



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9095</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Fiji</b>		
Project Title:	<b>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</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5589 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-2 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,502,968</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$14,260,093</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$17,913,061</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 28, 2015</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Nicole Glineur</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Johan Robinson</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	yes BD-2 Program 4
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	yes
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	yes
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	yes
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	yes
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender	yes

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	yes within BD STAR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	yes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>3/19/15 Please address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The section on co-financing is lacking. Please explain what the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji grant of \$11.76 M funds specifically. Also, please explain the Environmental NGOs grants of \$1.5M: which NGOs and the specific use of the funds.</li> <li>2. Under root causes and barriers, please correct the number of barriers in text from 3 to 4.</li> <li>3. The LOE incorrectly indicates that the total financing of \$4M is from GETF &amp; LDCF, while the table below is correctly reflecting the BD STAR allocation of \$4M. Please adjust the text accordingly.</li> </ol> <p>3/24/15 All comments have been satisfactorily addressed and the PIF is technically cleared. At CEO endorsement, kind reminder to include the all BAF &amp; others co-financing activities and demonstrate the synergies w/ GEF funding.</p>
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 19, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	