



Safeguarding Marine & Terrestrial Biodiversity in Fiji (SAMBIO)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10675

Countries

Fiji

Project Name

Safeguarding Marine & Terrestrial Biodiversity in Fiji (SAMBIO)

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

3/11/2022

Review completed by PM

5/6/2022

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/6/2022

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

4/25/2022

No, thank you for the revisions, but the activities described in component 3 are still specific to NBSAPs when they should serve broader goals than a single report.

3/29/2022

No, while the project overall is strong some of the outcomes are really more outputs (e.g. 3.1, 3.3) and it would be good to reframe them to be outcomes.

Also please address the following:

- Component 3 - Please broaden the focus of the capacity building beyond reporting for NBSAPs. The reporting and monitoring should be in service of results for biodiversity not only reports.

Agency Response

05/03/2022:

Outcomes and outputs in component 3 specific to NBSAP were included in the approved PIF and these were a priority for the government from the beginning. Nonetheless, Outcome 3.2, and Outputs 3.2.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4 have been changed to reflect work on broader goals.

New Outcome 3.2: Fiji's key biodiversity areas and keystone species better managed and protected against climate change and anthropogenic impacts

3.2.1: Management, recovery and monitoring plans and protocols for threatened keystone species developed or updated in accordance to the current biodiversity protection needs as an integral part of PA/MPA management plans, with key actions implemented.

3.3.2: Tracking system established to strengthen reporting on the status and trends of biodiversity and benefits

3.3.3: Relevant government agency capacity developed to implement, projects, actions, and reporting on Biodiversity through specific frameworks

3.3.4: Community and other relevant stakeholder capacity developed to implement, projects, actions, and reporting on Biodiversity through a specifically developed reporting framework

Changes have been done throughout the text to reflect and support the above revision.

04/19/2022:

Outcomes 3.1 & 3.3 have been changed for better alignment with programming language.

New Outcomes:

3.1 Increase in the marine and terrestrial area of MPAs and PAs that benefit from a sustainable financing framework

3.3 Ministry of Environment and relevant stakeholders have increased capacity to monitor and report on management of resources at scale for Biodiversity

New Component 3:

Enabling conditions strengthened to accelerate expansion and improved management of Fiji's PA and MPA network, in full alignment with Fiji's Biodiversity protection needs

Accordingly, indicators and indicators have been adjusted for these outcomes.

The narrative has been adjusted in order to clarify that the work under all components will be beyond NBSAP with the view to address the actual Biodiversity needs of the country rather than just focusing on the documentation commitments. This notion has now been mainstreamed across the project document and we are aware that we will need to emphasize it at the time of activity development and implementation.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/23/2022

Yes.

5/6/2022

No, please correct the year in the carbon entry and it appears that component 2 was cut and pasted twice in Table B in the Portal.

4/19/2022

No, please include carbon as a core indicator in the Portal entry.

3/29/2022

No, while reasonable, we believe that this project can and should report on the carbon benefits of this project. EXACT can provide methodologies even for marine areas.

Agency Response

05/03/2022:

Core indicator 6 included. EXACT tool uploaded. Error in fisheries and aquaculture tab fixed and duration of accounting is now 20 years.

04/19/2022:

ExAct has been used to calculate the mitigation potential in forest and coastal areas (see attached ExAct worksheets). The project will contribute with 5,199,212 metric tons of CO₂e carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of forestry and coastal ecosystems. We incorporated the figures in the core indicator worksheet and added text on GHG emissions and GEB.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/25/2022

Yes, however it would be good to incorporate the USAID Conservation Enterprise work specifically on the theory of change. We will not ask for it at this point because it needs to be done on each product/value chain specifically to recognize the barriers and ensure that there is actually potential for success (such as making sure that there is actually market demand for a product being developed).

3/29/2022

No, please address the following:

- Livelihoods - Please discuss how potential livelihood opportunities will be evaluated before being supported. Too often conservation livelihood support is unsuccessful due to not fully accounting for various barriers or gaps for commercialization. USAID has conducted significant work on conservation enterprise that could be a helpful framework.

Agency Response

04/19/2022:

This is a very valid comment and the proposal to consider conservation enterprises approaches in SAMBIO as livelihoods work is central to the project. Please see enhanced text in the ProDoc paragraphs: 2, 126, 191, 193, 215, 233, 271, 281, 283, 284, 298 (table 13).

CEO ER/portal: Changes in the RF from the PIF - A significant part of livelihood work will be based on approaches such as ?conservation enterprises? in order to highlight the specific links between income generation and reduction in environmentally harmful activities, which will in turn indicate the various intervention foci on value chains and livelihoods.

Proposed alternative section: For this to be achieved, SAMBIO will approach the subject matter through a conservation enterprises lens to highlight the links between

income increase and discontinuation of environmentally harmful activities, with the understanding that the systematic data is still rather insufficient.

Description of Output 1.1.3: These activities will be informed by approaches such as conservation enterprises with the objective to cast further light on the natural capital ? livelihood nexus and identify specific intervention points for generating income while discontinuing environmentally harmful activities.

Description of Output 2.2.3: Output 2.2.3 will also be informed by the work under Output 1.1.3 on the natural capital ? livelihoods nexus for conservation enterprises approaches.

Benefits section: informed by the natural capital ? livelihoods nexus in a conservation enterprises approach context, which will identify key entry points for generating sustainable income while reducing or stopping environmentally harmful activities, together with market and supply chain analysis, and consultations with community and private sector stakeholders and, The transition of income generation from environmentally harmful to environmentally neutral or positive activities will also be assessed

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender
differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so,
does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators
and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier
and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes, it will be important to special attention to this issue.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/23/2022

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

The PM clears the purchase of vehicles as necessary for working in remote places.

In addition, the TORs for staff who will be working on undertaking the project components have been cleared. It is important to note that in small teams and countries project staff do technical work along with project management. Also noting that laptops are necessary for the completion of the technical work of this project in remote places and recognizing that work from home may be required at various points.

1. On Core indicators:

a. Please include the missing Name of the Protected Area and WDPA ID under core indicator 1.1.

b. Please include the missing Name of the Protected Area and WDPA ID under core indicator 2.1 and 2.2.

c. Please include core indicator 6 in the results framework in the annex A.

2. On Co-financing: BirdLife International: change ?Other? to ?CSO?

3. On table B: please request the agency to include the expected outputs and outcomes for the component KM.

4. On the budget:

a. Project Manager and Project Technical Officer are charged to the project's components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 3.7 million, and there is a co-financing loan of 600 K represented in grants ? this could contribute to cover the costs of the project's staff.

b. Vehicles have been charged to the components: The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program. If approved please request the PM's and Manager's approval in the review sheet.

c. Laptop and other related equipment should be charged to the PMC

Agency Response

CI-GEF 05/23/2022:

Core Indicators:

1. The Protected Area is yet to be registered and the name will be decided during implementation phase. The Project will support the official designation of protected area and will thus contribute to the registration of these sites in the WDPA during the project implementation.
2. Under core indicator 2.1 the Protected Area is yet to be registered. The name will be decided during implementation phase. We will get the WPA ID once it has been registered.
3. Under core indicator 2.2, these are local community managed protected areas with no name and WDPA ID.
4. Core indicator 6 added as an objective indicator in the results framework in Annex A.

2. Co-financing - Birdlife changed to CSO.

3. KM was erroneously included as a separate component on Table B. The separate line for KM now been deleted from the Table. All KM is now captured under component 3 and aligns with the project budget in which KM is budgeted under component 3.

4.

a. We acknowledge that the Project Manager is charging to the components as this function will be hired to provide inputs to the components and provide Project Management, which is charged to PMC. While there is co-financing contributing to the project and PMC, it is paying for other activities that contribute to the goals of this project from other organizations, and not paying for the costs of staff for this project. The guidelines also state that when a staff is performing activities under the component and PMC, that a Terms of Reference should be provided, which we have done so in Appendix IX . In the budget, the ?Finance and Contract Specialist? has also been split between components and PMC according to the position?s technical function and PMC duties and is outlined in the Terms of Reference provided in Appendix IX. The Technical Officer is a specialist focusing on technical delivery through the life of the project and not project management, and therefore is charged across the components. The ToR for the Technical Officer can also be found in Appendix IX of the ProDoc. The Grant co-financing is being provided by a separate organization that is focusing on component 3.

b. We understand that ideally vehicles would be financed by the PMC co-financed portion of the project, however unfortunately this project, as part of Fiji?s STAR allocation, does not have the co-financing resources to pay for the purchase of vehicles. Per the vehicle justification letter in Appendix VII. B., the exception is requested based on the significant cost savings of GEF project funds when compared with the cost of renting cars and boats necessary to achieve the project?s outcomes, when considering the geographical region that it spans. The cost analysis is found in the Vehicle Justification form for the 2 vehicles and 1 boat over the life of the project and that figure does not include the additional administrative cost savings. This is on page 175 of the ProDoc. We note that per GEF policy, vehicles may not be charged to PMC and the vehicles charged to the components are requested to directly deliver on the project technical outcomes. As part of CI?s role as IA , the monitoring of proper vehicle usage will be done as part of the oversight. With the Vehicle Justification, CI is thereby requesting approval from the GEF Project Manager to move forward with this item in the budget.

c. Laptops and other related equipment costs are shared across PMC and technical components based on the level of effort of the staff persons who will be assigned to the equipment. As such, they will be utilized to primarily deliver on technical outputs of the project. This is consistent with best practices in allocation based on level of effort and contribution to the various technical aspects of the project.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/6/2022

Yes.

4/25/2022

No, thank you for the specific response however the referenced document has been uploaded to the Portal as GEF Secretariat Use Only. Please include the Appendix in the CEO Endorsement Request or another place that it would be accessible to Council members.

3/29/2022

No, please include a specific response to the comments from the German Council member.

Agency Response
05/03/2022:

The agency Project Document where Appendix XVII and XIII can be found is marked public.

04/19/2022:

In response to Germany's concern we highlight the element of complementarity as both technical and temporal since SAMBIO is designed and lined up to pick up from where BNA leaves off both technically and time-wise. BNA activated the stakeholder networks

and laid down the technical foundation for SAMBIO to come in and deliver management planning. Please see dedicated Appendix XVII and updated Appendix XIII of the ProDoc.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/29/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/23/2022

Yes, thank you for the response.

5/19/2022

No, please respond to the issues under the annexes question.

4/25/2022

No, thank you for the revisions. However, some issues still remain.

3/29/2022

No, please revise and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/29/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/23/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations