



## **EREPA - Ensuring Resilient Ecosystems and Representative Protected Areas in the Solomon Islands**

### **Part I: Project Information**

#### **GEF ID**

9846

#### **Project Type**

FSP

#### **Type of Trust Fund**

GET

#### **Project Title**

EREPA - Ensuring Resilient Ecosystems and Representative Protected Areas in the Solomon Islands

#### **Countries**

Solomon Islands

#### **Agency(ies)**

IUCN

#### **Other Executing Partner(s)**

SPREP

#### **Executing Partner Type**

Government

#### **GEF Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

#### **Taxonomy**

Focal Areas, Land Degradation Neutrality, Land Degradation, Biodiversity, Influencing models, Demonstrate innovative approach, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Stakeholders, Local Communities, Indigenous Peoples, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Non-Governmental Organization, Communications, Strategic Communications, Public Campaigns, Awareness Raising, Education,

Gender Mainstreaming, Gender Equality, Beneficiaries, Innovation, Capacity, Knowledge and Research,  
Capacity Development, Knowledge Exchange

**Rio Markers**

**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

**Climate Change Adaptation**

Climate Change Adaptation 1

**Duration**

48In Months

**Agency Fee(\$)**

442,653.00

**A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program**

<b>Objectives/Programs</b>	<b>Focal Area Outcomes</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Co-Fin Amount(\$)</b>
BD-4_P9	(Focal Area Outcome 9.2) 4 provincial ordinances developed or updated in partnership with communities in the four targeted provinces to establish a supportive framework for protected and conserved areas and sustainable natural resource management (ProDoc Output	GET	2,051,044.00	3,124,889.00
BD-1_P1	(Focal Area Outcome 1.1) 4 business plans and funding opportunities for the implementation of the PA management plan in each targeted site developed (ProDoc Output 2.5)	GET	1,022,043.00	1,815,128.00
BD-1_P2	Focal Area Outcome 2.1) Declarations made for at least 50,000 hectares of protected areas across four (4) provinces ? including the development of PA management plans ? through supporting consenting communities in the PA Act process (ProDoc Output 2.4).	GET	1,030,954.00	1,827,466.00

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
LD-3_P4	(Focal Area Outcome 3.1) Community-based and endorsed land-use management plans at the landscape level developed including delineating PAs, sustainable agricultural areas, agroforestry areas, settlement areas, and forest areas, and identifying improved livelihood activities (ProDoc Output 3.1)	GET	814,323.00	1,412,517.00
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>			<b>4,918,364.00</b>	<b>8,180,000.00</b>

## B. Project description summary

### Project Objective

Effective ecosystem management for healthy, complementary networks of protected, productive and restored landscapes in Guadalcanal, Malaita, Rennell-Bellona and Temotu

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Financing Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Project Financing(\$)</b>	<b>Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1. Enabling environment for integrated terrestrial ecosystem management and restoration	Technical Assistance	<b>Outcome 1. Stakeholders and planning mechanisms recognise the role of ecosystems and ecosystem services for improved management of land, forest and water resources.</b>	1.1 Provincial level land-use forums established for decision-making on land use and resolution of conflicts between natural resource protection and economic development.	GET	1,780,200.00	2,990,796.00
			1.2 Land and ecosystem characterisation studies (land-tenure, land-use, elevation, geology, hydrography) as well as biodiversity, vegetation and ecosystem health assessments completed to identify priority sites for proposed protected areas in the four priority provinces.			
			1.3 Provincial ordinances developed or updated in partnership with communities in the four targeted provinces to establish a supportive framework for protected and conserved areas and sustainable natural resource management.			
			1.4 100 government staff at the national and provincial scales, NGO staff and CBO leaders			

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 2. Formal declaration of terrestrial protected areas, and their effective management	Technical Assistance	Outcome 2. National PA network, PAs' Monitoring and Evaluation systems, knowledge management , financing plans and additional protected areas are declared.	<p>2.1 A national Protected Area Network (PAN) including all PA sites and PA actors developed.</p> <p>2.2 A standardized data repository platform established, information compiled on natural systems and assets, information and its metadata integrated into existing data platforms.</p> <p>2.3 A standardized monitoring and evaluation system developed and implemented</p> <p>2.4 Declarations made for at least 50,000 hectares of protected areas across four (4) provinces ? including the development of PA management plans ? through supporting consenting communities in the PA Act process.</p> <p>2.5 Business/operational plans and funding opportunities for the implementation of the PA management plan in each targeted site developed.</p>	GET	1,769,019.00	2,974,524.00

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Financing Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Project Financing(\$)</b>	<b>Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)</b>
Component 3. Improved land management, agricultural practices and restoration interventions in rural production landscapes	Technical Assistance	Outcome 3. The environmental quality and the livelihood benefits of production landscapes for communities within and adjoining PAs are sustained.	<p>3.1 Community-based and endorsed land-use management plans at the landscape level developed including delineating PAs, sustainable agricultural areas, agroforestry areas, settlement areas, and forest areas, and identifying improved livelihood activities.</p> <p>3.2 Improved and diversified livelihoods based on the sustainable use of forest and agricultural resources, including income generating and livelihood options for communities, adopted and implemented within and outside protected areas.</p> <p>3.3 Degraded forest areas restored through reforestation activities and natural regeneration interventions.</p>	GET	1,135,100.00	2,214,680.00
<b>Sub Total (\$)</b>					<b>4,684,319.00</b>	<b>8,180,000.00</b>

**Project Management Cost (PMC)**

---

GET	234,045.00	
<b>Sub Total(\$)</b>	<b>234,045.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>	<b>4,918,364.00</b>	<b>8,180,000.00</b>

---

**C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type**

<b>Sources of Co-financing</b>	<b>Name of Co-financier</b>	<b>Type of Co-financing</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>
Government	Government of Solomon Islands, Ministries of: - Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology -Forests and Research -Agriculture and Livestock (see co-financing letter for breakdown by Ministry)	In-kind	6,810,000.00
Donor Agency	European Union	In-kind	800,000.00
Donor Agency	German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB)	In-kind	570,000.00
<b>Total Co-Financing(\$)</b>			<b>8,180,000.00</b>

**D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Programmin g of Funds</b>	<b>NGI</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Fee(\$)</b>
IUCN	GET	Solomon Islands	Biodiversity		No	4,027,356	362,462
IUCN	GET	Solomon Islands	Land Degradation		No	891,008	80,191
<b>Total Grant Resources(\$)</b>						<b>4,918,364.00</b>	<b>442,653.00</b>

**E. Non Grant Instrument**

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

---

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

**F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

PPG Required

**PPG Amount (\$)**

150,000

**PPG Agency Fee (\$)**

13,500

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Programming of Funds</b>	<b>NGI</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Fee(\$)</b>
IUCN	GET	Solomon Islands	Biodiversity		No	122,826	11,054
IUCN	GET	Solomon Islands	Land Degradation		No	27,174	2,446
<b>Total Project Costs(\$)</b>						<b>150,000.00</b>	<b>13,500.00</b>

## Core Indicators

### Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	50,000.00	0.00	0.00

#### Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	50,000.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDP A ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
<b>Akula National Park</b> TBD - East Rennell	<b>125689</b> 168242	<b>Select</b>		20,000.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Akula National Park</b> TBD - Guadalcanal	<b>125689</b> TBD	<b>Select</b>		10,000.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Akula National Park</b> TBD - Malaita	<b>125689</b> TBD	<b>Select</b>		10,000.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Akula National Park</b> TBD - Temotou	<b>125689</b> TBD	<b>Select</b>		10,000.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	W DP A ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	-----------	---------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

**Indicator 3 Area of land restored**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00

**Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

**Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	100.00		

**Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

**Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

**Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated**

<b>Total Target Benefit</b>	<b>(At PIF)</b>	<b>(At CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>(Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>(Achieved at TE)</b>
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)	0	9112135	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)	0	0	0	0

**Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector**

<b>Total Target Benefit</b>	<b>(At PIF)</b>	<b>(At CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>(Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>(Achieved at TE)</b>
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)		9,112,135		
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting		2020		
Duration of accounting		20		

**Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector**

<b>Total Target Benefit</b>	<b>(At PIF)</b>	<b>(At CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>(Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>(Achieved at TE)</b>
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

**Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)**

<b>Total Target Benefit</b>	<b>Energy (MJ) (At PIF)</b>	<b>Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)</b>
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

**Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)**

<b>Technology</b>	<b>Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)</b>

**Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment**

	<b>Number (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Number (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Number (Achieved at TE)</b>
<b>Female</b>		21,237		
<b>Male</b>		21,427		
<b>Total</b>	0	42664	0	0

## PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

### 1. Project Description

1) The global environmental problems, root causes and barriers identified remain unchanged but their description has been expanded on. Specificities regarding the areas of interventions have also been integrated to enable better understanding of the project context.

2) The baseline situation was updated and further explained from the PIF to the Project Document. Information on the baseline situation and initiatives specific to each targeted island was integrated.

The activities of the country partners were also further detailed in Section 3.5.1 of the Project Document.

Regarding cofinancing sources, the total cofinancing budget has reduced from US\$ 8,510,000 to US\$ 8,180,000. The changes made to the cofinancing sources between the PIF and the Project Document are described in the table below.

Baseline investment in PIF	Baseline investment in CER	Comment
Government of Solomon Islands, Ministries of:  Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology  Forests and Research  Agriculture and Livestock (US\$) 6,810,000	(US\$) 6,810,000	Unchanged.
BIOPAMA project (US\$) 700,000	(US\$) 800,000	Solomon Islands is a key focus country for BIOPAMA.
PEBACC project (US\$) 500,000	(US\$) 570,000	Unchanged.
SPC/GIZ climate change and forest conservation (US\$ 500,000)	(US\$) 0	Project funding was not successful
	(US\$) 8,180,000	

3) No major adjustments have been made to the GEF alternative scenario. The wording of outcomes and outputs was adjusted to be clearer and some outcomes were merged. The justification of each outcomes and outputs was strengthened and the activities were further detailed.

PIF	Pro-Doc	Notes
<p><b>Component 1. Integrated terrestrial ecosystem management and restoration</b></p>	<p><b>Component 1. Enabling environment for integrated terrestrial ecosystem management and restoration</b></p>	<p><b>Note on PIF: Similar to Component 1 in ProDoc</b></p> <p><b>Note on ProDoc: Minor changes were made to the name of Component 1 in order to clarify it.</b></p>
<p><i>Outcome 1.1. Stakeholders and planning mechanisms mobilized for improved management of land, forest and water resources</i></p>	<p><i>Outcome 1. Stakeholders and planning mechanisms recognise the role of ecosystems and ecosystem services for improved management of land, forest and water resources.</i></p>	<p><i>Note on PIF: Similar to Outcome 1 in ProDoc</i></p> <p><i>Note on ProDoc: The outcome name was amended to make it clearer and to emphasize the need for awareness raising on the role of natural ecosystems.</i></p>
<p>Output 1.1.1. Institutional partnerships formalized between government bodies and key sector partners.</p>	<p>Output 1.1. Technical review panels (land-use forums) of the Environment, Forestry, Mines and Minerals, and Agriculture Acts established for decision-making on land use and resolution of conflicts between natural resource protection and economic development</p>	<p>Note on PIF: Similar to 1.1 in Pro-Doc</p> <p>Note on ProDoc: More specific, and builds on recommendation from MECDM that this output also integrate provincial level coordination (land-use forums) that (a) ensure coordinated development planning, including making recommendations on provincial development plans; (b) recommendations to the Protected Area Committee (PAC) and ministries on the creation of new protected areas</p>

<p>Output 1.1.2. Provincial scale land characterization studies completed.</p>	<p>Output 1.2. Land and ecosystem characterisation studies (land-tenure, land-use, elevation, geology, hydrography?) as well as biodiversity, vegetation and ecosystem health assessments completed to identify priority sites for proposed protected areas.</p>	<p>Note on PIF: Similar to 1.2 in Pro-Doc</p> <p>Note on ProDoc: More detailed than PIF, including biodiversity and landuse</p>
<p>Output 1.1.3. A standardized data platform(s) provides information from existing sources and new studies.</p>	<p>Output 1.3. Provincial ordinances protecting key ecosystems created/updated in the four targeted provinces to establish a supportive framework for natural resource management.</p>	<p>Note on PIF: Moved to 2.2 in Pro-doc</p> <p>Note on ProDoc: Incorporates 3.1.2 from the PIF</p>
<p>Output 1.1.4. Communication and outreach programme designed and delivered.</p>	<p>Output 1.4. 100 government staff at the national and provincial scales, NGO's staff and CBO's leaders trained in the sustainable management of natural resources including protected areas management, ecosystems restoration and improved agricultural practices.</p>	<p>Note on PIF: Moved to 1.5 in Pro-doc</p> <p>Note on ProDoc: ? This is 3.1.3 from the PIF , expanded to: highlight national and provincial scales include NGOs include protected areas management and ecosystems restoration</p>
<p>Output 1.1.5. Three spatially based local land use plans are negotiated, produced and implemented.</p>	<p>Output 1.5. Support ? including communication, awareness and outreach programmes on the sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem goods and services and the benefits of protected areas management ? delivered in EREPA interventions sites and other ecosystem-based management sites in the country</p>	<p>Note on PIF: Moved to 3.1 in Pro-doc</p> <p>Note on ProDoc: Incorporates 1.1.4 from the PIF</p>

<p><b>Outcome 1.2. Strengthened community capacity in harmonizing livelihood needs, income generation and good land management practices.</b></p>		<p>Note on PIF: This outcome was integrated into Component 3, with all on-the-ground interventions grouped there in order to articulate all complementary outputs following an integrated approach. The M&amp;E systems was moved to 2.3 and expanded</p> <p>Note on ProDoc:</p>
<p>Output 1.2.1. 6 to 10 local communities coached in diversifying their land use activities, enterprises, and income sources.</p>		<p>Note on PIF: Moved to 3.2 in ProDoc</p> <p>Note on ProDoc:</p>
<p>Output 1.2.2. A good practice forest use and restoration manual developed and applied in 3 demonstration sites with results documented.</p>		<p>Note on PIF: Moved to 3.1 in ProDoc</p> <p>Note on ProDoc:</p>
<p>Output 1.2.3. An income generation model based on sustainable land management and degraded forest management is developed and trialled in 2 demonstration sites.</p>		<p>Note on PIF: Moved to 3.2 in ProDoc</p> <p>Note on ProDoc:</p>
<p>Output 1.2.4. The project monitoring and evaluation system is in place providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcome and output targets.</p>		<p>Note on PIF: Moved to 2.3 in ProDoc and modified to be PA M+E (PAME)</p> <p>Note on ProDoc:</p>

<b>Component 2. Declaration of terrestrial protected areas and their effective management</b>	<b>Component 2. Formal declaration of terrestrial protected areas, and their effective management</b>	<b>Note on PIF: Similar</b>  <b>Note on ProDoc: Similar</b>
<i>Outcome 2.1. Increase in protected area coverage incorporating biogeographically representative, critical ecosystems and key habitats.</i>	<i>Outcome 2. National PA network, PAs' Monitoring and Evaluation systems, knowledge management, financing plans and additional protected areas are declared.</i>	<i>Note on PIF: Similar</i>  <i>Note on ProDoc: Amended to include National PA network, M and E systems, knowledge management and financing plans. Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2 from PIF are merged into this ProDoc Outcome</i>
Output 2.1.1. A participatory program designed and implemented assisting communities, CBOs and provincial government in formulating protected area proposals.	Output 2.1. A national Protected Area Network (PAN) including all PA sites and PA actors developed.	Note on PIF: Moved to 2.4 in ProDoc  Note on ProDoc:
Output 2.1.2. Declaration of at least 200,000 hectares of protected areas across four (4) provinces with landowner consent.	Output 2.2. A standardized data platform(s) providing information from existing sources and new studies established.	Note on PIF: Moved to 2.4 in ProDoc  Note on ProDoc: Incorporates 2.2.2 from PIF

<p><b><i>Outcome 2.2. Effective, equitable governance and management occurring and sustained by capacity building, reliable funding and viable incentives.</i></b></p>	<p>Output 2.3. A standardized monitoring and evaluation system ? and associated tools ? for biodiversity conservation as well as protected areas and resource management to inform and meet national, regional and international targets developed and implemented.</p>	<p>Note on PIF: Outputs under Outcome 2.1 and 2.2 of the PIF were complementary outputs that both related to the process of establishing, strengthening and sustaining PAs. They were therefore merged under a single outcome</p> <p>Note on ProDoc: Incorporates 1.2.4 from PIF, and modified to be PA M+E (PAME)</p>
<p>Output 2.2.1. One model protected area management plan is produced to guide the completion of four specific protected area management plans with on the ground management and monitoring actions occurring.</p>	<p>Output 2.4. Declarations made for at least 50,000 hectares of protected areas across four (4) provinces ? including the development of PA management plans ? through supporting the targeted communities in the PA Act process.</p>	<p>Note on PIF: Moved to 2.5 in ProDoc</p> <p>Note on ProDoc: Incorporates 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 from PIF. Following PPG consultations (and in line with STAP guidance) the HA declaration was reduced to a more realistic and achievable target in the project timeframe, noting challenges of traditional land tenure system. The target has also been refined to include both improved natural resource management planning and actual creation of protected areas. The target = 1.7% of SI total land area.</p>

Output 2.2.2. An approved protected areas financing plan for annual budget and resource needs.	Output 2.5. Business plans and funding opportunities for the implementation of the PA management plan in each targeted site developed	Note on PIF: Moved to 2.5 in ProDoc  Note on ProDoc: Combination of 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 from PIF. Also noting the two pilot networks of PA's for Malaita and Guadalcanal under Activity 2.1.2 in ProDoc.
Output 2.2.3. Complementary livelihood activities are introduced and trialled as integral elements of effective management in the four protected areas.		Note on PIF: Moved to 3.2 in Pro-doc to integrate with other direct livelihood activities  Note on ProDoc:
<b>Component 3. Improved land management in rural production landscapes</b>	<b>Component 3. Improved land management, agricultural practices and restoration interventions in rural production landscapes</b>	<b>Note on PIF: Similar</b>  <b>Note on ProDoc: Amended to include agricultural practices and restoration interventions</b>
<i>Outcome 3.1. The environmental quality and livelihood benefits of production landscapes are sustained.</i>	<i>Outcome 3. The environmental quality and the livelihood benefits of production landscapes for communities within and adjoining PAs are sustained.</i>	<i>Note on PIF: Similar</i>  <i>Note on ProDoc: Amended to specify PA and adjacent landscapes and communities</i>
Output 3.1.1. Land condition inventory assembled for selected landscapes in three (3) provinces.	Output 3.1. Community-based land-use Management Plans at the landscape level developed including delineating PAs, sustainable agricultural areas, agroforestry areas, settlement areas, and forest areas, and improved income-generating activities.	Note on PIF: Moved to 1.2 in ProDoc  Note on ProDoc: Incorporates 1.1.5 and 1.2.2 from PIF

Output 3.1.2. Legislative review processes establish a supportive contemporary framework for rural land use planning	Output 3.2. Improved and diversified livelihoods based on the sustainable use of forest and agricultural resources, including income generating and livelihood options for communities, adopted and implemented within and outside protected areas.	Note on PIF: Moved to 1.3 in Pro-doc  Note on ProDoc: Incorporates 1.2.1, 1.2.3 and 2.2.3 from PIF
Output 3.1.3. 100 government extension staff, CBO people and landowners trained in conservation agriculture and agro forestry practices.	Output 3.3. Degraded forest areas restored through reforestation activities and natural regeneration interventions.	Note on PIF: Moved to Output 1.4 in Pro-Doc  Note on ProDoc: New

It should be noted that adjustments have been made with respect to the GEF grant distribution over the different technical components and PMC. The table below summarises these changes, which are the result of a detailed costing of activities.

Component	GEF Project Financing at PIF stage (US\$)	GEF Project Financing at CER stage (US\$)
<i>Component 1:</i> Enabling environment for integrated terrestrial ecosystem management and restoration	1,903,946	1,780,200
<i>Component 2:</i> Formal declaration of terrestrial protected areas, and their effective management	1,930,000	1,769,019
<i>Component 3:</i> Improved Land Management in Rural Production Landscapes	850,210	1,130,100
PMC	234,208	239,045
TOTAL	4,918,364	4,918,364

4) The incremental cost reasoning was significantly developed from the PIF to the Project Document but no significant changes have been made. The nature of cofinancing remain unvaried.

5) The target regarding the Global Environment Benefits remain unchanged. However, the interventions to be undertaken in the 50,000 ha of forest targeted have been refined and include both improved natural resource management planning and actual creation of protected areas.

6) The innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up sections have been further developed from PIF to Project Document.

## A.2. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

## A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

Section 6 of the Project Document describes stakeholders engagement, including the role of stakeholders in the implementation of the project. The Project Document also refers to the environmental and social safeguards screening (see Section 4.12), and budgeted monitoring plan.

Mainly four categories of stakeholders will be involved in the execution of the project. Their involvement in the project is summarised below. More details on the planned involvement of each partner are provided in Section 6 of the Project Document.

Stakeholder	Role/Involvement in project	Means and timing of engagement	Dissemination of information	Resource requirements
<b>Government institutions</b>				
MECDM	Lead executing agency for the project	Continuously during the project implementation phase for the execution of the project	The project is carried by MECDM who will therefore manage all information generated by the project	The management of the project by a PMU to be hosted by MECDM has been budgeted for as well as staff time and travels for the implementation of the project.
MPGIS	Chair PPSC (through provincial secretary)	Twice a year for the project steering committee meetings and as needed	PSC meetings and additional meetings when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the chair of the PPSC.	Budget is available for the participation of PSC members to meetings.

Stakeholder	Role/Involvement in project	Means and timing of engagement	Dissemination of information	Resource requirements
<p>MWYCFA MAL and provincial division of MAL in the targeted provinces MoFR's Reforestation division and provincial division of MoFR in the targeted provinces</p>	<p>Main implementing partners Participate in the identification, design and implementation of project interventions according to their mandate and experience</p>	<p>Continuously during the project implementation phase for the implementation of project interventions</p>	<p>PSC meetings and additional meetings when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the implementing partners.</p>	<p>Budget is available to cover the costs of implementing partner for staff time and travels, and for the implementation of specific activities where appropriate.</p>
<p>Ministry of Infrastructure: road network needed (particularly in East Rennell) Ministry of Culture and Tourism Provincial Secretary LALSU</p>	<p>Other implementing partners to provide guidance and support the implementation of project activities</p>	<p>At different stages of the project implementation phase for the implementation of specific project interventions</p>	<p>Meeting will be organised when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the implementing partners.</p>	<p>Budget is available to cover the cost of implementing partner for staff time and travels, and for their contribution to project implementation where required (e.g. LALSU)</p>
<b>International non-government organisations</b>				

Stakeholder	Role/Involvement in project	Means and timing of engagement	Dissemination of information	Resource requirements
WWF TNC Live&Learn Ocean Watch Word Fish	Experience sharing, technical insight and support to implementation according to their respective projects and expertise	At different stages of the project implementation phase to gather insight for the implementation of specific project interventions, and potentially for the actual implementation of some interventions.	Meetings will be organised when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the project partners.	Budget is available to cover the costs of implementing partner for staff time and travels when meetings will be required. Budget might also be allocated to some of these partners through a service provider contract for the implementation of specific activities. This will be part of the budget lines for the service providers for each activities.
SPREP IUCN	Co-financing partners  SPREP will also chair the technical committee of the project in collaboration with MECDM and MAL, advisor of the project regarding environment issues and risks, experience sharing and technical insight	Continuously during the project implementation phase. SPREP and IUCN will participate in PSC meetings. Additional meetings will also be organised punctually between the PMU and the project team of cofinancing partners as required.	PSC meetings and additional meetings when necessary. All reports generated under the EREPA project will be shared with the co-financing partners. Detailed Information on the progress will be provided at PSC meetings.	The GEF grant foresees a budget for travel. Co-financing partners will make staff time available to participate to the meetings and communicate continuously with the PMU.
<b>National non-government organisations</b>				

Stakeholder	Role/Involvement in project	Means and timing of engagement	Dissemination of information	Resource requirements
Natural Resource Development Foundation (NRDF) Youth at Work Salomon Island Environmental Law Association (SIELA) Solomon Islands Community Conservation Partnership (SICCP) Ecological Solution Solomon Islands (ESSI)	Experience sharing, technical insight and support to implementation according to their respective projects and expertise	At different stages of the project implementation phase to gather insight for the implementation of specific project interventions, and potentially for the actual implementation of some interventions.	Meeting will be organised when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the project partners.	Budget might be allocated to some of these partners through a service provider contract for the implementation of specific activities. This will be part of the budget lines for the service providers for each activities.
<b>Final recipients</b>				
Community members	Select, design and implement on-the-ground project interventions with support from the project	Continuously during the project implementation phase for the implementation of the project interventions particularly under Components 2 and 3 including every stage of the PA creation process, participatory development planning, development of sustainable livelihoods	Continuous communication between the PMU and local communities on the project annual workplans, progress and results, as well as through the implementation of the awareness raising programme under Component 1 for the general public.	Component 2 and 3 of the project foresees a large amount of the GEF grant dedicated to PA creation and livelihood improvement.

Stakeholder	Role/Involvement in project	Means and timing of engagement	Dissemination of information	Resource requirements
Community-based organisations (e.g. Tanday Tribal Land-owner Association (Guadalcanal), Barana Women Association (Guadalcanal), Wai-Hau Association (Malaita), Wara Women Association (Malaita), WHS Management Committee (Rennell), and Temotu Conservation and Sustainable Development Association (Temotu))	Take a leading role in the design and implementation of EREPA interventions on the ground based on their specialities	Continuously during the project implementation phase for the awareness-raising interventions, and for data collection and knowledge-sharing activities, and contribution to implementation of project interventions particularly under Component 2 and 3	Continuous communication between the PMU and local communities on the project annual workplans, progress and results.	Component 2 and 3 of the project foresees a large amount of the GEF grant dedicated to supporting these community-based organisations.
Other ongoing or planned projects	Share lessons learned from the implementation of their projects, collaborate in identifying potential opportunities for collaboration to maximize impacts, replication and sustainability	At different stages of the project implementation phase for knowledge sharing and discussion on options for collaboration.	Meetings will be organised when necessary. All project outputs, project progress reports, and project communication tools will be shared with the project partners.	Budget is available to cover the cost of project partner for staff time and travels when meetings are needed.

## Documents

Title

Submitted

**In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.**

**Select what role civil society will play in the project:**

**Consulted only;**

**Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;**

**Co-financier;**

**Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body; Yes**

**Executor or co-executor; Yes**

**Other (Please explain)**

#### **A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).**

### **Documents**

**Title**

**Submitted**

**Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?**

Yes

**If yes, please upload document or equivalent here**

The project has several activities that will focus on women and gender equality. The outreach and communications will be planned to be gender responsive with plans to reach men and women participants equally (Activity 1.5.1, page 51). In Component 2 it is planned that the process of designating protected areas will be gender responsive (page 52). Measures to ensure equal involvement of women and men under the EREPA project are:

? To ensure that the project is gender sensitive, an in-depth assessment of the social context will be undertaken in each targeted site at inception to: understand the gender-related dynamics specific to the site and identify women in the village and assess their level of education and abilities. Guidelines will then be developed by a gender expert regarding gender integration for application by the coordination team. The gender expert will advise the project on activities with local communities. The implementation of the gender-sensitive approach of the project will start with: i) making sure ? at very early stages of the implementation phase ? that all members understand the purpose of the project; and ii) clearly informing the community that the project intervention have a clear focus on women as well

as men. This will enable women involvement to be understood and accepted. A MOU between the local communities and the MECDM will be signed to formalize collaboration and further clarify the gender focus of the project. This is also expected to facilitate communication with the community elders on gender issues.

? Women tend not to speak up in a mixed group. Specific focus groups will therefore be organised with women for all the project activities, especially under Component 2. Particular attention will be given to the timing of these focus groups to avoid putting an extra burden on women's routine. It was suggested during the consultations that Sunday after prayer could be a good time for discussion with women.

? Women access to higher education is lower than men access. In order to ensure adequate women involvement in every step of the project, consultations will be undertaken to identify the awareness-raising, knowledge-sharing and training material that can be understood by all. For example, visual communication tools will be preferred.

? Gender sensitive indicators have been developed in the project's result framework. A percentage of 50% women would have been ideal but based on government consultations, it is not realistic. This percentage must be defined specifically for each type of activity.

? The sustainable development actions identified and prioritised by local communities under Output 3.2 will be analysed to identify if they are men-led, female-led or mixed activities. In order to reach equal participation of women in economic activities<sup>[1]</sup>, the set of actions to be supported by the project will be selected in such a way that it generates economic benefits to an equal number of men and women.

? The micro-finance system under Output 3.2 will include financial literacy training and the development of savings groups that are targeted to and generally run by women, and will be based on existing successful examples of women's savings groups in the Solomon Islands.

---

[1] UN Women, 2015. Brief on the Market for Change project 2014-2019.

**If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:**

**Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;** No

**Improving women's participation and decision making** Yes

**Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women** Yes

---

**Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?**

Yes

**A.5. Risks**

**Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.**

A limited number of risks have been identified - external risks, technical & operational risks and environmental & social risks. Measures to mitigate these risks have been integrated into project design as demonstrated in Table below. The risk level describes the residual risks considering that mitigation measures are adequately implemented. References to relevant outputs/activities are provided in Table below.

<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Prob</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Mitigation measure(s)</b>
<b>External risks</b>				

<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Prob</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Mitigation measure(s)</b>
Climate variability (e.g. drought, cyclone, storm surges)	Med	High	Medium	Special attention to the impacts of recovery and post disaster actions in priority protected areas. Support the diversification of livelihood options ( <i>Activity 3.2.2: Select sustainable, environment-friendly and economically-viable livelihood micro projects</i> ).
Risks of livelihood and environmental loss caused by logging and mining industry	Med	Med	High	The whole project works on the creation and implementation of protected areas, in order to limit the expansion of logging and mining industry in these areas (as such activities are forbidden by law, under the PA Act).

Risk Description	Prob	Impact	Level	Mitigation measure(s)
Covid-19 disruptions to project implementation	Med	Med	Med	<p>The current global health crisis associated with COVID 19 has the potential to redirect the attention and resources of the Government of Solomon Islands and other stakeholders towards this challenge and affect the overall operations of the project. As of October 2020, Solomon Islands has recorded only one positive corona virus case. Travel within Solomon Islands remains unaffected. Travel to Solomon Islands by outside experts, the Chief Technical Advisor (if not currently in Solomon Islands) and other consultants will be difficult for the foreseeable future. Efforts will be made to mitigate this through prioritising local consultants, hiring local liaisons for outside consultants, and utilising virtual meetings. An outbreak of Covid-19 in neighbouring Papua New Guinea has potential to spread to Solomon Islands but the government has opened a quarantine centre and triage facility at the closest border with Papua New Guinea to mitigate potential cases that may cross the border.</p> <p>The project has integrated adaptive management instruments into its design and will apply these instruments to adapt as necessary to this risk. The inception workshop will be used to review the results framework and project timeline to determine if there is a need to make any adjustments due to operational challenges, funding, stakeholder involvement and partnerships as a result of the global health situation. The quarterly and annual reporting and review process will also be used to assure the project is able to adapt in a timely means.</p> <p>In addition, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be reviewed and finalized at project inception. As necessary, adjustments to the means and timing of engagement will be made to assure that relevant stakeholder groups are able to be represented and participate in key consultation and decision-making processes. The knowledge management and communication strategy and associated activities proposed for knowledge management at the landscape, cross-landscape, national and regional levels will also be developed taking into consideration the latest available information and guidance on social distancing.</p>
			<b>Technical &amp; operational risks</b>	

Risk Description	Prob	Impact	Level	Mitigation measure(s)
Low level of cooperation and coordination between stakeholders (e.g. amongst sectors)	Low	Med	Medium	The joint involvement of the different relevant sectors in most of project activities should normally lead to better cross-sector integration and new synergies (e.g <i>Activity 1.1.1: Develop cross-sector partnership agreements; Activity 1.4.2: Provide training to national and provincial government staff, NGOs and CBOs using a training-of-trainers model</i> ). Systematic information and the involvement of decentralized entities must also foster a good cross-sectoral integration at the local level.
Limited understanding of and commitment to the value of an expanded and representative protected areas network	Low	Med	Medium	Awareness and information campaign designed and implemented ( <i>Output 1.5 Support ? including communication, awareness and outreach programmes on the sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem goods and services and the benefits of protected areas management ? delivered in EREPA interventions sites and other ecosystem-based management sites in the country</i> ). The increase in visibility and relevancy of protected areas resulting from project activities and outputs, especially components 2 and 3 should significantly increase the interest for conservation problematic in Solomon Islands.
Weak implementation capacity at local and institutional levels	High	Med	Medium	Training and other assistance for institutions, community-based organizations and local community members ( <i>Output 1.4: 100 government staff at the national and provincial scales, NGO's staff and CBO's leaders trained</i> ). Tracking and monitoring to evaluate effectiveness and adapt as necessary ( <i>Activity 2.3.2: Support government, CBOs, communities and other stakeholders in the use of M&amp;E tools</i> ).
Low compliance with resource regulations and/or ineffective compliance mechanisms	Med	Med	Medium	Ensure that processes to develop local conventions detail principles and rules for the management of natural resources are community driven ( <i>Activity 1.3.2: Support provincial authorities and provincial stakeholders</i> ). Assure adequate communication on regulations and their benefits ( <i>Activity 2.3.1: Develop a monitoring and evaluation strategy and tools for protected areas</i> ). Build capacity for community surveillance networks ( <i>Activity 2.4.5: Review experiences in the implementation of the rangers programme in community-based resource management areas in the country, and draw lessons learned</i> ).

Risk Description	Prob	Impact	Level	Mitigation measure(s)
Delays for the preparation of designation and/or registration documentation	Low	medium	Medium	Respective requirements for the preparation of designation/registration documentation for each category must be tailored according to the relevance of each category for the protection of national biodiversity wealth, but also taking into account feasibility consideration; notably, deliverables of <i>Activity 1.2.2: Identify knowledge gaps, and develop and implement activities to fill in these gaps at the landscape or island level depending on the province</i> must be realistic and take into account practical implementation considerations.
Delays in work plan	Low	Medium	Low	IUCN to continually monitor progress of PMU, including regular informal communication as well as formal scheduled reporting
Delays in procurement disbursements	Low	Medium	Low	Adherence to IUCN procurement standards and processes, with
Lack of resources	Low	Medium	Low	IUCN to continually monitor budget and procurement through PMU
Inappropriate communication strategy	Low	Medium	Low	Gender and culturally sensitive communications plan developed at first stage of project. Plan aligns with GEF, IUCN and Solomon Islands Government communication policies.

#### A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

##### **Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.**

The institutional arrangement and coordination is summarized in the figure below, and a full description is provided in section 5 of the Project Document.

The execution of the project will be under the responsibility of Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM).

MECDM will work in partnership with SPREP given its assigned mandate from regional governments to provide technical and other assistance to protect and improve the environment and to ensure sustainable development for present and future generations in the Pacific. A National Project Management Board (PMB), chaired by MECDM will be responsible for guiding the project implementation, advising the National Project Coordinator and its PMU when needed, and validating reports. Provincial Project Steering Committees (PPSC) will be established in each of the four target provinces, and a Technical and scientific committee will be established in support of the PMB. IUCN is the implementing agency for the project and will support the MECDM to ensure execution of administrative and financial matters and will assist in key technical and scientific issues. Its role will also be to consolidate results, directly facilitate workshops and the convening of key stakeholders (consistent with its comparative advantage in capacity building), and secure financial resources to complement project activities.

Details and a diagram of the institutional arrangements for project implementation are noted in Section 5 of the Project Document.

**Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:**

**A.7. Benefits**

**Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?**

At the national level, the project will raise socioeconomic benefits for communities across the Solomon Islands through improving the governance regarding land tenure and land uses. These interventions will clarify the rights to access resources. This will generate two main benefits which are to reinforce and protect communities' rights regarding activities undertaken on their land and it will protect natural resources from competing land uses and misuses. In addition, awareness and access to knowledge on the role of natural ecosystems, on the rights of local communities regarding access and decision-making on the use of natural resources, and on existing opportunities for sustainable resources management and to increase the financial benefits from natural ecosystems will be increased. This will empower local communities and give them the opportunity to become active actors in the improvement of their livelihoods.

At the local level in the targeted provinces, the project will deliver direct socioeconomic benefits for the communities through the formalisation of protected area. This will enable communities to resist to the pressure they face from mining and logging companies to undertake unsustainable extractive activities on their land. This process of formalising the status of the area they are protecting will significantly reduce the risk of having a small group of individuals making decisions regarding land-use for the whole community without adequate consultations. This will support communities in protecting their natural heritage. The protected area status will also increase the visibility and legitimacy of the site for people within and outside the country thereby creating opportunities to develop sustainable tourism activities. In addition, the participatory approach promoted for decision making and management for the development of the community-based land-use Management Plans will further empower local communities and ? through increasing dialogues and enabling all groups to express themselves ? it will reduce the risk of conflicts within communities. Socioeconomic benefits will also be delivered by the project through directly financing the adoption of improved livelihoods based on the sustainable use of agricultural and forest resources and through supporting access to other funding sources. The formalisation of the PA will also increase the likelihood to receive financial support from within and outside the government. In the short to medium term, local communities will have access to resilient and sustainable sources of income. In the longer term, additional socioeconomic benefits (e.g. sources of income, health, quality of living environment) will be delivered through safeguarding biodiversity and the production of ecosystem goods and services under a climate change scenario.

The socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project will generate global environment benefits in the short to long term. The set of community-based interventions to be implemented under the project will lead to

community ownership of resources and make them first beneficiaries and responsible party for natural resources management. In addition, the financial value of biodiversity and natural ecosystems will be increased as a result of the project interventions. Strong incentives for local communities to protect natural ecosystems will therefore be created and maintained. The resulting preservation of ecosystem functioning and biodiversity will generate multiple benefits including inter alia carbon storage, buffering of climate change, and water quality and availability.

**A.8. Knowledge Management**

**Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user- friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.**

As part of Output 1.5, a communication strategy that supports the project's goal and is gender and culturally sensitive will be designed and implemented. Communication will be undertaken on two main aspects. Firstly, awareness will be raised on the project objectives, interventions and sites, targets, and timeline. The communication tools to be produced to raise awareness on the project will include *inter alia* a project website, project brochure and signs in each intervention sites. Secondly, awareness-raising activities will be implemented within and beyond the project intervention sites on the threats on natural resources, ecosystem functioning, ecosystem services and the role of natural ecosystems as climate change buffers, unsustainable exploitation practices and effects, sustainable management options, livelihood improvement and diversification, and the benefits of protected areas. This is expected to further contribute to achieving the Aichi targets of the country beyond the EREPA project scope and implementation period. The strategy will be developed in order to support the implementation and sustainability of the interventions under Components 1, 2 and 3. The strategy will also consider how to ensure the impacts and the lessons learned from this project can be used to scale up and institutionalize successful measures and best practices for natural resources management.

The communication and education materials will integrate traditional, incremental and scientific knowledge.. Community material will include digital and non-digital means and tools, using a diversity of media and events. All materials will be branded and marked according to project guidelines and GEF communication guidelines.

The set of tools to be developed will target numerous stakeholders from local communities and different levels of government authorities as it is shown in the table below.

EREPA Project Communication targets and tools

Scale	Target	Example of communication activities
-------	--------	-------------------------------------

Scale	Target	Example of communication activities
<b>Public awareness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Solomon Islands population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Production and broadcasting of radio show documentaries</li> <li>- Production and broadcasting of TV documentaries (15 min)</li> <li>- EREPA project website</li> </ul>
<b>Central level</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decision- and policy-makers</li> <li>- Government technical officers</li> <li>- National &amp; international NGOs</li> <li>- Research institutes</li> <li>- International organisation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A data platform</li> <li>- standardised M&amp;E system</li> <li>- Communication/Translation/Publication/Visibility</li> <li>- Distribution of progress and evaluation reports</li> <li>- Project national meetings</li> </ul>
<b>Provincial level</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provincial authorities</li> <li>- Decentralized government staff</li> <li>- Provincial NGOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project provincial meetings</li> </ul>
<b>Ward and constituency level</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community-based organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental education activities in schools</li> <li>- Communication tool kit</li> <li>- Project brochure and signs</li> </ul>
<b>Local level</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Village chiefs</li> <li>- Community members,</li> <li>- Tribal members which are not part of the community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project local meetings</li> <li>- project brochure and signs</li> </ul>

In addition to the implementation of Output 1.5, the application of the PA Act process under Output 2.4 will involve intensive awareness-raising activities at the local level to get all tribal members of the targeted villages on board, as well as members of surrounding villages.

Output 2.1 of this project is aimed at improving the knowledge sharing and access to information on SIs? formal and informal protected areas by supporting the creation of a Protected Areas Network at the national scale and two networks at the provincial scale. These networks will facilitate the sharing of knowledge, data, results and experiences between all actors involved in conservation initiatives, and in the creation or management of protected areas.

Knowledge management will be strongly linked to the project monitoring and evaluation to ensure that all collected M&E data are processed into knowledge and shared with the project staff through the most appropriate communication tools. The objectives of this internal knowledge management process are twofold (i) delivering the preliminary knowledge generated by the project to the main stakeholders; and (ii) improving this knowledge with individual know-how. This enriched operational knowledge through internal processes will serve as inputs to the external processes of knowledge management. External knowledge management will be geared towards outreaching the project achievements and lessons to external partners at local, national, regional and international levels.

A data platform will be created under the MECDM by building on existing platforms to share information on natural and human-made assets ? including current state of natural systems and assets, biodiversity values, land-use patterns and categories, and highlighting impacts and conflicts. A key component of this will be access to GIS layers and GIS modeling that allows users to add and display layers and information points relevant to their interest or particular decision-point. This platform will thereby support decision-making, planning and prioritization of interventions. The project management unit will work with partners to design this platform in such a way that it will be maintained beyond the project lifespan, and establish and manage this platform. The MECDM will be responsible for developing clear guidelines for the safeguarding and sharing of data. A commitment to assuring an open access policy will be required. The tools will be designed to generate data and inform analyses on the creation and management of informal and formal protected areas, as well as on biodiversity conservation. The data platform will grow constantly and in a systematic manner thanks to standardised M&E system that will be established under Output 2.2. In addition to increasing data availability and facilitating access to this information, a technical liaison group between all existing complementary data platforms will be created to further contribute to the complementarity, ease of access and maintenance of the three data platforms.

**B. Description of the consistency of the project with:**

**B.1. Consistency with National Priorities**

**Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.**

The project aims to operationalize high level commitments by the Government of Solomon Islands to ensure resilient ecosystems and representative protected areas in the Solomon Islands. It is highly consistent with national priorities, plans, and policies on the environment and development. See Section 4.6 of the Project Document for details.

**C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:**

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the proposed project will be conducted in accordance with established IUCN and GEF procedures/guidelines. The Monitoring and Coordination Unit of MECDM will be in charge of the ongoing M&E of the project throughout the implementation period and will ensure it meets the obligations of the Ministry regarding GEF. The standard M&E reports and procedures required for all IUCN/GEF projects will apply to the M&E plan for the proposed project, including the following elements in the table below.

M&E activities, timeframe and responsibilities

M&E activity	Description	Frequency	Responsible	Budget (GEF funded)
--------------	-------------	-----------	-------------	---------------------

<b>M&amp;E activity</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Budget (GEF funded)</b>
Inception Workshop and Report	The Inception Workshop gathering the stakeholders involved in the project, and resulting Inception Report, provide the occasions and means to finalize preparations for the implementation of the proposed project, involving the formulation of the first annual work plan, the detailing of stakeholder roles and responsibilities, and that of reporting and monitoring requirements. Considering the consultation process at PPG, only minor adjustments are expected.	Within the first two months of project start up. Will be undertaken at the national and provincial scales.	PMU M&E Specialist under Monitoring and Coordination Unit of MECDM CTA IUCN ORO	US\$ 15,000
Baseline study	The project logical framework ? particularly the reference level of the SMART indicators ? will be fine-tuned where necessary.	At project inception.	PMU M&E Specialist under Monitoring and Coordination Unit of MECDM CTA IUCN ORO	None
Strategic Result Framework	The Project Results Framework presented in section 2 includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. Measurements of means of verification for project progress on output and implementation will be made throughout the implementation period.	Data collected continuously in order to have the required quantitative and qualitative data on the progress against each indicator prior to Annual Project Reports and to the definition of annual work plans.	PMU M&E Specialist under Monitoring and Coordination Unit of MECDM CTA	None

<b>M&amp;E activity</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Budget (GEF funded)</b>
Quarterly Progress Report	Each quarter, the PMU will prepare a summary of the project's substantive and technical progress towards achieving its objectives. The summaries will be reviewed and cleared by the IUCN before being sent to the IUCN Regional Program Coordinator.	Quarterly	PMU M&E Specialist under Monitoring and Coordination Unit of MECDM CTA IUCN ORO	None
Annual Project Report (APR)	The APR covers performance assessments on project outputs and outcomes, major achievements, evidence of success, constraints, lessons learned and recommendations as well as an overall rating of the project. The APR will be prepared by the Project Coordinator after consultation with the relevant stakeholders, and will be submitted to IUCN.	Annually	PMU CTA IUCN ORO	None
Tripartite Review (TPR) (Steering committee)	The TPR members will meet twice a year to assess the progress of the project and make decisions on recommendations to improve the design and implementation of the project in order to achieve the expected results.	Twice a year	PMU CTA IUCN Regional Program Coordinator	None
Independent External Evaluation at mid-term	A mid-term project evaluation will be conducted during the third implementation year, focusing on relevance; performance (effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness); issues requiring decisions and actions; and initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.	At the mid-point of project implementation.	IUCN ORO	US\$ 40,000
Independent External Evaluation at termination of the project	A final evaluation, which occurs three months prior to the final TPR meeting, focuses on the same issues as the mid-term evaluation but also covers impact, sustainability, and follow-through recommendations, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals.	At least three months before the end of project implementation.	IUCN ORO	US\$ 50,000

<b>M&amp;E activity</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Budget (GEF funded)</b>
Terminal Project Report	A Terminal Project Report will be prepared for the terminal meeting.	On completion of the terminal evaluation.	PMU M&E Specialist under Monitoring and Coordination Unit of MECDM CTA IUCN ORO	None
Budget revisions	Project budget revisions will reflect the final expenditures for the preceding year, to enable the preparation of a realistic plan for the provision of inputs for the current year. It is expected that significant revisions will be cleared with the IUCN/GEF Coordinator for consistency with the GEF principle of incremental and GEF eligibility criteria before being approved.	At least every year and as necessary during the course of the project	PMU Administrative and Financial Assistant M&E Specialist under Monitoring and Coordination Unit of MECD CTA IUCN ORO	None
Audits	A financial audit will be undertaken every year. The PMU will develop and implement a strategy to address audit recommendations after each audit.	Annually	PMU Administrative and Financial Assistant IUCN ORO	US\$ 40,000
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b>				<b>US\$ 145,000</b>

### Capitalization

The main goal of the capitalization process is to produce knowledge to inform action. It is about building the capacity of staff to implement mechanisms or processes that have proven effective in fulfilling their objectives. It is also a question of allowing a more effective use of the resources made available, avoiding error repetition, understanding reasons for successes, but also for failures. It is important to make a clear distinction between Capitalization and Evaluation: these are convergent but distinct approaches. Capitalization processes and tools can be broadly similar to those used in evaluation, but there is a fundamental difference in the fact that capitalization does not lead to an evaluative judgement. The objective is to build an informed database of lessons learnt during project roll-out.

**PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)**

**A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

<b>GEF Agency Coordinator</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Sheila Aggarwal-Khan	5/28/2019	Andrew Foran		andrew.foran@iucn.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).**

See section 2 of the Project Document, page 8.

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).**

STAP comments	IUCN Response at Pro Doc
<p>STAP welcomes the IUCN proposal "EREPA ? Ensuring resilient ecosystems and representative protected areas in the Solomon Islands." The project's stated objective is the "effective management for healthy, complementary networks of protected, productive and restored landscapes in Guadalcanal, Malaita, Rennell-Bellona and Temotu".</p> <p>STAP feels that this is a well-written and solidly argued proposal, with a good understanding of process and the central role of communities in the context of the Solomon Islands.</p> <p>STAP is somewhat concerned, however, that while the project is logical, it is simply taking on too much for a 48- month \$4.9 million project.</p>	<p>The STAP comments regarding the scope of activities proposed being too ambitious were echoed during the PPG phase by stakeholders, and the project has been amended since the PIF, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Merging of Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2</li> <li>? Integration of a number of outputs and activities</li> <li>? Declaration of 50,000 hectares of protected areas scaled down from 200,000 hectares, a more realistic and achievable target in the project budget and timeframe.</li> <li>? Combining with existing interventions eg 2.4.4 re the GEF-5 IFM project; 2.2 re existing data platforms</li> </ul>

<p>First, STAP is pleased to note that Components 1 and 2 are well developed, and explicit references to the linkages between outputs and outcomes are made. The key barriers identified are directly being addressed, proposed interventions incorporate significant stakeholder engagement, and governance challenges are well acknowledged.</p> <p>That being said, Component 3 appears to be a weaker add-on to an otherwise interesting proposal. There is no clarity as to how it relates to the other two components, and the concept of integrated landscape management appears without much justification. Should the project proponents choose to use an integrated landscape management approach, it would be useful to consult some of the recent literature on the subject, and then use it to build a set of better related Components (<i>references listed in STAP document</i>)</p>	<p>Component 3 is intended to address pressing environmental problems associated with increasing levels of subsistence agricultural activity. It has been amended since the PIF to strengthen it, and to integrate better with Components 1 and 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? restoration interventions included</li> <li>? a focus on sustaining environmental quality and livelihood benefits of production landscapes for communities within and adjoining PAs.</li> <li>? developing community-based land-use Management Plans at the landscape level which includes delineating PAs, sustainable agricultural areas, agroforestry areas, settlement areas, and forest areas, and also improved income-generating activities</li> </ul>
<p>Second, the PIF explicitly states that it aims to gather lessons which can be up-scaled to the region, and the project proposal comprises several items which relate to the thorough documentation of practical experiences. It states that the lack of replicability of other local interventions is a key pitfall which this project should attempt to avoid. However, there appears to be no formal knowledge management system or monitoring and evaluation components to the project. At this stage, STAP's on-going advice to the GEF on knowledge management (available here: <a href="http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef">http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef</a>) might be a useful starting point to help address this issue.</p>	<p>Knowledge management has been enhanced and improved, including through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Data management (Output 2.2 A standardized data platform that includes integrating the compiled information and its metadata into existing data platforms the Solomon Islands Environmental Data Portal, PIPAP and SolGeo, and to ensure the complementary and collaborative management of the three platforms, a technical liaison group will be created.</li> <li>? Communication, awareness and outreach programmes (Output 1.5), including on the sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem goods and services and the benefits of protected areas management delivered in EREPA interventions sites and other ecosystem-based management sites in the country</li> <li>? A standardized monitoring and evaluation system including knowledge management and communication (Output 2.3) and associated tools, to inform and meet national, regional and international targets,</li> </ul>

<p>Finally, the PIF is quick to criticize other projects for their lack of replicability, yet it appears that there is limited information as to how this project can build upon existing interventions. This may become a concern when noting the wide array of proposed interventions and the seemingly modest financial resources available for this project. STAP does note, however, that there is some mention of the ambition to enhance cooperation between various actors using a range of strategies including the collection and exchange of information.</p>	<p>? The Project Management Board will be a key opportunity to draw together the many interventions in the Solomon Islands via the combined project experiences of the respective members eg. it will ostensibly be a continuance of the GEF-5 Ridges-to-Reef project committee, or at least having many of the same serving members. As well as MEDCM, it will also have members from a number of partner ministries (eg. Agriculture, Forestry ) which will enhance its critical implementation role and also for the support it can offer to project replicability.</p> <p>? MECDM will house the PMU, which will bring a number of existing PA and related interventions under the one roof.</p> <p>? The project is also designed to work closely with existing interventions, eg Activity 2.4.4 will support and build directly on the PA Trust Fund that is planned under the GEF-5 IFM project.</p> <p>? Underpinning EREPA is the national policy framework that includes key platforms such as the National Development Strategy 2011-2020 and the NBSAP 2016-2020, which are also critical commitments and tools to promote, and also require cross-disciplinary coordination and deliver mandates for collaboration.</p>
<p>GEF Council Comment</p>	<p>IUCN ORO Response</p>
<p>Comment from <a href="#">Japan</a></p>	

<p>Regarding the output 2.1.2, it sounds quite ambitious to declare 200,000 ha of protected areas with landowners' consent considering the system of land tenure in Solomon Islands.</p> <p>To acquire landowners' consent, it is important to provide adequate incentives and develop a system for fair benefit sharing during the project implementation. In addition, this project will cover four provinces.</p> <p>Therefore, effective monitoring system needs to be taken into account.</p>	<p>Since the comment, the result has been reduced to 50,000 ha of protected area.</p> <p>The incentives are incorporated into the landuse planning activities and livelihood activities in Component 3.</p> <p>This is noted and monitoring will be conducted by the Implementing Agency, the PMU and the provincial officers.</p>
<p>As for the JICA (The Japan International Cooperation Agency) project in the country, JICA is currently implementing a project titled 'The Project on Capacity Development for Sustainable Forest Resource Management in Solomon Islands' and this project has a component of sustainable forest management pilot activities by communities in two pilot sites, which have not been selected yet. When the project starts, it is recommended that this project team and JICA project team will exchange information.</p>	<p>The project will collaborate with the JICA project starting at inception.</p>
<p>Comment from <u>Germany</u></p>	

Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

? While for the three national government agencies (MECDM, MOFR, MAL) cross sector partnership agreements (Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) style frameworks) are envisioned under Output 1.1.1. For coordination with the three national government agencies (MECDM, MOFR, MAL), the placement of project liaison officers could be helpful.

? The proposal could benefit from including coordination mechanisms with other donors and/or implementing partners. We suggest considering this in the proposal.

? 1.6 Sustainability outlines measures aimed at improving local ownership in general terms. Germany suggests elaborating on their operationalisation in more detail. Again, the strategic placement of liaison officers could assist in fostering ownership.

In order to ensure successful implementation, the final proposal should provide a detailed overview of the envisaged co-financing, specifying the contribution by different ministries.

1. The budget did not allow for individual ministerial placement officers. A quarterly inter-ministerial coordination will be conducted for the project.

2. The Ministry of Environment conducts donor coordination meetings annually. This project will be included.

3. The project has local liaison officers at the provincial level included

4. The revised co-financing letter broken down by Ministries has been included as a separate document in the Portal. This is now broken down by:

Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology - \$2,810,000

Ministry of Forests and Research - \$1,500,000

Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock - \$2,500,000

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.**

**A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:**

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 163,500			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent Todate</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1.1. Consultant - staff input	89,440	92,336	
1.2. Consultants - expenses	25,980		23,084
2.1. Inception and validation workshops	34,580	25,588	8,992
4.1. Agency fee ORO	6,750	5,306	1,444
Agency fee HQ Corporate	3,750	3,750	
Agency fee GEF Coordination Unit	3,000	3,000	
<b>Total</b>	163,500	129,980	33,520

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

**Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)**

**ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet**

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

**ANNEX F: Project Taxonomy Worksheet**

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Please refer to Part 1

**ANNEX G: Project Budget Table**

**Please attach a project budget table.**

Please refer to the EREPA\_BUDGET\_19012021.xlsx spreadsheet file uploaded as a supporting document.