

Program Appraisal Meeting
28th of May 2013
UNDP Conference Room, Kadavu

Summary of the Meeting

Present: Asenaca Ravuvu (ARR-P), Brian Lenga, Chintan Kumar, Emma Mario, Floyd Robinson, Heena Khatri, Josua Turaganivalu, Karen Bernard, Kevin Petrini, Losana Mualaulau, Nacanieli Speigth, Nainasa Whippy, Patrick Tui, Ruth Verevukivuki, Sainimili Nabou, Tevita Dawai, Winifereti Nainoca

Chairperson: Asenaca Ravuvu (ARR-P)

1. Welcoming Remarks

- a. The Chairperson thanked everyone for the interest in the design of the project and apologized for multiple versions of the draft project document circulated for comments. She appreciated the contributions to the document provided earlier and during the pre-PAC meetings.
- b. The agenda was confirmed.
- c. Sainimili Nabou introduced the project by going through the document and briefed the key points, which was followed by the discussion as noted below.

2. Presentation and Review on “STRENGTHENING GOVERNANCE AND AID EFFECTIVENESS TO ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT”

- a. The PAC was informed that the latest version of the document reflects changes based on comments received from staff prior to and during the two pre-PAC meetings held on the 24th and the 28th of May, 2013.
- b. General comments made during the PAC are summarized below:

| Comments | Response to comments | Action |
|--|---|---|
| 1. The meeting noted that the DIM approval process takes time and concern raised on the possible delays. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ GoK endorsement to be sought together with proposal. | PDP unit will work on documents for DIM approval. |
| 2. DIM justification should be clearly outlined in the document: | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ HQ policy that projects less the 200k cannot be NIM implemented.▪ Short timeframe of nine months justifies Direct Implementation modality DIM. | This will be included in the request for DIM approval |
| 3. The meeting noted that the inter-linkages of | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ KJIP development is in response to GoK request and processes started earlier this year. | This is reflected on Page 3 of the revised |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| output seemed unclear. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KJIP implementation support is the gelling agent for the 3 main outputs of the project. Output 1 is in direct response to GoK, as well as Outputs 2 and 3 which involve governance component of strengthening CC and DRM. | document. |
| 4. Project title page | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information on page 1 to be updated. Include governance UNDAF outcome/SRPD and output statements. | This is reflected on Page 1 of the document |

Specific Comments

| Comments | Response to comments | Action |
|---|---|--|
| <p>5. Situation Analysis: The last paragraph makes reference to Pacific Leaders meeting and does not reflect the linkages.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The paragraph to be deleted. b. Add background of KJIP work as well as the institutional arrangement, costed plan etc (add as an additional annex on KJIP) c. Also add a sentence on the scope of this project in relation to KJIP, CC and DRM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This has been completed b. This is reflected in Annex 1, page 22 of revised document c. This is reflected in the Situation Analysis, on page 3 of revised document |
| 6. Strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Insert a paragraph before Strategy to summarize the proposal and also highlight linkages between all outputs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This is reflected on pages 4 of revised document |
| <p>7. Activity Result 1: The meeting noted that reference made to how this project will help GoK plan and determine its future allocation of resources and identify resource gaps” seems to be well beyond the scope of the project.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Link to the work on CPEIR in other countries, e.g. in Samoa, Nauru and Vanuatu. It is to be considered for further work, i.e. phase 2 etc. b. Include development and recurrent budgets and various ministries. It can be a rapid assessment for this project and further work needs to be done through the CPEIR. [Note: conceptual linkages between activity 1 and 3 are perhaps beyond this project.] Kevin to insert inputs to Activity Result 1.1 and keep in mind CPEIR can be done in Kiribati if requested by GOK. c. Find out from UNDP Samoa if CPEIR could also be included as part of PACC+ d. Sustainability of efforts in this output should be considered. Train a local counterpart (build local capacity) to sustain momentum and be able to carry on the work for the next donor forum (in-kind contribution from GoK). e. CPEIR could also be integrated in GEF projects such as CB-2 etc, LDCF PPG, and PACC+. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This is reflected on page 5 of revised document. b. This is reflected on page 5 of revised document. c. For further follow up by Kevin should GoK request for CPEIR d. This is reflected on page 5 of revised document e. For further follow-up by MCO should GoK request for CPEIR |
| <p>8. Activity Result 2 The bulk of budget to be used on IT equipment.</p> | | This is reflected on page 8 of the RF and page 13 of the AWP 2013. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>9. Activity Result 3</p> <p>a. TOR for administrative assistant needs to be provided.</p> <p>b. Include a sentence that shows the linkages between KJIP Secretariat, Parliamentary Committee on CC etc. Also state KJIP Secretariat has already been decided and that UNDP is putting in seed funding to establish KJIP secretariat.</p> | | <p>a. This is reflected in Annex 6 on page 29, of revised document.: Administrative assistant replaced with Project Assistant TOR</p> <p>b. This is reflected on page 6 of revised document</p> |
| <p>10. Activity Result 4</p> <p>Concern raised on why the project Management arrangements has to be reflected as Output 4: in the Activity result.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Management is a necessary part of any project and financial resources are allocated to this component. • UNDP guidelines reflects the need to have this activity in all projects so that project progress can be tracked and project management arrangements has and will always be part of the implementation of any projects. | <p>No follow-up required</p> |
| <p>11. Resource results Framework: RRF</p> <p>a. Output 1 (calculation of costs): Reduce national consultation to US\$5,000. Distribute costs to other budget lines.</p> <p>b. Output 2: agreed.</p> <p>c. Output 3: agreed.</p> <p>d. Output 4: agreed</p> | | <p>a. This is reflected on page 7 of the revised document</p> <p>b. No follow-up required</p> <p>c. As above</p> <p>d. As above</p> |
| <p>12. AWP 2013</p> <p>a. Output 1: agreed</p> <p>b. Output 2:agreed</p> <p>c. Output 3:agreed</p> <p>d. Output 4: agreed</p> | | <p>a. Changes in the RRF have to be reflected in the AWP 2013/2014.</p> <p>b. This is reflected on pages 13- 16</p> |
| <p>13. Management arrangements</p> <p>Replace project manager with project coordinator</p> | | <p>This is reflected on pages 18 to 20 on the revised document</p> |
| <p>14. Annex 1: Risk Log:</p> <p>Insert political risk for the</p> | | <p>This is reflected in Annex 8 on pages 32 of the revised document</p> |


| | | |
|---|--|---|
| support of KJIP secretariat. | | |
| 15. Annex 2 Replace all references to project manager with project coordinator | | This is reflected in Annex 3 on page 24 – 26 of the revised document |
| 16. Annex 3 Include as part of background – existing methodology such as CPEIR. | | This is reflected on Annex 4 on page 27 of revised document under <u>Scope of Work</u> . |
| 17. Annex 4 Ensure consistency in how the outputs have been referred to. | | This is reflected on Annex 5 on page 28 of revised document under <u>Scope of Work</u> . |
| 18. Annex 6 Revise due dates to correspond to actual timelines. | | This is reflected on Annex 6 on pages 29 - 30 in the revised document and Annex 7 Monitoring Plan on page 31 under each quarter. (Sept, Dec, March) |

3. Summary of Follow up Actions and Deadlines

- a. Proposal was endorsed provided that all necessary changes are made to the document.
- b. Way Forward:
 - Sainimili Nabou and Emma Mario to make sure that all the changes are incorporated and submitted to ARR-P by close of business on the 29th May.
 - ARR-P will share the revised final document with GoK, through DRR, by end of the week.
 - Ruth Verevukivuki to organize a discussion with Tuihai Tabai on logistics including: internal memo (for release of funds) for RR's signature, L-PAC and inception training and GOK endorsement on agreement for DIM modality.

*Ruth now travelling to do above.
to KIR*

The meeting ended at 4.20pm.

Endorsed by Chairperson: M/s Asenaca Ravuvu: 

Date: *6/6/13*