

**United Nations Development Programme**

**Fiji**  
**Initiation Plan**

**Project Title:** Leveraging COVID-19 recovery for sustainable blue economy in Fiji and the Pacific

**Expected UNDAF/CP Outcome(s):** United Nations outcome 1 involving UNDP: By 2022, people and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability and disasters;

and environmental protection is strengthened

**Expected CPD Output(s):** Outcome 1. Climate change, disaster resilience and environmental protection

**Initiation Plan Start/End Dates:** January 2021

**Implementing Partner:** UNDP

**Brief Description**

The Initiation Plan (IP) positions UNDP as a leader on blue economy in the Pacific. The IP will respond through focusing on development of a pipeline of investment-ready blue economy opportunities and funding for innovative solutions in partnership with on-going UNDP/UNCDF initiatives and the government's "Drua incubator" (a product of COP23 programme), which is mandated to operate as a regional body to promote the development of innovative climate finance projects with an aim to replicate and scale to other Pacific island countries. In this way, government can move quickly to leverage financing opportunities as soon as possible use of proceeds have identified while also identifying seeding regional innovations. Fiji was the first emerging market to issue a sovereign green bond (100 million Fijian dollars/US\$50 million in 2017) to support climate change mitigation and adaptation and can draw on its lessons to move ahead in an evidence and risk-informed fashion. Unlike the other Pacific SIDS, this has a local bond market and supply of institutional capital. The proposal has been developed by the Multi Country Office in consultation with key national counterparts and with technical inputs from relevant regional advisers. RBAP confirms that the proposal is fully compliant with RFF selection criteria and recommends the proposal for approval by the Investment Group. To note the proposal was originally uploaded on 30 October (ref: 201030-000159 Fiji) but was entered under Support Services. It was then re-entered under Ref number 201105-000350.

Programme Period: 2018-2022

Atlas Project Number: 00134725

Atlas Output ID: 00126261

Gender Marker: \_\_\_\_\_

Total resources required: USD 1.5 Million

Total allocated resources: \_\_\_\_\_

- Regular \_\_\_\_\_
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Donor UNDP
  - Donor \_\_\_\_\_
  - Government \_\_\_\_\_

Unfunded budget: \_\_\_\_\_

In-kind Contributions \_\_\_\_\_

Agreed by UNDP:

Levan Bouadze

08-Mar-2021

Resident Representative

## I. PURPOSE AND EXPECTED OUTPUT

The Fiji economy is projected to contract by 15% in 2020 because of the knock-on impacts of travel restrictions and global economic slowdown in the COVID-19 pandemic context. Growth is expected to be sluggish through 2021, and the tourism industry is projected to return to pre-COVID-19 levels only by 2023. (ADB PEM, 2020). Given Fiji's significant dependence on tourism (40% of GDP), this has had massive direct and indirect impacts on both formal jobs and informal sector livelihoods (66% of the economy) and food security, in a context where unemployment was already high, particularly amongst youth (15% compared to 4% average). Impacts are also disproportionate for women who are mostly informal workers, self-employed entrepreneurs and/or formal workers who typically lack social protection, including savings with the national pension fund. (SIEA for Fiji2). The Government of Fiji responded through an initial stimulus in March (focused on public health, food security, tax/ tariff reductions and relief from loan repayments), followed by an additional F\$2 billion as part of its 2020 National Budget in July. While critical for the response and recovery, these are expected to push public debt levels up to above 80% of GDP in FY2020 (from 49.3% in end FY2019). However, the Pacific SIDS, including Fiji, needs to focus not just on recovering from the COVID-19 slowdown, but to do so while ensuring resilience in the face of climate shocks (which also have a disproportionate impact on the poor) and adapt to climate change in a context where financing needs for climate-sensitive development (as a proportion of national output) are estimated to be among the world's highest. Such expenditures are also set to rise with climate change expected to increase the Pacific's frequency and severity of extreme weather events. The focus is on exploring innovative financing options in tandem with leveraging through other related projects to help government and stakeholders tap into new sources of financing and build on current interest in the blue economy while being conscious of debt sustainability issues. The crisis has pointed to the need to ensure resilience with social inclusion. The UN socio-economic assessment of COVID-19 in Fiji (SEIA) underscores that “the post COVID-19 strategy should be to aggressively implement the Fiji’s blue economy agenda to create more jobs among youth and coastal communities. Apart from the broad policy there is an urgent need to design a time bound strategy and institutional framework to make this agenda a reality with the support from various multilateral financial institutions and donors.” P Such a 'Blue Economy' where economic growth, social inclusion, and livelihoods (e.g., coastal tourism, fishing, food production, energy) can go together with environmental sustainability resonates with policymakers. The Fijian Government recently announced its support to a 'blue' economic recovery via the Savusavu "Blue Town Model." This seeks to promote income generation based on preservation rather than resource extraction, focusing on renewable energy, recycling, marine conservation, sustainable livelihoods, eco-tourism and education. With public debt at record levels and an economy that is, for a large part, dependent on the ocean surrounding it, either directly (e.g. fishing, renewable energy) or in-directly (e.g. tourism), and with a government that has already shown a healthy appetite for innovative finance instruments (such as green bonds to support climate and ocean related investments) and with commitments reflected under Goal 4 of Fiji’s draft National Ocean Policy , there is a “perfect storm” where financial and economic interests align with natural conservation interests to create an opportunity for the use of innovative financing solutions, such as a blue bonds, catastrophe bonds, social/gender bonds and/or sustainability bonds. Fiji was the first emerging market to issue a sovereign green bond (100 million Fijian dollars/US\$50 million in 2017) to support climate change mitigation and adaption and can draw on its lessons to move ahead in an evidence and risk-informed fashion.

This proposal intends to identify options for blue financing and complements two on-going initiatives: it brings the blue economy lens to an on-going Joint Programme (JP) for 4 Pacific SIDS, including Fiji, focused on mobilizing both public and private financing (INFF), where the JP can focus on the institutional and policy framework; and it is aligned with efforts to mobilize funding from the Global Fund for coral reefs (GFCR) where the focus is developing a pipeline of investible proposals.

**The theory of change:** IF a blue financing strategy is developed in synergy with the Government COVID-19 recovery stimulus; AND a pipeline of investment-ready blue economy opportunities are

fostered and accelerated in partnership with the Government of Fiji’s “Drua incubator” (COP23 programme) as well as the on-going UNDP/UNCDF joint initiatives (Joint SDG Fund / Global Fund for Coral Reefs), THEN there will be enhanced financing options for a bluer recovery and knowledge and lessons can be shared regionally in preparation for COP26 to ensure a more sustainable future that delivers on global targets under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement for the Pacific SIDS.

### **Output 1 – Financing options to inform a blue COVID-19 recovery and economy for Fiji assessed**

The recently published Fiji Climate Finance Snapshot 2016 to 2019 highlighted that there are “few public policies aimed at protecting coastal ecosystems and few cost estimates for adaptation in the blue economy, making it difficult to accurately assess the additional levels of funding needed to enhance resilience in this sector.”<sup>5</sup>The Government of Fiji has shown strong interest for UNDP to assist the Government identifying opportunities for both public and private investment in Fiji’s blue economy and supporting the Government to prepare for COP26 to present investment opportunities for global partners and investors.

Activity 1 Develop blue financing strategy for Government of Fiji.

This activity will use the analytical framework of UNDP’s Development Finance Assessment 3.0 (DFA) to apply a modular framework to assess financing options to inform the design of a financing strategy to mobilize resources, manage risks, such as debt sustainability, and achieve development targets linked to a sustainable blue economy. (DFA Guidebook 3.0). The Joint SDG Fund JP proposal noted the lack of capacity for developing and implementing such innovative financing instruments which this will address.

### **Output 2 – Improved innovation and investment in sustainable blue economic activities in the Pacific**

As highlighted in UNDP’s discussion paper on financing the SDG’s in the Pacific<sup>6</sup> “the challenge is to identify (catalytic) investment opportunities, new and innovative investments in the blue economy as well as opportunities for established industries to transition to more environmentally sustainable practices.” To address this challenge the Government of Fiji has established the Drua Incubator during its COP23 presidency; a think tank and incubator housed under the Ministry of Economy, which is mandated to operate as a **regional body** to promote the development of innovative climate finance projects with an aim to replicate and scale to other Pacific island countries.

Activity 2.1 Provide technical and financial assistance to the Drua Incubator to support the development of a blue economy investment portfolio In collaboration with the initiative, the Drua Incubator will develop and accelerate a blue economy investment pipeline, including through focused investor mapping to pitch the pipeline combined with the use of technical assistance and grant funding to unlock additional resources for blended finance investments. These will allow for de-risking to “prime the pump” for blue economy investments on more commercial terms. Specific activities include:

- Innovation Challenges<sup>7</sup>, such as those organized by UNDP’s Youth:Co Lab focused on youth and women entrepreneurship in the blue economy to identify and fund promising solutions
- Capacity building with support from UNDP’s AccLab and financial support through financial grants to existing blue economy incubators and accelerators (e.g. Matanataki) that can support additional sourcing, screening and graduation of investment prospects into bankable projects with a specific focus on those investments which benefit women.
- “Non-financial” de-risking by addressing market and business environment factors through advising on related policy and regulatory measures
- Catalyzing and attracting additional blended finance resources by offering expertise on (and subsidizing cost of) credit management

Activity 2.2 Promote South-South knowledge sharing and blue economy investment match making  
 One of the key issues with regards to Pacific SIDS investment is scale, a regional approach focused on common problems and investment opportunities will be applied to benefit all countries in the region and create opportunities for attracting larger investments. Regional event to share findings, lessons learned, and knowledge generated from the development of the blue finance strategy for Fiji.

- Regional events for presentation of a regional / multi-country blue economy investment pipeline combined with investment match making, inviting private sector investors, IFI's, MDB's, major donors and development partners. This could also act as lead event to prepare for the upcoming COP26.

---

## II. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Though for this initiative UNDP will work with UNCDF during the implementation, UNDP will be responsible for the coordination and implementation of the programme, whereas UNCDF will support the implementation using its technical expertise and connections regarding impact investment and where possible use its existing trust funds to support this initiative with blended finance resources.

The implementation of the programme will be managed by a Project Manager with experience in blended finance solutions for blue economy investments (P3 - TA). Additional technical expertise will be sourced through expert consultants leveraging either UNDP's or UNCDF's LTA's / roster of expert consultants.

The initiative will be governed by a Project Board chaired by representatives of Government of Fiji and joined by the UNDP and UNCDF. This Project Board is responsible to provide guidance and strategic direction to the initiative as well as approve planning and budgets.

**Partnerships** This initiative will be implemented in collaboration with the Government of Fiji and the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) along with other stakeholders.

### **Government of Fiji**

The initiative will operate on the cross-section of public finance and climate change within the Government of Fiji, UNDP Pacific Office's primary contact will be through the Ministry of Economy and more specifically the Treasury Division, as well as with the Climate Change and International Cooperation Division. The latter division is where the Drua incubator is housed. Depending on the type of investment prospects other ministries of the Government of Fiji may be involved as well.

### **UNCDF**

UNCDF will collaborate with UNDP in the implementation of "Building Back Blue" using its investment expertise to provide technical and financial assistance to the Drua Incubator to develop and accelerate a blue economy investment pipeline to be pitched to potential investors. Though not funded through RFF, it will aim to use additional blended finance from other funding sources to de-risk and "prime the pump" for these blue economy investments. These blended finance tools include subordinated financing, guarantees and contingent credit lines designed to enhance the investment rating of potential projects, thus enabling a crowding in of additional financing.

### **Other stakeholders**

Aside from the Government of Fiji and UNCDF, this initiative will proactively engage and collaborate with a wide range of other important external stakeholders who are critical for the implementation of the activities, such as ADB, World Bank, IMF / PFTAC, Australia DFAT, EU, UK FCDO, NZ MFAT and PIFS, but also interested parties such as WWF, IUCN, WCS, the Sustainable Ocean Fund, Global Fund for Coral Reefs, as well as internal stakeholders such as UNDP's Asia-Pacific SDG Financing Facility (APFIN) and the UN Joint SDG Fund. A key anticipated result of the programme implemented in tandem with the DFA and INFF and work to tap into the GFCR, is the strengthening of the ecosystem an institutional coordination and engagement space as well as awareness of the potential of blue economy projects and investments.

### III. MONITORING

A quarterly progress report will be produced to ensure progress is monitored on an ongoing basis. A final Progress Report will be prepared at the end of the Initiation Plan, using the standard format *in addition to attaching the full project document if developed or an explanation if initiation failed to produce a full project.*

<b>Monitoring Activity</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Expected Action</b>	<b>Partners (if joint)</b>	<b>Cost (if any)</b>
<b>Learn</b>	Knowledge, good practices and lessons will be captured regularly	End of the Project	Relevant lessons are captured by the project team and used to inform management decisions.	UNDP Project Management Team	N/A
	One blog post on the Innovation for Development community to share progress update and insights proactively	As when event/activity takes place	Share any photos, videos, press releases and any events related	UNDP	N/A
<b>Project Report</b>	A progress report will be presented to the key stakeholders, consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined targets at the output level	At the end of the project (final report)	Initiation Plan Results to be reviewed within first 3 months of implementation and issues associated with lack of progress in implementation, financial and human resources etc will be discussed and appropriate course of action decided.	UNDP Project Management Team	N/A

## IV. WORK PLAN

Period<sup>1</sup>:

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES <i>List all activities including M&amp;E to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs</i>	TIMEFRAME						RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET <sup>9</sup>		
		2020				2021			Source of Funds	Budget Description	Amount (USD)
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2				
1. Financing options to inform a blue COVID-19 recovery and economy for Fiji assessed	<i>1.1. Develop a blue financing strategy for Government of Fiji to tap into innovative financing instruments</i>	X	X	X	X			UNDP and Gov of Fiji	RFF	Staff, Consultants, Workshops and editing/ design /printing of publication	111,876
2. Foster innovation and investment in sustainable blue economic activities in the Pacific	<i>2.1. Provide technical and risksharing assistance to the regional Drua Incubator to support the development of a blue economy investment portfolio and to finance innovative solutions</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	UNCDF and UNDP	RFF	Staff, Consultants, Workshops and editing/ design/printing of publication, Grants, financial mechanisms	1,145,643
	<i>2.2. Promote South-South knowledge sharing and blue economy investment match making for the Pacific SIDS</i>		X		X		X				127,505
<i>M&amp;E</i>											41,551
<b>Contingency</b>											73,425
<b>Total</b>											1,500,000

<sup>1</sup> Maximum 18 months

## Social and Environmental Screening Template (2021 SESP Template, Version 1)

The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document at the design stage. Note: this template will be converted into an online tool. The online version will guide users through the process and will embed relevant guidance.

### Project Information

<b>Project Information</b>	
1. Project Title	Leveraging COVID-19 recovery for sustainable blue economy in Fiji and the Pacific
2. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+)	Award 00134725, Output 00126261
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Fiji
4. Project stage (Design or Implementation)	Design
5. Date	1 <sup>st</sup> Jan 2021

### Part A. Integrating Programming Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

<b>QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles in Order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?</b>
<b><i>Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach</i></b>
The project enhances the availability, accessibility and quality of blue economy services for potentially marginalized individuals and groups, thereby contributing to their inclusion in the development of a sustainable blue economy. It specifically aligns with the UNDP global strategy “Leaving No One Behind and as such has strong linkages to the SDGs.
<b><i>Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment</i></b>
The project has a specific focus on women as a target segment and has both tracking indicators and targets to increase participation of women in the sustainable blue economy.  The project design incorporates sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics and the results framework includes special measures/outputs and indicators to address gender inequality issues (Score 2 as per the ATLAS Gender Marker)  Furthermore, the project will be supported by UNDP’s UNV Gender Specialist in Quarter 2 of 2021.
<b><i>Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience</i></b>
This project will be implemented in conjunction with joint Global Coral Reef Programme and also the INNf project. There are no elements envisaged under the project that adversely affect environment sustainability.

***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders***

Aside from the Government of Fiji and UNCDF, this initiative will proactively engage and collaborate with a wide range of other important external stakeholders who are critical for the implementation of the activities, such as ADB, World Bank, IMF / PFTAC, Australia DFAT, EU, UK FCDO, NZ MFAT and PIFS, but also interested parties such as WWF, IUCN, WCS, the Sustainable Ocean Fund, Global Fund for Coral Reefs, as well as internal stakeholders such as UNDP's Asia-Pacific SDG Financing Facility (APFIN) and the UN Joint SDG Fund. A key anticipated result of the programme implemented in tandem with the DFA and INFF and work to tap into the GFCR, is the strengthening of the ecosystem an institutional coordination and engagement space as well as awareness of the potential of blue economy projects and investments.

**Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks**

<b>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?</b> <i>Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.</i>	<b>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?</b> <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 5</i>			<b>QUESTION 6: Describe the assessment and management measures for each risk rated Moderate, Substantial or High</b>
<b>Risk Description</b> <i>(broken down by event, cause, impact)</i>	<b>Impact and Likelihood (1-5)</b>	<b>Significance (Low, Moderate Substantial, High)</b>	<b>Comments (optional)</b>	<b>Description of assessment and management measures for risks rated as Moderate, Substantial or High</b>
Risk 1: ....	I = L =			
Risk 2 ....	I = L =			
[add additional rows as needed]				
<b>QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?</b>				
<b>Low Risk</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	



	<b>Moderate Risk</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>Substantial Risk</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>High Risk</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are triggered? (check all that apply)</b>			
Question only required for Moderate, Substantial and High Risk projects			
	<b><u>Is assessment required? (check if “yes”)</u></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Status? (completed, planned)</b>
<i>if yes, indicate overall type and status</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	Targeted assessment(s)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment)
	<b>Are management plans required? (check if “yes”)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>If yes, indicate overall type</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework)
	<b>Based on identified <u>risks</u>, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?</b>		<b>Comments (not required)</b>
	<b>Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind</b>		

	<b><i>Human Rights</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>Accountability</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>3. Community Health, Safety and Security</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>4. Cultural Heritage</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>5. Displacement and Resettlement</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>6. Indigenous Peoples</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>7. Labour and Working Conditions</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b><i>8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### **Final Sign Off**

*Final Screening at the design-stage is not complete until the following signatures are included*

<b><i>Signature</i></b>	<b><i>Date</i></b>	<b><i>Description</i></b>
QA Assessor		UNDP staff member responsible for the project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have “checked” to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver		UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have “cleared” the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair		UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.

## SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

<b>Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks</b>	
<p><b>INSTRUCTIONS:</b> The risk screening checklist will assist in answering Questions 2-6 of the Screening Template. Answers to the checklist questions help to (1) identify potential risks, (2) determine the overall risk categorization of the project, and (3) determine required level of assessment and management measures. Refer to the <a href="#">SES toolkit</a> for further guidance on addressing screening questions.</p>	
<p><b>Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind</b></p> <p><b>Human Rights</b></p>	<b>Answer (Yes/No)</b>
P.1 Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	NO
P.2 Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project?	NO
P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	NO
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>	NO
P.4 adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	NO
P.5 inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? <sup>2</sup>	NO
P.6 restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities?	NO
P.7 exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	NO
<b>Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</b>	

<sup>2</sup> Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, sex, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to "women and men" or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender and transsexual people.

P.8 Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project, (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	NO
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>	NO
P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	NO
P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	NO
P.11 limitations on women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i>	NO
P.12 exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence? <i>For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc.</i>	NO
<b>Sustainability and Resilience:</b> Screening questions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below	
<b>Accountability</b>	
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>	NO
P.13 exclusion of any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups and excluded individuals (including persons with disabilities), from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	NO
P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders?	NO
P.15 risks of retaliation or reprisals against stakeholders who express concerns or grievances, or who seek to participate in or to obtain information on the project?	NO
<b>Project-Level Standards</b>	
<b>Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</b>	
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>	NO

1.1	adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	NO
1.2	activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including (but not limited to) legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	NO
1.3	changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	NO
1.4	risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)?	NO
1.5	exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade?	NO
1.6	introduction of invasive alien species?	NO
1.7	adverse impacts on soils?	NO
1.8	harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	NO
1.9	significant agricultural production?	NO
1.10	animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	NO
1.11	significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	NO
1.12	handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms? <sup>3</sup>	NO
1.13	utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development) <sup>4</sup>	NO
1.14	adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	NO
<b>Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks</b>		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		NO
2.1	areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions?	NO

<sup>3</sup> See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](#).

<sup>4</sup> See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Nagoya Protocol](#) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources.

2.2	outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change or disasters? <i>For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes</i>	NO
2.3	increases in vulnerability to climate change impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	NO
2.4	increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change?	NO
<b>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security</b>		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		NO
3.1	construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g. roads, buildings, dams)? (Note: the GEF does not finance projects that would involve the construction or rehabilitation of large or complex dams)	NO
3.2	air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation?	NO
3.3	harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)?	NO
3.4	risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health?	NO
3.5	transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	NO
3.6	adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities' health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)?	NO
3.7	influx of project workers to project areas?	NO
3.8	engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities?	NO
<b>Standard 4: Cultural Heritage</b>		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		NO
4.1	activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site?	NO
4.2	significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes?	NO

4.3	adverse impacts to sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	NO
4.4	alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance?	NO
4.5	utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes?	NO
<b>Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement</b>		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		NO
5.1	temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement (including people without legally recognizable claims to land)?	NO
5.2	economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	NO
5.3	risk of forced evictions? <sup>5</sup>	NO
5.4	impacts on or changes to land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	NO
<b>Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples</b>		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		NO
6.1	areas where indigenous peoples are present (including project area of influence)?	NO
6.2	activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	NO
6.3	impacts (positive or negative) to the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the project is	NO

<sup>5</sup> Forced eviction is defined here as the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection. Forced evictions constitute gross violations of a range of internationally recognized human rights.

	located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? <i>If the answer to screening question 6.3 is “yes”, then the potential risk impacts are considered significant and the project would be categorized as either Substantial Risk or High Risk</i>	
6.4	the absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	NO
6.5	the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	NO
6.6	forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above</i>	NO
6.7	adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	NO
6.8	risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	NO
6.9	impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.</i>	NO
<b>Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions</b>		
	<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)</i>	NO
7.1	working conditions that do not meet national labour laws and international commitments?	NO
7.2	working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining?	NO
7.3	use of child labour?	NO
7.4	use of forced labour?	NO
7.5	discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity?	NO
7.6	occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle?	NO
<b>Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</b>		



<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>	NO
8.1 the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	NO
8.2 the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	NO
8.3 the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous materials and/or chemicals?	NO
8.4 the use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the <a href="#">Montreal Protocol</a>, <a href="#">Minamata Convention</a>, <a href="#">Basel Convention</a>, <a href="#">Rotterdam Convention</a>, <a href="#">Stockholm Convention</a></i>	NO
8.5 the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	NO
8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	NO

**Risks**

#	Description	Date Identified	Type	Impact Probability &	Countermeasures
1	Political events in pacific countries impact on ability to participate	2021	Political	Probability - 2 Impact - 2	Project allows continuation of activities even if there are political events impacting on participation from one country
2	Lack of ownership / engagement by Government	2021	Political Strategic	Probability - 2 Impact - 4	UNDP will ensure there is ownership via regular meetings
3	Natural disasters that impact directly on implementation	2021	Environmental	Probability 2 Impact 2	UNDP will have plans in place in case of disasters
4	Impact of COVID-19	2021	Operational	Prob. = 5 Impact = 5	A global pandemic resulting in lockdown, economic downturn, work disruptions, travel restrictions etc.  A pandemic is an uncommon event, however COVID-19 already has a devastating impact on lives, livelihoods as well as socio-economic implications that are far-reaching. The COVID-19 situation also leads to changes in donor priorities that can severely impact project implementation