

Revitalizing Ecosystems for Sustainable Agriculture and Resilience in Fiji (RESAR)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11718
Countries
Fiji
Project Name
Revitalizing Ecosystems for Sustainable Agriculture and Resilience in Fiji (RESAR)
Agencies
IFAD
Date received by PM
12/18/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Sarah Wyatt
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
FSP

PIF
CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/16/2026

Yes.

2/17/2026

No.

b.

Component 1 - Please include language in the outputs about the fact that these plans will incorporate environmental considerations. The GEF wouldn't support just any island management

plan but bringing in environmental considerations, including CCA, would be something we support.

Component 2 - The language describing this outcome (pg 33-34) is often in the passive voice making it seem as though the land will manage or improve itself. While there is good language on FPIC, it would help to have some description of the types of support envisioned (ex. extension services, equipment, nursery supplies) and the process for getting there.

Output 2.2.2 - It's unclear how species or KBAs can be protected against climate threats in this context. Please clarify or remove.

Component 4 - One of the challenges often faced by GEF projects is policies and regulations are drafted but never enacted. How will this project manage this risk?

c. We request the Agency to integrate the gender-sensitive indicators developed in the Gender Action Plan into the Results Framework. This includes sex-disaggregated data for Indicators 7, 8, 9, and 10 (including women-led households), as well as Indicator 19. Please also ensure that KM outputs capture and disseminate gender-specific results and lessons learned.

Agency Response

Component 1. The Indicative Project Overview has been revised to clarify that the Integrated Island Management Plan explicitly incorporates biodiversity conservation priorities, climate change adaptation (CCA) measures, and ecosystem-based management principles. Output 1.1.1 now specifies that environmental and climate-resilient considerations are embedded within the Plan and reflected in provincial strategic development plans, ensuring alignment with GEF-8 objectives.

The language under **Component 2** has been revised to clarify implementation mechanisms and avoid passive phrasing. Outputs now specify that producers will be trained and supported through extension services and technical assistance to adopt climate-resilient, biodiversity-sensitive, and market-oriented production practices. The description of investment packages has been strengthened to reference targeted support measures (including equipment, planting materials, and restoration inputs) delivered through participatory planning and FPIC processes. This clarifies that improved management outcomes result from defined institutional support and sequenced implementation rather than passive land transitions.

Output 2.2.2. The language under Output 2.2.2 has been revised to clarify that the project does not seek to shield species or KBAs from climate change directly, but rather to reduce anthropogenic pressures and enhance ecological resilience and adaptive capacity under projected climate conditions. This ensures technical accuracy while maintaining alignment with biodiversity and climate objectives.

The **Component 4** narrative has been strengthened to clarify how policy and regulatory instruments will move beyond drafting toward operationalization. To the extent possible, the project will prioritize instruments that can be enacted through existing administrative and sectoral mechanisms (e.g., ministerial directives, codes of practice, integration into provincial planning and annual work plans), rather than relying solely on lengthy legislative processes. Each instrument will be supported by an implementation roadmap and identification of responsible institutions, with progress reviewed by the Project Steering Committee to reduce the risk of instruments remaining unenacted.

c. Indicator 19 in the results framework has been updated, ensuring the KAP survey will be disaggregated by sex. Indicators 7, 8, 9, 10 under Outcome 2.1 directly extracted from the approved BE-GREEN project, with is blended with the GEF-IFAD RESAR project. Gender mainstreaming under this outcome will be tracked through the BE-GREEN monitoring framework,

which includes output-level indicators on participation of women and youth in training, adoption of climate-resilient practices, and access to extension services. These indicators are reflected in the BE-GREEN/RESAR Gender Action Plan and inform project reporting, while the outcome-level indicators for Outcome 2.1 remain aligned with the BE-GREEN design document. Gender-related results and lessons learned will be regularly documented and reported, including through the annual GEF Project Implementation Reports (PIRs).

A Gender Mainstreaming narrative has been added to the CER on p. 25.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/13/2026

Yes.

2/17/2026

No.

a. Conservation leases are mentioned frequently but there is not much information about what they are and how they work. It would be helpful to have short explanation about them and their long-term financial sustainability. We would like to note that there is evidence from other projects of how such payments can backfire when there are no longer financial resources in a program. The result was that people started using lands that they had been conserving prior to the project for free as the project created the expectation of payment for conservation.

b. The project description should elaborate on the different roles of key stakeholders in the project components and activities, including civil society and community-based groups and organizations and MSMEs. Similarly, the annexed stakeholder engagement plan should provide further details of the roles of these stakeholders related to project components and activities, including project plans and means to engage and consult these in project implementation .

Agency Response

a. The project document has been revised to clarify the nature, intended use, and sustainability considerations of conservation leases.

First, a short definition has been added in the baseline section to explain that conservation leases are voluntary, time-bound agreements between landowning units and implementing entities that formalize conservation or restoration commitments in defined areas.

Second, the Incremental Reasoning (?with project?) section has been strengthened to clarify that conservation leases are designed as transitional governance instruments applied selectively in areas facing demonstrable degradation or land-use transition pressures and paired with livelihood diversification and institutional strengthening measures to ensure durability beyond any defined support period.

Third, Component 4 (Output 4.1.3) has been refined to clarify that conservation leases are used as structured, time-bound financing instruments embedded within scalable implementation packages, reinforcing ? rather than displacing ? existing customary stewardship practices.

These revisions clarify both the operational mechanism and sustainability logic of conservation leases while maintaining alignment with REDD+, biodiversity objectives, and customary tenure systems.

b. The Project Rationale description has been strengthened to clarify differentiated stakeholder roles across components.

First, the ?Additionality and Stakeholder Roles? section (following Table 3) now clarifies that, while Table 3 identifies primary focal government agencies, the differentiated roles of community-based organizations, customary landowning units, civil society actors, MSMEs, private sector partners, and financial institutions are specified within the respective component descriptions.

Second, each component description (Components 1-4) has been revised to explicitly articulate actor-level responsibilities. These revisions clarify the respective roles of ministerial leadership, provincial administrations, community-based organizations, producer groups, MSMEs, private sector actors, and financial institutions in delivering restoration, sustainable production, value chain integration, policy reform, and knowledge dissemination outcomes.

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan further details engagement modalities, consultation processes, and participation mechanisms aligned with each component. These revisions strengthen clarity regarding stakeholder contributions to GEBs and adaptation benefits without altering project scope or institutional arrangements.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/16/2026

Yes.

3/13/2026

No.

Core indicator 3 shows nothing for CEO Endorsement only for PIF. Please correct.

2/17/2026

No.

Noting the allocation for LD, the planned SLM activities and reference to 500ha under SLM in the note below the core indicator table, please assign GEBs to sub-indicator 4.3.

Core indicator values are missing in the Portal for the CEO Endorsement. Please ensure that all values from the project are included.

Agency Response

16/03/26
Addressed.

13/03/26

The project's Core Indicator 4 total of 134,000 ha has been clarified and explicitly structured across sub-indicators in line with GEF-8 guidance. Of this total, 133,500 ha are reported under sub-indicator 4.1 (biodiversity landscapes under improved management), and 500 ha are reported under sub-indicator 4.3 (sustainable land management in production systems), reflecting the LD STAR allocation and associated SLM interventions. The narrative and Core Indicator explanation section have been revised to clearly distinguish these sub-indicator contributions and to emphasize that these hectares correspond to defined and monitored improved management regimes rather than spatial prioritization alone.

All Core Indicator values have been reviewed and entered consistently in the [Portal](#) for CEO Endorsement.

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/13/2026

Yes.

During inception and implementation, please examine how this project could support LDN target setting and reporting.

2/17/2026

No. While overall good, we welcome the strong alignment with Fiji's NAP (UNCCD). Noting that the plan is 20 years old, please explore the possibility to utilize this project set (or initiate the process to set) LDN targets for Fiji, which would align well with many of the integrated activities planned.

Agency Response

16/03/26

Noted, thanks.

13/03/26

Thank you for this suggestion. The Alignment section has been strengthened to clarify that RESAR will support initiation of an LDN-aligned analytical and coordination process in Fiji. The project's restoration and sustainable land management interventions under Components 1 and 2 will generate spatial baselines, monitoring data, and practice-level evidence that can inform the establishment or refinement of national Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets under the UNCCD.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/13/2026

Yes.

2/17/2026

No. On the status of utilization of PPG: Please specify if these are consultancies and/or contracts:
?Lead Design Expert?, ?National Resource Management Expert?, ?Biodiversity Expert?, ?GIS Specialist?.

Additionally, please describe the purpose and outputs for ?Flight and Field Visits - IFAD Country Team and Technical Specialists?.

Agency ResponsePPG utilization table revised
8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?
Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/13/2026

Yes.

2/17/2026

No. Please revise the type of cofinancing for the Ministry of forestry amount of USD 1,382,764.00 from the Public Investment to in-kind.

Agency ResponseThe portal entry has been corrected, indicating the USD 1,382,764.00 contribution from the Ministry of Forestry has in-kind (recurrent expenditures) co-financing.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/13/2026

Yes.

2/17/2026

No.

a. Please review GEF guidance on including hectares for CI 4. Also, how are the conserved areas that are being created and/or supported being included here?

Agency Response

Thank you for this comment. The Core Indicators have been reviewed to ensure alignment with GEF-8 guidance. The 134,000 ha reported under CI 4 are composed of 133,500 ha under sub-indicator 4.1 (biodiversity-priority landscapes under defined and monitored improved management regimes) and 500 ha under sub-indicator 4.3 (sustainable land management in production systems). These hectares reflect implemented management measures, including community management plans, biodiversity-sensitive production standards, restoration measures, and integration into provincial planning and monitoring systems.

While the project geography includes areas that are legally designated as forest or nature reserves, the project does not include formal protected area creation or protected area system strengthening (e.g., management effectiveness upgrades or METT assessments). The strategy focuses on integrated landscape management and biodiversity mainstreaming in production landscapes and biodiversity-priority areas. As such, hectares are appropriately reported under CI 4 rather than CI 1.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/17/2026

Yes.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2026

Yes.

4/16/2026

No.

1. There is a discrepancy between the PMC total shown in the Project Portal and the PMC total in the budget table, which also affects the overall total. Please update the budget table to match.

Grand Total		674 520	5 500 000	500 000	932 165	7 606 685	228 200	391 804	8 226 689	
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ										
GET								391,744.00		1,207,755.00
Sub Total(\$)								391,744.00		1,207,755.00
Total Project Cost(\$)								8,226,629.00		25,362,869.00

4/2/2026

No.

1. Regarding comment #6.a: We are still seeing many activities without any costs associated. If these positions will be funded by co-financing sources they do not need to be included in the budget. Please remove any activity that will not be using GEF funds.

2. Regarding the second part of comment #6.a: We are still seeing the budget presented by outcome. Please present the budget table per component instead of Outcomes, which will improve readability in the CEO Endorsement PDF document (which is the document that is circulated to Council and later web posted)

3. Please refer to Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy:

a. Please include a line with the sub-total for each category

b. Some activities have been wrongly categorized, as an example, Staff positions have been merged in the local consultant category. Please have a separate category for Salary and Benefits / Staff Costs and include in that category all expenses linked to staff positions and leave the consultancies in the consultant category.

c. Workshops and Travel costs seem to also have been included in the Local Consultants category. Please have a specific category for Trainings, Workshops, Meeting another for Travel and another for Office supplies

4. Please provide further details on the costs related to office equipment and office rental.

5. We will review the budget table again upon resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

2/17/2026

No.

1. Please remove budget lines that are not being charged to component, M&E or PMC. Additionally, please present the budget table per component instead

of Outcomes, which will improve readability in the CEO Endorsement PDF document (which is the document that is circulated to Council and later web posted).

Annex G: Budget table											
Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (US\$eq.)								Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2		Component 3	Component 4	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 4.1					
Works		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Goods		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Technical Manager - IFAD investment-related activities	Technical Manager - IFAD investment-related activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	BE-GREEN position
Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Officer	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Officer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	BE-GREEN position
Project expeditor	Project expeditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	BE-GREEN position
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

- The entity identified as responsible in both the budget and throughout the project document is listed as ?MoAW? (Ministry of Agriculture and Waterways). However, the Project Information section references the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change. Kindly ensure that the project information section is consistent with the rest of the document.

Project Executing Entity(s):	Ministry of Agriculture	Project Executing Type:	Government
	Ministry of Environment and Climate Change		Government

- The M&E Officer is charged to both the M&E component and PMC, and several positions may be redundant based on the budget table description. ANNEX K: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PMU STAFF was not found in the uploaded documents or agency Project Document. Please provide clear terms or references for each position to verify their validity and avoid redundancy.

Salary and benefits / Staff costs		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Project Director*	Project Director* (shared cost with the IFAD BE-GREEN project)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95 760	95 760		MoKW
Technical Manager - IFAD investment-related activities	Technical Manager - IFAD investment-related activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		BE-GREEN position
Financial Management and Administration Manager*	Financial Management and Administration Manager* (shared cost with the IFAD BE-GREEN project)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60 192	60 192		MoKW
Procurement Assistant*	Procurement Assistant* (shared cost with the IFAD BE-GREEN project)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55 725	55 725		MoKW
M&E officer*	M&E officer* (shared cost with the IFAD BE-GREEN project)	0	0	0	0	0	0	37 205	23 339	60 544		MoKW
KM officer*	KM officer* (shared cost with the IFAD BE-GREEN project)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60 544	60 544		MoKW
Finance Assistant*	Finance Assistant* (shared cost with the IFAD BE-GREEN project)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33 024	33 024		MoKW
Procurement Consultant*	Procurement Consultant* (shared cost with the IFAD BE-GREEN project)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42 840	42 840		MoKW
Office Assistant*	Office Assistant* (shared cost with the IFAD BE-GREEN project)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20 320	20 320		MoKW

4. We will review the budget table again upon resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

Agency Response

22/04/2026 budget table updated as indicated

1. addressed.

When the PIF was prepared, the Ministry name was Ministry of Agriculture. Since then, the Ministry named changed to Ministry of Agriculture and Waterways, hence that reference in the CER. In the PIF, both Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment and Climate Change were listed as Executing Agencies. It was decided during the project preparation phase that the Ministry of Agriculture and Waterways would be the Executing Agency.

There is significant cost-sharing between BE-GREEN and RESAR regarding project management costs. M&E and project management costs are combined in the BE-GREEN budget, which was prepared prior to the RESAR budget. To ensure the M&E and project management allocations in the RESAR budget are consistent with GEF policies and procedures, the costs for the M&E Officer were split accordingly. This approach maintains compliance with GEF budgeting requirements while recognizing the efficiencies gained through shared project management.

Annex K has been updated with inclusion of terms of reference for PMU staff.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/22/2026

Yes.

4/16/2026

No, there is a minor issue remaining with the budget entry.

4/2/2026

No, please address the issues related to the budget.

3/13/2026

Not at this time. Please fix the quick core indicator entry issue quickly before the budget review.

2/17/2026

Not at this time.

Thank you for a well-written and thoughtful project, which shows a strong foundation of biodiversity values for sustainable livelihoods.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/21/2026

- We strongly recommend exploring synergies and exchange of knowledge and experiences with the BGI IP community given the similarities in approach between the RESAR project and the BGI IP.

- For projects engaging in SLM, we recommend to share experiences with the [World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies \(WOCAT\)](#) , a global network on Sustainable Land Management (SLM) that promotes the documentation, sharing and use of knowledge to support

adaptation, innovation and decision-making in SLM. Best practice SLM interventions and experiences from the Pacific are very much needed. Please explore this knowledge sharing opportunity during project implementation.

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		3/13/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		4/16/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		4/22/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		