



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Region: | Pacific |
| Country (ies): | Solomon Islands |
| Project Title: | Integrated Forest Management in the Solomon Islands |
| FAO Project Symbol: | GCP/SOI/001/GFF |
| GEF ID: | 5122 |
| GEF Focal Area(s): | Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Climate Change, SFM/REDD |
| Project Executing Partners: | Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology; Ministry of Forests and Research; Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock |
| Project Duration: | 5 years |

Milestone Dates:

| | |
|---|----------------|
| GEF CEO Endorsement Date: | May 4, 2016 |
| Project Implementation Start Date/EOD : | March 13, 2017 |
| Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹: | July 30, 2021 |
| Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ² | n/a |
| Actual Implementation End Date³: | n/a |

Funding

| | |
|---|------------|
| GEF Grant Amount (USD): | 5,676,454 |
| Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴: | 30,670,500 |
| Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m): | 689,956 |
| Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵ | 2,275,000 |

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

Review and Evaluation

| | |
|---|---|
| Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee: | October 30,2018 |
| Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable): | We should do the MTR later this year or early next year – please propose timing |
| Mid-term review/evaluation actual: | n/a |
| Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020). | Yes or No ✓ |
| Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020). | Yes or No ✓ |
| Terminal Evaluation Date Actual: | n/a |
| Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶ | Yes or No ✓ |

Ratings

| | | |
|--|----|--|
| Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative): | MU | |
| Overall implementation progress rating: | MU | |
| Overall risk rating: | M | |

Status

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR): | 2 nd |
|---|-----------------|

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Project Contacts

| Contact | Name, Title, Division/Affiliation | E-mail |
|--|--|--------------------------------|
| Project Manager / Coordinator | Douglas Yee Mr. | Douglas.Yee@fao.org |
| Lead Technical Officer | Aru Mathias, Mr., SAPM | Aru.Mathias@fao.org |
| Interim Lead Technical Officer | Madankumar Janakiraman, Mr., SAP | Madankumar.janakiraman@fao.org |
| Budget Holder | Eriko Hibi, Ms., SAPDD | Eriko.Hibi@fao.org |
| GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division | Yurie Naito, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit | Yurie.Naito@fao.org |

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

| Project objective and Outcomes | Description of indicator(s) ⁷ | Baseline level | Mid-term target ⁸ | End-of-project target | Level at 30 June 2019 | Progress rating ⁹ |
|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|
| Objective(s): | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1: 1.1 Terrestrial protected area network expanded to improve ecosystem coverage. | Area formally brought under the national system of protected areas legally designated with the consent of local landowners. | 0 ha terrestrial PA formally recognized | | Terrestrial protected area network expanded to cover an additional area of 143,000 ha; that covers key biodiversity hotspots | Out of 5 protected area 3 PA Sites are in a position to form Management Committee. Details are given in section 2. | U |
| 1.2 Improved management effectiveness of new and existing terrestrial protected areas. | Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by METT | Baseline METT scores Kolombangara – 65, Bauro Highlands – 30, Tina-Popomanaseu – 28, Are'areMaramasike – 32, Mount Maetambe– 33 | | METT score increased by 25% over baseline for each PA | Project has not reached to this stage. Next step is to form management committee and protected area management plan. This outcome will be addressed during management plan preparation. | U |

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

| Project objective and Outcomes | Description of indicator(s) ⁷ | Baseline level | Mid-term target ⁸ | End-of-project target | Level at 30 June 2019 | Progress rating ⁹ |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|
| 1.3 Sustainability of protected area management improved through sustainable financing and local income generating activities. | PA finance scorecard | No formal PAs system and financing system existent | -- | Target for the scorecard to be established | Project has not reached to this stage. | U |
| Outcome 2: 2.1 Improved decision-making in management of production landscapes | ha. under SLM practices | Landscapes not effectively coordinated for SLM | -- | 51,650ha. | Hiring of National and International Sustainable land management consultant is underway. Project has not reached at the stage where it can contribute to output 2.1. | U |
| 2.2 Improved land use practices promoted | Number of HH adopting SLM practices such as conservation agriculture, integrated soil fertility management and agroforestry (including women headed households) | Poor land use practices affecting soil and water quality in and around PAs | -- | At least 25% of HH living in/around PAs | Project has not reached to this stage. | U |

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

| Project objective and Outcomes | Description of indicator(s) ⁷ | Baseline level | Mid-term target ⁸ | End-of-project target | Level at 30 June 2019 | Progress rating ⁹ |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|
| Outcome 3: 3.1 National capacities enhanced to monitor carbon stocks in natural forests and plantations | Number of peer reviewed national Carbon monitoring reports | None | -- | At least 1 Carbon monitoring reports available | Forest Reference Level Report (FRL) was produced last year and submitted to UNFCCC. FRL assessment is underway and Foreste Department is undertaking reviews and submitted responses to UNFCCC. FAO is providing technical support. | MS |
| Outcome 4: 4.1 Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests | tCO2 sequestered in forests through degraded forest restoration | Unsustainable logging operations affecting carbon stocks | -- | Degraded forests restored and carbon stocks enhanced 3183842tC sequestered in 5 years of project. | One nursery facility at Tina Popomanaseu established, awaiting supply of seeds. Another two nursery facility to be established in Q3 of year 2019 at Bauro Highlands and Mount Maetambe. | MS |
| Outcome 5: 5.1 Increased local capacity to monitor, evaluate and manage biodiversity, land-use change and sustainable forest management. | M+E system operational and producing regular reports for use in national projects, policies and plans as well as reporting to international organizations | Low levels of capacity to monitor, evaluate and manage biodiversity land use change and SFM | -- | Local capacity increased to monitor, evaluate and manage biodiversity land use change and SFM. An operational M+E system in place producing national | Project has not reached to this stage. Project management unit established within MECDM takes care of M&E of all ministry projects. | U |

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

| Project objective and Outcomes | Description of indicator(s) ⁷ | Baseline level | Mid-term target ⁸ | End-of-project target | Level at 30 June 2019 | Progress rating ⁹ |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|
| | | | | policies, plans and projects | | |
| 5.2 Community-based forest management (including tree planting) strengthened | Number of communities involved in effective forest management | No formal community-based forest management | -- | Community based forest management strengthened and forest areas under effective local community control | One nursery facility at Tina Popomanaseu established, awaiting supply of seeds. Another two nursery facility to be established in Q3 of year 2019 at Bauro Highlands and Mount Maetambe. | MS |
| 5.3 Policymakers and the general public are better informed about biodiversity conservation, climate change, SLM and SFM. | Number of policymakers and general public aware about issues on BD conservation, CC, SLM and SFM through training and workshops | NA | -- | 100 | At least 11 number of awareness consultations completed to make general public and policy makers aware about the biodiversity, conservation and climate change. | MS |

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

| Outcome | Action(s) to be taken | By whom? | By when? |
|---|--|---|--------------|
| Outcome 1: 1.1 Terrestrial protected area network expanded to improve ecosystem coverage. | Management committee to be formed at all PA sites Mapping and Biodiversity Survey to be carried out PA management plan | Through a competent organisation using LOA method | By June 2020 |
| 1.2 Improved management effectiveness of new and existing terrestrial protected areas. | Training on SFM, Climate Change and Protected Area management plan will improve the effectiveness of PA management committee and other stakeholders | FAO, Local Sstakeholders, International Consultants, National Consultants | By June 2020 |
| 1.3 Sustainability of protected area management improved through sustainable financing and local income generating activities. | Not planned yet. Initiation of sustainable financing and alternative income generating activities will be planned after June 2019 | FAO, Local Stakeholders, International Consultants, National Consultants | By June 2020 |
| Outcome 2: 2.1 Improved decision-making in management of production landscapes | Hiring of National and International Sustainable land management consultant is underway. | FAO, Project team | By Dec 2019 |
| 2.2 Improved land use practices promoted | Not planned as yet but will be under taken as soon as at least one consultant is engaged. | FAO, Project team, International Consultants, National Consultants | By June 2020 |
| Outcome 3: 3.1 National capacities enhanced to monitor | FAO and the project will continue to support efforts to achieve this outcome. | FAO, Project team, International Consultants, National Consultants | By Dec 2019 |

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

| Outcome | Action(s) to be taken | By whom? | By when? |
|--|---|--|-----------------|
| carbon stocks in natural forests and plantations | | | |
| Outcome 4: 4.1 Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests | Project will continue to liaise with MoFR for their support and input to ensure all sites are established with nursery facilities. | Project team and MoFR | By Dec 2019 |
| Outcome 5: 5.1 Increased local capacity to monitor, evaluate and manage biodiversity, land-use change and sustainable forest management. | Training will be conducted on systems to monitor and evaluate biodiversity, land use change and sustainable forest management | FAO, Project team, MECDM, MAL, MoFR, Consultants | By June 2020 |
| 5.2 Community-based forest management (including tree planting) strengthened | Training to be conducted and facilitation of techniques for tree planting with relevant communities | FAO, Project Team, MoFR | By June 2020 |
| 5.3 Policymakers and the general public are better informed about biodiversity conservation, climate change, SLM and SFM. | Continued awareness to be undertaken | Project Team, MECDM, MoFR and MAL | June 2020 |

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

| Outputs ¹¹ | Expected completion date ¹² | Achievements at each PIR ¹³ | | | | | Implement. status (cumulative) | Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| | | 1 st PIR | 2 nd PIR | 3 rd PIR | 4 th PIR | 5 th PIR | | |
| Output 1.1.1 <i>Community agreements to designate new protected areas</i> | Q4 Y3 | Community groups and tribal members made aware of Conservation opportunities using the PA Act and the need to establish PA Committee, with PA management plans and their agreement to protect terrestrial land areas. Also work under activity 6: to consolidate and undertake biodiversity and other relevant baseline studies | Number of communities and wider interest groups were further consulted on PA efforts with continued awareness raising. This is being supported also through mobilisation of project staff to continue work with communities, for example in Makira covering the Bauro Highland areas and as well as at Mount Maetambe on Choiseul, and support on the establishment of tree nursery at the Tina/Mt. Popomanaseu while awaiting processes for funds to undertake wider | | | | 30% | <p>Staff turn-over, slow response time from the core administration of the project combined with lack of experience by local staff, especially at the field level on PA establishments and processes is a huge barrier.</p> <p>A lot of work relating to PA planning process (following PA Tool Kit of Solomon Island) to go in with the planned activities.</p> <p>Actual designation of PA is expected to go beyond the completion date due to slow</p> |

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>consultations and awareness on PA network establishments for the area.</p> <p>Four tribes on Choiseul have made submission for PA and a 30-day public notice was in place for Qarasa and Siporae tribe. Meanwhile the Qarasa tribe have received objections and as such will have to go through a hearing process.</p> <p>On Makira 3 Conservation Association were established under which a great number of Community Based Organisations some of which represents tribal groups get affiliated to. Pamahima is an example of one association that have made commitments to move towards PA establishment. They have already defined their land boundaries and undertook genealogy recordings and have established their management committee. Waihita is yet another Association under which six tribal groups are affiliated. All of them, is are ready to go through the process and would need close guidance and support.</p> | | | | <p>start.</p> <p>Clear concepts and ideas on alternative livelihood opportunities and income generating activities needs to be provided to the communities. There are common questions on benefits that also relates to livelihood options and sustainable development.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|--|--|--|--|-----|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| Output 1.2.1: <i>Effective inter-sectorial coordination for PA management</i> | Q3 Y3 | Inter-sectorial coordination mechanism is yet to be established | Not started | | | | 10% | An inter-sectorial coordination mechanism that may be deemed for establishment should be done so in consultation with the PA Act 2010 on the part of the established Advisory Committee. Need to clarify its necessity. |
| Output 1.2.2: <i>Current weaknesses in protected area management identified and rectified through the establishment and implementation of conservation agreements with communities and management plans</i> | Q4 Y3 | | As per Output 1.1.1 four tribal groups in the Mt. Maetambe region of Choiseul have submitted for PA. PA Management Plans would have been in place prior to submission as required under the PA Act 2010. | | | | 10% | <p>Due to the complexity in the land tenure system it may not be possible to place one whole area over Mt Maetambe under a single PA and the effect, as in this case is the likely subset of PAs with separate PA Management Plans. A number of PA and PA Management Plans is therefore envisaged for Mt. Maetambe alone.</p> <p>The Qarasa and Siporae tribes were being mainly supported by the Ecological Solution Solomon Islands and the Natural Resource Development Foundation who are being recognised as partners under this project.</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------------|-------------|--|--|--|----|---|
| Output 1.3.1: National Level PA financing strategy | Q4 Y3 | Not started | Not started | | | | 0% | Have started dialogue with ECD on PA Act regulations, this is part of ECD AWP for 2019. Certain consultations have taken place by consulting groups such as WCS to understand the status of PATF. |
| Output 1.3.2: Sustainable income generating activities in each protected area as part of PA management plans | Q4 Y3 | Not started | Not started | | | | 0% | One Pamahima CBO in the Bauro Highlands has submitted their proposal for a Livelihood project to IFMP team for consideration. Mt. Maetambe communities are requesting training/awareness workshop on Savings Club. |
| Output 2.1.1: Assessment of impacts of current land-use practices on biodiversity, land degradation and the provision of other ecosystem services (ecosystem valuation) and identification of potential areas for improvement. | Q2 Y3 | Not started | Not started | | | | 0% | Project team have engaged with MAL to seek ways forward particularly in the part to engage a consultant to lead the activities under this. |
| Output 2.1.2: Policy, legal and regulatory frameworks for land-use change | Q2 Y3 | Not Started | Not started | | | | 0% | MAL (Ministry partner) has indicated support needs from the Project to review the existing draft of the SI National Rural Land Use Policy 2018- |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|-----|---|
| <i>reviewed and revised as necessary.</i> | | | | | | | | 2022 and to have it approved by the Cabinet. |
| Output 2.1.3: <i>Mechanism for policy coordination between sectors (i.e. government ministries and agencies) established and operating successfully</i> | Q2 Y3 | Not started | Not started | | | | 0% | Consultation will take place as soon as a consultant is engaged in collaboration with MAL. |
| Output 2.2.1: <i>Sustainable land and forest management techniques applied in protected area buffer zone</i> | No Activities until 2020 | Not started | Not started | | | | 0% | This depend much on activities under component 1 where delineation of PA zones are defined before buffer areas can be determined. |
| Output 2.2.2: <i>Training Programme on SLM</i> | No Activities until 2020 | Not started | Not started | | | | 0% | This will depend much on consultations and understanding on relevant agency (MAL). |
| Output 3.1.1: <i>Carbon monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) systems for forests in the Solomon Islands</i> | Q3 Y3 | Started | The REDD+ Unit of the Forest Management Division submitted Solomon Islands proposed Forest Reference Level (FRL) to the UNFCCC and currently undergoing reviews | | | | 40% | There is currently ongoing reviews particularly on FRL with timelines right through to December 2019 as determine by UNFCCC. |
| Output 3.1.2: <i>National capacity to control deforestation,</i> | No Activities until 2020 | A review on the Forest Timber Utilization Act has been conducted | Finalisation of the reviewed Timber Utilization Act is pending with further reviews to be undertaken. | | | | 50% | Further reviews of the Timber Utilization Act is to be undertaken by MOFR. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|-----|--|
| <i>forest degradation and carbon measuring and monitoring</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Output 3.1.3: <i>National forest carbon assessment</i> | No Activities until 2020 | Not started | Not started | | | | 0% | Depend much on consultation with the project and MOFR with technical guidance from FAO. |
| Output 4.1.1: <i>Forest cover increased through agro-forestry, small-scale tree planting and assisted natural regeneration</i> | Q4 Y3 | Not started | Efforts have gone into establishing a tree nursery at the site on Guadalcanal (Tina/Popomanaseu). MoFR currently has a Donor Obligation as part of their Development Budget Proposal and is part of the forest restoration effort that of which IFMP communities can Make submissions for micro finance and in-kind support such as for tools to undertake activities ranging from nursery work to tree growing efforts. | | | | 10% | Ongoing efforts on establishing tree nurseries with expected support from MOFR. |
| Output 5.1.1: <i>Baseline surveys of local flora and fauna, invasive species threats, genetic conservation, etc.</i> | No Activities until Dec 2019 | Few surveys carried out on Makira under output 1.1.1 | On-going | | | | 30% | Highly likely to be continued with efforts to establish more understanding of any significance in the biodiversity and general ecosystems setups of the different sites. |
| Output 5.2.1: <i>Training on SFM techniques such as in forest restoration, land suitability,</i> | No Activities until Dec 2019 | Not started | Not started | | | | 0% | Activities will start in December 2019, however consultations will continue to be undertaken between the project and MOFR. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------------|-------------|--|--|--|-----|--|
| <i>harvesting techniques, law enforcement, fire management, etc.).</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Output 5.3.1: <i>Training, awareness and educational materials produced and disseminated through SINU, RTC's and relevant Government Ministries and NGO's</i> | Q2 Y3 | Not started | Not started | | | | 30% | Consultations are being undertaken by relevant stakeholders on how activities under this can be expedited. |

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

- The importance of sustainable development with high regard to environmental health as key to future livelihoods and sustenance is realized.
- Resource owners become richly aware of Protected Areas Act 2010 and other relevant legislations and government policies, including public awareness on the reviewed Forest Resource and Timber Utilization Act
- Alternative options to logging such as with payments for ecosystem services through incentives has come to being realized by resource owners. REDD+ and results based payments schemes such as being arranged by the World Bank under its Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and more recently the Green Climate Fund are examples, besides some voluntary carbon schemes.
- A historical emissions and emission factors from national forest monitoring system is being calculated and analyzed.
- Capacity building workshops and seminars on Forest Reference Emission Levels (FREL) and Forest Reference Levels (FRL) with different stakeholders in line with REDD+ awareness workshops.
- Submission of Forest Reference Level (FRL) to the UNFCCC Secretariat and reviews undertaken accordingly in order to establish a baseline where measurement of forest emission would be measured against.
- Continued engagement with relevant communities, at east in Choiseul, allowed for two tribal groups to submit for PA designation over their identified area.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

Max 200 words:

- Current lack of proper office space and equipment provides problems with staff finding difficulty to comfortably work.
- Varying educational levels and standards of experiences by subordinates at the field sites points out different understandings and so as commitments to engage with communities.
- The lag in the recruitment of the Chief Technical Advisor has caused considerable delays to progress implementation. But having the position filled in the middle of June there is optimism for directing and putting the project back on track.
- The delays and response time from the administration office and technical heads also causes delays and setbacks and effects on staff-moral.
- Staff turnover at project administration brings surely leads to slowness and lag in implementation.
- Although so far on operational aspect there has not been any major obstacle, the isolation of admin and operations unit away from the rest of the PMO and the project field sites has contributing factors to staff performances and outputs. At least with two local positions created would probably remove burdens and speed up process time.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

| | FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵ | FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶ | Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period |
|--|---|--|--|
| Project Manager / Coordinator | U | U | <i>Delayed response time and staff turnover from project admin site including the slow recruitment of CTA caused considerable delays. The CTA only join at the very end of the PIR period.</i> |
| Budget Holder | MU | MU | <i>Though there have been delays in overall implementation, there has been considerable work carried out in raising public awareness and community consultations-which will form the base for the work to be carried out with an increased pace now with the CTA on board now.</i> |
| Lead Technical Officer¹⁷ | MU | MU | <i>The project carry out most of the awareness with core stakeholders and increased networking and working relationships with Government agencies and the Provincial Government. This is important. Actual implementation of field activities has been discussed, planned and initiated but is yet to gain momentum. With the CTA now on board, it is expected that the project implementation will gain speed and several core activities initiated can be completed this year.</i> |
| GEF Funding Liaison Officer | U | U | <i>Unfortunately, this project has been suffering slow implementation progress. The CTA is now on board and we expect the project can now accelerate the implementation.</i> |

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

| Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission) | Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain. |
|--|---|
| L | L |

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

Risk ratings

| RISK TABLE | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| <p><i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | Risk | Risk rating ¹⁹ | Mitigation Action | Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰ | Notes from the Project Task Force |
| 1 | Natural changes in ecosystems and associated species due to gradual changes in climate and extreme weather events. | M | The monitoring system developed under Component 5 will be designed to identify changes in ecosystems likely to be linked to climate change (e.g. occurrence of forest fires, pests and diseases, spread of invasive species) so that remedial actions can be taken. If necessary, this will be supported by research activities under the same component. | Discussion on NFMS portal is underway with Forest Department. | |

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|--|--|
| 2 | Productivity changes in forestry and agriculture. | M | Plant and assist natural regeneration of multiple purpose tree species used for restoration and improvements to agriculture (for SLM and income generation) will be selected in such way that they are resilient to the most likely impacts of climate change (e.g. drought, outbreaks of pests and diseases, etc.) and also provide multiple benefits to the local communities. Climate resilient forest and land management techniques will also be promoted in local communities (e.g. soil and water conservation). | No considerable progress made except for initiated establishments of tree nursery at one site on Guadalcanal | |
| 3 | Risks to biodiversity from introduction of new invasive alien species | M | SIs, being a nation of small islands is vulnerable to accidental introduction of invasive alien species. The project will ensure that PA management and landscape management also consider monitoring any presence or increase of such species. | Less progress. Two PA Management Plans associated with two tribal PA submissions are in place. | |
| 4 | Inadequate funding for protected area management. | M-H | The financing strategy will assess all possible sources of funding and focus on those most easily secured. Trust fund for PA management will be established. Protected area management activities will also be prioritised in case funding is limited. | The project is yet to initiate activity to cover this. | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|-----|---|--|--|
| 5 | Incentives are too low to persuade landowners to change their behaviour. | M-H | <p>The project will focus on PA management, CC, SLM and SFM activities that are both good for the environment and economically viable. The project will also devote time and resources to explain why and how improved forest and land management techniques can benefit the land owners economically.</p> <p>The project will minimise and try to avoid monetary incentives wherever possible, unless these can be sustained. Instead it will focus more on income generating activities. When these are proposed, they will be based on a detailed and realistic analysis of costs and benefits, learning from experiences on other similar projects. The project will also ensure that the benefits are distributed in a way that is reasonable, fair and equitable.</p> | Progress is yet to made on developing income generating activities as part of reciprocity over protected environment and systems and incentives. | |
|---|--|-----|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----|--|---|--|
| 6 | Lack of experience in fund management | M | <p>The project will establish the PA Trust fund as per the provisions of the Protected Area Act with community involvement for sustainable management of PAs.</p> <p>The project will put a special emphasis on training the key stakeholders in fund management and operation, including those MECDM staff that will have an ongoing role in supporting the functions of the Fund.</p> <p>This is also a potential risk at local level. The project aims to ensure that local PA management committees have the capacity, and are aware of their obligations and responsibilities, to manage any funds received for management of individual protected areas.</p> | The project is yet to initiate activities relating to this. | |
| 7 | Logging pressure | M-H | <p>In 2014, 2.1 million m3 of logs were harvested, against an estimated sustainable annual cut of about 300,000 m3. The project aims to set aside some of the last remaining intact lowland forest areas, which may come under pressure from logging interests. This risk will be mitigated through constant dialogue with the policy makers in relevant government ministries (MOFR, MECDM, Finance and Treasury) and through awareness-raising activities with the general public.</p> | Although there exist the understanding of this risk and so as the mitigation actions required, no real actions are made to lower pressure on log harvest. | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 8 | Limited support and implementation capacity in government. | H | <p>The capacity of government agencies in the Solomon Islands is weak. The project will emphasise working in collaboration across agencies and with local communities to reduce the demands placed on government staff. Capacity building will also target key weaknesses in government and develop strategies to overcome these for the long-term sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>Broader support for the project will be generated by awareness raising targeted at influential decision makers at local, provincial and national levels. These mitigation measures will also be supported by regular monitoring of project progress, so that corrective actions can be taken if necessary.</p> | Government continues to face human capacity needs and the project is yet to work on any related weaknesses and develop strategies. | |
| 9 | Dissatisfaction or disengagement of communities in project areas. | M | <p>Communication between local people and donor projects can be difficult and could lead to confusion and misunderstanding of the work of the project and it' capacity to deliver on community expectations.</p> <p>Significant time will be spent during the early stages of the project in establishing a framework for ongoing community consultation, as well as ensuring a sound understanding of community and project objectives and the approach to delivering on these. To facilitate in this process, specific project personnel will be tasked to co-ordinate communications with communities in the individual project areas.</p> | No specific project personnel has yet been identified to deal with the issue. However community engagements and consultations is proving to be on going and somewhat is in this direction to lower such risk. | |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|--|
| 10 | Disagreement between different landowner groups on establishment of protected areas and other key project interventions. | M | <p>The presence of several landowner groups in or near a given project area, such as is the case near the proposed PA of Mount Maetambe, has the potential to lead to complexities during project implementation. Collaboration and involvement of landowning communities will be crucial for the long-term success of this project. Therefore, communities will be active participants from the very beginning in the design, implementation and management of project activities. The project design will also be guided and learn from the ongoing work on customary land reform and from the stakeholders involved in that process.</p> <p>The main strategy proposed to overcome reluctance will be the provision of incentives (i.e. development benefits) for communities to engage in conservation (see above). However, the project will also build upon the existing interest in conservation and explain how conservation and improved forest and land management techniques can benefit them in other ways.</p> | Project is yet to identify the specific kinds of incentives and development benefits that can be practically offered to the different communities and tribal land owners. | |
|----|--|---|---|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 11 | Linkages with other institutions | M | As per the situation assessment made during the project preparation phase field visits, the project will develop linkages with private and public institutions operating in the project sites for effective and unhindered implementation of project activities. However, in the case of the Tina River Hydro Project (TRHDP), while recognizing that these linkages are essential, the project should maintain its independence from TRHDP while engaging with landowners and other stakeholders. At the same time it is important that the project maintain ongoing communication and collaboration with the TRHDP office. This approach should ensure that the relationship between communities and the project is determined separately from relationships between these same communities and TRHDP. | The independence of this project to the THDP has been explicitly described in recent consultations with the two House of Chiefs of Mbahomea and Malango who have great interests and links to the THDP. However, the way the THDP has progressed particularly with the applied land acquisition process has caused resentments within the tribal groups and this will seem to have slight impacts on how this project will be implemented on this particular site. | |
|----|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

| FY2018 rating | FY2019 rating | Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period |
|---------------|---------------|--|
| M | M | |

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

| Change Made to | Yes/No | Describe the Change and Reason for Change |
|------------------|--------|---|
| Project Outcomes | No | |
| Project Outputs | No | |

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

| Change | Describe the Change and Reason for Change |
|-------------------|--|
| Project extension | <div>Original NTE: n/a</div> <div>Revised NTE: n/a</div> <div>Justification:</div> |

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

The issue of gender and the effort to consider balancing it is being recognized under this project and where there is general reference to inclusion of women participation in the project. This recognition stems from the global environmental objectives right through to activity level. Section 2.4 of the project document expresses an outline of how gender is being integrated in project activities, and where it begins with having this consideration in the project team itself, in community engagements with inclusion of women in established committees, and through to the implementation of the some specific project activities. For example, under output 2.2.2 there is an indicative training on SLM and where gender mainstreaming would be undertaken.

To ensure that inclusion of women take places in the various facets of the project the encouragement of gender balance within the project team itself has taken place and where comparably a good number of women have already joined the project team, reflecting the importance of gender equality to project stakeholders.

The same principle of gender balance will be encouraged within the committees that will be set up, which include; the locally based Protected Area Management Committees, and the steering committee for development of a national land use policy, as well as other groups as appropriate.

The project as such will have effects to:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

The project strategy is to improve the management of forests in the SIs by integrating biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest management (SFM), and sustainable land management (SLM) into policymaking at the national level and livelihood activities of local communities living in and around forests. Land and natural resource use issues in Solomon Islands are sometimes exacerbated by traditional land tenure arrangements. All for the reason that land ownership in Solomon Islands is primarily customary with an estimated 83% of the land under customary tenure which effectively give rise to forest land at 90 % being owned also by customary owners. The Land and Titles Act, originally enacted in 1968 further acknowledge that customary land is governed by customary law. Land ownership patterns within the customary land area essentially start on the coast and follow geographic features (such as a ridge top or waterway) up to the centre of the island. In all these cases, customary ownership would already refer to indigenous people who have rights over the land and the sites concerned with this project.

In view of this, the project realized and expressed that the entire proposed project area is under customary ownership, hence indigenous people are the ones who are going to be involved in this project.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|---|---|
| Local community | |
| <p>☑ Local communities using resources from project sites and PAs including NTFP users, traditional healers, (e.g. traditional medicines, craft material) and subsistence farmers</p> <p>Local communities using resources from project sites and PAs including NTFP users, traditional healers, (e.g. traditional medicines, craft material) and subsistence farmers</p> | <p>These stakeholders groups represent the local communities and largely the indigenous people at the sites where project activities will be rolled out in.</p> <p>They participated in the various community consultations and Inception workshops as follows:</p> <p>1. Makira Ulawa Prov:</p> |
| Customary land owners | |
| Local people living adjacent to PAs and people involved currently in tourism activities | <p>- Na'ara Community, Central Bauro, Makira Ulawa Province for the joint project's stakeholder (ESSI) mission on pre-biodiversity survey to Bauro Highlands; June 2018</p> <p>-Bauro Highlands, Central Bauro District Tribal Leaders Meeting that was hosted in Kirakira (San Christobal Venue) to seek a way forward towards establishing PA Management Committee and other relevant community relation matters; July 2018</p> <p>-First community consultation for PA with Pamahima (Mato tribal land), convened at Arohane community, 28th October 2018.</p> <p>- Piruma Community, South Makira, for the project and its implementing partners general community awareness; December 2018</p> <p>Hunauri Community, Central Bauro District, Makira Ulawa Province, for the project and its implementing partners general community awareness; February 2019</p> <p>Arohane community, East Bauro, Makira Ulawa province for the project and its implementing partners general awareness; February 2019</p> <p>-Warihito Community, East Bauro, Bauro District, Makira Ulawa Province for the project and its implementing partners general awareness; February 2019</p> <p>-Waioto and Mamara Communities, West Bauro, Bauro District,</p> |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|-------------|--|
| | <p>Makira Ulawa Province for the project and its implementing partners general awareness and 1st management committee meeting for their tribal group and proposed PA plot; February 2019</p> <p>2. Choiseul Province</p> <p>-First Community Management Committee meeting for Jito Tribe, 14th September 2018</p> <p>-Padezaka Land boundary workshop, 21 to 22 November 2018.</p> <p>- First Voba tribal community PA management committee meeting on 11th December 2018.</p> <p>-Community consultations with Padezaka tribe and carried out GPS Mapping for proposed PA (Padezaka land), November 2018</p> <p>-Padezaka tribal Ritual ceremony, April 2019</p> <p>3. Guadalcanal Province</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 13th March 2018- Visit to Tina/ Bahomea/ scoping identify landowners. -Talk with -Michael Laosa & George Vari-Kochiabol Tribe 2. 25th May 2018- Guadalcanal Province Community Inception: Marava village community hall/ Attend by community stakeholders and tribal representatives. 3. 7th June 2018- support & witness a meeting organised by Michael Meki & his extended family for the possibility of allowing their registered for the establishment of the Nursery. 4. 12th June 2018- Map of Registered Land provided with Title. 5. (June) Sharon Tabea- of Kochiabol Tribe call up to enquire of the possibility to start up early with reforestation. 6. (June) Mrs. Lilian Para- of Valele Community (Registered Land) Call up to enquire of the possibility to start up early with reforestation. 7. (July) Derick Gisi- Salasivo Tribe enquire about reforesting their log over area. (current) 8. (July) Zimri Launi- Charana Tribe call up to enquire about reforesting their log over area. (current) 9. 30th August 2018- Consultation with Marava Community and the immediate landowners of Tina of the Intention to establish |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|---|---|
| | <p>a central nursery at Marava/ MOFR (5) officers/ FAO SAP (2) officers.- Heard confirmation from the owner of Marava Land in the allowing of their land.</p> <p>10. Community awareness on PA establishment with Bahomea House of Chiefs, 18th to 19th June 2019, Marava community, Central Guadalcanal.</p> <p>11. Community awareness on PA establishment with Malango House of Chiefs, 20-21 June 2019</p> <p>4. Malaita Province</p> <p>-Malaita consultation meeting with the Provincial government prior to the Malaita Inception, March 2019.</p> <p>-Community Consultations with communities prior to the Malaita Inception, March-April 2019</p> <p>-Community Inception workshop with communities at Afio, May 2019</p> <p>-Provincial Inception workshop with Senior Provincial officer, Auki, May 2019, Malaita Province</p> <p>4. Western Province</p> <p>-Provide awareness on the project activities and meet with Kolombangara communities, December 2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - -Meet and planned a consultation with Communities for the Stakeholders meeting in July 2019 |
| Civil Society and Non- Governmental Organizations, educational institutions and Research Organizations | |
| Kolombangara Island Biodiversity Conservation Association (KIBCA) | -Meet and planned a consultation with KIBCA for the Stakeholders meeting in July 2019 |
| SPREP | <p>-22nd August 2018- EIA Training workshop.</p> <p>- 29th May 2019- Attend and assist with their reforestation training at Marava</p> |
| Natural Resources Development Foundation | <p>-Engaged in the Padezaka Land boundary workshop, 21 to 22 November 2018.</p> <p>- Engaged in the first Voba tribal community PA management committee meeting on 11th December 2018.</p> <p>-Engaged in the community consultations with Padezaka tribe and carried out GPS Mapping for proposed PA (Padezaka land), November 2018, draft map of proposed PA is now available.</p> |
| Lauru Land Conference of Tribal Communities (LLCTC) | <p>- Engaged in the Padezaka Land boundary workshop, November 2018.</p> <p>-Engaged in the First Voba tribal community PA management committee meeting on 11th December 2018.</p> <p>-PFC engage in LLCTC Annual General meeting, Nukiki community,</p> |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|---|---|
| | Choiseul Province 23-26 October 2018, presenting IFMP work in Choiseul. |
| Pamahina Land Owners Association | <p>Makira Ulawa Prov:</p> <p>-Arohane Community Hall, Kira Kira, for the community awareness on 13-14 February 2019.</p> <p>- Joined in one of the consultation meetings held in Arohane to address resource owners challenges of CBRM and PA working closely with MCNCT in June 2019</p> <p>-Consultation meetings with project held in Kirakira, April to June 2019 on Livelihood activities, challenges experienced with logistics (transport, hosting meetings, telecommunication, Printing and Photocopying), Budget assistance, Present Association Structure for PA, submission of Association constitution (Charity Act) and workplan, Draft Sketch Map of Pamahima Association, tribal list, genealogy, community relations and logistics.</p> |
| Henuaraha Community organization (HLOCDA) | <p>Makira Ulawa Prov:</p> <p>- Bauro Highlands, Central Bauro District Tribal Leaders Meeting that was hosted in Kirakira (San Christobal Venue) to seek a way forward towards establishing PA Management Committee and other relevant community relation matters; July 2018</p> <p>- Courtesy call made to MUP Executive on the 22nd of February 2019 with IFMP team to brief them on the awareness done in the communities of HLOCDA and Pamahima.</p> <p>-Engaged at the Piruma Awareness in December 2018 at Piruma community Hall, Waihita Association, South Makira.</p> <p>-Hunauri Community Hall, Bauro Highlands, for the community awareness on 5th to 8th February 2019.</p> <p>- Two consultation meetings held in Arohane and Kirakira to address resource owners challenges of CBRM and PA working closely with MCNCT in May and June 2019.</p> <p>-Engaged in all community awareness activities in: Warihito (East Bauro) and Waioto (West Bauro) communities, February 2019</p> <p>-Consultation meetings with project held in Kirakira, April to June 2019 on Livelihood activities, challenges experienced with consented CBOs to its Association for PA work under IFMP, Budget assistance, Present Association Structure for PA given numerous CBOS under HLOCDA, submission of Association constitution (Charity Act) and workplan, Draft GPS Map of Henuaraha Association, tribal list, genealogy, community relations and logistics.</p> |
| Tawatana Community Conservation and Development Association | - Kindly note that this stakeholder group's head or leader is also the same person representing the MUCCN at the provincial scale. |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|---|---|
| Waihita Association | <p>-Bauro Highlands, Central Bauro District Tribal Leaders Meeting that was hosted in Kirakira (San Christobal Venue) to seek a way forward towards establishing PA Management Committee and other relevant community relation matters; July 2018</p> <p>-Piruma Community, South Makira, for the project and its implementing partners general community awareness; December 2018</p> <p>-Consultation meetings with project held in Kirakira, April to June 2019 on Livelihood activities, challenges experienced with consented CBOs to its Association for PA work under IFMP, Budget assistance, Present Association Structure for PA given numerous CBOS under Waihita, submission of Association constitution (Charity Act) and workplan, Draft GPS Map of Waihita Association, tribal list, genealogy, community relations and logistics.</p> |
| MUCCN Makira Ulawa Conservation Community Network | <p><u>During the project's early days (that is, June 2018 – September 2018)</u> of settling and setting up at the duty station (Kirakira), MUCCN has been the key focal person of contact to the customary land owners and association groups of Bauro Highlands. It has contributed in knowledge and experience sharing to the locals.</p> |
| ATAWA/ATAMEA Tribal Association | <p>-First community consultation with project in April, 2019 for PA establishment, held at Kirakira.</p> <p>-Second Atamea Leaders consultation with project in April to May 2019, purposely to discuss PA steps and tribal population distribution, discuss project assistant and Livelihood activity.</p> <p>-Consultation meetings with project held in Kirakira, April to June 2019 on Livelihood activities, challenges experienced with logistics (transport, hosting meetings, telecommunication, Printing and Photocopying), Budget assistance, Present Association Structure for PA, submission of Association constitution (Charity Act), Rangers, PA management committee and workplan, Draft Sketch Map of Pamahima Association, tribal list, genealogy, community relations and logistics.</p> |
| logona Land Trustee | <p>Makira</p> <p>-First consultation meeting with project regarding PA establishment, Kirakira, June 2019</p> <p>-Submission of documents (Sketch Map of PA, tribal list, and minutes of 1st tribal meeting, list of proposed PA management committee), June 2019, Kirakira</p> |
| Ecological Solutions Solomon Islands | <p>Choiseul</p> <p>Participated in the community consultations in the Mt.Maetambe communities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). Voba tribal community 1st PA community consultation on 19 to 20th July 2018. 2). First Community Management Committee meeting for Jito Tribe, 14th September 2018 3). Padezaka Land boundary workshop, November 2018. |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|--|---|
| | <p>4). First Voba tribal community PA management committee meeting on 11th December 2018.</p> <p>5).</p> <p>Makira Joint mission with the project (IFMP) to the Central Bauro Highlands to carry out biodiversity survey on birds, mammals (bats) and possibly reptiles and amphibians (snakes and frogs); June 2018</p> |
| Solomon Islands National University | Participated in the joint ESSI & IFMP Mission for Biodiversity survey to the Bauro Highlands; June 2018 |
| World Vision | <p>Makira Had invited the project officer to part-take in their workshop that was hosted in Kirakira as a means for information sharing (that is through group discussions and listening and identifying possible key stakeholders); November 2018, Kirakira, Makira</p> <p>Malaita IFMP- PFC is using internet and electricity from world vision office in Afio (April 2019-Current)</p> |
| WorldFish Centre | Engaged in the Provincial Inception workshop at Auki, Malaita Province May 2019. |
| RWASH, UNDP | <p>Makira This team had also during their inception program at Kirakira, invited the project (IFMP) to participate in information sharing (through survey and open and closed group discussions); Meeting held in November 2018, Kirakira, Makira Province.</p> |
| Government Agencies | |
| Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology | <p>Makira There are no MECDM at the provincial level (Kirakira), instead there is only an allocated provincial officer and of whom specializes in tourism who is looking after the tourism together with the conservation in Makira. For such means, the officer had been engaged to do awareness or information sharing (Tourism presentation) during the project's activity of the Bauro Highlands 1st Tribal Leaders Meeting in Kirakira (San Christobal venue); July 2018 The mother ministry in Honiara has been supportive in providing ECD representative (s) to be readily available and catered for under the project's budget since upon request(s) for engagement to activities carried out for IFMP to Bauro Highlands; ESSI Joint mission with IFMP; (June 2018). Community Consultations; (December 2018 & February 2019).</p> <p>Guadalcanal 15th June 2019- Invitation to participate & do presentation on component 1- PA Act-PA Toolkit/ Bahomea & Malango House of Chiefs. (Attend)</p> <p>Malaita -Community Inception workshop with communities at Afio, May 2019 -Provincial Inception workshop with Senior Provincial officer, Auki, May 2019, Malaita Province</p> |
| Ministry of Forestry and Research Extension staff and Research Divisions of focal and collaborating Ministries | <p>Makira MoFR extension exists in the provincial level and of which are of two (2) divisions only, the Operational and the FDRD, reforestation. IFMP has been working closely with the FDRD or reforestation division as agreed by the Director of Reforestation in Honiara. - Together, drafted and compiled an awareness module for the general</p> |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|-------------|--|
| | <p>public community awareness purposes; <u>November 2018</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Together, a reforestation quarterly line of activities (work-plan) and budget was accomplished and put-forth for the “Cooperate Budget” towards the Head-quarter Ministry for their approval and financial support. This further includes the first (1st) proposal to establish 4 nursery sites. Kindly note that activity has been approved 2 months ago but is yet to be implemented at the field; <u>17th April 2019</u> - Officer(s) had engaged in the Bauro Highlands 1st Tribal Leaders Meeting and the Provincial Lead partners’ Meeting in Kirakira; <u>July 2018 and August 2018.</u> - Their assigned reforestation officer has been engaged in awareness programs at the community levels under the project as well; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Piruma Community of Waihita Association – <u>December 2019</u> 2) Hunaury Community of Henuaraha Association – <u>February 2019</u> 3) Warihito Community of Henuaraha Association – <u>February 2019</u> 4) Arohane Community of Pamahima Association – <u>February 2019</u> 5) Waioto Community of Henuaraha but of which currently, will be working on its own – <u>February 2019.</u> <p>Their MoFR extension officer has most importantly often been engaged in and during consultations at the provincial level when available; <u>Weekly basis since June 2018 – July 2019.</u></p> <p>IFMP engagement in their OBM for project implementation to Waihita Association, Piruma Community in December 2018.</p> <p>PMO & Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Met with the Reforestation Coordinator Mr Richard Raomae with regards to the budget submissions and reforestation activities in general, meeting held in March 2019. <p>-PFC-GP and NPO met with REDD+ team regarding their plans for Tina-Popomanaseu site, June 2019</p> <p>Choiseul</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PFC-CPG Met with the Reforestation Coordinator Mr Richard Raomae with regards to the budget submissions and reforestation activities in general, meeting held in March 2019. <p>Guadalcanal Province</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 8 July 2018- 3rd Consultation on Historical Annual Forest & Land use change assessment & Forest reference level in SI. 2. 25th March 2019- Email (FAO PNG & REDD+ Expert assisting local REDD+Team) for any updated work plan for 2019. 3. 16th May 2018- Invitation to participate & do presentation on component 3 & 4/ Provincial & Community Inception. (Attend) 4. 23rd July 2018- Provide Information to Reforestation as why |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|---|---|
| | <p>there is an immediate need to establish nursery.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. 27th July 2018- NPC/NPO/PFC Guadalcanal, meet with Reforestation division & discuss over the Nursery initiation/ Agriculture officers were invited also. (No turn up) 6. 15th June 2019- Invitation to participate & do presentation on component 3 & 4- Policies-Reforestation-REDD+/ Bahomea & Malango House of Chiefs. (Reforestation-Attend/ REDD+ NO Turn up) 7. 22nd March 2019- Assisting PFC Choiseul to Reforestation office-Talk with Richard Raomae, Minnie Fahu & other officer over the Reforestation obligatory funds & submitted budget. 8. 29th April 2019- Meet with REDD+ UNIT @ their Office/ Discuss on any of their update work plan, relating to, Conduct a coping and scoping study and identify high priority areas for forest restoration with multiple value tree species of community choice (Comp 3-Output3.1.3-Activity 4) <p><u>Malaita</u></p> <p>-Community Inception workshop with communities at Afio, May 2019</p> <p>-Provincial Inception workshop with Senior Provincial officer, Auki, May 2019, Malaita Province</p> |
| <p>Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Extension staff and Research Divisions of focal and collaborating Ministries</p> | <p><u>Makira</u></p> <p>There is a MAL Extension available at the provincial level and of whom the project (IFMP) has also worked closely with through their appointed officer since the Headquarter (Land Use Planning Division) is very busy and often does not respond well to requests made or put-forth.</p> <p>At the provincial level, the MAL vehicle and Out boat motor are available but of which requires formal request and arrangements. Kindly note that the vehicle has been engaged in several project activities upon formal request;</p> <p>Truck's engagement- Hunauri Community of Henuaraha Association (return trip); <u>February 2019</u></p> <p>- Arohane Community of Pamahima Association (return trip); <u>February 2019</u></p> <p>- Waioto Community of Henuaraha Association then (half way and one way trip); <u>February 2019</u></p> <p>- Officer(s) had engaged in the Bauro Highlands 1st Tribal Leaders Meeting and the Provincial Lead partners' Meeting in Kirakira; <u>July 2018 and August 2018.</u></p> <p>- Similarly as the MOFR Extension has;</p> <p>- Together, drafted and compiled an awareness module for the general public community awareness purposes; <u>November 2018</u></p> <p>However, they have only begun to actively engage in the community awareness programs in 2019 to carry out a general MAL awareness and its linkage(s) to the IFMP. Therefore, had only engaged in the;</p> |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|------------------------|--|
| | <p>1) Hunauri Community of Henuaraha Association – <u>February 2019</u> 2) Warihito Community of Henuaraha Association – <u>February 2019</u> 3) Arohane Community of Pamahima Association – <u>February 2019</u> 4) Waio Community of Henuaraha but of which currently, will be working on its own – <u>February 2019</u>.</p> <p>- Their MAL extension officer(s) has most importantly often been engaged in and during consultations at the provincial level when available; <u>Weekly basis since June 2018 – July 2019</u>.</p> <p>Guadalcanal</p> <p>-15th June 2019- Invitation to participate & do presentation on component 2- Policies-SLM-Agro Forestry/ Bahomea & Malango House of Chiefs. (Attend)</p> <p>-Community awareness on PA establishment with Bahomea House of Chiefs, 18th to 19th June 2019, Marava community, Central Guadalcanal</p> <p>- Community awareness on PA establishment with Malango House of Chiefs, 20-21 June 2019</p> <p><u>Malaita</u></p> <p>-Community Inception workshop with communities at Afio, May 2019</p> <p>-Provincial Inception workshop with Senior Provincial officer, Auki, May 2019, Malaita Province</p> |
| Provincial Governments | <p>They participated in the inception meetings and consultations as follows:</p> <p>1. Makira Ulawa Prov:</p> <p>MUP has engaged with the project during the project inception (both at the community and township level) by having concerned officers available to share with the resource owners, and other stakeholders and the project itself. They have also provided free transport (truck) then; <u>April 2018</u></p> <p>- MUPG Responds well to any request put-forth by the project to them and is therefore very supportive.</p> <p>-On the other hand, information sharing is often done at a monthly basis through the sharing of the project's (IFMP to Bauro Highlands) monthly report.</p> <p>-For relevant provincial officers engagement to targeted communities identified, it is often an issue as the officers are often tied up with their priority duties or even holiday moods.</p> <p>-Senior Provincial Leaders meeting held in August 2018 purposely to provide awareness on related matters experienced and also related to the proposed Bauro Highlands PA. Moreover, awareness on the PA and IFMP was also carried out.</p> <p>-Courtesy call made to the MUP Executive on the 29th December 2018 to update them of the work progress of IFMP.</p> |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| | <p>-Courtesy call made to the MUP Executive on the 21st December 2018 to update them on the Awareness done in the Piruma community.</p> <p>-Courtesy call made to MUP Executive on the 22nd of February 2019 to brief them on the awareness done in the communities of HLOCD and Pamahima.</p> <p>2. Guadalcanal Prov:</p> <p>-Attempt to visit Provincial Secretary to make arrangement for a courtesy visit by the IFM Team (NPC,NPO, PFC Guadalcanal)</p> <p>-Guadalcanal Province Inception: Mendana Hotel/ Conducted on 23/05/2018 for senior Guadalcanal Provincial Officials (11) including provincial executive members (10) headed by the Premier and Provincial secretary.</p> <p>-18th May 2018- Letter requesting for office space from the Guadalcanal Province.</p> <p>16th June 2018- Receive confirmation for providing office space with the Provincial Ministry of Environment</p> <p>-15th June 2019- Invitation to participate & do presentation on component 2- Policies-SLM-Agro Forestry/ Bahomea & Malango House of Chiefs. (Attend)</p> <p>-Community awareness on PA establishment with Bahomea House of Chiefs, 18th to 19th June 2019, Marava community, Central Guadalcanal</p> <p>- Community awareness on PA establishment with Malango House of Chiefs, 20-21 June 2019</p> <p>3. Choiseul Prov:</p> <p>- Engaged in the Padezaka Land boundary workshop, 21- 22 November 2018.</p> <p>-Engaged in the First Voba tribal community PA management committee meeting on 11th December 2018.</p> <p><u>Malaita</u></p> <p>-Community Inception workshop with communities at Afio, May 2019</p> <p>-Provincial Inception workshop with Senior Provincial officer, Auki, May 2019, Malaita Province</p> |
| Private Sector Organizations | |
| Kolombangara Forest Products Limited | -Meet and planned a consultation meeting with KFPL for the community stakeholders meeting in July 2019 with the project team. |

| Stakeholder | Descriptions participation and the period (dates) |
|--|---|
| World Bank | <p>Through the “Community Governance and Grievance Management project to Makira Ulawa province”, IFMP has engaged them to do awareness talks during the Bauro Highlands 1st Tribal leaders’ Meeting in Kirakira; <u>August 2019</u>.</p> <p>Hence, brief back to office reports were made available to the project upon request; <u>August 2018</u>.</p> |
| TINA RIVER HYDRO DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (TRHDP) | <p>5th May 2018-Courtesy visit to the project office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introducing myself as the IFM PFC for Tina/ Mt.Popomanseu. - Consult with the Coordinator for their office & personals contact address. - Aware the project office of the intending Inception for Guadalcanal. <p>6rd May 2018- Send email to the project coordinator (Fred Conning)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Asking him for support in providing land owning tribes that the project had already identified. - Provide name of any of his officers whom IFM would work close with & to send invitation to for the Inception. - Respond/ Bradly Jim (Community Liaison officer) <p>7th -13th May 2018– Mail exchange with Mr B-Jim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No identified Landowners list being provided but would like to verify my list as provided upon my own consultation with the Community people up at Tina. <p>16th May 2018- Invitation letter to attend Inception delivered via hard copy & email.</p> <p>Agenda supplied also/ TRHDP- Supposed to do presentation also. (Unfortunately no turn out)</p> |

8. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

Unfortunately, the project is already lagging behind in terms of progress and implementation. As such there is already an effect with the slowness to deliver on expected outcomes and outputs.

So there has not been any satisfactory level of implementation so to realize any impact on people's livelihood or standard of living or achievement of environmental benefits. In this context no products have been developed such on education and awareness materials and video/audio materials. However, since the community inceptions and through the rounds of later consultations people in the communities have continued to express support towards this project. So generally, people would have understood the advantages this project would bring to them, with themselves through the cultural and traditions systems and heritage have learned of what nature and the natural systems or the ecosystems within their surroundings can support them with in terms of their livelihood needs and sustenance.

There is now greater optimism to deliver following the arrival of the technical expertise for the project.

9. Co-Financing Table

| Sources of Co-financing ²² | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval | Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019- | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) | Expected total disbursement by the end of the project |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Government | Ministry of Forestry and Research | In-kind | 13,000,000 | 1,000,000 | | 13,000,000 |
| Government | Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock | In-kind | 8,000,000 | 500,000 | | 8,000,000 |
| Government | Ministry of Environment, Conservation, Disaster Management and Meteorology | In-kind | 2,500,000 | 100,000 | | 2,500,000 |
| | Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR) | In-kind | 2,030,000 | 0 | | 0 |
| | Kolombangara Forest Products Limited (KFPL) | In-kind | 500,000 | 50,000 | | 500,000 |
| | Secretariat for Pacific Community (SPC) | In-kind | 500,000 | 0 | | 500,000 |

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|-------------------|------------------|--|-------------------|
| | Natural Resources Development Foundation (NRDF) | In-kind | 750,000 | 0 | | 750,000 |
| | Solomon Islands Community Conservation Partnership (SICCP) | In-kind | 15,500 | 0 | | 15,500 |
| | Live and Learn | In-kind | 200,000 | 50,000 | | 200,000 |
| | Tina River Hydro Power Development Project (TRHDP) | In-kind | 1,325,000 | 225,000 | | 1,325,000 |
| | American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) | In-kind | 350,000 | 0 | | 350,000 |
| | FAO | Cash | 1,000,000 | 200,000 | | 1,000,000 |
| | FAO | In-kind | 500,000 | 150,000 | | 500,000 |
| | TOTAL | | 30,670,500 | 2,275,000 | | 28,640,500 |

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

ACIAR project ended before the project implementation began.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”; **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings; **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.