



## **Award ID: 00094415 Title; Disaster Resilience in the Pacific (RESPAC)** *Minutes of the Project Appraisal Committee*

### 1. Timing

An electronic Project Appraisal Committee (e-PAC) consultation was undertaken 8 – 14 March, 2016. Official PAC date will be the closing day of the consultation, **14 March 2016**

### 2. E-PAC members

Name	Designation
Lizbeth Cullity <lizbeth.cullity@one.un.org>;	RR Samoa MCO
Jaime Aguinaga <jaime.aguinaga@undp.org>;	DRR a.i. Samoa MCO
Roy Trivedy <roy.trivedy@one.un.org>;	RR PNG CO
Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov <sukhrob.khoshmukhamedov@undp.org>;	DRR PNG CO
Azusa Kubota <azusa.kubota@undp.org>;	DRR Solomon Sub-office
Lynelle Popot <lynelle.popot@undp.org>;	RSD Team Leader, Solomon Sub-office
Jo Scheuer <jo.scheuer@undp.org>;	Head CCDRM Cluster, BPPS, HQ
Rita Missal <rita.missal@undp.org>;	BPPS, HQ
Krishna Vatsa <krishna.vatsa@undp.org>;	BPPS, HQ
Gordon Johnson <gordon.johnson@undp.org>;	RSD Team Leader, BRH
Sanny Ramos Jegillos <sanny.jegillos@undp.org>;	CCDRR Advisor, BRH
Rajesh Sharma <rajesh.sharma@undp.org>;	CCDRR Advisor, BRH
Devanand Ramiah <devanand.ramiah@undp.org>;	BRH
Naoko Takasu <naoko.takasu@undp.org>;	BRH
Tshering Pem <tshering.pem@undp.org>;	BRH
Craig Hawke <craig.hawke@undp.org>;	BPPS, HQ
Sophie Baranes <sophie.baranes@undp.org>;	HQ
Sitara Syed <sitara.syed@undp.org>;	HQ
Aminisitai Delaisainiai <aminisitai.delaisainiai@undp.org>;	Finance Officer, Pacific Office
Elena Wakolo <elena.wakolo@undp.org>;	Pacific Office
Ruth Verevukivuki <ruth.verevukivuki@undp.org>;	Pacific Office
Asenaca Ravuvu <asenaca.ravuvu@undp.org>;	Pacific Office
Winifereti Nainoca <winifereti.nainoca@undp.org>;	Pacific Office
Moortaza Jiwanji <moortaza.jiwanji@undp.org>;	Pacific Office
Thomas Jensen <thomas.jensen@undp.org>;	Pacific Office
Akiko Fujii <akiko.fujii@undp.org>;	Pacific Office
Osnat Lubrani <osnat.lubrani@one.un.org>	Pacific Office

### 3. Project Development Timeline:

In March 2014, the UNDP Executive Committee visited Samoa and Fiji. During a presentation from the Government of Samoa on Climate Early Warning Systems, the Russian Federation indicated interest in this type of work in the Pacific. For the remainder of 2014 and the start of 2015, the UNDP Pacific Center worked closely with UNDP Istanbul and Bangkok office to develop the concept.

In June 2015, UNDP established a USD\$25 million UNDP Russia Trust Fund. It was indicated that the funding for the concept would come from this Fund.

In August and September 2015, the UNDP Pacific Center undertook national consultations in Samoa and Fiji and regional consultations with SPREP, WMO, and ISDR. Overall, the project proposal development benefited from an extensive consultative process involving over 72 individuals, representing 32 entities and stakeholders from around the Pacific and globally. These included national stakeholders, Pacific regional agencies, UN agencies and UNDP (Samoa MCO, Solomon Islands Sub-office, PNG CO, Pacific Office, BRH, Europe & CIS Regional Hub and BPPS).

In October 2015, submitted draft prodoc to UNDP Russia Trust Fund for approval

In December 2015, UNDP Russia Trust Fund approves USD\$7.5m for RESPAC project

In March 2016, an e-PAC was undertaken.

#### 4. PAC Comments and Response

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	PO: The project needs to have an explicit exit strategy (although "sustainability" strategies may be in narrative throughout already);	<p>Section IX on Project Sustainability indicates that "By the end of 2017 the project will propose a detailed Project Sustainability and Exit Strategy for the approval of the key national and regional stakeholders. The strategy will be based on the gap analysis, consultations conducted, and will contain the following essential sustainability considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the regional level, the project will propose sustainability actions and funding priorities to regional agencies and, if appropriate, member governments and other donors and discuss the possibilities of next steps beyond the life of the project in support of enhance climate and disaster-resilience development.</li> <li>• At the national level, the project will strengthen the capacities of public sectors by providing the stakeholders and beneficiaries with tools and mechanisms for improved coordination and integration of CCDRM, as well as a plan for more effective climate services. Each participating national Ministry and sector must identify how the project outputs will be institutionalized, maintained and resourced.</li> <li>• The project will build the buy-in of national governments by engaging the stakeholders in the articulation, implementation and monitoring of climate risk and recovery management. The project will strengthen existing coordination mechanisms supporting stronger links and partnerships between national and regional institutions and civil society that can sustain beyond the life of the project.</li> <li>• Knowledge generated by the project will be applied for the further strengthening of national and regional capacities to provide effective climate services and recovery, and enhancing the advocacy for mainstreaming of risk</li> </ul>

		management for climate and disaster-resilient development planning, policies and programs.										
2	PO: Can the document be more specific with targeting e.g. rural and outer islands, or urban, information settlements if relevant; can these be made more focused with data?	As this is a regional project, the pilot countries have not been selected yet. This will come in the inception phase. See section IV – intervention logic.  As such, the targeting will need to be identified through the inception phase through stakeholder consultations and data collection.										
3	PO: Is scaling up relevant in this project; if so, can it be spelt out more clearly? Or if scaling up is not relevant, can this be also spelt out;	There is no explicit strategy for scaling up; however, the Pacific Islands Meteorological Strategy (PIMS) 2012-2021 identifies that “Sustaining weather and climate services in Pacific Island Countries and Territories” are crucial to enhancing resilience to and reducing vulnerability of Pacific Islands’ peoples and communities from natural hazards and the effects of climate variability and climate change.  PIMS identifies four priorities for action: 1) improved weather services, in particular aviation, marine and public weather services; 2) improved end-to-end Multi-Hazard Early Warning System (MHEWS); 3) enhanced infrastructure (data and information services) for weather, climate and water; and 4) improved climate services.  This project will need to spell out its scaling potential in the inception phase.										
4	PO: Is there some partnerships possible with civic societies in this project? Can this be spelt out, if so.	Yes – however, this is a regional project, the pilot countries have not been selected yet. This will come in the inception phase. See section IV – intervention logic.  As such, civil society partnership will need to be explored in the inception phase.										
5	PO: <b>Cover Page:</b> To correct project duration years – 2016-2018. It is correct under Brief Description and different in the box.	Have changed the project dates to June 2016 – December 2019. Through discussion with the UNDP Russia Trust Fund Manager, it was decided to have a 3.5 year project as the disbursement toward the end of the project would be larger than expected.										
6	PO: <b>Legal Context:</b> 1) Review Legal Context section. Maybe just refer to working within the framework/legal instrument of SBAA or equivalent within which UNDP is already working with these 14 countries. The other suggestion is to use the <b>Legal Context and Risk Management</b> from the new project document which seems simpler and more straightforward.	I have put in the standard text for regional projects and for DIM implementation.										
7	PO: <b>Missing:</b> The key document missing which I think needs to be developed is a RISK LOG Template. This is something that has been weak in past UNDP projects. It would be useful to develop one now	Please see annex 2: Offline Risk Log which has been developed.										
8	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of DPC cost</th> <th>Basis of cost</th> <th>Where to include in the budget</th> <th>Your project</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staff time</td> <td>Based on proforma salary costs</td> <td>Allocate the salary across the activities of the project</td> <td>Proforma for NOB, G7 and G5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type of DPC cost	Basis of cost	Where to include in the budget	Your project	Staff time	Based on proforma salary costs	Allocate the salary across the activities of the project	Proforma for NOB, G7 and G5	There are a total of 6 project staff. 3 are associated with the project management unit and 3 are technical advisors. The 3 technical advisors salary is disbursed according to		
Type of DPC cost	Basis of cost	Where to include in the budget	Your project									
Staff time	Based on proforma salary costs	Allocate the salary across the activities of the project	Proforma for NOB, G7 and G5									

					their connection with various components.
9	<b>Type of DPC cost</b>	<b>Basis of cost</b>	<b>Where to include in the budget</b>	<b>Your project</b>	This is incorporated
	General Operating Costs (GOE)	Based on prorated rental & support staff costs	Allocate under Programme Management Activity	For the Regional Programme its \$10k per head per annum	
10	<b>Type of DPC cost</b>	<b>Basis of cost</b>	<b>Where to include in the budget</b>	<b>Your project</b>	This is incorporated
	General Management Service Fees (GMS)	Based on 8% of total resources	Allocate under Programme Management Activity	8% of US\$7.5million over 3 years	
11	<b>Type of DPC cost</b>	<b>Basis of cost</b>	<b>Where to include in the budget</b>	<b>Your project</b>	We allocated USD\$150k for this project for evaluation and audit costs.
	Monitoring & Evaluation Costs	Based on 2% of programmable budget	Allocate the salary across the activities of the project	2% of US\$7.5million over 3 years	
12	<b>Type of DPC cost</b>	<b>Basis of cost</b>	<b>Where to include in the budget</b>	<b>Your project</b>	At the time of determining the budget in 2015 in negotiation with our Russian counterparts, this was not flagged by our finance team. As such, the USD\$75k (1% of 7.5m) was not allocated to the budget. This will need to be explored in the inception phase.
	Communication costs	Based on 1% of programmable budget	Allocate the salary across the activities of the project	1% of US\$7.5million over 3 years	
13	<b>Type of DPC cost</b>	<b>Basis of cost</b>	<b>Where to include in the budget</b>	<b>Your project</b>	At the time of determining the budget in 2015 in negotiation with our Russian counterparts, this was not flagged by our finance team. As such, the USD\$15k was not allocated to the budget. This will need to be explored in the inception phase.
	JOC transaction costs (UPL/LPL)	Based on transactions for HR/Procurement/Finance	Allocate under Programme Management Activity	Given the size of your project, I would allocate \$15k per year for JOC fees	
14	PO: Apologies if I missed this but Knowledge Management could be one of the outputs – so you can have a Comms staff on board too.			<p>During the design phase discussions with our Russian colleagues, the 3 outcome areas plus project management costs were agreed upon in 2015, so there is little room to adjust.</p> <p>As per DPC costing, we will need to explore putting 1% toward comms and see what we can expect for services.</p> <p>There is no standalone comms person for this project, but can be explored in the inception phase.</p>	
15	PO: This RESPAC is so timely. Apologies for going micro – but I had a conversation with DG Fiji RedCross				

	<p>(Filipe Nainoca) who was outlining how they use instant electronic feedback (not AKVO – that UNICEF uses for Vanuatu &amp; we are considering for our various Env projects – a bit pricy) from community to aid in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Firstly, needs assessment for <u>each household</u></li> <li>2) Relief goods <u>distribution</u> are household targeted (as per needs assessment above).</li> </ol> <p>This is in contrast to some deliveries made to Turagani-koros/village admin heads (abbreviated TNK) where the rations are delivered and the TNK distribute opening a window of opportunity for abuse (as blatantly highlighted in the newspapers last weekend)... this abuse is also happening in other PICs. I suspect that most govts in PICs may be delivering to communities TNK's (equivalent in other PICs)</p>	<p>This project will focus on preparedness for recovery in outputs 2 and 3. There will be 3 pilot countries which still need to be identified.</p> <p>Once we identify countries, the scope of recovery preparedness needs to be articulated. This type of experience can help inform those discussions in the inception phase.</p>
16	BPPS: Have included all comments from BPPS and the following with associated reasoning:	
17	BPPS: Inclusion of "risk governance" into Component 3 (pp. 18, 19, 22, 28)	<p>I believe this is adding in something that has not been discussed with stakeholders. Component 3 really provides financing for recovery and a modest study on disaster risk finance at the national level in 1 country. I don't see the strong connection with risk governance other than that risk governance is connected to all the pathways.</p> <p><u>Follow-up discussion with BPPS on April 1<sup>st</sup> decided to remove reference to risk governance.</u></p>
18	BPPS: Output 3 and linkages to 5-10-50 pathways (p.27)	<p>Component 3 links more with pathway 4 and not risk governance (pathway 2)</p> <p><u>Follow-up discussion with BPPS on April 1<sup>st</sup> decided to remove reference to pathway 2 for component 3.</u></p>
19	BPPS: Language should however be altered throughout the text to indicate that this project covers disaster and climate risk.	<p>I agree that globally and locally we have an integrated approach so coming under an integrated approach is fine. A multi-hazard approach will be used where relevant.</p>
20	BPPS: change in the wording for Output 3 statement (p.27, 41 and 45)	<p>Suggest to maintain original wording, as this wording talks about strengthening institutions which is not the main focus. The key here is about financing mechanisms in particular, a recovery seed fund and some exploratory work on DRF.</p> <p><u>Follow-up discussion with BPPS on April 1<sup>st</sup> decided to maintain original wording for component 3.</u></p>
21	BPPS: Including assessment in 3.1 on legal frameworks (p.41, 45)	<p>Suggest that this is integrated with the other assessments that are proposed for this outcome activity area and not stand alone.</p> <p><u>Follow-up discussion with BPPS on April 1<sup>st</sup> decided to remove reference to a standalone assessment with a focus on legal frameworks.</u></p>

Ms. Akiko Fujii, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Pacific  
PAC Chair Signature

Date: 12 April 2016



