

# Restoring Ecosystems: Tackling Invasive Alien Species to Preserve Biodiversity in Fiji

Review PPG Request and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

<b>GEF ID</b>	12162
<b>Countries</b>	Fiji
<b>Project Name</b>	Restoring Ecosystems: Tackling Invasive Alien Species to Preserve Biodiversity in Fiji
<b>Agencies</b>	UNEP
<b>Date received by PM</b>	1/15/2026
<b>Review completed by PM</b>	
<b>Program Manager</b>	Celine Augereau ep Coisy
<b>Focal Area</b>	Biodiversity
<b>Project Type</b>	GBFF

## GEF-8 Project Preparation Grant request Review Sheet

### 1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GBFF funding?

**b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**II. Indicative Project Overview**

- a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**
- b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

- c) Are the components adequately funded?**
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional (only for Multi-trust Funds PPGs with BD from the GEF Trust Fund)?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for projects of more than \$2 million or 10% for projects of less than \$2 million? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**III. Project Rationale**

- a. Does the project adequately describe the: (i) current situation/baseline conditions within the project geographic area or project thematic area; (ii) problem(s) that the project will address; (iii) goal and objectives of the project; and (iv) justification for the project intervention; and (v) expected results including the Global Environmental Benefits and an estimate of the project's contributions to the relevant biodiversity core indicators.**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**IV. Project Description**

- a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**
- b) Are the project components and activities identified in the theory of change adequately described.**
- c) Is a list of stakeholders that will be involved in the project and their roles in the design and implementation of the project provided?**
- d) Are the Specific Action Area(s) that the project is aligned with identified and an explanation provided on and how the project will support the achievement of the specific Action Area objective(s).**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**V. Does the proposal adequately describe how the project meets the following criteria:**

- a) Potential to generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) (include a description of the GEBs the project will generate per the GEF-8 Core Indicators for biodiversity);**
- b) Alignment with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and/or National Biodiversity Finance Plans or similar instruments to identify national and/or regional priorities;**
- c) The level of policy coherence and coordination across multiple ministries, agencies, the private sector, and civil society that the project aims to support;**
- d) Whether the project will mobilize the resources of the private sector and philanthropies'; and**
- e) Whether and how the project will engage with and provide support to IPLCs.**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**VI. Project results indicators**

**Is the table correctly populated and consistent with the Project Description?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**VII. Project Financing Tables**

- a) Are all the tables correctly populated?**
- b) Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines (only for projects with GEF TF components)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**VIII. Project Endorsement**

- a) Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) OFP and has the OFP at the time of PPG request submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**
- b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**
- c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

## Secretariat's Comments

03/06/2026

Cleared.

**2/18/2026**

Thank you for this submission. For this project to be further considered in the selection round, please address the comments included in this review sheet and resubmit as soon as possible.

VIII. The LoE is missing the footnote. Please secure an email from the OFP confirming he/she is OK with the content of the footnote and upload the email in the document tab in the portal (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

## Agency's Comments

2/23/2026

Thank you for your review. As advised, we have received the email from the OFP confirming the footnote content and have uploaded it to the portal.

**RE: Urgent: GBFF Secretariat Comment on LOE – Inclusion of Required Footnote**

 Sivendra Michael <sivendra.michael@environment.gov.fj>  
To: Sangjin Lee  
Cc: Sanjeshni Devi; Kaushtik D. Ball; Krishneel Nandi; Senivasa Waqairamas; Genevieve G. Jva

Follow up. Start by Monday, February 23, 2026. Due by Monday, February 23, 2026.

Bula Vina'a Mr. Lee,

I refer to the recent comments from the GEF Secretariat regarding Fiji's GBFF project submission and the Letter of Endorsement (LOE).

This email serves to formally confirm that the Fiji Government is comfortable with the inclusion of the following footnote in the LOE linked to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MECC):

"Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate."

We note that this aligns with the standard GEF template requirements and confirms that project execution will remain subject to the necessary capacity assessment by the GEF Implementing Agency, in accordance with GEF procedures and due diligence requirements.

Please proceed accordingly and do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further clarification.

Kind regards,  
Dr. Sivendra Michael

Mon 2/23/2026 5:14 PM

## IX. GEFSEC Decision

**a. Is the PPG recommended for technical clearance?**

**b. Additional comments to be considered by the Agency during project preparation**

## Secretariat's Comments

03/06/2026

a) This PPG request has been selected by the CEO as part of the 5<sup>th</sup> GBFF selection round. It is recommended for technical clearance.

b)

- The project presents lack of costing of National Invasive Species Framework and Action Plan as main barrier to implementation. The approach chosen by the agency to address the problem of IAS eradication does not really mainly focus on the legal and cross-cutting policies across sectors and planification, but more on ground eradication. It will gain to better explain the link and how it builds on previous projects on that IAS management framework. GEF-6 IAS project ID 9095 2018-2023 TE concluded that eradication work was Successful but policy work had not been successful.

- During the preparation of the project, please clarify how will the sustainable financing of IAS strategies be ensured.
- Ensure that a risk management approach emphasizes focusing on the highest risk pathways of invasion and on prevention. The border control authority needs to be part of the project.
- Provide evidence that Targeted eradication would be low-cost and effective eradication and result in the extermination of the IAS and the survival of globally significant species and/or ecosystems.
- 4.1.1 needs to be focused on IAS monitoring.

- Since submission, [GBFF guidelines on supporting actions by IPLCs](#) have been published. Please follow these guidelines carefully during PPG implementation, taking care to involve IPLC representatives in co-designing relevant components and including IPLC institutions identified by IPLCs themselves. The CEO endorsement request is expected to provide evidence that the reported dollar amount to support actions by IPLCs for biodiversity was calculated according to the guidelines.

- Since submission, the GBFF Council adopted a [new results framework](#) for the GBFF. Please note this project will be requested to transition to this new results framework at its next best occasion, either the CEO endorsement request if submitted after July 1, 2026, or the first PIR. Please note that detailed guidelines for the new results framework will be release before July. New requirements include the provision of polygon data for the location of project interventions at CEO endorsement stage. In addition, projects' results frameworks are:

- encouraged to draw extensively in the headline, binary, component or complementary indicators of the [KMGBF monitoring framework](#) to better measure their contributions to the KMGBF goals and targets.

- requested, whenever feasible and relevant, to include indicators of biodiversity outcomes to complement and underpin the GBFF indicators

**2/18/2026**

Thank you for this submission. For this project to be further considered in the selection round, please address the comments included in this review sheet and resubmit as soon as possible.

Agency's Comments

2/23/2026

Thank you for your review and your comment has been addressed.

**Review Dates**

**First Review**  
**Additional Review (as necessary)**  
**Additional Review (as necessary)**  
**Additional Review (as necessary)**  
**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**PPG Request Review**  
**2/18/2026**  
**3/6/2026**

**Agency Response**