

# Resilient rural economic growth and food security

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11699

**Countries**

Solomon Islands

**Project Name**

Resilient rural economic growth and food security

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

9/18/2024

**Review completed by PM**

9/23/2024

**Program Manager**

Yuki Shiga

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.9.22:

Please delete 'climate change adaptation sector' under 'project sector' as this is for CCM only.

Agency's Comments Changes have been made, as advised

### 2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments 2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.10.1:

Please provide less general background and instead summarize the actual project, i.e., provide an indication of the communities to be supported, their constraints in the context of climate change, and how the project will build their climate resilience.

Agency's Comments

Kindly confirm if this response is cleared

The summary has been significantly edited to make it clearer what the project will do in practice, including its innovative focus on addressing the societal impacts of climate change and adaptation measures.

### 3 Indicative Project Overview

- 3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**
- b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

Secretariat's Comments

2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.9.22:

- M&E Component in Indicative Project Overview Table misses the outputs ? please amend.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)						
M&E	Technical Assistance	Regular and systematic monitoring		LDCF	400,000.00	830,953.00
		Mid-term Review and Terminal Evaluation conducted successfully				

- Gender: Please discuss how climate change impacts women's vulnerability and any particular measures the project will take in this regard.
- Gender: Please reflect gender dimensions in Components 1 and 3 (for example, ensuring that the mechanisms are gender-responsive and taking into consideration women's roles and contributions in, and benefits from the food systems value chain. KM products and activities should capture good practices and lessons learned from a gender perspective and ensure their wide dissemination. On M&E, please include a reference to capturing gender-specific results and reporting on those.

Agency's Comments

- The M&E outputs have been elaborated
- The FAO/SPC country gender assessment of agriculture and the rural sector in Solomon Islands points out that gender-related impacts of climate change are difficult to assess in the Solomon Islands as there are limited sex-disaggregated data available on women's and men's distinct roles in resource management and on gender-responsive adaptation strategies. Information has however been added in the PIF regarding the importance of women's knowledge of climate- and disaster-resilient wild foods, their reliance on open-

access areas where CC-related tensions may occur, and their marginalization in decision-making and conflict resolution

- Increased emphasis to gender dimensions has been included throughout: in particular, Component 1 now includes 'Strengthened reflection of information on the gender implications of climate change and of alternative adaptation options into policy and planning instruments related to food systems', in response to the currently limited information on women's and men's distinct roles in resource management and gender-responsive adaptation strategies; and Component 3 now emphasizes that the promotion of resilient commercial agriculture will include the identification of specific opportunities for women, and that women's ability to participate beneficially in food production are protected.

Results framework table adjusted to reflect gender dimensions in KM. Gender specific results have been reflected in the M&E

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

#### **4 Project Outline**

##### **A. Project Rationale**

##### **4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS**

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

Secretariat's Comments 2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.10.1:

- Climate change projections: thank you for providing the projections under the various

scenarios. Please summarize what these changes mean in terms of impacts on vulnerable poor communities such as those selected for this project.

- Table 1: what information are the numbers in the last four columns providing?
- Please summarize how climate change is expected to affect the subsistence crops being grown by communities, as well as poultry, livestock etc.
- Para 35: if these are the three provinces where project interventions will be made, could further information please be provided on how climate change is expected to exacerbate vulnerability (in addition to the low capacity mentioned in the PIF)?
- Para 35: could you please summarize in a sentence or two the 'clear evidence of climate impact on agricultural production' provided by the GEF-6 project?

### Agency's Comments

Kindly confirm if this response is cleared

- Under the section on 'Implications' specific mention has been made of how climate change will affect the vulnerable poor communities in the different localities targeted by the project.
- These data, taken from the Agricultural Survey, indicate the numbers of households in each province that report having been affected moderately or severely by hydrometeorological events and climate change in the last 12 months; to take into account the different sizes of the provinces, these data are then weighted by population per province in Table 2.
- Additional information has been included in paragraph 24.
- Please note the additional information given in paragraphs 24-27 in response to the comment regarding how climate change will exacerbate vulnerability in the target localities.
- GEF 6 project - This observation is based on field observations by MECDM staff, in consultation with farmers, and is substantiated by media reports. More detailed assessments of the magnitude and nature of climate change impacts in the province will be carried out during the PPG phase

## 4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.9.22:

Stakeholder Engagement: Considering the objective of this project is to ?To identify and promote climate-resilient options for stimulating the rural economy and enhancing food security and nutrition? stakeholder consultation and engagement will be critical to its success. While the project alludes to some consultations in project design with civil society, please elaborate on its approach/plans to consult and engage relevant civil society, youth, women groups and local communities in project development.

Agency's CommentsThe new paragraph 97 summarizes the measures that will be taken to ensure effective and inclusive participation of stakeholders in project development.

### **5 B. Project Description**

#### **5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE**

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

2024.10.22: cleared.

2024.10.14:

- Please elaborate on the 'strengthened mechanisms'. In the response it is mentioned: 'Component 1 provides for strengthened mechanisms for increasing and adjusting financial investment (from public, private and blended finance, and carbon markets) in support of food system resilience'

- In the response it is mentioned: 'As now explained under the Stakeholder Engagement section, under Component 3 the project will feature strong and real participation by farmers and other community members in defining and tailoring adaptation solutions.' Can 'farmers and community members' be further engaged in the implementation so that they can learn by doing?

2024.9.22:

- under objective, it is stated ?this will be achieved in accordance with the conservation of

biodiversity and natural capital??. Conservation of biodiversity and natural capital seem to be more fit under different focal area. Please elaborate further on this point.

- Adaptation priorities tailored to regional needs: The proposal has quite a few target locations, which appear to be geographically apart, each having its own unique context and background and thus different adaptation needs. While the justification for selecting different regions is well documented in the proposal, how different adaptation needs will be identified, and activities explained under each component of the project will be tailored to different local adaptation needs while integrating different activities in different regions under one project, are not clear.
- While examples of adaptation measures are summarized in the proposal, please ensure how these can be fully adapted by the locals. Capacity building and training (preferably on-hand) is mentioned in the proposal but further measures, in particular incentives, such as ensuring economic benefit, increased production etc. could be further considered.
- The project mentions that it will engage with private sector although how etc. is not clear. Please describe more fully how private sector will be engaged.
- Please describe how communities will be engaged in project implementation.
- Please discuss any measures the project will take to engage youth in adaptation capacity measures and implementation of solutions.

#### Agency's Comments

- Options of financial instruments will be explored further during the PPG phase, but may include for example voluntary carbon markets for initiatives which have potential to deliver adaptation and mitigation benefits simultaneously (such as on low carbon, renewable energy microgrid technology, and diversified agroforestry systems), and adjustments to the eligibility criteria of baseline credit options.

- Paragraph 84 has been expanded to make this clearer.

This has been explained further in paragraph 75. The statement is not intended to imply that the conservation of biodiversity and natural capital is a primary aim of the project, but rather that it has an important role to play in ecosystem-based adaptation, and that maladaptation that undermines biodiversity must be avoided.

-Adaptation needs and corresponding activities will be identified on a location-by-location basis as set out in paragraph 97.

-The theory of change description (particularly paragraph 69) sets out the clear paradigm shift to which the project aspires, and which characterizes it, constituting the common thread running through, and holding together, the five contrasting target localities.

-Activities under Component 1 seek to achieve that paradigm shift at national level, in policy and planning instruments; Components 2 and 3 will generate 'proof of concept' at ground level in a range of contrasting conditions where the maximum of opportunity exists to achieve significant adaptation benefits.

-As now explained in paragraph 84, emphasis will be placed on participatory farmer-driven approaches to the definition and generation of appropriate adaptation measures, and their tailoring to the specific needs and conditions in each of the contrasting target localities of the project, together with definition of the support and inputs needed by farmers for the measures to be feasible.

-Component 1 provides for strengthened mechanisms for increasing and adjusting financial investment (from public, private and blended finance, and carbon markets) in support of food system resilience.

-Component 1 refers to leveraging public and private investment in resilience; Component 3 also addresses commercial agriculture, including private sector actors.

-As now explained under the Stakeholder Engagement section, under Component 3 the project will feature strong and real participation by farmers and other community members in defining and tailoring adaptation solutions. Component 2 will strengthen organisations and conflict management capacities at community and provincial levels, with the aim of making community members the 'owners' planning and governance practices in support of adaptation

-As explained under Component 2, the project will actively promote the participation of youth in community governance frameworks, and under Component 3 it will ensure that youth are involved in the definition and application of adaptation measures, in the light of cultural changes and processes of rural-urban migration, especially of youth.

## **5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING**

**Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat's Comments

2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.9.22:

please mention and highlight the incremental/additional cost reasoning.



Agency's Comments Paragraphs 72-74 now explain the additional cost reasoning in detail.

### **5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK**

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

**d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments 2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.9.22:

- As the project is proposed to have different target areas which appear to be not just geographically apart but have different adaptation needs thus requiring different approaches and measures to be taken, please elaborate on how the project will ensure good coordination and learning between different regions.
- Coordination with Adaptation Fund: Thank you for providing information on coordination with the GCF. The Adaptation Fund is also supporting climate resilient food security and agriculture in the Solomon Islands. Please discuss how this project will coordinate and synergize with the AF projects, and please revise the relevant meta-indicator accordingly.

### **Agency's Comments**

- Paragraph 87 explains how implementation arrangement (to be confirmed during PPG) will provide for effective engagement of, and coordination between, actors in the five target localities

- The Adaptation Fund website <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/projects-programmes/project-information/projects-table-view/> shows no currently active projects in Solomon Islands. A new paragraph (51) has been added stating that the project will build on the results of the more relevant of the two past projects (which will be discussed in more depth with Government and the EA during the PPG phase)

- An area target for core indicator 2b has been added, together with an explanation in paragraph 93.

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

Secretariat's Comments

2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.9.22:

- The proposed project seems to possibly address fisheries as well. If that is the case, please consider Core Indicator 2(b) coastal and marine area managed for climate resilience, or provide further explanation on why not.
- Related to the comment under section 5.1, while the project has a target regarding private sector 'adaptation benefits to the private sector' is indicated as 'false'. Please elaborate on this difference.

This Project will provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector.  
false

Agency's Comments

-An area target for core indicator 2b has been added, to include coastal and marine area managed for climate resilience, together with an explanation in paragraph 93.

-This Project will provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector.

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**5.6 RISKS**

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**

**b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

## **5.7 Qualitative assessment**

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

## **6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

- 6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

- 6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

- 6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

## **7 D. Policy Requirements**

- 7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

## **8 Annexes**

### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments  
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments  
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments  
8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments  
2024.10.14: cleared.  
2024.9.22:  
The 'investment mobilized' column for co-financiers from GCF are missing.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	75,000.00
Donor Agency	European Union	Grant	Investment mobilized	150,000.00
Donor Agency	Green Climate Fund	Grant		500,000.00
Donor Agency	Green Climate Fund	Grant		7,000,000.00
Donor Agency	Green Climate Fund	Grant		10,000,000.00
Donor Agency	Green Climate Fund	Grant		12,000,000.00


Agency's Comments This has been filled now  
Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments  
2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.9.25:

- The template utilized for this project removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate". While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).
- (One of the institutions that is included in Portal as executing partner (Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology) is shown in the LoE as supporting the preparation of the project, but not as executor. Please remove this institution as executing partner (it can be reinstated during the preparation phase).

General Project information 			
Project Title:	Resilient rural economic growth and food security		
Region:	Solomon Islands	GEF Project ID:	11699
Country(ies):	Solomon Islands	Type of Project:	FSP
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency ID:	753858
Executing Partner:	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	Executing Partner Type:	Government
	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology		Government

Subject: Endorsement for LDCF project on "Resilient rural economies growth and food security"

In my capacity as GEF Operational Focal Point for the Solomon Islands, I confirm that the above project proposal (a) is in accordance with my government's national priorities, and our commitment to the relevant global environmental conventions; and (b) was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points.

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM) and the project executed by the Ministry of Agriculture & Livestock (MAL). I request the GEF Implementing Agency to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement/Approval.

Agency's Comments

- attached is the mail from the GEF OFP accepting the footnote.
- the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology has been removed as the executing partner

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

2024.10.14: cleared.

2024.9.22:

Environmental and social safeguards: We note that FAO attached the Risk screening checklist and an overall ESS risk of the project is classified as moderate. However, it is not clear how these moderate environmental and social risks will be avoided, minimized, mitigated, and managed during the project preparation stage.

- Please provide a plan for environmental and social assessment and the development of an environmental and social risk management plan.

#### Agency's Comments

In line with FAO's safeguard policy, risk screening is conducted during the project concept development phase for all projects. Given that this project carries moderate environmental and social risks, a detailed risk assessment will be carried out during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase, following the appropriate methodology. Based on the findings, a risk mitigation plan will be developed through a consultative process, aimed at minimizing risks and, where feasible, eliminating them altogether.

- During PPG phase, the project formulation team will identify and assess the environmental and social risks and prepare a risk mitigation plan following the consultative process to ensure that the project is sustainable, environmentally responsible, and socially acceptable. The environmental and social risk management plan (ESRMP) will emphasize stakeholder engagement, the use of socio-economic, natural resource and climate data, and the implementation of effective mitigation measures. The ESRMP will include, but is not limited to, the following sections.

#### **Annex E: Rio Markers**

**8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

#### Agency's Comments

#### **Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

#### Agency's Comments

#### **Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**



**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments2024.10.22:  
This PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

2024.10.14 /9.22:  
Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the update).

Agency's Comments  
**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

Secretariat's CommentsThank you for providing the table under para 76, summarizing the types of interventions that will enhance climate resilience. By CEO endorsement, please describe the specific activities that will be undertaken in each province.

Agency's CommentsWell noted. Thank you for the comment.  
**Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/22/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/14/2024</b>	

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		