



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5398		
Country/Region:	Fiji		
Project Title:	R2R: Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Sequester Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5216 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; LD-1; LD-3; CCM-5; IW-1; SFM/REDD+-1; CCA-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$250,000	Project Grant:	\$7,387,614
Co-financing:	\$30,242,012	Total Project Cost:	\$37,879,626
PIF Approval:	April 26, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 20, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Erez Padilla

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes.	Confirmed.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes.	Addressed at PIF level.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes	No change with the PIF.
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. 4/10/2013 CCM JS Yes. Fiji has \$2M available under the climate change allocation.	No change with the PIF.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	Yes.	No change with the PIF.
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes.	Addressed.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>4/10/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>Yes. The project is in-line with the country's Climate Change Policy.</p> <p>Yes. The project is in-line with the country's NBSAP.</p>	Addressed.
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>4/10/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>No. The identification of deforestation driver in each is appreciated. Discussion of baseline conditions in each target site does not discuss the specific areas under deforestation and degradation threat. Current acreage at risk, forest status, type, and existing CO2 stocks are not discussed.</p> <p>Please identify the major drivers of land use change or unsustainable land use and</p>	12/16/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>their size. Current land tenure arrangements and how they might change with this project are unclear.</p> <p>4/15/2013 CCM JS Yes for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please identify forests and grasslands under degradation risk in each of the identified watershed. Provide information on current acreage at risk, forest status, type, and existing C stocks based on on-site information. Please provide detailed information on the land tenure-ship in each of the target areas and develop systems to enable the proposed project to be implemented successfully within each tenure system.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>- All outputs and activities on financing mechanisms are welcome There is a broad strategy to look for the most appropriate mechanism depending on the situation (valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services, assessment of existing trust funds, etc). However, as often, we wonder if PES is not oversold in the concept. Is it reasonable to propose 4 PES systems (2 for PAs and 2 for SFM) will be operationalized during the project duration while no information is given on the basics (i.e. users, sellers, services, sustainability)? Please refer to the STAP guidance document to propose a reasonable and feasible approach.</p> <p>- Overall, this project proposes a number of important changes to current land and marine management practices. However,</p>	<p>- The result framework is based on the one approved at PIF level. Many pending questions were clarified. We take note of the responses made at PIF level about the site selection and the risks of "land use change", "reforestation", and "exotic species". Thanks</p> <p>- Please, confirm the level of resources and the nature of activities related to Invasive and Alien Species. In the current Request for CEO Endorsement, IAS is not included in table A. If it appears to be a significant component of the project, it should be included in Table A (outcome 2.3) and have the corresponding Tracking Tools. Please, clarify.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>it is unclear how these changes will be implemented “ if farmers are to plant more trees or otherwise change practices, what incentives or programs are available to them? If public land is being used, how will investments be protected?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please explain how pineapple agriculture can contribute to preventing erosion. What other options have been explored to achieve the same objective? - BD: There are clearly biodiversity values to be protected in these areas, but it is unclear how this project will achieve these goals. - Some of these PAs are quite small. Please explain the reasoning behind the selection of these particular areas and how they will be managed to prevent overuse. - There are references to the PAs including sustainable use and/or community management, but there do not appear to be plans to establish and enforce these measures. The use of traditional management ideas and structures can be very effective, but this idea needs to be better fleshed out. How have communities been involved with the selection and management of these areas? - SFM: In the results framework, the output 2.1.2. related to the restoration of carbon stocks in degraded forests mention the use of native species. In the text p.8, the definition of forest restoration let the door open for native and exotic species. Please make the text consistent and provide elements of safeguards “ at least at CEO 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>endorsement. The mention of mahogany is surprising given the fact that it is not native and requires long rotations to be managed sustainably. Please clarify the programs mentioned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 8, there is a sentence on afforestation. Please note that the GEF does not finance afforestation per se. - Page 11: Again, there is a problem with the notion of "reforestation of open grasslands" – this is afforestation. Please remove this mention. - Forest certification and supply chain management is an important potential goal, but no specific plans or programs are discussed (i.e. FSC or SFI). - Under the outcome 3.1., most of the activities to define the baseline should be financed during the PPG. What is expected with the "biophysical, demographic and socioeconomic assessments in the main priority watersheds"? If such inventories are needed, please justify them and explain the sustainability of such tools. - There is no problem to highlight additional benefits in terms of adaptation of an integrated land and natural resource management approach using GEF resources. However, adaptation outcomes cannot be claimed with CCM resources without confirming that the CCM5 resources are used for activities that are eligible under the GEF5 strategy. Please consider removing "CC adaptation" in the outcomes 3.1, 3.2., as well as in the outputs 3.1.1., 3.2.2 and renaming the component 3 "Integrated Natural 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Resources Management for Adaptation to Climate Change". We suggest to remove "adaptation". Again, we acknowledge the potential additional adaptation benefits for this component, but adaptation cannot be the core target of a full component financed by the GEFTF (there are other trust funds as the SCCF to focus on adaptation).</p> <p>- Please clarify "the empowerment of local communities with the development of market-based instruments by the project (outcome 3.2.3.)"</p> <p>4/10/2013 CCM JS No. Please see below:</p> <p>a. It is not clear how various types of deforestation drivers identified in the 6 different watersheds will be addressed.</p> <p>b. Criteria for the selection of the sites for reforestation are not clear. The criteria should ensure that reforestation activities in such sites are plausible and likely to succeed.</p> <p>c. Project components do not address the leakage issue that may arise from the project activities. The project should also detail the effects of maintaining timber supply chain on the overall carbon benefits of the project.</p> <p>d. The project components do not articulate a mechanism by which forest coverage and net carbon stocks (in tCO₂e) will be tracked.</p> <p>4/15/2013 CCM/BD JS The assurance that the concerns raised will be addressed during the PPG phase is</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		adequate.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>4/10/2013 CCM JS No. The proposal needs to address to the comments made in the previous sections. Also, please see below:</p> <p>a. Incremental benefits related to preservation and increase of carbon stocks (tCO₂ e) is unclear. The proposal needs to describe and estimate the carbon stocks that will be increased or protected against an identified threat. Such estimation should be at Tier 1 level detail (at the PIF stage), should consider possibility of leakage and should take into account emissions that may be generated due to other activities proposed in the project.</p> <p>4/15/2013 CCM JS Yes. Preliminary estimation of GHG emissions avoided and C sequestered is adequate for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please consider the possibility of leakage and account for it in the total C calculations. Please provide more concrete calculations based on the on-site information to estimate tCO₂e avoided or sequestered.</p>	<p>4/10/2013 CCM JS By CEO endorsement stage tCO₂e estimations need to be directly based on the on-site information and more concrete than simple Tier 1 level.</p> <p>December 12, 2014 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		12/16/2014 SW Yes.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	4/10/2013 No. Please explain the role of CSOs in particular and the provisions to ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	The risks seem reasonable, but, as stated previously, please clarify further how unsustainable use ("pressure on the environment...due to poverty") will be avoided.	Addressed.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	A list of projects, programs, and initiatives is given.	A deeper analysis of these initiatives is expected as well as modalities of partnerships and/or coordination. Coordination between different GEF projects is welcome, but a GEF project cannot cofinance another GEF operation and double cofinancing must be avoided. December 12, 2014 Addressed.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. 	No. Please clarify how sustainability will be achieved and the role of capacity development described. 4/15/2013 BD Yes. We expect this concern to be	December 12, 2014 Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	addressed during PPG and it is expected that capacity building activities will also include management of PA along with carbon MRV systems.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		12/16/2014 Yes, the interventions are cost-effective.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>In the PPG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include the definition of baseline values for the monitoring, as well as any technical assessment that is needed at the very beginning of the project; <p>4/10/2013 CCM JS No. This would need to be revisited upon revision of the PIF.</p> <p>4/15/2013 CCM JS Yes, the project framework and the associated costs have been revised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please confirm the cofinancing from the government, partners, and UNDP; - Develop a Monitoring Plan showing baseline values, indicators, and targets; - Include a sustainability strategy; - Develop operational partnerships with key partners on the ground. These partnerships should reflect the incremental reasoning and the baseline projects that are used to anchor GEF activities. <p>December 12, 2014 Addressed.</p>
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency		12/16/2014 The co-financing amount in the letter from the Ministry of Fisheries and

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		Forests does not match project documents (FJD544,000 in the letter vs. \$1,557,766 in the table C. Please address this issue.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. The management costs are very reasonable in such complex context.	December 12, 2014 Addressed.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		December 12, 2014 Addressed (annex C, p39).
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		12/16/2014 SW - For the BD tracking tool, it is very unusual to have two different METTs for a single protected area. Some of the PAs appear to have different management entities for the marine and terrestrial areas, which may be a good reason to have two different METTs. However, in the case that the PA is managed by the same management entity or as a single unit (as appears to be the case for Vunivia) then there should be a single METT. Please revise the TT or provide an explanation for the structure. - As for the IAS section, IAS is not

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			included in table A in the Request for CEO Endorsement. If it appears to be a significant component of the project, it should be included in Table A, with a new outcome 2.3, and have the corresponding TT. Please, clarify.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Addressed.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>4/10/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>Not yet. Please adequately respond to the comments raised in the review. Some main points are given below for your convenience:</p> <p>a) Details on current efforts to limit deforestation in the country and the existing gaps that limit their effectiveness.</p> <p>b) Current status of forests in the target areas need to be described and carbon stocks that are contained in these areas need to be estimated.</p> <p>c) Explanation of how the identified deforestation drivers will be addressed through the project or other ongoing activities, such that outcomes of the proposed project can be sustained is required.</p> <p>d) Clear acknowledgement of leakage</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>issue and means to address the issue is needed.</p> <p>e) Carbon stocks that are expected to be conserved or generated should be estimated. This estimation should clearly account for project activities that may generate emissions. At PIF stage Tier 1 level detail is acceptable.</p> <p>f) Articulate the reasoning behind the choice of PA locations and sizes.</p> <p>g) Outline the plan for implementing land use changes and inclusion of local communities in these efforts.</p> <p>h) Explain the development of management plans for the new and existing PAs and how they will be sustainable beyond the life of the project.</p> <p>4/15/2013 Yes. A number of issues need to be addressed before the CEO Endorsement Stage.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		We thank the Agency for a high quality submission. Upon receipt of a revised project package responding the questions 7, 17, and 21, the CEO endorsement will be recommended.
	First review*	April 10, 2013	December 12, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 15, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.