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

GEF ID:	**9880**		
Country/Region:	**Fiji**		
Project Title:	**Community-based Integrated Natural Resource Management Project**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**LD-3 Program 4; CCM-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$2,119,425**
Co-financing:	**$13,400,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$15,519,425**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**November 01, 2017**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Cyrille Barnerias**	Agency Contact Person:	**Aru Mathias**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	2017-08-29 Yes. - the project is aligned with CCM 2 – program 4 and LD3- program 4. Though, it would be helpful if you could expand a bit more on the involvement of the private sector when relevant.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	2017-08-31 - Could you please confirm if Fiji has adopted and LDN strategy and if yes	

[1] 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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		provide elements regarding the consistency with the project? 2017-09-28 - Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	2017-08-31 No -If data exists, could you please indicate the rate of natural forest loss? - Innovation, sustainability and scaling-up are sufficiently indicated. Could you please elaborate during PPG on the lessons dissemination processes that could participate in the scaling-up? 2017-09-28 - Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	2017-08-31 no - Regarding the coordination with the "Ridge to Reef" (R2R) project, could you please expand on the potential articulation and synergy with the current proposal - Please include the R2R project and any other relevant one in the baseline initiatives (in addition to those	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		mentioned as co-financing ones). - More detailed map of the project intervention is required to situate the Navaudra and Tomaniivi-Wabu forest reserves, as well as the mentioned low lands including mangrove zones into Tailevu province. - The project will target at least 60 villages: please provide information on the criteria used to select these villages 2017-09-28 - Yes, cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	2017-08-21 No -could you please make the component 1 title more explicit to reflect the project objectives? Component 2: - the activities to achieve SFM remain vague as "forest protection measures". Please be more specific about the planned activities that will be able to address in a sustainable manner the barriers and root causes of the deforestation and forest degradation. - As regard to forest restoration, please provide information on the way the project results will be	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		sustainable after the duration of the project. Regarding in particular the mangroves restoration, please specify cause of the degradation (if different from the other targeted forests) and the planned strategy to ensure the success of the operation (as this kind of activity often fail). - Carbon benefit estimate: the reference for the numbers and methodology used for the calculation is not informed and the final estimate doesn't take into account the capitalization phase after the project ends. As a result, the carbon benefit may be underestimated. Please use recognized methodology and referenced data to estimate the carbon benefits of the project. 2017-09-28 - Yes, cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	2017-08-31 -In the gender paragraph, the use of the word adequate leave an important place for interpretation. Could you please use a more specific wording? - As hinted in the paragraph on gender (page 12) we expect a full inclusion of gender considerations	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		during the PPG phase. - as mentioned in the stakeholders' part, we expect a full inclusion of indigenous people (local communities) through the PPG and project phase. 2017-09-28 - Yes, cleared	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	2017-08-31 Yes	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	2017-08-31 No - please address the above comments. 2017-09-28 - Yes, comments have been addressed.	
Review Date	Review	August 31, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 28, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] 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.