



ANNUAL PROJECT REPORT 2020



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Project title: Capacity Building For Mainstreaming MEA Objectives Into Inter-Ministerial Structures And Mechanisms		
Country: Fiji	Implementing Partner: Ministry of Waterways and Environment (MWE)	Management Arrangements: NIM
Atlas Project ID/Award ID number: 00083221		Atlas Output ID/Project ID number: 00091812
UNDP-GEF PIMS ID number: 4727		GEF ID number: 5166
Project start date (ProDoc signature date): 26-Mar-2015		Original Planned project closing date: 26-Mar-2018
		Revised project closing date: 26-Sep-2019
FINANCING PLAN & EXPENDITURES		
Total GEF Grant (U\$S): 611,364		Total Co-financing (as planned in CEO endorsement request) (U\$S): 1,175,000
GEF Grant Disbursed as of 30 June 2020 (U\$S): 274,894.35		GEF Grant Annual Expenditures (U\$S): 2015: 2.26 2016: 32,595.49 2017: 93,084.78 2018: 76,504.64 2019: 70,813.80 2020: 1,893.38 Total: 274,894.35
Project Contacts and Links		
Partner	Contact Name	Email Address
<i>Project Coordinator / Manager</i>	Ms. Vilimaina Civavonovono (Left the Fiji's Department of Environment on January 2020, she is not available at the writing of this APR)	vcivavonovono@govnet.gov.fj or vilimainarokai@gmail.com
<i>UNDP Country Office Programme Officer</i>	Mr. Rusiate Ratuniata (the responsible person for writing this APR)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org

<i>Project Implementing Partner</i>	Ms. Sandeep Singh	<i>singhsk@govnet.gov.fj</i>
<i>GEF Operational Focal Point</i>	Mr. Joshua Wycliffe	<i>Joshua.wycliffe@govnet.gov.fj</i>
<i>Other Partners</i>	Mr. Nilesh Prakash (Director Climate Change, Ministry of Economy) Dr. Apaitia Macanawai (Director Research, Ministry of Agriculture)	nprakash001@economy.gov.fj apaitia.macanawai@govnet.gov.fj
<i>UNDP Technical Adviser</i>	Mr. Tom Twining-Ward	<i>tom.twining-ward@undp.org</i>
<i>UNDP Programme Associate</i>	Ms. Nadezda Liscakova	<i>nadezda.liscakova@undp.org</i>
<i>Project website, etc.</i>	Not applicable	
<i>Links to media coverage</i>	Not applicable	
Brief project summary:		
<p>This project is in line with the following CCD Programme Objectives: i) CD 3 - Strengthening capacities to develop policy and legislative frameworks; ii) CD 4 - Strengthening capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines; and, to some extent iii) CD 5 – Enhancing capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends. It is a direct response to the GEF-funded National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) project conducted in Fiji during the period of 2006-2010, which, through its endorsement by the National Environment Council (NEC) in early 2010, prioritized cross-cutting capacity issues related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions. It addresses the identified cross-cutting issues including the review and formulation of relevant legislations and policies; the promotion and establishment of cross-sector cooperation; the establishment of proper performance and reporting mechanisms; the establishment of sustainable financing mechanisms; the establishment of a systematic research and monitoring system; the development and the support of relevant training and education; and the strengthening of communication and awareness raising. Through a learning-by-doing process, this project will strengthen the capacities of individuals and institutions involved in environmental management in Fiji to coordinate better, make better decisions addressing global environmental issues and mainstream global environmental issues into national legislation, policies, plans and programmes. Under the first component, the project will focus on assessing and structuring an improved consultative and decision-making process that effectively integrates global environmental objectives into existing national environmental legislation. The project will support the development of capacities of decision-makers to interpret and agree on how best to govern the environment in Fiji that not only meets national priorities, but also global environmental obligations. This component will focus on the processes to facilitate these decisions. This component will also include strengthening the process to engage, coordinate and collaborate with non-governmental stakeholders, such as NGOs, civil society, private sector and academia. Under the second component, the project will focus on reconciling and strengthening the set of legislative instruments - inclusive of key national policies and programmes – that are used to govern environmental management and ensure that these instruments are aligned with Fiji’s MEA obligations. This will help Fiji to improve its compliance with various related Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEAs), particularly the three Rio Conventions.</p>		
Link to Project QA assessment implementation report for the reporting period:	QA on Implementation Completed in 2019	

I. Executive Summary

(one page maximum)

A concise brief on the progress towards the Project key deliverables, and outputs (project output is the same as CPAP output), related to Country Programme Outcome and SP Output and Outcome during the reporting period. The section should also include key results related to the capacity development, gender equality (marker), environment and social safeguard, partnership, South-South and Triangular Cooperation efforts, implementation issues/challenges and the main lessons learnt.

The project should have been operationally closed by the 26th of September 2019. The last pending activity remains the Terminal Evaluation, thus the project's status in Atlas is still on-going. As is evident from the project's 2020 expenditure there was only \$1,893.38 utilized. There were no activities at all implemented by the project after the 26th of September. There was no progress report submitted by IP to the Fiji CO for Q3 and Q4, 2019. The project's finance officer and the UNCBD liaison officer both resigned late 2018. The project coordinator resigned 6 months prior to the project's extension end date, in the month of March 2019.

The project was then single-handedly looked after by Mrs. Vilimaina Civavonovono, the remaining UNCBD liaison personnel. No further activities were implemented as approval for any from the IP's senior management was not forthcoming. Therefore, in the cumulative progress column of the table on the Implementation Progress, the status remained the same as it was for the July 2018 -June 2019 APR period. The two new issues that emerged are the only change to this APR. These were on the shifting priorities from the main IP and the resignation of the current project management unit. There was no urgency from the main IP to hire replacements for these that have resigned, specifically the project coordinator role. A technical advisor (TA) was procured by the Fiji CO as an intervention measure to assist in implementation. The TA also reported of the IP's prolonged delays in approvals. There was nothing much the TA could do.

The only project milestone that pends is the terminal evaluation (TE) due to start the week of 12th October 2020. The overall delay of the TE is primarily due to the limited understanding on the TE timeline by the CO programme officer, which eventually led to the oversight on the timing of the process. When the delay exceeded December 2019, the issuance of the authorized spending limit (ASL) was an added layer of complication. A note-to-file with strong justification and exceptional budget revision accompanied with necessary corrective actions in Atlas, was required to have this cleared and the \$15,000 ASL issued for the TE. The lesson learnt is to initiate TEs or MTRs on the initial prompting email automatically generated by Atlas. This is usually a 3-months period for medium sized projects and a 6-months period for full sized projects.

II. Implementation Progress

Progress toward Development Objective:

For each indicator, the Project Manager should enter the cumulative progress since project start directly into the box in the far right column.

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Cumulative progress from start of the project
Objective: To integrate and institutionalize inter-ministerial decision-making for MEA implementation.	1. Alignment of institutional framework with the objectives and obligations of the Rio Conventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiji is committed to meet its MEAs obligations; however, some critical gaps in its institutional framework exist; including an uneven capacity within key ministries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conventions obligations are well integrated into institutional framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 22 government institutions mandates have been reviewed and most institutional frameworks are aligned to the Rio Convention obligations Gaps and Overlap analysis indicated few issues that will be addressed by the project by developing a strategy to address these gaps and challenges. This is part of the Consultants work and should be finalized by May 2019 <p>UPDATE June 2020: The strategy for integration Conventions into institutional framework, addressing the gaps and challenges, has NOT been finalized.</p>
	2. Alignment of legislative and policy frameworks with the objectives and obligations of the Rio Conventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to its institutional framework, some critical gaps in its legal and policy frameworks exist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MEAs obligations are well integrated into legislative and policy frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan and its Implementation Framework (UNCBD), Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) and its Roadmap, National Climate Change Policy (UNFCCC) and the National Action Plan (UNCCD) have been reviewed and most policy frameworks are aligned to the obligations of the Rio Conventions. Consultants will be working on the addressing gaps and overlaps identified in the reviews. Consultant should be hired before the end of December 2018 UPDATE June 2020: Consultants who were to work further and process the results of the review were NOT hired.
	3. Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement: 6 of 9 Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 7 of 15 Policy and legislation 	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement: 7 of 9 Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 10 of 15 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is engaging with 22 government intuitions and agencies and 12 non-government organizations Most government and non-government intuitions have access and use of information through established MOUs and MOAs The project supported technically and financially the development and implementation of the NBSAP & IF, NDC, ABS and NAP. The project is supporting technically the management and implementation of the existing Rio Conventions technical working groups e.g. established Fiji Invasive Species Taskforce, Integrated

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Cumulative progress from start of the project
		development: 6 of 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management and implementation: 3 of 6 • Monitor and evaluate: 2 of 6 (total score: 24/45) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy and legislation development: 8 of 9 • Management and implementation: 5 of 6 • Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6 (total targeted score: 34/45) 	Coastal Management Committee, Inland Waters, Sustainable Land Care Management Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CD score card will be completed for TE in February 2019. • UPDATE June 2020: The Capacity scorecard has not been completed. UPDATE June 2020: This target was not fully achieved
<p>Outcome 1: The institutional framework is strengthened and more coordinated, and more able to address global environmental concerns.</p> <p>Output 1.1 Institutions with clear mandates and responsibilities to implement MEAs</p> <p>Output 1.2 An operational inter-sectorial coordination</p>	<p>4. Strategies implemented that address prioritized institutional gaps and overlaps in respective government MEA convention focal points.</p> <p>5. Number of relevant government institutions represented in training that effectively execute these strategies</p> <p>6. Percentage of Environmental</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant policies (what are the policies?), national strategies (what are the strategies?), institutional set-ups (#? type?), endorsed by Govt from 2008 to 2013 • Insert number of relevant institutions trained in since 2010 • Insert percentage of relevant EMUs and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-structure of institutions to fully comply to obligations under MEAs • All relevant institutions trained, improved quality of national reports produced (e.g. national communications, 5th National Report, etc.) • 100% of relevant EMUs and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps, overlaps and strategies have been developed using outcomes of the National Consultation Workshops for government institutions and agencies • Most institutions comply to Rio Convention obligations, however, recommended strategies to overcome gaps and overlaps will be communicated to various government and non-government organizations • UPDATE June 2020: - Strategies/results of the National Consultations Workshops were not communicated as planned. UPDATE June 2020: The target was not fully achieved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 22 government institutions and agencies and 12 non-government organizations are represented in all training workshops • Fiji is working on its 3rd National Report to UNFCCC; the Climate Change Division of the Ministry of Economy is responsible for collating the report, 6th National Report to UNCBD; Department of Environment is responsible and 2nd National Report to UNCCD; Ministry of Agriculture is responsible. Reports undergoes rigorous national consultations and are then passed through the Fiji Cabinet before forwarding that to the various convention secretariats. • As much as possible the project tries to ensure gender parity in participants number attending the trainings, with 50% women and the other 50% men UPDATE June 2020: The target was partially achieved.. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 17 Environment Management Unit (EMU) staffs and 14 conservation officers (one per province for the 14 provinces of the Fiji

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Cumulative progress from start of the project
mechanism for implementing MEAs.	Management Units and conservation officers supported in the reporting and monitoring of MEAs	conservation officers trained in since 2010	conservation officers trained	Islands) have been trained on the reporting and monitoring of MEAs. This 17 EMU and 14 conservation officers represented the core of the support staff that will be tasked on the collection and collation of pertinent environmental data. UPDATE June 2020: The target was partially achieved.
Output 1.3 Improved contribution from NGO sector, Academia, CBO/Faith based organizations and private sector to implement MEAs.	7. An operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism) that build on existing instruments such as NEC, NBSAP committee, NCCCC, NLCSC, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three existing mechanisms are operational, however there is very little • inter-sectorial coordination. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinating MEAs including a broader stakeholder involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing instruments such as NEC, NBSAP, NLCSC have been reviewed and inter-sectorial coordination mechanism developed <p>UPDATE June 2020: The target was partially achieved.</p>
	8. Policy decisions supported through improved MEA awareness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited awareness of policy-makers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of policy-papers at various levels (ministries, Cabinet, NEC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has supported the NBSAP (awaiting cabinet approval), supporting development of the NBSAP IF), supported the NDC (approved by cabinet) and supporting the development of the NAP and the ABS Implementation Framework <p>UPDATE June 2020: The target was partially achieved.</p>
	9. Endorsed annual work plans for MEAs (from government, NGOs, Academia, CBOs/Faith Organizations and private sector) to support government's MEA obligations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validated MOUs/NBSAP/draft NAP/CC Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewed commitments under annual work plans with specific budgets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most AWP's for government and non-government organizations supports government MEAs obligations through their various policies and are also aligned to government 5 years and 20 years national development plans <p>UPDATE June 2020: The target was partially achieved.</p>
OUTCOME 2: Global environmental objectives are reconciled and integrated into national legislation, policy, strategies and planning frameworks.	10. An analytical legal framework for the three MEAs emerging issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, 56 legislations exist that need to be improved to incorporate MEAs and emerging issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal framework / instructions developed for the three MEAs and emerging issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and reviews of legal frameworks will be core part of consultancy. Consultants will be recruited on the week of 24th December 2018, TOR has been developed, and the UNDP procurement unit in their attempt to expedite the hiring process has guided the project to a desk review. The desk review is on the consultancies recommended by the project management unit for its technical capability and efficiency for the consultancy work at hand. The successful consultant's work is to be completed by May 2019.

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Cumulative progress from start of the project
Output 2.1				UPDATE June 2020: Consultants were finally not hired, instruction for Legal framework were not prepared. This target was not achieved.
Revised legislation and policies addressing MEAs obligations.	11. Number of institutions that are actively involved in the formulation of environmental legal framework.	• 3 (Department of Environment, the Fiji Environment Law Association, and the Solicitor-General's Office)	• 5 institutions (2 additional - Climate Change Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs & International Corporation; and the Land Use Division of the Ministry of Agriculture)	• Department of Environment (Ministry of Waterways and Environment), Fiji Environment Law Association, Solicitor General's Office, Climate Change Division (Ministry of Economy), Research Division (Ministry of Agriculture) UPDATE June 2020: This target was partially achieved
Output 2.2				
An effective system to monitor implementation of MEAs.	12. Number of individual MEA monitoring systems upgraded and operational (with strong guidelines, data collection methods, data norms and standards, database structures, and data sharing), and a centralized data bank.	• Each institution has its own database/data sets, which need to be upgraded and fed into a centralized data bank.	• Indicator-based monitoring systems in all institutions, and a central data bank established.	• Desktop review on UNFCCC, UNCBD and UNCCD monitoring systems and reports submitted, an integrated work plan for a central data bank is proposed. This is part of the consultant's work as well UPDATE June 2020: Consultant has not been hired. This target was not fully achieved.
Output 2.3				
Guidelines for Sustainable financing mechanisms developed	13. Comparative analysis of research on Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) based on national and international practices	• Environmental Financing Mechanisms currently in place/ practice and other relevant research materials	• Formalized MEAs sustainable financing mechanisms	• Desktop review done on PES and reports yet to be submitted. This is part of the consultants work as well UPDATE June 2020: Consultant has not been hired. This target was not fully achieved.

Key outputs delivered during reporting period:

Project Outcome	Key Outputs for the 2020 reporting period from July 2019 to June 2020
Output 1.1	There is no update in this table. In the period from July 2019 to June 2020 the project has not had any activities and its delivery was just up to 2,000 USD due to adjustments (IPSAS adjustments) in Financial system (Atlas).
Output 1.2	
Output 1.3	
Output 2.1	
Output 2.2	
Output 2.3	

III. Project Implementation Challenges

Please identify and analyse project high risks and project issues:

- 1) That had an impact on project deliverables (quality, schedule) during the reporting period, or
- 2) That were newly identified during the reporting period and are being addressed by the project (in the case of risks, describe project prozed means to mitigate their effects or decrease the likelihood of impact in the future, and in the case of issues, how to resolve them).
- 3) Describe the Covid-19 pandemic-related challenges, delays and impact and how these are to be addressed (in case these are considered as high risks for the project)

a. Updated project risks and actions as updated in Atlas risk log and marked as CRITICAL

(please note that ONLY high risks should be reflected in the table below)

Project Risk Description	Type	Date identified	Mitigation Measures
Enter a brief description of the risk	Environmental Financial Operational Organizational Political Regulatory Strategic Other	dd-mm-yyyy	What actions will be taken to mitigate this risk
SUBSTANTIAL risk in the Risk Register Shifting priorities – initially the project was on the verge of procuring the services of a consultancy group to review the governance framework that supports Fiji’s reporting to the Rio Conventions. The Fiji Government made a reshuffle of governmental ministries at about the same time, the reshuffling came with a relegation of the governance structure review to a lesser priority. Until now this has not been done.	Operational Alignment with National Priorities	2 March 2019	Persuade (by emails, phone call and face-to-face meetings) the IP to reprioritize the reviewing of the governance framework that supports Fiji’s reporting to the Rio Conventions.
SUBSTANTIAL risk in the Risk Register Unavailability of dedicated project staff to follow	Operational Organizational	31 March 2019	Persuaded the senior management of the IP to provide a work environment conducive to growth and self-improvement.

through with pending activities identified from the 2018-2019 APR period.			
---	--	--	--

b. Updated project issues and actions

Explain the main implementation issues encountered in the course of implementation during the year and the proposed actions to solve the issues.

Describe the Covid-19 pandemic-related challenges, delays and impact and how these are to be addressed (if not described yet in the table above, among high risks)

Project Issue Description	Mitigation Measures, Actions Taken
Enter a brief description of the issue	What actions will be taken to mitigate this risk
Prolonged delay of the TE for the project.	<p>The overall delay of the TE is primarily due to the limited understanding on the TE timeline by the CO programme officer, which eventually led to the oversight (by HQ) on the timing of the process. When the delay exceeded December 2019, the issuance of the authorized spending limit (ASL) was an added layer of complication. A note-to-file with strong justification and exceptional budget revision accompanied with necessary corrective actions in Atlas, was required to have this cleared and the \$15,000 ASL issued for the TE.</p> <p>The lesson learnt is to initiate TEs or MTRs on the initial prompting email automatically generated by Atlas. This is usually a 3-months period for medium sized projects and a 6-months period for full sized projects.</p>
COVID-19 was not considered as an issue, as the project had no activities in the reporting period (July 2019 – June 2020)	N/A

IV. Annexes

Annex 1: Workplan and budget (mandatory only for projects that have been extended in this reporting period)

Outcome:					
Outputs	Planned activities	Chronogram		Budget 2020	Budget 2021
		Start (month)	End (month)	GEF (USD)	GEF
Output 1.1 as in PRODOC	1.1.1				
Terminal Evaluation	1.1.2				
	1.1.3				
	1.1.4				
Subtotal output 1.1				0.00	
Output 1.2 as in PRODOC	1.2.1				
Terminal Evaluation	1.2.2				
	1.2.3				
	1.2.4				
	1.2.5				
Subtotal output 1.2				0.00	
Output 1.3 as in PRODOC	1.3.1				
	1.3.2				
	1.3.3				
	1.3.4				
Subtotal output 1.3				0.00	
<i>Insert additional rows if necessary</i>					
TOTAL per budget line				15,000	

Use the same format for additional Outcomes...