

Safeguarding Marine & Terrestrial Biodiversity in Fiji (SAMBIO)

Basic Information

GEF ID

10675

Countries

Fiji

Project Title

Safeguarding Marine & Terrestrial Biodiversity in Fiji (SAMBIO)

GEF Agency(ies)

CI

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2020

Yes.

10/9/2020

No, the project is well-designed. There are a few issues to address.

- On page 13 the water and reef quality is described as “fair” but declining rapidly. At least to my American English ear, “fair” would be a classification just above “poor” so the “but declining rapidly” doesn’t really make sense.

- It will be important to coordinate with other initiatives and new projects that may arise in the area.

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/14/2020:

The description is using the millennium assessment classification for ecosystems: Bad, poor, fair, good, excellent.

The trend is a declining one as from ‘fair’ ecosystems can go to ‘poor’ or ‘bad’. In this respect the afore-mentioned ecosystems can go from ‘fair’ to ‘bad’ very quickly. We enhanced the text in pp 13-14 to resonate better.

Thank you for the sub-comment. We added extra text on p.20

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes. Please include carbon mitigation calculations during PPG.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes. Working with the Navy is particularly interesting and pairing LMMA work with that is innovative. Please plan to collect knowledge and lessons learned. Potentially an entry in [IW:LEARN](#) would be a way to share this information.

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/14/2020;

We have modified the text on page 31 to reflect the suggestion.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2020

Yes, thank you for the additions.

10/9/2020

No, it would be good to describe the National Dialogue and any other consultations that preceded this project and the activities included in it and the plans for further consultations. We understand that COVID-19 has made these activities more limited or challenging.

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/14/2020:

We have further clarified the current extent of national consultations and enhanced the text on p.24 related to planned consultations during the PPG stage.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2020

Yes. thank you for completing a climate risk screening.

Yes, thank you for completing a climate risk screening.

10/9/2020

No.

Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:

- a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).
- b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.
- c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).
- d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/14/2020:

The climate risk screening has been completed and included with this resubmission. Risk section also updated with summary of climate risk screening.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/9/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

CI-GEF response 10/21:

- 1) EA - note that the Department of Environment is located in the Ministry of Environment. However, we removed reference to DoE.
- 2) MFA changed to BD
- 3) Co-financing from CI labeled as GEF Agency and from Birdlife labeled as CSO. Co-financing from development partners was removed from the description since at PIF submission there was no co-financing from development partners.
- 4) Core indicator 5 updated

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/22/20120

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

10/17/2020

No, please change the focal area in the Portal, correct the classification of co-financing organizations, and include the marine ha outside of MPAs in core indicator 5. Please note the relationship between the Department of the Environment and the MoE.

10/9/2020

While the project is good, there are a few issues to address. Please revise and resubmit.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

/iew Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/9/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/17/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Fiji is a country of significant marine as well as terrestrial biodiversity. Much of the territory are managed under traditional systems of governance. While this has helped maintain traditional sustainable practices, it has been too expensive or otherwise challenging to create new protected areas. Realistically in many remote areas, the only way to create protected areas is to promote and support the idea of locally managed marine areas (LMMAs) that help communities ensure the long term health of the marine ecosystems that they depend upon. At the same time, foreign fishing fleets represent an increasing threat to biodiversity.

This project will establish new marine and terrestrial protected areas within priority areas of biodiversity and strengthen Fiji's protected area network, improve the management of key biodiversity areas in forests and coastal ecosystems to protect Fiji's most threatened biodiversity, and strengthen policy and financing pathways to secure ecosystem services and other benefits to island communities into the future. The project will focus on: the improvement of management and expansion of protection of key terrestrial biodiversity areas on Fiji's two largest islands of Viti Levu and Vanua Levu; the establishment of new and better management of existing MPAs/LMMAs within the Eastern Division; and promoting strengthened enabling conditions to accelerate expansion and improved management of Fiji's PA and MPA network, in full alignment with Fiji's NBSAP.

Innovation, Sustainability and Potential for Scaling up: This project will engage the Fijian Navy to work on the control and enforcement of Fiji's marine protected areas while engaging with communities to establish and support locally managed marine areas, which will address the challenge of IUU fishing and sustainable practices from multiple directions. By creating a diverse coalition, this also supports the sustainability of project activities. Fiji could provide a model for the Pacific of engagement with the military in support of marine conservation as it is also protecting the natural assets and capital of the country. They've committed to collecting lessons in [IW:LEARN](#).

This project will support the creation of protected areas of 10,809,738 ha of new PAs (Marine: 10,761,579; terrestrial: 49,738) and mainstreaming in 47,064 ha (marine: 22,500 ha; terrestrial 24,564 ha).