



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT
 TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Building capacities to address invasive alien species to enhance the chances of long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni island and surrounding islets			
Country(ies):	Fiji	GEF Project ID: ¹	9095
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5589
Other Executing Partner(s):	Biosecurity Authority of Fiji	Submission Date:	30 Nov 2016
		Re-submission Date:	21 Mar 2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	BD	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Parent Program	N/A	Agency Fee (\$)	332,782

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-2 Program 4	Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species	GEFTF	3,502,968	26,864,514
Total project costs			3,502,968	26,864,514

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: To improve the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island and surrounding islets by building national and local capacity to prevent, detect, control and manage Invasive Alien Species.						
Project Components/Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1. Emplace national IAS management framework to prevent terrestrial IAS entering Fiji	TA	<p><i>Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji, as measured by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAS of high risk to biodiversity prevented from entering Fiji, measured by increased score in the GEF IAS TT. • 20% increase in funding towards biosecurity in Fiji. • 100% risk assessment for all organisms proposed for import consistent with international standards • An increase in national and local capacity in detection, prevention and control of entry of high-risk IAS, measured by the UNDP 	<p>1.1 National inter-sectoral, multi-stakeholder institutional framework in place to serve as coordinating body for biosecurity activities throughout the country. Framework codified in national legislation. Coordinating committee established and forms rules for its operation.</p> <p>1.2 National Invasive Species Framework and Strategic Action Plan (NISFSAP) approved, indicating priority terrestrial ecosystems to protect, IAS species to control and internalizing climate risks.</p> <p>1.3 Capacity for surveillance,</p>	GEFTF	1,010,000	15,799,874

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#) and [CBIT programming directions](#).

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		Capacity Development Scorecard for BAF rising from 14 to at least 21.	<p>prevention, detection, monitoring and control of IAS strengthened consistent with biosecurity requirements and international standards.</p> <p>1.4 Potential economic impacts of selected IAS (including GII) on agriculture, forestry, health, livelihood and biodiversity including cost/benefit analysis of prevention measures (current and enhanced) evaluated, supporting the mobilization of long-term financing and stakeholder support for biosecurity.</p> <p>1.5 Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR system) developed and implemented on Viti Levu as a demonstration project for the country; experience gained from rapid detection efforts used to develop a national EDRR system.</p>			
2. System for inter-island IAS movement prevention and control demonstrated in order to protect vulnerable globally significant ecosystems on Taveuni Island and surrounding islets	TA	<p><i>Enhanced IAS prevention, surveillance and control operations prevent new introductions into Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala, Matagi (covering 47,897ha), as measured by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional establishment on Taveuni Island and surrounding islets of any IAS species listed in the Fiji black list as well as well as any high risk species already present in Fiji but not Taveuni. • Improved capacity and effective engagement of 100% of frontline staff (around 20 biosecurity, police, customs, agriculture, and forestry staff; of which 40% are women) in increased detection, prevention and control of entry of high risk IAS on the four islands. 	<p>2.1 Information on the IAS present on Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala collated in a database and island specific black lists of high-risk species established.</p> <p>2.2 System put in place for strengthened IAS prevention, surveillance inspection and quarantine services to prevent new introductions and spread of IAS into and between Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala.</p> <p>2.3 Training of key personnel (biosecurity officers, military, police, community members and sector stakeholders) conducted on best practices for inspection, control and management to prevent inter-island IAS spread.</p>	GEFTF	721,000	3,500,000

3. Eradication of invasive iguana or GII (<i>Iguana iguana</i>) in Taveuni Island and surrounding islets	TA	<p><i>Long-term protection of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity in the selected islands measured through:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No GIIs seen or captured on Taveuni during last year of project. • Reduction of GII numbers on the Qamea, Matagi and Laucala by 50% or more. • Stable or improved populations of native banded iguana (<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>) in areas previously occupied by GII (prior to eradication). • No/reduced community perceptions of damage to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII (prior to eradication). 	<p>3.1 Comprehensive survey and public outreach on four islands conducted to determine status of GII on Taveuni.</p> <p>3.2 Detailed plan for GII eradication and prevention of re-establishment developed and endorsed by government.</p> <p>3.3 GII eradication plan implemented simultaneously on all four islands with adequate staffing and funding and updated as needed.</p> <p>3.4 Survey of native banded iguana on island(s) conducted where GII are known to be established.</p> <p>3.5 Survey and assessment of local community perceptions of GII impacts on food crops and livelihoods, building understanding of current GII damage.</p>	GEFTF	1,203,000	3,000,000	
4. Knowledge management and awareness raising to address IAS	TA	<p><i>Increased awareness of risks posed by IAS and need for biosecurity of local communities, travelling public, tour operators, and shipping agents, as measured by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 50% of sampled tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents aware of potential adverse impacts of IAS and need for biosecurity. 	<p>4.1 Strengthened awareness of IAS issues among public developed nationally, following initial trialing in four island area.</p> <p>4.2 National IAS online clearinghouse and IAS database developed, improving collation, accessibility and use of IAS information.</p> <p>4.3. IAS best practices and project lessons learned are synthesized and shared among stakeholders.</p>	GEFTF	403,000	3,663,544	
Subtotal						3,337,000	25,963,418
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴					GEFTF	165,968	901,096
Total project costs						3,502,968	26,864,514

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	Biosecurity Authority of Fiji	Grant	9,063,064
Recipient Government	Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (BAF)	In-kind	6,000,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Environment	Grant	700,000
Recipient Government	Fiji Revenue and Customs Authority	Grant	1,763,981
Recipient Government	Fiji Revenue and Customs Authority	In-kind	661,373

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

Recipient Government	Fiji Airports Limited	Grant	6,300,000
Recipient Government	Fiji National University	Grant	2,275,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	101,096
Total Co-financing			26,864,514

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) ²	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEFTF	Fiji	Biodiversity		3,502,968	332,782	3,835,750
Total Grant Resources					3,502,968	332,782	3,835,750

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	47,897 hectares

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? N/A

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Fund) in Annex D.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

A.1 Project Description.

There are no major changes to the objectives, intention or scope of the project from the PIF stage. The relevance and feasibility of the proposed outcomes and outputs have been confirmed through additional expert review and through extensive consultations during the preparation phase of the project. Project indicators and targets have been refined to reflect on-ground practicalities and ecological considerations, in particular for Component 3 in relation to the eradication of giant invasive iguana (GII) from Qamea island.

The elaboration of the project description is summarized as follows. Invasive alien species (IAS) are the greatest threat to biodiversity in the Pacific Islands. Numerous IAS have been introduced to Fiji, with significant impacts on natural landscapes and biodiversity. The recent introduction of Giant Invasive Iguana – GII (*Iguana iguana*) – to Fiji represents the first established population of this species in the Pacific and is a potential bridgehead to some of the world's most isolated island ecosystems. GII have already caused harm throughout the Caribbean where they exist at exceptionally high densities and cause significant detrimental effects, including on biodiversity, agriculture and tourism. Although there are several national and local-level initiatives to address IAS in Fiji, these efforts, lack adequate capacity and an

⁵ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the Corporate Results Framework in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

overall comprehensive strategy to ensure a systematic and effective protection of biodiversity-rich and important areas. An effective, systematic and comprehensive eradication effort against GII, before populations grow beyond the point where they can be controlled, is currently lacking and urgently needed.

The preferred solution requires a suite of preventative measures to reduce IAS incursion and establishment that will be introduced by this project, including: (Component 1) Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji, including a comprehensive multi-sectorial coordination mechanism to ensure the best possible use of resources and capacities for prevention, management, eradication, awareness and restoration, and capacity building of biosecurity staff; (Component 2) Improved IAS prevention and surveillance operations at the island level on Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala to reduce potential for pest species to enter and establish within the four-island group and move between these islands; (Component 3) Implementation of a comprehensive eradication plan for GII based on comprehensive survey and public outreach on Taveuni and an increase in removal effort of GII on the islands of Qamea, Matagi, and Laucala; and (Component 4) Strengthened knowledge management and awareness raising that targets the general public, tour operators and visitors, so as to safeguard the nation from IAS. Components 1 and 4 will both operate at the national level, with components 2 and 3 operating sub-nationally at the four island area.

1) Global environmental problems, threats, root causes and barriers to be addressed.

There are no significant changes from the PIF, although all sections have been better detailed. The current and potential threat of IAS to Fiji has been further assessed and elaborated in response to STAP comments, including to note high risk IAS present in Fiji but not yet on Taveuni, and present elsewhere in the Pacific but not yet on Fiji. Please refer to *Section II Development challenge* (pages 6-12) in the UNDP Project Document for details.

2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.

There are no significant change from the PIF. However, *Section II Development challenge, baseline scenario* (pages 12-14) and *Section IV Results & partnerships, Parts (ii) Partnerships* and *(iii) Stakeholder engagement* (pages 37-42) of the UNDP Project Document identify a wider range of partners that would be involved in project implementation and include baseline initiatives (including baseline budget estimates) that will contribute to the results of the project.

3) Proposed alternative scenario, with brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

There are no significant changes from the PIF at the outcome level, with the exception of the fine-tuning of targets to better measure project impact. Some changes have been made at the output level based on the STAP comments on the PIF and the findings and recommendations of specialist IAS expertise engaged during project preparation. These changes aim to provide greater clarity of the focus of the project and what it can feasibly achieve within time and budget in alignment with best practice eradication approaches, and to define more logical distinction and sequencing of project outputs within and across the four project components.

In summary, Output 1.1 has been broken down into two outputs for better organization of interventions, namely Output 1.1 would remain (multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder institutional framework) and Output 1.2 will specifically address the preparation of a National Invasive Species Framework and Strategic Action Plan (NISFSAP) as a separate output, given its significance and priority for Fiji. Output 2.2 in the PIF (Early Detection and Rapid Response EDRR system for Taveuni Island and/or surrounding islets) will now be developed (as Output 1.5) on Viti Levu (rather than one of the four islands, where agency capacity and resources are limited) as it receives most new IAS incursions and it has the greatest concentration of agency and academic capacity needed to implement such a program. Once developed and perfected on Viti Levu, the EDRR model can be expanded to the remainder of Fiji. A new output (Output 2.1) has been added to Component 2 to develop a collated database of information on IAS on the four islands and preparation of island-specific black and white lists, necessary actions to ensure that information is available to the public (including biosecurity staff, importers and shipping agents) for their active engagement in the prevention of IAS entry and inter-island movement of IAS. Outcome 3 now includes three new outputs relating to survey and public outreach to determine status of GII on Taveuni (Output 3.1) and survey of native banded iguana (Output 3.4) and perceptions of

damage to livelihoods (Output 3.5), building evidence bases of the detrimental impacts of GII to inform policy, outreach and the on-ground roll-out of the eradication program. Outcome 4 includes two additional outputs, namely the development of a national on-line clearinghouse and database for IAS information (Output 4.2) and the documentation and sharing of best practices and lessons learned (Output 4.3), improving the emphasis on data and knowledge management. The wording of outputs and targets has also been fine-tuned and improved in response to STAP comments and the recommendations arising from specialist biosecurity and IAS eradication expertise engaged during PPG. Please refer to *Section VI Results & partnerships, Part (i) Expected results* (pages 17-37) of the UNDP Project Document for specific discussion of outcomes and outputs.

Major changes to project targets and outputs from the PIF and their rationale are summarized in the below table:

PIF	GEF CEO ER	Rationale
Component 1 (revised targets and outputs)		
<p><i>Outcome 1</i></p> <p><i>Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji, as measured by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IAS of high risk to biodiversity prevented from entering Fiji (as measured by increased score in the GEF IAS TT). - 20% increase in funding towards biosecurity in Fiji. 	<p><i>Outcome 1 (new targets)</i></p> <p><i>Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji, as measured by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IAS of high risk to biodiversity prevented from entering Fiji, measured by increased score in the GEF IAS TT. - 20% increase in funding towards biosecurity in Fiji. - 100% risk assessment for all organisms proposed for import consistent with international standards. - An increase in national and local capacity in detection, prevention and control of entry of high-risk IAS, measured by the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard for BAF rising from 14 to at least 21. 	<p>Two new outcome targets have been added to better articulate the depth of activity that will take place to strengthen IAS frameworks and systems at the national level.</p> <p>The target of achieving ‘100% risk assessment for all organisms proposed for import consistent with international standards’ emphasizes the importance of quarantine and understanding of potential invasion pathways and high-risk IAS. Related text under Output 1.1 in the PIF has been subsumed into activity level for the purposes of brevity.</p> <p>The target of increasing national institutional capacity, via the ‘UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard for BAF rising from 14 to at least 21’ by project end, has also been incorporated to highlight the importance of building nationwide capacity for IAS prevention and control, alongside the targeted capacity building of frontline staff in the four island area under Component 2.</p>
N/A	<p><i>Output 1.2 (new)</i></p> <p><i>National Invasive Species Framework and Strategic Action Plan (NISFSAP) approved, indicating priority terrestrial ecosystems to protect, IAS species to control and internalizing climate change.</i></p>	<p>At PIF stage, the establishment of a national IAS action plan was included as a subset of Output 1.1 to establish a multi-stakeholder institutional framework. This has since been separated, and the establishment of a national IAS action plan included as a specific output to clarify the logic of different outputs and to highlight the importance of a multi-sectorial, comprehensive IAS strategy and action plan to facilitate IAS prevention and management, ensuring that existing resources and capacity are used effectively and that capacity gaps are addressed in an effective and timely manner.</p>
<p><i>Output 1.3</i></p> <p><i>Study on the economic impacts of IAS on food security, livelihoods, health and biodiversity and production sectors and the cost/benefits of these vs prevention measures supports mobilizing long-term financing as a basis for</i></p>	<p><i>Output 1.4 (revised)</i></p> <p><i>Potential economic impacts of selected IAS (including GII) on agriculture, forestry, health, livelihood and biodiversity including cost/benefit analysis of prevention measures (current and enhanced) evaluated, supporting the mobilization of long-term financing and</i></p>	<p>At PIF stage, the project design included two separate, but related, assessments of potential damage from IAS (at national stage under Component 1, and at four island stage under Component 3 – originally envisaged to cover current and potential damage from GII). PPG findings confirmed a low likelihood of current GII damage, requiring a reconsideration of the project’s approach to these assessments. The national assessment of potential IAS economic impacts has been revised to also include the assessment of potential impacts of GII (relocated from Outcome 3) whereby potential GII impacts will be used as a case study (among other species) within the national assessment to build a business case to support long-term financing and government investment in biosecurity. Additionally, the assessments will in practice be most efficiently completed in parallel as they will draw on the same data and forecasts. The findings of the</p>

<p><i>brokering new public and donor financing for biosecurity.</i></p>	<p><i>stakeholder support for biosecurity.</i></p>	<p>assessment and information on potential economic impacts will also feed into outreach programs conducted at four island (Component 3; specifically using information from the GII case study) and national levels (Component 4; drawing on information from multiple case studies) to build stakeholder support and awareness of the need for biosecurity and the GII eradication program.</p>
<p>Component 2 (revised targets and outputs)</p>		
<p><i>Outcome 2</i></p> <p><i>Enhanced IAS prevention, surveillance and control operations prevent new introductions into Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala and Matagi (Covering 47,897 ha) as measured by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No upgrade or addition of threatened species from Taveuni Island and surrounding islets (Qamea, Matagi and Laucala) onto the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species as a result of IAS. - No additional establishment on Taveuni Island and surrounding islets of any IAS species listed in the Fiji black list as well as any high risk species already present in Fiji but not Taveuni. - Increase in capacity of Biosecurity Officers as measured by UNDP Capacity Development scorecard. 	<p><i>Outcome 2 (revised targets)</i></p> <p><i>Enhanced IAS prevention, surveillance and control operations prevent new introductions into Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala and Matagi (Covering 47,897 ha) as measured by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -No additional establishment on Taveuni Island and surrounding islets of any IAS species listed in the Fiji black list as well as any high risk species already present in Fiji but not Taveuni. - 100% of frontline staff (around 20 biosecurity, police, customs staff etc, of which 40% are women) trained and undertaking random inspections of passengers and goods at airports and cargo ports. 	<p>The target on measuring change in species listing and status on the IUCN Red List as a result of IAS is not considered to offer a practical target nor measurable indicator of the biodiversity benefit of the activities conducted under this project. While indeed strengthened biosecurity controls will help prevent the future introduction of high-risk IAS to Fiji and limit the spread of existing IAS – and their potential impacts on Fiji’s globally-significant biodiversity – such impacts are unlikely to be translated over the project term into a measurable change in the number or status of Taveuni endemic species on the IUCN Red List. This in part results from ecological considerations such that significant impacts of IAS native species, to the point where conservation status would become threatened, typically occur at very high IAS densities. The pilot eradication program under this project is to eradicate GII from islands <i>before</i> such impacts on native species become evident. For example, impacts of GII on the endangered native Fijian banded iguana (<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>) are not yet known (ref: IUCN Red List). There are also administrative challenges with the target such as the time lag in the process to list/uplist species. There may already be proposals in train for species on Taveuni that predate any impact of this project on strengthening IAS controls and management. Finally, listings typically include a comprehensive assessment of threats to a species conservation status and it would be difficult to prescribe any listings as a ‘result of IAS’ as envisaged in the target. Rather it is likely that any listings would be the result of a complex and interacting web of threats – among them IAS – but also including habitat fragmentation, loss and degradation, shifting fire patterns, and unsustainable use. An indicator of IUCN listings is therefore considered to have low sensitivity to detect and measure reduced biodiversity impacts from IAS brought about through this project. Preventing the establishment of any further IAS is considered a better measure of the strengthened biosecurity response that will be enabled by this project and has been retained as a target. A specific biodiversity response indicator to the GII eradication efforts in the four island area is included under Component 3.</p> <p>The target on biosecurity capacity has been made more specific to the four islands area by emphasizing the critical importance of quarantine and frontline staff being effectively trained and conducting routine inspections of passengers and goods to prevent IAS movement. The UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard, considered to provide the best measure of overall national capacity, has been shifted to a target of national capacity development (Output 1.3) under Component 1.</p>
<p><i>N/A</i></p>	<p><i>Output 2.1 (new)</i></p> <p><i>Information on the IAS present on Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala collated in a database and island-specific black lists of high-risk species established.</i></p>	<p>This has been introduced as a separate output to more logically set out the different elements of achieving effective biosecurity in the four island area and to emphasize the importance of black lists for IAS prevention and management to allow local importers, exporters and travellers to understand and comply with measures to reduce inter-island movement of high risk IAS.</p>
<p><i>Output 2.2</i></p> <p><i>Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR system) developed and implemented at the selected islands to prevent establishment and impacts of IAS; experience gained from rapid detection efforts used to develop a</i></p>	<p><i>Output 1.4 (revised, relocated)</i></p> <p><i>Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR system) developed and implemented on Viti Levu as a demonstration project for the country; experience gained from rapid detection efforts used to develop a national EDRR system.</i></p>	<p>The PIF envisaged the piloting of the EDRR system in the four island area. PPG investigations however identified that Viti Levu is the logical location to initiate EDRR in Fiji as it receives most new IAS incursions and it has the greatest concentration of agency and academic capacity needed to implement such a program. Once developed and perfected on Viti Levu, the EDRR model can be expanded to the remainder of Fiji.</p> <p>This will also allow for the parallel development and strengthening of different approaches emphasizing the importance of prevention and early action in different parts of Fiji, ultimately generating more lessons learned, capacity and framework systems that can be deployed across Fiji. Actions in Component 2 will focus on building capacity and the establishment of minimum biosecurity standards in the four island area, where capacity and resources are currently very</p>

national EDRR system.		limited.
Component 3 (revised targets and outputs)		
<p><i>Outcome 3</i></p> <p><i>Long-term natural restoration of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity in the selected islands measured through:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Eradication of GII from Qamea island resulting in 3,400 ha of habitat that is GII free. - Stable populations of the banded iguana (<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>) across 47,897 ha (Taveuni and surrounding islets; stable or possibly increasing on Qamea). -Increased or stable food security. 	<p><i>Outcome 3 (revised targets)</i></p> <p><i>Long-term protection of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity in the selected islands measured through:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No GII seen or captured on Taveuni during last year of project. -Reduction of GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala by 50% or more. - Stable or improved populations of native banded iguana (<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>) in areas previously occupied by GII (prior to eradication). - No/reduced community perception of damage to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII (prior to eradication). 	<p>The targets for Outcome 3 have been revised to better reflect best practice IAS eradication strategies and the knowledge obtained on current distribution and extent of impacts of GII (both known and unknown) during project development.</p> <p>First, a new target “<i>No GIIs seen or captured on Taveuni during last year of project</i>” has been added to highlight the pivotal importance of making/keeping Taveuni GII-free if the long-term protection of the area’s biodiversity is to be secured. Since the status of GII on the larger island of Taveuni remains unknown (only 4-5 verifiable records have been recorded in the past 7 years), determining this status (and subsequently eradicating any iguanas from Taveuni) is the highest priority for the project. In turn the status of GII on Taveuni also determines the best available options for managing the GII invasion. If a single small population of GII were discovered on Taveuni, eradication of that population would be the highest priority and therefore the target is to have no GII seen or captured on Taveuni by the end of project. However, if no iguanas are discovered on Taveuni, that would suggest that populations remain confined to Qamea, Matagi, and Laucala, and eradication of GI from those islands would be the highest priority. The wording of the target has been chosen to reflect the current unknown status of GII invasion on Taveuni and provide an appropriate target in either situation.</p> <p>Second, and in parallel with the above change, the eradication target has been revised to “<i>Reduce GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala by 50% or more</i>”. Originally this target was focussed on eradicating GII from Qamea alone. However, eradicating GII from Qamea while leaving populations established on Matagi and Laucala would pose a risk to the success of the project and the sustainability of eradication efforts, as the remaining GII populations would soon recolonize Qamea. Instead, to maximize success, eradication will proceed across all three known infested islands simultaneously. The target has therefore been revised to focus on reducing GII numbers on all three islets known to have GII populations. The broadened eradication efforts, and the practical reality of fully eradicating GII by the end of the project have informed the revised target of reducing GII populations on the three islands by 50% or more (based on the baselines established in Year 1 using eradication removal rates). The elusiveness and difficulty of locating GII in the rocky terrain and heavily vegetated slopes of Qamea, Matagi and Laucala, will require a large, coordinated, and competently planned and executed eradication operation over many years until the very last elusive GII are captured. It is likely that full eradication may require search and eradication efforts to continue for up to or over 10 years as the only certainty of full eradication will come if there are no reports or sightings of GII for many years. The revised target of achieving a 50% reduction also indicates that eradication efforts will need to continue beyond the project term and that the government will need to vigorously pursue continued eradication efforts until it can be confirmed that GII have been fully eradicated. BAF recognizes and has committed to this longer-term commitment.</p> <p>The biodiversity response target has been revised to “<i>Stable or improved populations of native banded iguana (Brachylophus bulabula) in areas previously occupied by GII on islands</i>”. This minor revision better aligns the target with project activities, and will provide useful information on the impacts of GII on native iguanas which are currently unknown. The target has also been revised to anticipate the same biodiversity response across all three islets in response to the standardization of eradication efforts.</p> <p>The final target has been revised to “<i>No/reduced community perceptions of damage to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII (prior to eradication)</i>”. There are currently few reported impacts of damage or impact of GII on food security. Experience elsewhere indicates that visible damage will not be obvious until GII population numbers are far beyond possible control (e.g. tens or hundreds of thousands). Without a plausible link between GII populations and food security, it would be difficult to use the PIF target to measure the impact of the project. The target has been changed to a more sensitive measure of detecting change in GII impacts, by instead achieving a reduction in community perceptions of damage and impact from GII. This change will allow for a broader</p>

		range of potential impacts of GII to be assessed, providing useful information on the impacts and interaction of GII with local livelihoods. It will also indirectly also support outreach efforts by engaging villagers in discussions about the invasive status of GII and the potential impacts being observed. The revised target will be supported by a new Output 3.5 to develop and implement a standardized system for understanding and measuring community perceptions of GII impact.
N/A	<u>Output 3.1 (new)</u> <i>Comprehensive survey and public outreach on four islands conducted to determine status of GII on Taveuni.</i>	As the status of GII on Taveuni remains unknown, determining its status is the highest priority because it in turn determines the available options for eradicating GII and indicates where eradication efforts need to be deployed on Taveuni (if at all). This output will therefore assess whether iguanas have successfully become established on Taveuni or not, through the implementation of two simultaneous strategies: (i) a comprehensive public outreach program that will endeavor to reach every community on the island so as to enlist the help of as great a percentage of the population to report all iguana sightings; and (ii) project staff survey likely iguana nesting areas to assess presence or absence of GII on the island. Outreach to raise awareness of GII will spread across the four-island area.
<i>Output 3.2</i> <i>Detailed plan, including detailed costings (using above studies), for GII eradication and prevention of re-establishment for Fiji developed.</i> <i>-Eradication of GII on Qamea island implemented.</i> <i>-Intensive control and containment measures implemented on Taevuni, Laucala and Matagi islands to prevent re-entry of GII to Qamea and spread to other islands.</i>	<i>Split into two outputs:</i> <u>Output 3.2</u> <i>Detailed plan for GII eradication and prevention of re-establishment developed and endorsed by government.</i> <u>Output 3.3</u> <i>GII eradication plan implemented simultaneously on all four islands with adequate staffing and funding, and updated as needed.</i>	This development and implementation of a well-planned and resourced eradication plan is pivotal for the overall success of the eradication of GII. These were originally included in the PIF in the one output. To more clearly outline the logic and sequencing of different elements in response to STAP comments, it has been separated into two distinct, yet equally important, outputs. Successfully eradicating GII from the four islands will require a well-coordinated effort, extending beyond the term of this project, and requiring long-term government commitment. The PIF output has been split into two parts to i) recognize the crucial importance of obtaining government endorsement of the proposed eradication plan; ii) emphasize the importance of deploying a well-coordinated and competently planned and executed eradication operation across the four islands in parallel. The revision of the focus from eradication on Qamea to all known infested islets in parallel has also been incorporated to match the revised target described earlier in accordance with best practice eradication strategies.
N/A	<u>Output 3.4 (new)</u> <i>Survey of native banded iguana on island(s) conducted where GII are known to be established.</i>	Currently, the presence of any impacts of GII invasion on native iguana population size and distribution is unknown. A specific output has been added to recognize the importance of building this evidence base through standardized and repeatable survey techniques, allowing for any change in native iguana populations as GII are eradicated from the four island area to be detected. This also responds to STAP comments to improve the logic and clarity of outputs under Component 3.
<i>Output 3.1</i> <i>Survey and assessment to determine both the costs of damage already caused by GII to livelihoods, food security, health and biodiversity, as well as the projected future costs. Then an economic study to determine cost of eradication of GII from Qamea, Laucala, Matagi vs. the costs of current and projected future damage with no control or eradication to build the evidence base for eradication and</i>	<u>Output 3.5 (revised)</u> <i>Survey and assessment of local community perceptions of GII impacts on food crops and livelihoods, building understanding of current GII damage.</i>	This output has been revised based on the limited evidence of current damage from GII observed during PPG investigations and visits to the four island area. An economic assessment of current damage may not provide much useful information given that it appears that visible damage has not yet occurred. Further, experience elsewhere suggests that such damage will not be obvious until GII numbers are far beyond current levels and possible control (e.g. tens or hundreds of thousands). However, obtaining a better understanding of any current GII impacts or <i>perceptions</i> of GII impacts – alongside a more detailed understanding of potential impacts should populations explode – remain important. The output has therefore been revised to better reflect the current situation and status of impacts, to a survey and assessment of community perceptions of impacts of GII on food crops and livelihoods particularly in areas that GII are known to occur. The second half of the original output – the economic study on projected future impacts of GII and an indication of the costs/benefit of eradication versus future damage with no control will be completed as part of the economic study under Output 1.4.

<i>secure stakeholder support for eradication.</i>		
Component 4 (revised outputs)		
N/A	<u>Output 4.2 (new)</u> <i>National IAS online clearinghouse and IAS database developed, improving collation, accessibility and use of IAS information.</i>	The development of an online public access IAS clearinghouse and IAS database has been included as a separate output to emphasize the need for improved collation, accessibility and use of IAS information to build awareness and inform policy. The clearinghouse will improve public access to information on IAS, their current impacts, and ways to support prevention. The national IAS database will support IAS prevention and management across multi-sectorial efforts and allow both managers and policy makers to better understand IAS and improve development and implementation of regulations, policy and field actions throughout the country. This also responds to STAP comments about the absence of knowledge management from Component 4 as presented in the PIF.
N/A	<u>Output 4.3 (new)</u> <i>IAS best practices and project lessons learned are synthesized and shared among stakeholders.</i>	This introduces a specific output on knowledge management which was missing from the original PIF, covering the sharing of best practices and the establishment of a community of practice on IAS management in Fiji. This increases alignment to the GEF-6 focus on knowledge management and responds to STAP comments about the absence of knowledge management from Component 4.

4) *Incremental cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF and cofinancing.*

5) *Global environmental benefits*

Section III Strategy and Section IV Results & partnerships, i) Expected results of the UNDP Project Document, including articulation of the baseline and GEF alternative for the four components, have been clarified and improved in response to STAP comments. These are detailed on pages 17-37 of the UNDP Project Document and briefly summarized as follows:

- *Component 1 will strengthen national IAS frameworks, policy, coordination and capacity:* Without the project, biosecurity for Fiji will remain at or around its current level with some improvements over time, but without a clear comprehensive strategy or coverage, or comprehensive legislation to advance biosecurity. The GEF increment will provide technical support, training and equipment for strengthening pre-border, border and post-border biosecurity, compilation of IAS information for Fiji and development of a national IAS strategy and action plan and strengthened biosecurity legislation, development of black and white lists of organisms and guidelines for determining such lists, development of a BAF multi-year strategy, development of a national-level Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) program trialed in Viti Levu, capacity building of biosecurity officers and cross training of front-line staff from other front-line agencies to help improve biosecurity inspection services at key national and domestic seaports and airports, and improving understanding of potential economic impacts of IAS. Government co-financing support from BAF and other agencies will finance the improvement of inspection services at international and domestic airports and seaports, improved incineration facilities and upgrading of laboratory facilities, improved detection and inspections, rapid response measures, and additional staff.
- *Component 2 will put in place effective systems to prevent introduction and spread of IAS in the four island area:* Without the project, biosecurity for Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala will remain at current limited levels or will be improved slowly in a piecemeal fashion with no overall comprehensive strategy. Surveillance and quarantine and inspection procedures and facilities will remain limited, with no random inspections and limited staff capacity. The GEF increment will provide technical support and equipment for development of a collated database of information on IAS on the four-islands site and preparation of island-specific black and white lists, technical support and training for improving IAS prevention and management capacities in the four-islands site, and technical support for improving biosecurity at all ports, jetties, wharfs and landing. Improved training in all aspects of biosecurity services for front-line inspectors as well as other agency staff on the four islands will provide for more comprehensive inspection/quarantine services at ports of entry and improved detection of arriving pests. Government co-financing will support the above actions on a long-term basis through the establishment of a four island multi-sectoral IAS taskforce, improved biosecurity staff and facilities, vehicles and communication equipment, quarantine and incineration facilities, veterinary services, vehicle and watercraft sanitation facilities, and enhanced inspections of inter-island domestic cargo and passengers.

- *Component 3 will develop and implement a well-planned and best practice eradication program for GII in the four island area:* Without the project, it is likely that the GII would not be eradicated from Fiji, and that impacts and damage to food crops, livelihoods, biodiversity and tourism would start to be felt as populations increased. Without eradication from the four island group, it would only be a matter of time before GII became widespread throughout Fiji and potentially nearby Pacific nations. This GEF increment will allow for an immediate program of comprehensive survey and public outreach on Taveuni and an increase in the search effort and take rate of GII on the islands of Qamea, Matagi, and Laucala, through the provision of international technical support and access to new techniques, training and technology to support eradication efforts (e.g. use of trained detector dogs, use of small-caliber rifles, thermal imaging, night vision, infrared technology). It will also build evidence bases of the impacts of GII on livelihoods and biodiversity. To achieve eradication, the Government of Fiji will significantly increase its efforts and commitment immediately (finding eradication teams, office space and operational costs) and sustain that commitment through to final eradication, a period likely to be ten years or more. GEF funding will supplement this co-financing, providing the accelerated effort needed to quickly depress GII numbers over the next five critical years and provide essential access to best practice eradication techniques and tools.
- *Component 4 will build national awareness and stakeholder support for biosecurity and improve the collation and use of biosecurity information:* Without the project, Fiji will remain under-capacitated because existing knowledge and information are not readily accessible to all stakeholders. IAS and biosecurity outreach efforts will remain limited with no coordinated programmatic approach, and public engagement will remain low. The GEF increment will allow for the establishment of national public and visitor awareness and outreach campaigns, the creation and maintenance of an online public access IAS clearing-house and the establishment of a national IAS database. Recognition that IAS impacts everyone at all levels will ensure that prevention and management efforts receive public and government support, ensuring their continuance and maximizing their effectiveness. Co-financing will support the coordination and dissemination of outreach programs developed with GEF funds.

Budget allocations across the four project components have been adjusted from the PIF levels based on the PPG results and the detailed articulation of activities. The project length has also been extended from 48 to 60 months, due to the complex nature of interacting activities being delivered by the project and the need to practically schedule these for implementation. This also better reflects the time required to put in place technically-sound and competent eradication teams and programs, and to ensure the overall success of the project at meeting GII eradication targets by project end. However, these budgetary amendments do not change the focus of the project.

The total amount of co-financing committed has increased from the PIF, rising from USD 14,260,093 to USD 26,864,514. A greater number of co-financiers has been identified and the contributions have been fine-tuned. The increase in co-financing from PIF reflects the broader identification of aligned efforts and activities across the full spectrum of biosecurity and IAS management. The commitment of multiple agencies within the Government of Fiji with a mandate related to biosecurity is now better indicated. Aligned efforts of tertiary research institutions have also been captured. In terms of GII eradication under Component 3, the Government of Fiji will co-finance the actual eradication effort, with GEF providing technical support, training and specialized eradication equipment and techniques. The Government of Fiji will also fund the continuation of eradication and search efforts on the four island area beyond the project term until GII is confirmed as fully eradicated, supporting project sustainability and impact. Further detail is provided in *Section IX Financial planning & management* (page 63) of the UNDP Project Document.

Global environmental benefits have been assessed in more detail, and better articulated to show the end-of-project and longer-term benefits generated. The revised incremental cost reasoning and benefits are presented in the table below:

Baseline Practices	Alternative to be put in place by the project	Selected environmental and development benefits
NATIONAL LEVEL		
There is a lack of a national coordinating mechanism for IAS resulting in inefficient and ad hoc approaches to IAS	Multi-agency IAS national coordinating mechanism results in more efficient and effective actions to address IAS the best possible use of resources and capacities and likewise ensuring the best possible outcomes, including: prevention, management,	IAS of high risk to biodiversity, food security, livelihoods, health, tourism and trade prevented from entering Fiji resulting in reduced threats to endemic and threatened species within Fiji including <i>Pseadobulweria macgillivrayi</i> , <i>Charmosyna amabilis</i> ,

	eradication, awareness and restoration as needed and when feasible.	<i>Lamprolia victoriae</i> , <i>Mayrornis versicolor</i> , <i>Clytorhynchus nigrogularis</i> , <i>Emoia parkeri</i> , <i>Ogmodon vitianus</i> , <i>Brachylophus fasciatus</i> , <i>Brachylophus bulabula</i> and <i>Brachylophus vitiensis</i> .
There is a lack of a clear national comprehensive framework or strategy or coverage, or comprehensive legislation to advance biosecurity. The lack of a IAS multi-party planning document resulting in an under-capacitated IAS management system that does not support synergistic, multi-party use of resources including cross-agency planning and action implementation	A national invasive species framework strategic action plan (NISFSAP) guides and support efforts throughout the country to comprehensively and strategically address IAS issues and concerns, including developing a pathway forward toward addressing prioritized IAS issues at both the national and local levels.	Increased awareness of travelling public, tourism operators, importers and shipping agents of the risks posed by IAS and the need for biosecurity reduces risk of new introductions of IAS resulting in reduced threats to endemic and threatened species including among others the species mentioned above, as well as reduced threats to food security, livelihoods, health, tourism and trade.
No system for Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) plan for any locations within the country. This lack of EDRR planning, established resources, and EDRR protocols currently prevents Fiji from responding adequately and effectively to new IAS incursions into the country, allowing populations to grow to the point where they are very difficult to impossible to eradicate and control	Improved capacity to both detect and respond to non-native species that may arrive within the country through an IAS Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) mechanism, initially trialed on Viti Levu, allows multi-sectorial partners to gain experience working collaboratively to detect, identify, and remove incipient pest populations, and it will allow for barriers and limitations in the system to be identified and corrected before expanding the program nationwide.	Increase in funding towards Biosecurity in Fiji further reduces risk of alien introductions which in turn results in reduced threats to endemic and threatened species including among others the species mentioned above, as well as reduced threats to food security, livelihoods, health, tourism and trade.
Inadequate information on which are the highest risk IAS to native biodiversity, food security, livelihoods, health, trade and tourism and the pathways by which they enter the country results in introductions of high risk IAS	Risk assessments of risk priority IAS for biodiversity, food security, livelihoods, health, trade and tourism and official blacklist (prohibition of high risk imports) and improved pre-border and border biosecurity screening with anticipated 60% compliance with risk assessments instituted in the second year of project implementation, reaching 100% risk assessments for all organisms proposed for importation overtime (by end of project).	Increased national and local capacity in detection, prevention and control of entry of high risk IAS.
Lack of adequate biosecurity inspection services, particularly for domestic flights and domestic watercraft inspections and googs pose a high potential for new non-native species to spread further within the country	Improved tools and more comprehensive pre-border and border biosecurity programs for the country, including internal borders, will reduce the potential for unwanted non-native species to enter and establish within the country or portions of the country for those IAS which are already established but not wide spread.	
Lack of comprehensive IAS informational sources at the national level and awareness ensures that the prevention, management and awareness of IAS in Fiji is under capacitated as existing knowledge and information not readily accessible to all stakeholders	Change in attitudes and understanding that IAs impact everyone at all levels will ensure that prevention and management efforts are maximized and effective. Public access details regarding established IAS and their current impacts as well as IAS of high risk of establishing and their prevention will facilitate biosecurity. Improved training in all aspects of biosecurity services for frontline will provide for more comprehensive inspection/quarantine services at ports of entry at international entry points and domestic and will greatly improve safeguarding for pest already established in various locations but as of yet not spread nationwide.	
SITE LEVEL (Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala)		
No source of comprehensive information exists for IAS on these islands, making it difficult, if not impossible, to fully manage established IAS, to develop EDRR capacity or to prevent incursions of new species.	IAS database specific to each four island with known established invasives and relative range and population sizes, attempted and ongoing management actions, including back and white lists and species considered endemic/native generates support among general public, including tourists and transport operators, of	No additional establishment on Taveuni and surrounding islets of any IAS species listed in Fiji black list as well as any high risk species already present in Fiji, but not in taveuni or surrounding islets.

	the cost-effectiveness of a pro-active biosecurity approach to prevent the inter-island spread of invasives.	Strengthened measures for prevention of entry of IAS of high risk to biodiversity and economic sectors into Taveuni and surrounding islets in place.
Inadequate IAS prevention surveillance, monitoring, early detection and control measures at inter-island level results in established IAS spreading to further islands of Fiji threatening remaining populations of globally significant biodiversity as well as food security, livelihoods, health and trade.	Additional facilities, improved resources, increased workforce and trained workforce enhances prevention, surveillance, management and control , and reduces inter-island movement and spread of high risk IAS. Established four-island IAS Taskforce (FIIT) enhances use of resources and capacities for prevention, management, eradication, and control of spread of IAS.	Increase in capacity of frontline Officers (Biosecurity, Police, Customs, Agriculture and Forestry) in prevention, control, and management of IAS in the four islands. Significant reduction (50% from baseline to be established in Year 1) of GII populations from Qamea, Laucala and Matagi islands, and on the longer-term (10 years) total eradication from these three islands resulting in 4,717 ha of habitat that is GII free. Total eradication of GII from Taveuni island covering 43,400 ha of habitat that is GII free Reduced threats to endemic and threatened species such banded iguana (<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>) and other species such as <i>Alopecoenas stari</i> and <i>Chamosyna amabilis</i> . Reduced risk of impacts on local food security and livelihoods.
The lack of an effective, systematic and comprehensive eradication effort to exterminate GII, enables GII to proliferate through the islands where it is found now, impacting the native Fiji banded-iguana and other threatened biodiversity in Taveuni and surrounding islets, as well as local food security, livelihoods, health, tourism and risking spread to other islands, where it will have significantly serious impacts on the economy of the country.	A strategic and tactical GII eradication and prevention of re-establishment plan ensure cost-effective eradication and prevention of re-establishment, recovery of global biodiversity and greater local food security in the four islands that brings greater national economic benefits in preventing GII spread through the country.	

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and scaling up

The project’s innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up have been described in detail. A summary is outlined below. Please refer to *Section V Feasibility, Part (iv) Sustainability & scaling up* (pages 48-50) of the UNDP Project document for more detail.

Innovative aspects: Fiji’s move from an agricultural-based quarantine program to a more holistic biosecurity approach is an innovative and modern approach to managing IAS that is rarely seen in the developing world. Further, this biosecurity program was initially developed largely to address international travel and goods, but it is now being extended to inter-island transport as well, which is also practiced in a few countries. The EDRR system to be developed and tested at Viti Levu through this investment is a new approach for Fiji, but is critical for any comprehensive biosecurity program. It too is innovative, and would set Fiji apart as a leader in biosecurity protection. The creation of a national multi-stakeholder and multi-sector coordination mechanism for biosecurity activities will ensure that resources and capacity are being used as effectively as possible.

The GII eradication activities under Component 3 represent a pioneering effort to remove an invasive reptilian species before it reaches levels at which it will be impossible to eradicate and likely to result in significant and irreparable damage to biodiversity, livelihoods, and agriculture and tourism sectors. This is a very forward-looking strategy for a developing nation to take and reflects the commitment that the Fijian Government has to improving its biosecurity. If successful, this would perhaps be the first reptile eradication in the world, and that precedent would provide good lessons for other countries interested in proactively responding to reptilian IAS invasions.

Financial and institutional sustainability: The Government of Fiji is fully committed to protecting the country from the introduction of IAS, as is made clear through the establishment of a separate statutory agency for biosecurity. Placement of BAF under the Ministry of Economy, Public Enterprises, Public Services and Communication promotes institutional sustainability for biosecurity activities because this ministry has a well-established revenue collection mechanism to improve and expand overall biosecurity in the country. The annual revenue generated by BAF is currently around USD 4 million, and this is likely to grow further as BAF’s outreach expands. These revenues are used to improve biosecurity

detection, surveillance and monitoring systems. The government commitment is further demonstrated by the fact that BAF has over 200 front-line officers with facilities at all international ports (sea and air) and on-going services at all major domestic seaports. What is more, they have initiated efforts to respond to GII and other invaders within the country and have modern supportive legislation in the form of the 2008 Biosecurity Promulgation.

The long-term commitment of the government to biosecurity provides very positive signs for sustainability of project impact. This is further evidenced by the fact that BAF and its partners are committed to increase staff and resources for GII eradication in the four-island site, expand biosecurity activities to include inter-island transport, upgrade and expand existing scanning and incineration facilities at international and domestic airports and seaports, improve detection and surveillance measures, and improve risk management and information exchange as a long-term commitment from the government. The intent of the GEF alternative is to complement existing government activities by helping to build the capacity of existing public institutions (particularly that of BAF and its partner agencies such as AFL and FRCA and the local communities) to work in integrated ways to reduce the threat of IAS, and explore public-private partnership and cost-recovery opportunities to strengthen IAS management in Fiji. The project will further strengthen existing alliances, and build new ones, for IAS exclusion, control and management and consequently the conservation of Fiji's rich biodiversity. The project also focuses on supporting BAF's current business model on biosecurity which allows for channeling revenues to other islands that were not part of the initial biosecurity focus and management of BAF.

To facilitate long-term sustainability of the existing biosecurity activities in the country, the project will ensure:

- Improved cost-recovery system, public-private partnerships and financial mechanisms to cover biosecurity activities in Fiji.
- Tailored training and capacity-building to expand the skills of biosecurity staff within and outside BAF.
- The introduction and adoption of new technologies and tools for detection, surveillance and eradication of IAS.
- The establishment of new and strengthened collaborations for comprehensive IAS management and control, including through establishment of a national coordinating body for IAS, reconstitution of FIST, preparation of NISFSAP, risk assessment and data management and sharing.
- Outreach and awareness programs delivered at four island and national levels in parallel to build local community and stakeholder support and responsibility for biosecurity and IAS eradication, based on the core message of "IAS and biosecurity is everyone's responsibility".

Potential for scale-up: The EDRR system developed and tested at Viti Levu through this investment will be replicated elsewhere in Fiji until it becomes national in scope. BAF will integrate the lessons learned from demonstrating the EDRR system and IAS management in islands into its information management systems and share the results nationally to promote replication at other sites during and after the project. In addition, the project will address measures to reduce or eliminate risky practices in key pathway sectors and will develop practical experience for IAS management by implementing IAS strategic programs at selected sites encompassing high-priority ecosystems, such as Taveuni. These will enable the Government of Fiji to determine cost effective IAS management practices over the long-term and provide models for replication.

Capacity building at BAF, the development of the NISFSAP, and the expansion of BAF's multi-year strategy and outreach program will strongly support further up-scaling. The involvement of NGOs, private enterprises and local communities is also expected to lead to further support and commitment to up-scaling of the project's actions and successes. Improvement in capacity, awareness and regulatory frameworks will ensure post-project sustainability and encourage investments from public and private sector in biosecurity control and management, also contributing to up-scaling.

A.2. Child Project: N/A

A.3. Stakeholders

The project included a wide range of consultations during the PPG stage. Initial stakeholder analysis during the PIF stage was followed up with broader consultation on the design and stakeholder expectations of the project. During the

PPG stage, the stakeholder analysis was updated and elaborated following consultations undertaken by the PPG team with institutional stakeholders with statutory mandates related to biosecurity in Fiji, and non-governmental stakeholders (NGOs and tertiary institutions) and local communities and stakeholders (e.g. hoteliers) in the four islands GII eradication zone. A stakeholder validation workshop was held in August 2016 in Suva to obtain the perspectives of the different stakeholders to the proposed strategy to address IAS issues in the country, and in particular, to the eradication of the GII from the four islands. Additionally, a formal stakeholder analysis was undertaken by the PPG team and a Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP) included in *Section IV Results & partnerships, Part (iii) Stakeholder engagement* (pages 38-43) of the UNDP Project Document.

Identification of potential stakeholders: The SIP was prepared by identifying those stakeholders that would be involved as partners in the project. Stakeholders at national, island, and local levels - including relevant government ministries such as Environment, Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, iTaukei Affairs, Health, Lands and Education and their respective line agencies such as Department of Environment, AFL, FRCA, Fiji Police, Maritime Safety Authority and Northern Division Offices of various Ministries and Departments, NGOs, academic institutions, hoteliers and resort owners, and local communities. These stakeholders will have specific roles to play in implementing the project, as identified and discussed during the PPG phase and summarized in Table 2 of the Project Document.

Role and responsibilities of key stakeholders and their involvement mechanisms and strategies: Mechanisms and strategies for stakeholder involvement will ensure that relevant shareholders receive and share information, provide input in the planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of project initiatives, and play a role in sustaining the initiatives during and following the closure of the project. In particular, the multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral national coordination mechanism (Fiji Invasive Species Task Force, FIST) will provide an opportunity for broad stakeholder participation in IAS management and biosecurity in the country, including development of NISFSAP and EDRR system. Through an extensive outreach program in the four islands, communities, resort owners, tour operators and general public will become aware of the long-term threat to their livelihood, health and economy and become partners in the prevention, detection and eradication of IAS.

Further, BAF will be instrumental in establishing coordinative and collaborative links with key government and non-government partners and other stakeholders during the implementation of the project. To the extent necessary, BAF will collaborate with the Taveuni and Government District Committees to promote outreach and galvanize broad local and community support for eradication of the GII from Taveuni and surrounding islands.

Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders have been revised from the PIF and are summarized in the table below:

Key Stakeholder	Role and responsibilities	Role in the project	Involvement mechanisms and strategies
Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (BAF)	Key government agency responsible for biosecurity in Fiji. Is involved with monitoring, prevention, control and eradication, as well as promoting biosecurity among the different sectors in the country, coordination of biosecurity actions, training, establishing regulations and standards, community outreach and awareness creation.	Implementing Partner.	Chair of Project Board Convene inception workshop. Member of national IAS committee Chairmanship and convener of Fiji Invasive Species Taskforce (FIST) Development of stakeholder outreach program.
Ministry of Economy, Public Enterprises, Public Services and Communication	Responsible for overseeing reform and monitoring of public enterprises to facilitate improvement in services to the public. Ministry under which BAF falls.	Responsible for budgetary and staffing aspects related to BAF.	Inception workshop. Member of Project Board (including BAF representation). Member of national IAS committee.
Ministry of Industry, Trade and Tourism	Tourism and trade promotion entity of the Fijian government.	Creation of awareness in the tourism and trade sectors on IAS issues.	Inception workshop. Member of national IAS committee.
Ministry of	Responsible for maintaining food security through extension and research services for livestock and crops,	Its National Disaster Management Office can be	Member of national IAS committee.

Agriculture	commodity projects, building capacity of farmers to increase production, sustainable management of natural resources through flood protection and sustainable land management.	potential lead partner for rapid response action relating to IAS.	Member of FIST (Fiji Quarantine and Inspection Division).
Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry	Responsible for the formulation and implementation of policies to promote best practice in Fisheries and Forestry sector.	Important partner for ensuring prevention of entry of forest pests into the country, undertakes pest risk analysis for incoming seeds and plants for BAF.	Inception workshop. Member of national IAS committee. Member of FIST (Department of Forests, Department of Fisheries).
Ministry of <i>iTaukei</i> Affairs	Responsible for developing, maintaining and promoting policies that will provide for the continued good governance and welfare of the itaukei or native people in the country. The Ministry operates at the district and provincial level.	Support for community awareness and outreach, particularly at local level and with communities in four-island area.	Inception workshop. Member of national IAS committee. Member of FIST. Development of stakeholder outreach program. Participation in GII eradication outreach in four island sites.
Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Environment	Focused on legislative reviews, urban planning and managing the impacts of rapid urbanization, municipal reforms, fire protection and disaster management, and control and regulation of land use.	Department of Environment provides overall environmental guidance and oversight, monitoring and reporting to various conventions and international agreements.	Inception workshop. Member of Project Board. Member of national IAS committee. Member of FIST. Reporting to GEF. Development of stakeholder outreach program.
Ministry of Health and Medical Services	Overseas management and control of IAS related health diseases.	Awareness raising and training on health-related IAS concerns.	Inception workshop. Member of national IAS committee.
Ministry of Education	Ministry of Education is concerned with broad policy issues on all aspects of education and ensuring that available resources are judiciously allocated and put to optimum use to ensure that relevance and quality of education provided at all levels of the education system particularly in rural areas.	Supporting awareness by including IAS in all levels of curriculum.	Inception workshop. Participation in training activities. Development of stakeholder outreach program.
Ministry of Defense, Police and Military	Maintaining law and order and upholding rule of law effectively.	Enforcing and strengthening collaboration with BAF in biosecurity measures.	Inception workshop. Member of FIST. Training of GII eradication teams in use of firearms.
Fiji Revenue and Customs Authority (FRCA)	Responsible for enforcement of control of imports and exports from the country, including IAS and pests, in collaboration with BAF.	Collaboration with BAF to enhance enforcement of biosecurity regulations at borders.	Inception workshop. Member of FIST. Participation in training activities.
Airports Fiji Limited (AFL)	Responsible for control and management of travellers into and within Fiji, including biosecurity related issues in collaboration with BAF.	Collaboration with BAF to enhance enforcement of biosecurity regulations at borders.	Inception workshop. Participation in training activities.
Northern Division Offices of Agriculture, Environment, <i>iTaukei</i> , Forests, Fisheries, etc.	Providing extension support for ministerial activities at the division level.	Participate in related activities at four islands.	Members of Four Island IAS Taskforce (FIIT). Development of local outreach program. Participate in related activities at four islands including training.
Resort Owners on four island site	Operate and runs resorts on the islands of Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala, and responsible for tourist lodging, recreation and food.	Collaboration with BAF and GII eradication teams in undertaking biosecurity measures.	Regular consultations, meetings, and information sharing. Staff participation in outreach activities and training and communication on GII sightings. Members of Four Island IAS Taskforce (FIIT).

Local communities on four island sites	Mainly farmers, skilled workers, local government staff, small-business persons, etc.	Provide support for GII eradication and biosecurity measures.	Participate in outreach and information sharing. Contribute to GII search efforts and share sighting information. Will be invited to serve as members of four island IAS committee/ taskforce
Academic and research institutions (SPREP, FNU, USP, etc.)	Academic courses, taxonomic and IAS related research, etc.	Training, education and capacity building relating to IAS.	Inception workshop. Support for development of IAS databases and clearinghouse mechanism, including provision of data. Participate in NISFSAP, EDRR, and risk assessment. Development of stakeholder outreach program.
Non-governmental organizations (CI, IUCN, Birdlife, WWF etc.)	Involved in a range of activities (biological surveys, IAS eradication, conservation activities, community conservation initiatives, financing local initiatives, environmental education, etc.).	Sharing of lessons and best practices, training resources, etc.	Inception workshop. Potential members of FIST through independent EOI process. Participate in NISFSAP, EDRR, and risk assessment. Development of stakeholder outreach program. Exchange of lessons and experiences including regional workshops
Pacific Invasive Partnership (PIP) and Pacific Invasive Learning Network (PILN)	PIP is umbrella regional coordinating body (coordinated by Island Conservation with Fiji members being Birdlife International, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, and the University of the South Pacific) for agencies working on IAS in more than one country of the Pacific and PILN is a network for invasive species workers in the countries and territories themselves.	Potential opportunities for South-South cooperation and mutually beneficial learning.	Inception workshop. Exchange of lessons and experiences including regional workshops.

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

A gender analysis has been completed and a gender action plan developed. Please refer to *Section IV Results & partnerships, Part (iii) Mainstreaming gender* (pages 43-45) and *Annex 15* of the UNDP Project Document.

Based on the gender analysis, the project has developed a gender mainstreaming strategy that seeks to engage and promote the role of women in numerous activities, including the direct engagement of women in capacity-building and training activities for BAF technical staff (over 40% of whom are women). Efforts will be made to encourage women's participation in outreach activities, including that outreach teams in the four islands GII eradication area will include local women mobilizers to encourage greater participation of women from local communities. The project will actively promote adequate representation and active participation of women in project committees, technical workshops, and stakeholder forums. Disaggregated gender-specific indicators have been developed and included in the Project Results Framework (*Annex A* of this CEO Endorsement Request) and gender-specific data will be collected to gauge the efficacy of project implementation with regards to promoting the participation and empowerment of Fijian women.

A.5 Risk.

The main risks and mitigation measures have been further elaborated from the PIF. Please refer to *Section V Feasibility, Part (ii) Risk management* (pages 45-48) of the UNDP Project Document. As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Coordinator will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. 5). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported in annual Project Implementation Reports.

Updated project risks are reflected in the table below:

Description	Type	Impact & Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner
Conflicts of interest and different priorities of stakeholders constrain implementation of activities	Political	Local communities might display resistance to the killing of GII, which may have a profound impact of locating and eradicating GIIs. Consequently, the long term impact might be the non containment of GIIs within the four islands and elsewhere in Fiji P=3; I=3 (Moderate)	Needs and priorities of stakeholders will be identified, and constructive dialogue, joint planning and problem solving will be promoted through the multi-stakeholder, inter-sectoral coordination mechanism. Interest will also be fostered among stakeholders by making the economic case for strengthened biosecurity measures to prevent and control IAS.	BAF
Insufficient funding to continue necessary IAS management after the project ends	Financial	The lack of funding can have a serious impact on improving biosecurity measures in Fiji, in particular the control and spread of IAS between islands as well as sustaining the eradication effort beyond the life of the GEF project, which is necessary to completely eradicate GIIs from the country. P=1; I=4 (Moderate)	Governmental support for biosecurity and IAS management has increased in recent years along with an increased awareness of the economic/environmental impacts of IAS. While, this is encouraging and likely to continue, significant additional budgetary resources would be required in the future to deal with the expanding threat of IAS, including strengthening inter-island biosecurity, developing early detection and rapid response systems, strengthening awareness and improving risk assessment for organisms proposed for import. The project will take advantage of the government commitment to biosecurity to continue to raise awareness, and bring in further information to guide decision making on investments, including providing with detailed analysis of the overall cost of IAS to the Fiji economy and promote increased and efficient government budget allocations and revenue generation for IAS management over the long-term.	Ministry of Economy, Public Enterprise, Public Services and Communication (MEPEPSC)
Governmental agencies/ private companies unwilling to share information/ data	Organizational	The lack of a comprehensive IAS informational sources at the national level, constraints the effective prevention, management and awareness of IAS in Fiji as existing knowledge and information will not be readily accessible to all stakeholders and no comprehensive source of information will exist. P=3; I=2 (Moderate)	Information and knowledge generation, management and dissemination are a key component of this project. Open-access and the mutual benefits of information sharing will be included in all agreements for databases, websites, etc. sponsored by the project.	Ministry of Economy, Public Enterprise, Public Services and Communication (MEPEPSC)
Local knowledge and personnel resources may not be adequate to guarantee comprehensive planning and implementation	Organizational	While BAF and its partner agencies have adequate numbers of front-line staff, training opportunities are limited. Front-line staff do not have full knowledge in terms of pest identification, control measures, eradication methods, etc. Mid-level staff that should be involved in policy setting tasks appear limited. Technical capacities to identify pathways, commodities and organisms that present an IAS risk, or to measure the threats and impacts of IAS, are still rudimentary. Information on the economic impacts of IAS (on biodiversity, livelihoods and key	A needs assessment for capacity building of government, district and local community organizations would be undertaken, following which a comprehensive training strategy and plan for front-line staff and local communities would be designed and developed early during project implementation. International experts will be hired to facilitate the conduct of the training programs, as well as staff will be able to participate in regional training programs. Training programs would be regularly evaluated for their effectiveness and adjusted to meet the needs. BAF will recruit and/or promote and train a coterie of mid-level planning staff. In addition, BAF will recruit additional front-line staff who would be sufficiently trained and posted to	BAF

		economic sectors) and the costs of different interventions is not available P=2; I=3 (Moderate)	improve its capacity on the four islands site for reducing the potential for unwanted non-native species to enter and establish within the country or portions of the country for those IAS which are already established but not wide spread. A comprehensive strategy for GII eradication would be developed and implemented, along with specialized training to improve staff skills at survey and detection of GIIs and in improved eradication methods.	
Not all GIIs are likely to be killed during an eradication operation because animals are difficult to detect	Environmental	The arboreal and shy nature of the GII makes detection of animals very difficult. As a result, it is yet unknown whether most animals can be placed at risk of removal. I = 3; P = 3 (Moderate)	Iguana detection is very difficult, but capture probability can be improved by targeting females at nesting sites and by using canine teams. Use of rifles will greatly improve removal rates, and low-cost conservation drones will be tested for their ability to improve GII detectability.	BAF
Eradication activities of Giant Invasive Iguana (GII) under the project may pose a risk to native endangered species (Fiji banded iguana; <i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>) if not conducted properly.	Environmental	Because juveniles of the native and invasive iguana species are similar in appearance, there is potential for inadvertent removal of native iguanas during the eradication process I = 2; P = 1 (Low)	All personnel involved in eradication are properly trained in identification and distinction of the two species (there are differences in morphology and behavior). The project will also support awareness campaigns to increase public understanding of the differences between the native and invasive iguana and the risks posed by the invasive. A risk assessment of the eradication plan developed by the project will be conducted, and corresponding management and mitigation measures incorporated into the eradication plan.	BAF
Inability to fully predict all aspects of species invasiveness and establishment is a challenge	Technical	Because the ability to anticipate IAS entry and establishment to the country is unpredictable, its management and control requires adequate preparedness and resources to respond to any eventuality I =3; P =3 (Moderate)	The development of an Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) plan, initially as a trial in Viti Levu, will include: (1) a database of baseline information on IAS already established on Viti Levu and their distributions, (2) an EDRR plan for Viti Levu that assigns roles and responsibilities of all EDRR partners, (3) a protocol for how rapid-response actions will be implemented, (4) a central hotline that the public can use to report suspicious new plants and animals, (5) a regime of regular monitoring surveys at likely introduction sites for IAS (e.g., ports, nurseries) to discover new incursions, (6) an outreach strategy to inform residents and institutional stakeholders of the need for vigilance and rapid reporting of new pests, (7) a training program for rapid responders, and (8) a dedicated rapid-response fund to pay for program activities. Once trialed in Viti Levu, it would be expanded nationally based on the initial learning.	BAF and partners
Climate change may alter the threats and risks associated with IAS	Environmental	Climate change may raise the threat of IAS by increasing the frequency/severity of fires, floods, and other natural events and thereby decreasing ecosystem resilience and creating conditions where invasive species can more	Climatic parameters will be included in the IAS risk analysis activities to be undertaken in the project as well as in the National Invasive Species Framework and Strategic Action Plan (NISFSAP).	MOE

		easily become established. The exact ways and timeframes over which climate change impacts will emerge are largely unknown, however they are expected to increase over time, most likely affecting localized expansion of suitable IAS range and species introductions in the short to medium-term. I = 3; P=3 (Moderate)		
--	--	--	--	--

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.

Institutional arrangements and governance have been elaborated. Please refer to *Section VIII Governance & management arrangements* (pages 60-63) of the UNDP Project Document for further details.

The Implementing Partner for this project is the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (BAF) under the Ministry of Economy, Public Enterprises, Public Services and Communication, responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

Project implementation will be overseen by strategic and technical governance mechanisms including a Project Board, and technical committees at national and four island GII eradication area levels. A summary of the roles of these governance bodies are outlined below:

- *National governing body:* The Project Board will be constituted under the Executive Chairman of BAF and will include representatives of UNDP and the Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Environment. The Board will meet twice per year and provide strategic direction for implementation of the project, approve annual work-plans and provide a coordination forum between key stakeholders. The committee will be responsible for making by consensus, management decisions when guidance is required by the Project Coordinator, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions.
- *National technical advisory committee:* The Fiji Invasive Species Taskforce (FIST) constituted by the National Environment Council (NEC) under the *National Environment Management Act of 2005*, and convened under the chairmanship of BAF will advise and facilitate the coordination of the project. FIST is comprised of representatives of BAF, Department of Environment, Department of Fisheries, Department of Forests, Department of Agriculture, FRCA, Department of *iTaukei* Affairs, Nature Land Trust Board, SPREP, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), NGOs and academic institutions. The key function of FIST will be to coordinate implementation of IAS-related activities in the country, facilitate higher-level policy decisions related to project implementation, provide advice and support relating to biosecurity priorities, facilitate cross-training of border control agencies, and advise on emerging issues relating to IAS, and support annual work plan development and implementation.
- *Four island technical advisory committee:* The Four Island IAS Taskforce (FIIT) will oversee and support BAF in the implementation of Outcome 2 and Outcome 3. The Task Force will be convened by BAF and include representatives of the Departments of *iTaukei* Affairs, Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, and Police, along with representatives of private resort owners, tour operators, NGOs and local communities. The Task Force will help coordinate efforts across different agencies to facilitate biosecurity monitoring and surveillance, facilitate outreach activities, coordinate local and cross-training activities, support preparation of eradication work plans, facilitate coordination with resort owners and tour operators, and support efforts for coordination of resource mobilization and manpower for eradication and biosecurity activities.

The coordination of the project with other GEF projects in Fiji and the region has been elaborated. Among others, the implementation of project components/products/activities will be coordinated with ‘Ridge to Reef approach to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Sequester Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Fiji’, ‘Capacity

Building For Mainstreaming MEA Objectives Into Inter-Ministerial Structures And Mechanisms in Fiji’, ‘Integration of Biodiversity Safeguards and Conservation into Development in Palau’, and ‘Preventing costs for IAS’ project in the Caribbean. Coordination will also be ensured with the UNEP-implemented regional IAS project ‘Strengthening national and regional capacities to reduce the impact of Invasive Alien Species on globally significant biodiversity in the Pacific’ (operating in the Republic of Marshall Islands, Niue, Tonga and Tuvalu) currently in project preparation phase, including opportunities related to knowledge management and the sharing of lessons and best practices. Coordination will take place through formal and informal consultations and discussions for exchange of information and lessons learned between the proposed project and other GEF, government and donor funded projects and programs. In particular, efforts to strengthen biosecurity and pre- and post-border control efforts will be shared with other IAS projects under operation in the Pacific, including to encourage stronger controls at potential exit points for IAS that pose a risk to Fiji. Further details are provided in *Section IV Results & partnerships, Part (ii) Partnerships* (pages 37-38) of the UNDP Project Document.

A.7 Benefits

The project will undertake a number of key interventions to prevent the introduction of new IAS and limit the inter-island spread of IAS within Fiji that could otherwise cause irreversible damage to native biodiversity, agriculture, industry, and local incomes and livelihoods – and in doing so will provide broad socioeconomic benefits. To this end, the project will support a number of measures, including (i) development of a National Invasive Species Framework and Strategic Action Plan (NISFSAP) that defines activities aimed at control and management of IAS; (ii) establishment of pre-border and border biosecurity programs; (iii) development of early detection and rapid response systems; (iv) improvement of inspection and quarantine services to prevent inter-island spread of IAS; (v) development and implementation of a plan to eradicate GII from Taveuni and surrounding islets; and (vi) enhanced awareness among local communities, tour operators and importers on the danger of IAS introduction and the need for biosecurity.

These project activities will reduce the threat of IAS to food security, health and livelihoods of the Fijian people, as well as protect the tourism industry, which is largely based on attraction to Fiji’s native biodiversity. Over 1,000 people will be directly engaged in project activities. This includes an estimated 270 BAF and other government staff being engaged in training and awareness activities (40% of which are women). Further, it is estimated that the project will directly engage at least 800 local people to participate in and support project activities, including active searching and reporting of GII sightings. The project will benefit around 11,500 people who live on Taveuni and the surrounding islets of Qamea, Matagi and Laucala and its associated tourism revenues through direct investment linked to (i) eradicating the GII from these islands; (ii) improved capacity of biosecurity front-line staff and improved facilities to better prevent entry and spread of new IAS into the four-island region; and (iii) increased awareness of local communities, tour operators, land owners and importers of the risk of IAS and need for biosecurity. The measures taken against GII are aimed at reducing the risk this IAS poses to the local economy, livelihoods and tourism revenues and the prevention of impacts on subsistence and market agriculture, tourism, health and quality of life, before GII escalates to catastrophic densities.

The strengthening of national biosecurity systems, in particular pre-border and border controls and early detection and rapid response systems, will have indirect socioeconomic benefits that flow broadly across Fiji, through the mitigation of potential future IAS threats and their potential impacts on agriculture and tourism revenues, and on the health and livelihoods of Fijian people.

A.8 Knowledge Management.

Component 4 (knowledge management and awareness raising) includes a specific output (Output 4.3) addressing publication and dissemination of knowledge products, best practices and lessons learned. The project will publish at least five best practice and case study reports systematizing project experiences, best practices and lessons learned, in electronic formats that will be shared through mailing lists, partner’s websites and social media, and through integration into stakeholder forums and training sessions as relevant. These reports will approach different themes provisionally scoped as: i) NISFSAP as a mechanism for cross-sectorial, multi-stakeholder engagement; ii) international best practices in IAS prevention, quarantine, surveillance and rapid response, and relevance for Fiji; iii) GII eradication best practices from the four island case study; iv) impacts and interaction of IAS with livelihoods in Fiji, including any

gender-related differences in perceptions of impacts; v) project lessons learned. Publications will include information on the methodologies applied, the difficulties encountered, as well as the projects successes and on-ground impacts. All project knowledge products will be shared with the multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms to be established with project support, thereby reaching an important number of institutions in each sector at national and local level. This will help ensure access of the wider stakeholder community to the experiences, failures and successes of the project. Output 4.3 will also support the establishment of a community of practice on IAS management in Fiji, bringing together multiple stakeholders through face-to-face and virtual engagement. The community of practice will build from the on-ground action at the four-island level and use the practical insights from the GII eradication program and four-island EDRR and biosecurity strengthening to inform IAS management across Fiji and the definition of policies, guidelines and regulations, along with national outreach and engagement campaigns. Component 4 will also include information management improvements such as collation and use of IAS data that will also support enhanced knowledge management. National awareness raising and outreach efforts will also offer an opportunity to disseminate successes and lessons learned during the project among a broad range of stakeholders – including the public – building awareness of the project and stakeholder support for biosecurity. Please refer to the description of Outcome 4 in *Section IV Results & partnerships, Part (i) Expected results* (pages 34-37) of the UNDP Project Document for further details of the knowledge management activities to be supported under the project.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 Consistency with National Priorities:

The proposed project is consistent with national priorities and plans and will advance Fiji's national targets and international commitments for biodiversity conservation. Fiji's National Biodiversity Strategy (2007) identifies control of IAS as critical to the success of biodiversity conservation and proposes priority actions, including: adopt relevant quarantine regulations; standards and tools developed to assist in the decision making processes involved in the importation of exotic species; strengthen legislation and enforce heavy penalties on individuals and organisations illegally importing organisms; increase public awareness on the risks and impact of exotic invasive species on native ecosystems and biodiversity; effectively control invasive and potentially invasive species present in Fiji. This investment promotes closer cooperation among agencies, sectors and stakeholders on biosecurity; strengthens capacity; develops inter-island quarantine awareness and enforcement and raises public awareness of the threat caused by inter-island traffic in spread of IAS; and establishes a database of invasive species present in Fiji (these all directly relate to/implement action items under Objective 5.2 which calls for "Effective control of invasive and potentially invasive species present in Fiji").

In addition, the project will contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets, in particular under strategic goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use, Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent introduction and establishment; and under strategic goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity, Target 12: By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has improved and sustained. The project will also support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals specifically SDG 15: Life on land, target 15.8 to introduce measures to prevent the introduction and significantly reduce the impact of IAS on land and water ecosystems and control or eradicate the priority species. Reducing and preventing risks from IAS will also support the achievement of SDG 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN

A M&E plan adhering to GEF M&E requirements and tailored to the specific circumstances of the project has been developed, as detailed in *Section VII M&E Plan* (pages 56-60) and *Annexes 9 and 10* of the UNDP Project Document. Key M&E components are also shown in the below table:

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget ⁷ (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Inception Workshop	UNDP Country Office	5,000	5,000	Within three months of project document signature
Inception Report	Project Coordinator	3,000		Within two weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP	UNDP Country Office	None	5,000	Quarterly, annually
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework (refer Annexes 9 and 10)	Project Coordinator and Chief Technical Specialist, Specialist Contractors	25,000 (Outputs 3.4, 3.5)	10,000	Inception, mid-term and end of project
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Project Coordinator and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF RTA	None	5,000	Annually
NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies	UNDP Country Office	15,000		Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Coordinator	3,000		Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Coordinator UNDP Country Office	None		Ongoing
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Coordinator UNDP Country Office BPPS as needed	None	5,000	
Project Board meetings	Project Board UNDP Country Office Project Coordinator	2,500	10,000	At minimum annually
Supervision missions	UNDP Country Office	None ⁸		Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team	None ⁸		Troubleshooting as needed
Knowledge management as outlined in Outcome 4	Project Coordinator	50,000	50,000	Ongoing
GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits	UNDP Country Office and Project Coordinator and UNDP-GEF team	None		To be determined.
Mid-term GEF IAS Tracking Tool to be updated by PIU (refer Annex 11 for	Project Coordinator and Chief Technical	None		Before mid-term review mission

⁷ Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

⁸ The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

baseline TT)	Specialist			takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	30,000		Between 2 nd and 3 rd PIR.
Terminal GEF IAS Tracking Tool to be updated by PIU	Project Coordinator and Chief Technical Specialist	None		Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	35,000		At least three months before operational closure
TOTAL indicative COST		USD 168,500	USD 90,000	

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies⁹ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu Executive Coordinator UNDP/GEF		30 Nov 2016	Lisa Farroway Regional Technical Advisor, EBD	+662- 3049100 Ext.5102	lisa.farroway@undp.org

⁹ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective To improve the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island, surrounding islets and throughout Fiji by building national and local capacity to manage Invasive Alien Species	0.1: Extent to which legal or policy or institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems. (<i>UNDP mandatory indicator: IRRF Output 2.5 indicator 2.5.1</i>)	NISFSAP under development Long-term strategy for BAF non-existent Specific, targeted IAS legislation non-existent	NISFSAP completed through collaborative, multi-agency process BAF long-term strategy completed Legislative framework related to IAS reviewed and needed legislative revisions identified and drafted	NISFSAP endorsed by national IAS Committee with committed resources for implementation BAF long-term strategy adopted and under implementation Specific legislation and regulations for IAS adopted and in place	Assumptions - Relevant agencies are willing to cooperate fully - Cabinet support for adopting legislative reforms required
	0.2: Number of direct project beneficiaries (<i>UNDP mandatory indicator</i>)	0	At least 170 BAF and other relevant government staff engaged in training and awareness activities (40% of which are women) At least 500 local people in four islands area are engaged in project activities (40% of which are women)	At least 270 ¹⁰ BAF and other relevant government staff engaged in training and awareness activities (40% of which are women) At least 800 ¹¹ local people in four islands area are engaged in project activities (40% of which are women)	Assumptions - Continuing level of political will to support the project interventions -Local communities, tour operators, resort owners, importers and shipping agents recognize the benefits of IAS prevention and control
	0.3: Comprehensiveness of national level IAS management framework and ability to prevent IAS of high risk to biodiversity from entering Fiji, as measured by IAS Tracking Tool	IAS Tracking Tool Score of 4 (out of total of 27) due to lack of national coordinating mechanism; no IAS strategy; detection surveys non-existent; priority pathways not actively managed, etc.	An increase score of at least 8 in IAS Tracking Tool with established national coordination mechanism, IAS strategy exists, priority pathways identified, detection survey methods agreed, and criteria for prioritization of species and infestations defined	An increase score of at least 12 in IAS Tracking Tool with national coordinating mechanism overseeing IAS actions codified by law; IAS strategy under implementation: regulations in place to implement National IAS strategy; priority pathways actively managed; detection surveys conducted regularly, etc.	Risks: -Relevant agencies may not be willing to cooperate fully Assumptions: -Willingness within the GoF to commit funding/resources to the management of IAS that impact biodiversity -Improved BAF revenue generation -National and international macroeconomic conditions remain stable.

¹⁰ Includes 200 national BAF and partner agency staff, 20 BAF and partner staff in Taveuni and three islets and 50 staff trained specifically for the eradication work in Outcome 3

¹¹ Includes (i) 50 local villages directly hired for the eradication work, (ii) estimated 600 community members actively engaged in volunteering sightings of GII and hence benefit from their eradication, (iii) and estimated 150 tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents directly participating in IAS prevention and control

	0.4: Level of government funding and revenues for Biosecurity in Fiji	USD 4.5 million/year in GOF budget allocation and USD 4.0 million/year in revenues	At least 10% increase to USD 4.95 million/year in GOF budget allocation and USD 4.4 million/year in revenues	At least 20% increase to USD 5.4 million/year in GOF budget allocation and USD 4.8 million/year in revenues	
Outcome 1 Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji	1.1: National and local capacity in detection, prevention and control of entry of high risk IAS, as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard	UNDP Capacity Development Score of 14 for BAF	UNDP Capacity Development Score increase to 17 for BAF	UNDP Capacity Development Score of at least 21 for BAF	Risks -Some agencies and/or sectors may have difficulty coordinating with other agencies and/or sectors Assumption - Sufficient political interest for action on IAS -Willingness of institutions to share responsibilities
	1.2: Operational status of national level, multi-agency, multi-sector coordinating group for IAS activities, including biosecurity and management	Non-existent	TOR for multi-agency, multi-sectorial coordinating group agreed, and group established and first meeting conducted	Multi-agency, multi-sectorial coordinating group established, codified by national legislation, and functioning effectively	
	1.3: Extent of biosecurity capacity for comprehensive prevention, early detection and rapid response (EDRR)	Risk assessment undertaken, but not comprehensive and do not have full coverage and data records scattered in notebooks or non-existent Some elements for early detection and rapid response exist but no comprehensive system available currently	Risks assessment conducted for 60% of all organisms for import and documentation system developed and used Draft EDRR plan developed and clear concept developed for public reporting system. Field staff to implement EDRR in place and training initiated	100% risk assessments for all organisms for import and systematically documented Established EDRR capacity on Viti Levu serving as a national pilot and resources to support EDRR in place	Risks -Adequate resources to implement comprehensive inspection and quarantine may not be developed -Sufficient trained and committed personnel unavailable -Insufficient rapid-response resources and funding available to support EDRR activities -Differences between daily operations and rapid-response actions are not fully recognized and/or supported Assumptions -Additional revenues can be developed to support inspection and quarantine services throughout the country -Adequate laws and regulations are in place to support improved inspection and quarantine services -Legislation/regulations are in place to support EDRR actions - Local actors understand the role of IAS management in reducing social vulnerability -Buy-in at all levels of society, including timely reporting of novel species encounters

Outcome 2 Enhanced IAS prevention, surveillance and control operations to prevent new introductions on Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala and Matagi	2.1: Number of new establishments of IAS species on Taveuni and islets, covering species listed in the Fiji black list and well as any high-risk IAS present in Fiji but not Taveuni	Baseline to be established in Year 1 as part of Output 1.3 (national black and white lists) and Output 2.1 (four-island specific black and white lists)	National black and white lists and four-island specific black and white lists of species established No new establishments from baseline	No new establishments from baseline	Risks -Means of ensuring public access to the data are uncertain Assumptions -Baseline surveys of IAS can be rapidly completed
	2.2: Capacity and engagement of biosecurity personnel and partners for inspection, control and management to prevent inter-island IAS spread	Currently limited to 2 weeks general training Low level of biosecurity inspection of goods, persons and vectors arriving at islands	Additional biosecurity staff recruited, comprehensive training program developed and 80% of existing frontline staff trained and undertaking random inspections of passengers and goods at airports and cargo ports Standardized systems and processes developed and in place for inspection of good, persons and vectors arriving at islands, required new staff for increased inspection in place and training underway	100% of frontline staff (around 20 biosecurity, police, customs staff etc., of which 40% are women) undertaking random inspections of passengers and goods at airports and cargo ports At least 50% of goods, persons and vectors (transport vehicles) arriving at islands are subject to biosecurity inspections	Risks -Taxonomic expertise for some IAS groups may not be readily available -Market-driven changes to pathways and vectors cannot be fully anticipated -Establishment of new high-risk IAS within trade-partner countries cannot be fully anticipated -The invasiveness of many species is simply unknown, making it difficult to determine exactly which species training should focus on.
Outcome 3 Long-term measures for protection of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity from GII on Taveuni, Qamea, Laucala and Matagi	3.1: Status of GIIs seen or captured on Taveuni	GII population size on Taveuni currently un-surveyed	Initial surveys completed in all potential GII sites on Taveuni If surveys indicate GII are present, search and eradication efforts indicate a decline in sighting/capture of GII	No GIIs seen or captured on Taveuni during last year of project	Risks - Inter-agency cooperation may be stifled by territorial rivalries -Expertise to formulate an effective plan is limited, both in Fiji and abroad Assumption - Interest and commitment of all relevant organizations to engage in this program

	3.2: GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala, as indicated by rates of removal.	Baseline GII population size to be established in Year 1 based on eradication removal rates	Capture operations vigorously and systematically conducted to reach 100% coverage of the islands Rates of removal indicate a decline in GII numbers on Qamea, Matagi and Laucala	Reduction in GII numbers on the Qamea, Matagi and Laucala by 50% or more	Risks -Not all animals can be put at risk of being killed -Animals are difficult to detect -Lethal methods are limited and require further development -Agency and staff interest may wane with time -Lack of understanding of the need for long-term commitment to ensure success in eradication
	3.3: Status and trends in native banded iguana populations (<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>) in areas occupied by GII	Baseline to be established in Year 1	Stable populations of native banded iguana (<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>) in areas occupied by GII on island(s) and eradication efforts ongoing	Stable or improved populations of native banded iguana (<i>Brachylophus bulabula</i>) in areas previously (prior to eradication) occupied by GII on island(s)	Assumptions -Resources and commitment will be available beyond the duration of the project -Improved detection and removal methods can be developed -The GIIs have not already spread too far to eradicate -Adequate capacity for monitoring native biodiversity exists
	3.4: Community perceptions of damage to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII, disaggregated by gender	Impacts not yet visible or reported Limited awareness of potential impact of GII No standardized assessment or understanding of community perceptions and awareness of damage or impacts from GII Standardized baseline will be established in Year 1	Baselines established of community perceptions and awareness of GII impacts and monitoring protocols for evaluating changes in community perceptions designed and being monitored At least 30% of sampled local population (40% of which are women), aware of potential adverse impacts of GII and need for biosecurity	No/reduced community perceptions of damage to food crops and livelihoods in areas occupied by GII (prior to eradication) At least 50% of sampled local population (40% of which are women), aware of potential adverse impacts of GII and need for biosecurity	-That damage from GII on food crops and livelihoods likely not occurred and use of perception study to validate it appropriate

Outcome 4 Increased awareness of risks posed by IAS and need for biosecurity of local communities, travelling public, tour operators and shipping agents	4.1: Level of awareness of IAS and biosecurity among tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents	Coordinated outreach on biosecurity lacking Limited awareness of impact IAS among general public Baseline survey established in Year 1	At least 20% of sampled tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents aware of potential adverse impacts of IAS and need for biosecurity	At least 50% of sampled tour operators, resort owners, importers, tourists and shipping agents aware of potential adverse impacts of IAS and need for biosecurity	Risks -Actions among the assorted agencies and NGOs remain uncoordinated Assumptions -Community diversity will not be a hindrance to outreach activities
	4.2: Operational status of on-line clearinghouse for IAS information to collate and make accessible IAS information to stakeholders	Partial existence of on-line clearinghouse for IAS information at Department of Environment	Enhancement of on-line clearinghouse fully scoped and improvements in progress	On-line clearinghouse completed and actively used by relevant agencies	Risks -Lack of resources, information and personnel to move project forward -Difficult with obtaining species information Assumptions -Required information is readily available -Partnerships can be established that facilitate the sharing of existing information

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Response	Relevant Section of UNDP Pro-Doc. and GEF CEO Doc.
GEF Review		
At CEO endorsement, include the all BAF & others co-financing activities and demonstrate the synergies with GEF funding.	Co-financing details and synergies between GEF funding have been demonstrated and articulated, showing the incremental nature of the GEF funding.	Section IV and Annex 14 of UNDP Project Document
STAP Review Comments		
1. The proposed alternative scenario is also basically sound, though the actual implementation strategy is somewhat vague. The project could be strengthened by a theory of change that explains how the four project components should be sequenced, while the PPG must strengthen outcome targets, and clarifying project outputs, some of which are quite general and wordy.	<p>A theory of change outlining the focus and interaction of the four project components and their outputs has been developed. The focus of outputs has been reviewed, with revisions and rearrangement of a number of outputs to build clarity around the focus of each component and how they will inter-relate. Further clarity and understanding is provided by the articulation of indicative activities under each output, which also detail a road map for project implementation and how outputs will be delivered and inter-relate. The sequencing of activities has been defined in the multi-year work plan.</p> <p>Outcome indicators have been revised and indicator baselines, mid-term and end-of-project targets defined. Specialist biosecurity and IAS eradication expertise engaged in the PPG phase has been used to ensure the technical feasibility of project targets. In places this has resulted in revision of the targets presented at PIF stage, such as for example adjusting the project targets from eradication of GII on Qamea, to achieving a substantial and simultaneous eradication of GII across the three known infested islands to minimize re-colonization and provide a cost-effective approach to eradication. These changes are explained and justified earlier in this CEO Endorsement Request.</p>	UNDP Project Document – Theory of Change diagram (Figure 3) and Multi-Year Workplan in Annex 8
2. Implementation of component 3 (i.e. eradication of Giant Iguana from Taveuni) could be used to build a community of practice around developing IAS guidelines, action plans, methods, etc. through practical action. This could trial both component 2 (surveillance and control strategies) and component 4 (awareness). With communities of practicing gelling around doing real things together, this community of practice could be carefully managed (by a champion) to evolve into component 4 (IAS policy, institutions, coordination, outreach at national level).	<p>The project will ensure that experiences and practice from the implementation of Component 3 (GII eradication) will help build learning, strengthen capacity, and create adequate awareness and support to deal with the potential threats from IAS and feed it into policy, legislation, and practice through the other components of the project as discussed below:</p> <p><u>In Component 1</u>, through (i) identifying changes in policy, legislation, protocols and actions plans for IAS prevention, surveillance and control as part of NISFSAP development; (ii) developing protocols for risk assessment of species proposed for entry; (iii) developing early detection and rapid response plans to prevent GII entry into Viti Levu; (v) undertaking economic study of IAS impacts to specifically inform government of costs of damage of potential IAS (including GII) versus the costs of prevention and control to build the economic argument for budgetary resources and changes in policy and practices as well as create awareness among the general public to the impacts of IAS and the need for biosecurity.</p> <p><u>In Component 2</u>, through enhancing capacity and systems to improve surveillance, monitoring and rapid response to prevent re-entry of GII to already cleared areas or where GII is not currently present in the four islands and its movement to other islands in Fiji.</p> <p><u>In Component 4</u>, through developing appropriate outreach and awareness programs nationally after initial trailing in the four-islands on the damage that IAS can cause. Public outreach will be used to inform citizens of the threat that GII pose to their future livelihoods and the need for biosecurity, but more importantly, to seek their cooperation in quickly reporting any further sightings of GII in the four islands and of new high-risk IAS across Fiji, as well prevent spread of IAS across Fiji through strengthened biosecurity behaviours at an individual level.</p>	Section IV, Part (i) Expected Results and Figure 3 of UNDP Project Document
3. Component 1 however is vague what, for example, is a "national inter-	The different parts of building an effective national IAS framework (Component 1) have been scoped during the PPG and more clearly articulated	UNDP Project Document

<p>sectoral, multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism? This vagueness infuses both the narrative and project description table. What about: IAS policy, national action plan and implementing agency in place; risk analyses of x conducted; surveillance shows y trends in IAS, funding for IAS control increases partly due to business case?</p>	<p>and arranged in the Project Results Framework. Component 1 outputs have been revised and reorganized to better reflect the key national-level elements of inter-sector coordination, policy and action plans, institutional capacity, economic assessment to build a business case for enhanced investment, and effective frameworks for early detection and rapid response.</p> <p>Clarity of how the different outputs of Component 1 will be delivered through the project has been provided. For example, the national inter-sectoral, multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism – a essential foundation of coordinated, collaborative, well-resourced and effective national and local efforts across detection, quarantine, surveillance, monitoring, management, control and eradication – will be achieved through the strengthening of existing multi-sector mechanisms such as the National Environmental Council (NEC) and its advisory Fiji Invasive Species Taskforce (FIST), which is currently defunct but provides an ideal platform on which to build whole-of-government engagement. The re-invigoration of FIST will be achieved through giving it distinct and tangible roles in facilitating the development of national policy, national invasive species framework and strategic action plan (NISFSAP), early detection and rapid response (EDRR) plans, IAS clearinghouse mechanisms, and coordination among front-line agencies (airport and seaports, mail and package centers, etc.) to detect and prevent entry of IAS.</p> <p>Project indicators have also been revised to ensure that key responses of an effective, well-resourced and coordinated IAS management system are captured. These include improvements in the GEF IAS tracking tool, the use of risk assessments, and Government of Fiji funding towards biosecurity. A specific indicator to measure trends in IAS establishment is incorporated under Component 2, with an end-of-project target of no additional establishments of high-risk IAS in the four island area. Such an indicator is considered to be more effective at the four-island area over the project term as this is where strengthened prevention, surveillance and control operations will be piloted ahead of brooder national rollout beyond the project term.</p>	<p>Section IV, Part (i) Expected Results</p>
<p>4. Component 2 is sufficient, with the exception of 2.1 that is too general and overlaps with 4 (awareness raising). How about: Early detection and rapid response system in place; key personnel trained at spread control points. Note that surveillance is mentioned both here and in Component 1, while awareness training is here and in Component 4. Which is it?</p>	<p>The overlap and lack of clarity among the different components has been reviewed and clarified through the revisions to outputs and outcome targets. However, many IAS approaches such as surveillance and outreach remain relevant to multiple project components, which are distinguished in part on their spatial focus – Component 1 building national frameworks, coordination, capacity and early detection and response systems; Component 2 focused on strengthening inter-island biosecurity in the four island area; Component 3 similarly focused on the four island area, but specific to the eradication of GII; and Component 4 providing national outreach and knowledge management. This project design is considered most appropriate to deliver the desired project objective and outcomes, and to emphasize that activities such as surveillance and outreach – action targeted towards prevention and eradication of IAS <i>before</i> they result in catastrophic impacts – must be an integral part of biosecurity systems at local, inter-island and national levels.</p> <p>With regards to Component 2, Output 2.2 (formerly Output 2.1 at PIF stage), has been clarified to make clear its focus on improving inspection and quarantine services to reduce the entry and spread of IAS into and between Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Laucala. The focus of surveillance efforts to detect and prevent entry of IAS into Fiji has been clarified in Components 1 and 2. It has been retained in both components as it is relevant at the national level (Component 1; emphasizing enhanced national capacity for surveillance) and to the prevention of inter-island transfer of IAS (Component 2; establishing specific surveillance, inspection and quarantine procedures and systems on Taveuni and surrounding islets, training front-line staff in the four-island area in best practices).</p> <p>Outreach activities under Component 2 have been made more specific to clarify that they are directed at obtaining community support to reporting GII sightings and support the containment of GII and its eradication from Taveuni, and prevent its spread to other islands. Outreach included in Component 4 is now directed more broadly at the national level to establish public and visitor awareness, outreach, and buy-in with regards to IAS prevention and management and ensure that such an effort reaches all levels of the population</p>	<p>UNDP Project Document Section IV, Part (i) Expected Results</p>

	for ensuring that prevention and management efforts are maximized and effective. This will be accomplished through awareness/outreach campaigns, establishing and keeping current an online public access IAS clearing-house and through an established and updated black-list of species.	
5. The narrative (p9) and outcomes for Component 3 are good. Outputs are repetitive and unclear. How about: survey status of GII and damage caused; implement eradication plan; develop model cost/benefit analysis for eradication; develop model awareness strategy?	<p>The outputs for Component 3 have been revised and better defined in response to STAP comments and the specialist IAS eradication input to the PPG. The revised outputs aim to set out a logical and clear flow of the steps required to put in place a well-coordinated, technically-feasible and sustainable long-term eradication strategy for GII in the four island area. The revised outputs are listed below and changes and their rationale outlined earlier in this CEO Endorsement Request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output 3.1: Comprehensive survey and public outreach on four islands conducted to determine status of GII on Taveuni. • Output 3.2: Comprehensive survey and public outreach on four islands conducted to determine status of GII on Taveuni. • Output 3.3: GII eradication plan implemented simultaneously on all four islands with adequate staffing and funding and updated as needed. • Output 3.4: Survey of native banded iguana on island(s) conducted where GII are known to be established. • Output 3.5: Survey and assessment of local community perceptions of GII impacts on food crops and livelihoods, building understanding of current GII damage. <p>The output related to assessing damage caused by GII has been amended to match the current understanding of low levels of impacts and the lack of visible damage observed during PPG inspections at current GII population size and distribution. A standardized means of collating perceptions of damage will be developed and rolled out across local communities and tourism operators (e.g. resort owners).</p> <p>The completion of cost/benefit analysis for GII eradication has been incorporated in the economic assessment in Output 1.4. This will include an assessment of potential economic impacts of GII on agricultural and forestry crops, livelihoods and biodiversity providing the business case for mobilization of long-term financing for biosecurity and informing local and national awareness-raising campaigns of potential impacts and need for biosecurity.</p> <p>Further awareness raising and outreach efforts are included in Output 4.1 that will operate at the national level, and will be informed by pilot activities and the results of awareness completed on the four islands area under Output 3.1.</p>	UNDP Project Document Section IV, Part (i) Expected Results
6. Component 4 is called "knowledge management" but outcomes and outputs are public awareness.	This has been resolved through revising the name of Component 4 to "Knowledge management and awareness raising to address IAS" and broadening its outputs to ensure that both awareness raising and information and knowledge management are included. A specific output on documenting and sharing lessons learned and best practices (Output 4.3) has been developed.	UNDP Project Document Section IV, Part (i) Expected Results
7. The PIF could be strengthened by clarifying the narrative in the Component description, and making sure this matches the table, while making clearer and shorter statements in the table.	Clarified in UNDP Project Document, including full discussion of existing baseline, GEF alternative and government co-financing. Output names have been revised and simplified as possible, improving the overall logic and flow of the project design results framework.	UNDP Project Document Sections II, III and IV Part (i)
8. The document states that there is strong commitment from the Government of Fiji (under Sustainability section), but this needs to be validated.	<p>The commitment of the government of Fiji has been articulated and validated in the UNDP Project Document, as summarized below.</p> <p>There is a strong commitment to biosecurity from the Government of Fiji, as validated by: (i) establishment of a separate statutory agency for biosecurity (Biosecurity Authority of Fiji, BAF) in the country that has updated supportive legislation in the form of the 2008 Biosecurity Act, which established BAF and provides for guidance. Other Pacific Island nations still have their equivalent to biosecurity under a quarantine branch of Agriculture Department rather than as a separate entity; (ii) the Government of Fiji has taken steps to move from a limited agricultural-based quarantine program to a more holistic biosecurity approach under their current Ministry of Economy, Public Enterprises, Public Services and Communication (one of the most powerful Ministries in the</p>	UNDP Project Document Section V, Parts (i) and (iv) Annex 16 co-financing letters

	<p>country); (iii) a well-established revenue-collection mechanism exists that enables BAF to improve and expand overall biosecurity in the country; (iv) The government commitment is further demonstrated by the fact that BAF has over 200 front-line officers with facilities at all international ports (sea and air) and on-going services at all major domestic seaports; (v) BAF initiated efforts with Government funding to address GII and other IAS within Fiji.</p> <p>The government's commitment that will support the sustainability of project outcomes and impact has been validated through the description of specific activities that will be co-financed by the Government of Fiji, in particular the on-ground eradication efforts under Component 3 that will be co-financed by BAF through provision of additional staff and resources for GII eradication. Multiple agencies across the Government of Fiji with a mandate related to biosecurity have made co-financing commitments to the project as detailed in the co-financing letters Annexed to the UNDP Project Document.</p>	
<p>9. The document does not refer to lessons from elsewhere, and surely should review and refer to similar actions that have been implemented elsewhere.</p>	<p>The experiences and lessons learned from elsewhere have been incorporated into Components 1, 2, and 4. Similarly, lessons learned from GII invasions in the Caribbean have informed the design of Component 3. While there are no successful GII eradications from elsewhere that can inform the design of Component 3, it has been built on best practice eradication techniques, low-cost proven techniques that are transferable and suitable for deploying in Fiji, and sound technical understanding of the biology of GII such as breeding dynamics and seasons. The success of Component 3 would be a globally significant achievement, demonstrating the feasibility of conducting reptile eradications elsewhere.</p>	<p>UNDP Project Document Section IV, Part (i) Expected Results and Annex 6</p>
<p>10. The risk from global climate change is listed as 'high' which is accurate since warming temperatures and changes in CO2 concentrations are likely to increase opportunities for invasive species. The project will address this by including climatic parameters in the projects' risk analysis activities. Will the project employ specific models/simulation approaches to ensure that IAS strategies are effective both now and in the future under changing conditions? This should be elaborated further in the PPG.</p>	<p>The risks to the project have been further assessed and revised during the PPG phase. The risk rating for climate change has been re-assessed as 'moderate'. Climate change may raise the threat of IAS by increasing the frequency/severity of fires, floods, and other natural events and thereby decreasing ecosystem resilience and creating conditions where invasive species can more easily become established. The exact ways and timeframes over which climate change impacts will emerge and exacerbate IAS invasion and expansion are largely unknown and likely to vary across particular IAS species. They are expected to increase over time, most likely affecting localized expansion of suitable IAS range and species introductions in the short to medium-term, informing the revised rating of 'moderate'.</p> <p>In response to this risk and the lack of knowledge on how it will emerge in space and time, climatic parameters will be considered during the undertaking of IAS risk assessments as well as during the preparation of the NISFSAP, which will further explore and address issues related to potential climate risks and IAS, including particular species likely to be more suitable to IAS introduction and establishment in Fiji under likely changes to climatic parameters.</p>	<p>UNDP Project Document, Annex 1</p>
<p>11. However, the PPG needs to include a much stronger assessment of the extent of the IAS threat, together with much clearer indicators of baseline and intended targets for IAS to be achieved by the project.</p>	<p>The IAS threat to Fiji has been assessed during the PPG phase and articulated in the UNDP Project Document. This includes discussion of the current IAS present on Fiji and their impacts (including high risk species present in Fiji but not yet on Taveuni, e.g. mongoose), and of IAS present in the Pacific but not yet present in Fiji (e.g. brown tree snake, Asian gypsy moth, giant African land snail). Finally, the potential in which the IAS threat may change into the future has been outlined. The primary factor expected to influence future IAS introduction, spread and establishment is the increasing travel and trade within and across Fiji's over 300 islands, including through the development of tourism and offshore fisheries. Pathways of entry of IAS into Fiji include tourism, travel and transport and production sectors. The extent of the IAS threat will be further quantified through Output 1.4 which will complete an assessment of the potential economic impacts on agricultural and forestry crops, livelihood and biodiversity of a number of high risk IAS including GII. This information will be used to provide justification for improved commitment of resources for IAS management and improved biosecurity and inform local and national awareness raising campaigns to build public support.</p> <p>Outcome targets have been revised and baselines, mid-term and end-of-project targets defined. Specialist biosecurity and IAS eradication expertise engaged in</p>	<p>UNDP Project Document Section II Development Challenge, and Section IV, Part (i) Expected Results and Project Results Framework in Annex A of this document</p>

	<p>the PPG phase has been used to ensure the technical feasibility of project targets. In places this has resulted in revision of the targets presented at PIF stage, such as for example adjusting the project targets from eradication of GII on Qamea, to achieving a substantial and simultaneous reduction of GII populations across the three known infested islands to minimize re-colonization and provide a cost-effective approach to eradication. These changes are explained and justified in this CEO Endorsement Request.</p>	
--	---	--

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹²

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A – Technical review	45,000.00	29,749.80	15,250.20
Component B – Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	35,000.00	23,138.73	11,861.27
Component C – Financial planning and co-financing investment	20,000.00	13,222.13	6,777.87
Component D – Validation workshop	15,000.00	9,916.60	5,083.40
Component E – Completion of final documentation	35,000.00	23,138.73	11,861.27
TOTAL	150,000.00	99,166.00	50,834.00

¹² If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A