily accessible environmental information at ECD
 | * Surveys of decision-makers
* Citations in newspapers and other media
* References in brochures, pamphlets, flyers, etc.
 | ***Risk***:* Socio-economic pressures do not de-value environmental attitudes and concern

***Assumption***:* Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions’ implementation for decision-makers
 |
| **COMPONENT 2.0: ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS AND COMPLIANCE MONITORING SYSTEM (CMS)** |
| **Outcome 2:** A Compliance Monitoring System (CMS) developed and tracking key environmental indicators.**Output 2.1:** An institutionalized set of environmental indicators.**Output 2.2:** An operational compliance monitoring system. | 1. Adequate environmental indicators monitored
 | * The existing set of environmental indicators is not comprehensive and does not respond to the information requirements
 | * Set of environmental indicators in place and responds to national and international information requirements
 | * List of official environmental indicators monitored by relevant institutions
* Final Evaluation report
* State of environment report and National communications/reports
 | ***Risk***:* New indicators are adopted but they require additional resources to be monitored; which might not be available

***Assumption***:The government pursues its budget support to integrate the 3 Rio Conventions obligations into the Kiribati information management approach and monitoring system |
| 1. Adequate national standards, norms, procedures for monitoring these environmental indicators are officially in place
 | * There is no unified set of standards, norms and procedures to collect data, conduct observations and make sampling
 | * Adequate official standards, norms and procedures are in place and use by the relevant institutions
 | * List of official standards, norms and procedures
* Assessment reports
* Final Evaluation report
 | ***Risk***:* New standards, norms and procedures are identified but might not be adopted by the Government

***Assumption***:* The government pursues its policies to integrate the 3 Rio Conventions obligations into the Kiribati information management approach and monitoring system
 |
| 1. An in-service training programme for public servants include course(s) covering environmental information management and monitoring system
 | * There is no training programme for public administrators on environmental information management and monitoring system
 | * The catalogue of in-service training programme include course(s) on environmental information management and monitoring system
 | * Catalogue of in-service training programme
* Other training programmes
* PIRs
 | ***Risk***:* The in-service training system for public servants might not be interested in integrating into its catalogue the training curricula developed with the support of the project

***Assumption***:* The related in-service training institution(s) will be contacted early on to establish a partnership with the project and involved them in designing and delivering the course
 |
| 1. Number of public servants trained by taking the course(s) on EMIS and CMS
 | * 0
 | * 100 Public Servants are trained using the new training programme
 | * Proceeding of courses delivered
* PIRs
* Project management reports
 | ***Risk***:* No interest in better integrating environmental information in government decision-making

***Assumption***:There is sufficient commitment from decision-makers to maintain long-term support to public servant training in the environmental area, including MEAs implementation in Kiribati |

## **Annex 3: Outcome Budget (GEF Contribution and Co-financing****)**

| **Activity** | **Description** | **Year****1** | **Year****2** | **Year****3** | **GEF** | **Co-financing** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1: Environmental Management Information System (EMIS)** | **75,060** | **85,380** | **72,060** | **232,500** | **240,000** | **472,500** |
| **Output 1.1** |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.1.1 | Review existing databases and management information systems in place | 1,500 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 5,000 | 15,000 | 20,000 |
| 1.1.2 | Identify environmental information needs | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 7,500 | 10,000 | 17,500 |
| 1.1.3 | Design and develop an environmental data repository | 2,500 | 4,000 | 2,500 | 9,000 | 10,000 | 19,000 |
| 1.1.4 | Design a mechanism for the collection, QC and validation of produced data  | 2,500 | 2,000 | 2,500 | 7,000 | 5,000 | 12,000 |
| 1.1.5 | Establish protocol for the provision of data and information | 2,000 | 1,500 | 3,000 | 6,500 | 5,000 | 11,500 |
| 1.1.6 | Establish and set benchmarks | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 4,500 | 5,000 | 9,500 |
| 1.1.7 | Train staff on the new data architecture, the tools, standards, norms and protocols | 5,000 | 6,000 | 5,000 | 16,000 | 15,000 | 31,000 |
| **Output 1.2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2.1 | Assess existing technologies in use | 4,000 | 6,000 | 4,000 | 14,000 | 15,000 | 29,000 |
| 1.2.2 | Identify technology needs/requirements to support the EMIS | 4,000 | 4,000 | 3,000 | 11,000 | 15,000 | 26,000 |
| 1.2.3 | Procure the required equipment and software | 8,560 | 10,000 | 2,000 | 20,560 | 18,000 | 38,560 |
| 1.2.4 | Install this equipment and set up the EMIS |  | 2,500 | 500 | 3,000 | 2,000 | 5,000 |
| 1.2.5 | Train staff in using this equipment | 5,000 | 6,000 | 5,000 | 16,000 | 15,000 | 31,000 |
| **Output 1.3** |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |
| 1.3.1 | Elaborate directives for data interpretation and thematic reporting | 7,000 | 7,000 | 5,560 | 19,560 | 25,000 | 44,560 |
| 1.3.2 | Implement a communication strategy for the efficient diffusion of information | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 9,000 | 5,000 | 14,000 |
| 1.3.3 | Conduct a public awareness campaign | 1,000 | 2,000 | 3,000 | 6,000 | 30,000 | 36,000 |
| 1.3.4 | Formalize collaboration protocols among ministries and agencies | 4,000 | 5,880 | 5,000 | 14,880 | 14,000 | 28,880 |
| 1.3.5 | Network in the region with similar EMIS | 4,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 14,000 |  15,000 |  29,000 |
| 1.3.6 | Conduct a Training Needs Analysis (TNA)  | 2,000 |  |  | 2,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 |
| 1.3.7 | Develop training curricula addressing priorities identified in the TNA | 5,000 | 2,000 | 4,000 | 11,000 | 10,000 | 21,000 |
| 1.3.8 | Conduct training activities targeting decision-makers and policy-makers | 10,000 | 13,000 | 13,000 | 36,000 | 10,000 | 46,000 |
| **Component 2: Environmental Indicators And Compliance Monitoring System** | **57,000** | **94,514** | **73,514** | **225,028** | **220,000** | **445,028** |
| **Output 2.1** |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |
| 2.1.1 | Review existing indicators | 11,000 | 8,000 | 9,000 | 28,000 | 30,000 | 58,000 |
| 2.1.2 | Review international/regional best practices for compliance monitoring | 1,500 | 10,000 | 4,000 | 15,500 | 20,000 | 35,500 |
| 2.1.3 | Identify environmental monitoring indicators to address the information needs | 3,000 | 16,000 | 4,000 | 23,000 | 30,000 | 53,000 |
| 2.1.4 | Formalize indicators and integrate them in the respective M&E procedures | 3,000 | 4,500 | 4,000 | 11,500 | 23,000 | 34,500 |
| **Output 2.2** |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.2.1 | Review existing protocols, standards, norms and procedures in place  | 11,000 | 11,000 | 13,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 70,000 |
| 2.2.2 | Develop the required protocols, standards, norms and procedures  | 9,500 | 9,500 | 11,000 | 30,000 | 32,000 | 62,000 |
| 2.2.3 | Procure and install the necessary software and other information technologies |  | 11,000 |  | 11,000 | 20,000 | 31,000 |
| 2.2.4 | Develop and conduct training activities on environmental monitoring | 18,000 | 24,514 | 28,514 | 71,028 | 30,000 | 101,028 |
| **Project Management** | **12,500** | **14,986** | **14,986** | **42,472** | **70,000** | **112,472** |
| **A** | Locally recruited personnel: Project Coordinator | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| **B** | Locally recruited personnel: Project Assistant  | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 36,000 |  | 36,000 |
| **C** | International Evaluation Consultant Fee |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| **D** | Office facilities and communications | 500 | 500 | 500 | 1,500 | 30,000 | 31,500 |
| **E** | Travel |  |  | - | - | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| **F** | Direct Project Services |  | 486 | 486 | 972 |  | 972 |
|  | Management Support |  |  |  |  | 37,000 | 37,000 |
|  | Audit fee |  | 2,000 | 2,000 | 4,000 |  | 4,000 |
|  | **Total** | **144,560** | **194,880** | **160,560** | **500,000** | **530,000** | **1,030,000** |

## **Annex 4:** **Provisional Work Plan**

| **Activity** | **Description** | Quarters |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | Inception: Organize project team, review project strategy, work plan, etc. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | Project Board Meetings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Component 1: Environmental Management Information System (EMIS)** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output 1.1** |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.1.1 | Review existing databases and management information systems in place in Kiribati |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.1.2 | Identify environmental information needs |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.1.3 | Design and develop an environmental data repository |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1.4 | Design a mechanism for the collection, quality control and validation of produced data and information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1.5 | Establish protocol for the provision of data and information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1.6 | Establish and set benchmarks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1.7 | Train staff on the new data architecture, the tools, standards, norms and protocols |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 1.2** |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.2.1 | Assess existing technologies in use |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.2.2 | Identify technology needs/requirements to support the EMIS |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.2.3 | Procure the required equipment and software |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2.4 | Install this equipment and set up the EMIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2.5 | Train staff in using this equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 1.3** |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.3.1 | Elaborate directives for data interpretation and thematic reporting |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.3.2 | Implement a communication strategy for the efficient diffusion of information |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.3.3 | Conduct a public awareness campaign |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3.4 | Formalize collaboration protocols among ministries and agencies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3.5 | Network in the region with similar environmental management information system |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3.6 | Conduct a Training Needs Analysis (TNA) related to environmental information and environmental monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3.7 | Develop training curricula addressing priorities identified in the TNA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3.8 | Conduct training activities targeting decision-makers and policy-makers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Component 2: Environmental Indicators And Compliance Monitoring System** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output 2.1** |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.1.1 | Review existing indicators |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.1.2 | Review international/regional best practices for compliance monitoring |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.1.3 | Identify environmental monitoring indicators to address the information needs |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.1.4 | Formalize the list of environmental indicators and integrate these indicators in the respective M&E procedures |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output 2.2** |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.2.1 | Review existing protocols, standards, norms and procedures in place to monitor the environment |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.2.2 | Develop the required protocols, standards, norms and procedures in line with internationally recognized environmental monitoring guidelines |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.2.3 | Procure and install the necessary software and other information technologies |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.2.4 | Develop and conduct training activities on environmental monitoring |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Project Management** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | Project administration and management |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | International Evaluation Consultant: Terminal Evaluation |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

## **Annex 5: Terms of References**

The following Terms of Reference outlines the general responsibilities to be carried out by project staff contracted under the project.

**Background**

Collection, storage, maintenance, archiving, generation and utilization of environmental data are major issues within ECD because of its limited institutional capacity. Some data/information is readily available within the various Units of ECD. Yet proper information collection, storage, maintenance, archiving, generation, utilization and collation is not undertaken because of human and institutional capacities limitations. There is also a lack of technical capacity within ECD to develop, maintain and operate this environment information management system for national, regional and international reporting on the state of the environment in Kiribati. This project will address this critical need to provide better environmental information in Kiribati. This is a timely response to address this national priority, particularly when considering the emerging issues due to global climate change. The possibility to monitor and record environmental data will be useful to respond to threats including negative impacts of global climate change on the local environment, which is the basis of livelihoods, human health and economy in Kiribati.

**Project Goal and Objectives**

The goal of this project is to target the critical need for new and improved environmental data and environmental analysis to strengthen the foundations of Kiribati's policy and planning frameworks to fulfill Kiribati’s Rio Convention obligations. Using a holistic approach and integrating the Rio Conventions principles, the project will support the development of an institutionalized sustainable environment management information system to underpin more complex policy and decision-making processes designed to frame and direct the management and the protection of the environment within the context of global climate change. By developing a comprehensive and robust environmental management information system (EMIS), this project will greatly improve Kiribati's ability to integrate important global environmental concerns and priorities into the national environment legislative and policy frameworks, as well as national programming frameworks. The project will also support the development of an effective compliance monitoring system (CMS). This will feed analysis and information directly to planners and other decision-makers as to whether environmental objectives are being achieved, and as to whether environmental management efforts are sufficient. This will also feed into reporting to the global conventions.

The project’s objective is to improve information management and compliance monitoring in order to achieve global environmental benefits. This project will develop an environmental management and information system (EMIS) and a compliance monitoring system (CMS) that will be appropriately embedded within Kiribati's institutional framework governing the management and the protection of the environment within the context of global climate change.

**Project Strategy**

The expected achievements of this project are a set of improved capacities to meet and sustain Rio Convention objectives. This project will have strengthened and helped institutionalize commitments under the Rio Conventions by redesigning the existent national Environmental Management Information System that can support decision-making on sound natural resources management for sustainable development and coordinating the institutional network that provides and uses the resulting environmental information, among others for reporting progress on the implementation of the Rio conventions and other MEAs. This project will be implemented in two linked components:

* 1. Development of an Environmental Management Information System (EMIS)
	2. Identification of Environmental Indicators and development of a Compliance Monitoring System (CMS)

**Project Outcomes and Components**

Under outcome I, project resources will be used to develop a comprehensive Environmental Management Information System (EMIS) at ECD that serves to create new and improved environmental data and information. This EMIS will be developed through active collaboration and coordination with work programmes of key stakeholder agencies, research institutions, and other non-government organizations as appropriate to ensure the generation, collection, exchange and distribution of the required data and information. The EMIS will also be accompanied by improved capacities to generate and use new and improved data and information for policy and planning purposes and training will be provided to strengthen institutional and staff capacities to use best practice methodologies in data collection and analysis for environmental mainstreaming and environmental protection and management in the face of global climate change.

Under outcome II, the project will support the development of a compliance monitoring system (CMS). It will include the identification of a set of environmental indicators that will provide information on the state of the environment in Kiribati, including the drafting of national reports to international conventions. The CMS would be used as part of the learning and re-tooling (i.e., adaptive collaborative management) of programmes and plans to ensure that their implementation proceed as planned to deliver the agreed-upon objectives and expected outcomes. Under this outcome, the project will support the development of capacities to monitor and report on progress made towards achieving Rio Conventions commitments, and to feed that information to planners and decision-makers.

**Responsibilities**

***1. Project Coordinator***

The individual contracted as the Project Coordinator will be recruited to coordinate the implementation of the project. 50% of his/her time will be spent on overseeing the implementation of the project and 50% on managing capacity development activities undertaken under the two expected outcomes. The Project Coordinator will also be responsible to monitor and evaluate the progress made by the project. The main tasks for this position include:

* Oversee the day-to-day monitoring of project implementation
* In consultation with stakeholders, recommend modifications to project management to maintain project’s cost-effectiveness, timeliness, and quality project deliverables (adaptive collaborative management) to be approved by the Project Board
* Prepare all required progress and management reports, e.g., APR/PIR and project initiation report
* Support all meetings of the Project Board
* Maintain effective communication with project partners and stakeholders to dissemination project results, as well as to facilitate input from stakeholder representatives as project partners
* Support the independent terminal evaluation
* Ensure full compliance with the UNDP and GEF branding policy

***2. Project Assistant***

The Project Assistant will support the Project Coordinator in carrying out his/her duties, which will include:

1. Organizational and logistical issues related to project execution and as per UNDP guidelines and procedures
2. Record keeping of project documents, including financial in accordance with audit requirements
3. Ensure all logistical arrangements are carried out smoothly
4. Assist Project Coordinator in preparing and updating project work plans in collaboration with the UNDP Country Office
5. Facilitate timely preparation and submission of financial reports and settlement of advances, including progress reports and other substantial reports
6. Report to the Project Coordinator and UNDP Programme Officer on a regular basis
7. Identification and resolution of logistical and organizational problems, under the guidance of the Project Coordinator

The Project Assistant will have at least five (5) years’ experience in supporting the implementation of UNDP implemented projects, with preference in environment and natural resource management project.

## **Annex 6: Environmental and Social Review Criteria**

***Annex A.1: Environmental and Social Screening Checklist***

Do all outputs and activities described in the Project Document fall within the following categories? 

Procurement (in which case UNDP‟s Procurement Ethics and Environmental Procurement Guide need to be complied with)

Report preparation

Training

Event/workshop/meeting/conference (refer to Green Meeting Guide)

Communication and dissemination of results

Select answer below and follow instructions: 

☐NO  Continue to Question 3 

YES  No further environmental and social review required. Complete Annex A.2, selecting Category 1, and submit the completed template (Annex A) to the PAC.

***Annex A.2: Environmental And Social Screening Summary***

**Name of Proposed Project:** Integrating global environmental priorities into national policies and programmes

*A. Environmental and Social Screening Outcome*

Select from the following: 

Category 1. No further action is needed

☐Category 2. Further review and management is needed. There are possible environmental and social benefits, impacts, and/or risks associated with the project (or specific project component), but these are predominantly indirect or very long-term and so extremely difficult or impossible to directly identify and assess.

☐Category 3. Further review and management is needed, and it is possible to identify these with a reasonable degree of certainty. If Category 3, select one or more of the following sub-categories: 

☐Category 3a: Impacts and risks are limited in scale and can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty and can often be handled through application of standard best practice, but require some minimal or targeted further review and assessment to identify and evaluate whether there is a need for a full environmental and social assessment (in which case the project would move to Category 3b). 

☐Category 3b: Impacts and risks may well be significant, and so full environmental and social assessment is required. In these cases, a scoping exercise will need to be conducted to identify the level and approach of assessment that is most appropriate.

*B. Environmental and Social Issues:* Not applicable.

*C. Next Steps:* Not applicable.

*D. Sign Off*

Project Manager Date

PAC Date

Programme Manager Date

## **Annex 7: PPG Status Report**

The Kiribati CCCD proposal development was led by an International Consultant with the support of UNDP Fiji (including Kiribati). The formulation mission was undertaken during the week of 31st March to 4th April 2014. The 1-week formulation mission was able to complete the majority of activities of the Initiation Plan of the PPG. Specifically, the mission: (i) introduced the Kiribati CCCD PPG; (ii) collected and reviewed baseline information; (iii) met with key stakeholders; and (iv) developed the Kiribati CCCD project results framework through a consultation workshop. Key stakeholders, including the proposed implementing partner (ECD), were widely consulted during the formulation of this proposal.

To date, the PPG has expended a total of US$8,567.73 and remaining funds are committed for payments during 3rd quarter 2014.

|  |
| --- |
| PPG Grant Approved at PIF:  **24,000** |
| ***Project Preparation Activities Implemented*** | ***GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)*** |
| ***Budgeted Amount*** | ***Amount Spent To date*** | ***Amount Committed*** |
| Local Consultants | 10,000 |  |  |
| International Consultants | 7,500 | 8,567.73 | 8,691.22 |
| Travel | 1,500 |  | 2,741.05 |
| Workshops | 5,000 |  | 4,000.00 |
|  |       |       |       |
|  |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |
| **Total** | 24,000 | **8,567.73** | **15,432.27** |

## **Annex 8: Letter of agreement between UNDP and Government of Kiribati for the provision of support services**

**Project Title** “*Integrating global environmental priorities into national policies and programmes*”

**Award ID / Project ID: TBC / TBC**

Excellency,

1. Reference is made to consultations between officials of the Government of***Kiribati***(hereinafter referred to as “the Government”) and officials of UNDP with respect to the provision of support services by the UNDP country office for nationally managed programmes and projects. UNDP and the Government hereby agree that the UNDP country office may provide such support services at the request of the Government through its institution designated in the relevant programme support document or project document, as described below.

2. The UNDP country office may provide support services for assistance with reporting requirements and direct payment. In providing such support services, the UNDP country office shall ensure that the capacity of the Government-designated institution is strengthened to enable it to carry out such activities directly. The costs incurred by the UNDP country office in providing such support services shall be recovered from the administrative budget of the office.

3. The UNDP country office may provide, at the request of the designated institution, the following support services for the activities of the programme/project:

(a) Identification and/orrecruitment of project and programme personnel;

(b) Identification and facilitation of training activities;

1. Procurement of goods and services;

4. The procurement of goods and services and the recruitment of project and programme personnel by the UNDP country office shall be in accordance with the UNDP regulations, rules, policies and procedures. Support services described in paragraph 3 above shall be detailed in an annex to the programme support document or project document, in the form provided in the Attachment hereto. If the requirements for support services by the country office change during the life of a programme or project, the annex to the programme support document or project document is revised with the mutual agreement of the UNDP resident representative and the designated institution.

5. The relevant provisions of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) between the Authorities of the Government of ***Kiribati*** and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), signed by the Parties on May 5, 1987 (the "SBAA") including the provisions on liability and privileges and immunities, shall apply to the provision of such support services. The Government shall retain overall responsibility for the nationally managed programme or project through its designated institution. The responsibility of the UNDP country office for the provision of the support services described herein shall be limited to the provision of such support services detailed in the annex to the programme support document or project document.

6. Any claim or dispute arising under or in connection with the provision of support services by the UNDP country office in accordance with this letter shall be handled pursuant to the relevant provisions of the SBAA.

7. The manner and method of cost-recovery by the UNDP country office in providing the support services described in paragraph 3 above shall be specified in the annex to the programme support document or project document.

8. The UNDP country office shall submit progress reports on the support services provided and shall report on the costs reimbursed in providing such services, as may be required.

9. Any modification of the present arrangements shall be effected by mutual written agreement of the parties hereto.

10. If you are in agreement with the provisions set forth above, please sign and return to this office two signed copies of this letter. Upon your signature, this letter shall constitute an agreement between your Government and UNDP on the terms and conditions for the provision of support services by the UNDP country office for nationally managed programmes and projects.

Yours sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signed on behalf of UNDP

*Ms. Osnat Lubrani*

*UNDP Resident Representative*

Date:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

For the Government of ***Kiribati***

 *Mr. Timi Kaiekieki*

*Secretary – Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development*

Date:

Attachment: Description of UNDP Country Office Support Services

1. Reference is made to consultations between the Ministry of Environment, Land, Agriculture and Development (MELAD), the institution designated by the Government of ***Kiribati*** and officials of UNDP with respect to the provision of support services by the UNDP country office for the nationally managed programme or project “*Integrating global environmental priorities into national policies and programmes*”, project number TBC.

2. In accordance with the provisions of the letter of agreement signed and the programme support document (*project* *document*), the UNDP country office shall provide support services for the Programme as described below.

3. Support services to be provided:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Support services(insert description) | Schedule for the provision of the support services | Cost to UNDP of providing such support services (where appropriate) | Amount and method of reimbursement of UNDP (where appropriate) |
| 1. Identification and/or recruitment of project personnel\* Project Manager\* Project Assistant | August 2014 – July 2017August 2014 – July 2017 | As per the UPL:US$ 876.82 | UNDP will directly charge the project upon receipt of request of services from the Implementing Partner |
| 2. Procurement of goods: \* Data show \* PCs \* Printers | Nov. 2014 – April 2016 | As per the UPL:US$ 500.00 for each purchasing process | As above |
| 3. Procurement of ServicesContractual services for companies | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL:US$ 486.12 each hiring process | As above |
| 4. Payment Process | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL:US$ 31.62 for each payment  | As above |
| 5.Staff HR & Benefits Administration & Management | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | N/A | N/A |
| 6. Recurrent personnel management services: Staff Payroll & BankingAdministration & Management | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | N/A | N/A |
| 8. Ticket request (booking, purchase) | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL:US$ 164.04 for each ticket  | As above |
| 10. F10 settlement | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL:US$ 31.62 for each settlement  | As above |
|  | **Total:** | **$972.24** |  |

4. Description of functions and responsibilities of the parties involved:

UNDP will conduct the full process while the role of the Implementing Partner (IP) will be as follows:

* The Implementing Partner will send a timetable for services requested annually/ updated quarterly
* The Implementing Partner will send the request to UNDP for the services enclosing the specifications or Terms of Reference required
* For the hiring staff process: the IP representatives will be on the interview panel,
* For Hiring CV: the IP representatives will be on the interview panel, or participate in CV review in case an interview is not scheduled
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1. See <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf>.  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)