



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

Review PIF 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

9/19/2024

Review completed by PM

11/5/2024

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

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

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

10/16/2024

No.

b. the Agency (perhaps accidentally) selected AFOLU in the field ?Project Sector?, which is for Climate Change Mitigation projects only ? please ask the Agency to amend.

Agency's Comments This has been addressed

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

10/3/2024

No. Please include core indicator benefits of the project and it would benefit from a few sentences with a concise summary of activities without mixing in the justifications and other general descriptors.

Agency's Comments

Core indicator benefits of the project have been added to the project summary.
The summary has also been updated with a concise summary of activities.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 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 and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

a. Yes, thank you for the revision.

b. Yes.

During PPG, please ensure that the focus is on a sustainable integrated island plan and something to that effect in the component.

10/3/2024

No.

a. Please revise the objective to be more specific to this project.

b. The project is a noteworthy effort to utilize the majority of the STAR allocation for one strategic investment linked to other larger projects from the World Bank etc . There is however space to improve the narrative to demonstrate efforts to address the drivers of environmental degradation and delivery of GEBs. The centre and focus of the project should be to build the capacity and enable the country to sustainably manage and use their natural resources (land, BD etc) in a context of threats from climate change, rather than enhancing the agri-business efforts which is coming across more strongly (see Component 2- Project overview table)

-Component 1 and more specifically the Integrated Island Plan is quite vague. Please provide further details on the scope of the plan, which government bodies and stakeholders are expected to be involved in the development of the plan, how will it be institutionalized (funded and implemented) and what are the expected GEBs. In addition, there seems to only be a focus on biodiversity and climate within the plan, however if the project is taking a landscape approach, integrated land use planning (ILUP) and integrated landscape management (ILM) should also be incorporated. You may refer to this helpful guide <https://www.unccd.int/resources/brief/science-policy-brief-integrated-land-use-planning-and-integrated-landscape>

- Expected GEBs have not been included in the Project Overview table. Please incorporate.

Agency's Comments

- a. The objective statement has been revised accordingly.
- b. The narrative has been improved in response to the comments raised.

GEBS have been incorporated into the project description narrative and the overview table.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

10/3/2024

Yes. However, did tourism only contribute 0.93 million USD to the Fijian economy (\$2/tourist)? This seems small. (page 9)

Agency's Comments This entry was a typographical error. The figure has been corrected to USD 0.93 billion.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

10/16/2024

No.

d. No.

- Private sector ? It will be important to engage the private sector, such as tourism operators that are the target customers for produce, from beginning of the PPG. It will be important to address their needs and challenges to build the connections. IFC has done good work in this area. Private sector also likely can bring helpful cofinance if brought in early. There were some lessons in this regard from the UNDP IAS GEF-6 project.

At CEO Endorsement, please include a table with the stakeholders and descriptions of their various roles.

During PPG, it would be good to engage with the CI GEF project that includes some focus on sustainable kava production to exchange lessons learned and build on that work.

Agency's Comments

The following entry has been added to the Stakeholder Engagement section of the PIF.

Regarding consultations with private sector partners, the IFAD loan design team has been engaging private enterprises and associations in various discussions. This includes input suppliers, extension service providers, and the tourism sector. The PPG team will engage them from the very beginning. Consultations will also be held with other GEF agencies and partners to gain insights into learnings and best practices.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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 key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

However, please refine/expand these during PPG. For the related indicators, please seek to define indicators that address the quality of the activities rather than simply the number of activities. For example, number of people downloading publications rather than or in addition to number of publications.

Agency's Comments Well noted, will be addressed at PPG

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

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

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

10/16/2024

No, given the focus on LD 1, we expect to see GEBs/targets included for sub-indicator 4.3. Please incorporate. Please include the anticipated start year of GHG accounting and duration of accounting directly under the indicator 6.1.

Agency's Comments

A target for sub-indicator 4.3 has been incorporated into the core indicator narrative description of the PIF and in the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Worksheet.

The anticipated start year of GHG accounting is 2026. This information has been added to the PIF and is included in the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Worksheet.

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

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

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 screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

10/16/2024

No.

c. This has not been discussed. Please provide some information and a more thorough examination and plan during PPG.

During PPG, more consideration is necessary for the aspect of supporting scaling-up.

Agency's Comments

Section C of the PIF contains information on how the project is aligned with Fiji's National Development Plan, as well as sector level strategies and plans. The narrative has been amended by indicating the following: "Alignment of national policies will be more thoroughly examined and planned during the PPG phase".

Also, the "Innovation, sustainability and scaling towards wider transformation" discussion in Section B of the PIF has been amended with the following entry: "During the PPG phase, further considerations will be explored for scaling up of project achievements."

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

See above.

Agency's Comments

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's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

10/26/2024

No.

Please provide just a few sentences with specifics on alignment with the NBSAP.

From the LD perspective there is a missed opportunity to link the activities of the project to the LDN agenda, in particular given the Fiji's National Action Plan (NAP) to Combat Desertification/Land Degradation and to Mitigate against Drought was developed 20 years ago. Given the multi-focal area aspect of the project and the aim to take a landscape approach, Fiji can work on ensuring that their productive landscapes can continue to support their plan for import substitution, while also working on biodiversity mainstreaming. Please refer to this helpful guide <https://www.unccd.int/resources/manuals-and-guides/checklist-land-degradation-neutrality-transformative-projects-and>

Agency's Comments

A few additional sentences have been added on alignment with the NBSAP.

Also, the opportunity to link the project activities to the LDN agenda has been incorporated into the narrative.

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's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

10/16/2024

No, please provide dates. In addition, please ask agency to provide additional details on specific local governments, private sector and civil society stakeholders consulted, and plans to engage and consult these in project development.

Agency's Comments A table was added in the PIF under the Stakeholder Engagements Section, with dates of consultations held. During PPG, consultation is planned with stakeholders in all three provinces of the project area ? community leaders, CSOs, Community organisations, private sector and Govt. agencies.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments

11/4/2024

No.

10/16/2024

No, Please ask the Agency to remove the decimals from GEF Financing table

Agency's Comments

The decimal points have been removed in the GEF Financing Table.

05/11/2024

We are not able to get rid of the decimals.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

11/5/2024

Yes.

11/4/2024

No, upon review it's hard to see how a road project could be justified as co-financing for a biodiversity project. Please remove. If there is a good justification for this, it can be included at CEO Endorsement.

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

10/16/2024

No.

The Letter of Endorsement only included the Ministry of Agriculture and Waterways, while in Portal the Agency added the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change. Please ask the Agency to remove the latter to match the LoE (the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change can play a role as executing Partner if decided during the preparation). If they insist in leaving it, a new loE will be required.

Some figures in tables Project Financing in Portal (US\$ 8,226,629) are higher than those allocated in LoE (US\$ 8,206,674 - see below). The Agency needs to adjust the figures in Portal to match those in LoE (or to get a new LoE). If there is a new LoE, please ask the Agency to amend by adjusting the figures in Portal to match those in LoE. When resubmitted, we will recalculate the amounts to ascertain that the amounts in Portal are not higher than those in LoE and provide comments if appropriate.

Agency's Comments A revised letter is attached from the Focal Point. Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment & Climate Change are executing agencies.

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes. At this point, it would not make sense to have a more detailed map given the small size of Vanua Levu.

Agency's Comments OK, this is well noted and will be further addressed at PPG.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

11/4/2024

Yes.

10/16/2024

No, We note that the project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and IFAD attached the climate screening list and the ESS classification. However, it is not clear what is a plan during the PPG stage to address risks related access to legally protected areas, marine or inland fisheries, cultural heritage, Labor and working conditions and IPLCs.

- Please provide a risk mitigation plan including further environmental and social impact assessment and management plan, Indigenous Peoples plan, or others during the PPG.

Agency's Comments

A Social, Environmental, and Climate Assessment Procedure (SECAP) Review Note was developed during the PIF stage. It has described the baseline status and issues related to applicable safeguard standards. Additionally, the review note has detailed relevant policies, responsible institutions, and the monitoring and evaluation process. It will be further enhanced during PPG stage.

A comprehensive Environmental, Social, and Climate Management Plan (ESCMP) will be prepared during the PPG, outlining issues and impacts related to biodiversity, cultural heritage, community health and safety, labor conditions, and Indigenous Peoples, among other SECAP standards.

Furthermore, a Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) implementation plan for Indigenous Peoples will be developed.

In addition, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) will be established at the project level.

Other relevant assessment will be conducted following the outcome of risk screening exercise.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

10/16/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

11/5/2024

Yes. Thank you for the revisions.

11/4/2024

Not at this time. Two minor issues - please remove the road project as co-financing and try again to remove the decimals in the "GEF Project Financing Table".

10/16/2024

Not at this time. Please revise and resubmit.

Agency's Comments

The road project was removed from the cofinancing tables.

We are unable to remove the decimals in the "GEF project financing table"

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

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

