



# Strengthening capacity in the agriculture and land-use as well as energy sectors in Solomon Islands for enhanced transparency in implementation and monitoring of Solomon Island's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10760

**Countries**

Solomon Islands

**Project Name**

Strengthening capacity in the agriculture and land-use as well as energy sectors in Solomon Islands for enhanced transparency in implementation and monitoring of Solomon Island's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

2/16/2021

**Review completed by PM**

6/15/2021

**Program Manager**

Milena Vasquez

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## PIF

**Part I ? Project Information****Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please apply the Rio Markers. We suggest 2 for Mitigation and 1 for Adaptation.

6/15/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response Thanks for the comment. The suggested Rio Markers (2 for Mitigation and 1 for Adaptation) are entered.

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please address comments below:

- The project objective makes reference to 2023 as the target year, yet the project has a 3 year duration (i.e. will likely reach completion in in 2024). Please revise.

- Per GEF guidelines, there should be proportionality in the amount of PMC covered by the co-financing and by the GEF. At the moment, co-financing directed at PMC is 5%, while GEF resources directed at PMC are 10%. These amounts should be more proportional (i.e. increase the proportion of co-financing that will be supporting PMC).

6/15/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

- Thanks for the observation. The target year in the project objective is revised to 2024 in the project objective statement.

- The in-kind co-financing contribution from the recipient government ? Ministry of Environment, Climate Change Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM) has been revised from USD 348,000.00 to 450,000.00 to cover office rental space, including utility costs. Similarly, in-kind support from MECDM has increased from USD 142,856.76 to USD 342,856.76 to cover staff time. The initial staff time estimate was only for the Climate Change Division and Project Coordination staff covering MECDM. But, after the review of the activities under the three components, the revised staff time cost estimates include staff time for officers in the Ministry of Forestry and Research (MFR), Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL), and Solomon Islands Meteorological Services, in addition to MECDM. Hence, the PMC cost has been revised to USD 385,625.76 from 83,625.76. Now the ratio is 1:3.77 (GEF: SIG). This revision is shown in the PMC row of Table B, and co-finance Table (Table C).

**Co-financing**

**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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please provide the name of the national government ministry expected to provide the co-financing, which is currently simply listed as SIG. If unknown at this stage, please spell out acronym in Table C.

6/15/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response -Thanks for the observation. More details regarding specific ministries in the Solomon Island Government (SIG) providing the co-financing support are provided in Table C

**GEF Resource Availability**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 4/1/2021: The project is requesting a total of \$1.3 million from the CBIT set-aside. At this time the originally allocated \$55 million have been expended; however, resources from the CCM set-aside can be utilized while ensuring that Convention obligations are being met.

Agency Response - This is well noted. As communicated with the reviewer, it is confirmed that there is no change to the requested amount of USD 1.3 million.

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 4/1/2021: See above.

Agency Response The above comment is well noted. It is confirmed that there is no change to the requested amount of USD 1.3 million

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 4/1/2021: Yes, a PPG of \$50,000 is requested and within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: An estimate for the number of beneficiaries is provided. However, the paragraph below the table does not provide an explanation for how this number was approximated. Please revise

6/15/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response -An explanation is added below Table F on CORE INDICATORS to describe how the estimated number of beneficiaries were derived

**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: As this project is not a NAPA or a NAP, please remove these two keywords (although we understand how it is related to them). Likewise for the CCM sectors: renewable energy, energy efficiency and AFOLU.

6/15/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

- Modification has been made by removing the suggested keywords

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021:This is well elaborated; however the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed are missing from this section. Please summarize (we note they are further elaborated in section 2.9).

6/15/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response -Thanks for the comment. A summary of root causes and barriers that need to be addressed are summarised in section 1.3. in paragraph 6.

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please address comments below:

- Section 2.1 could be further streamlined, in particular the information regarding Vanuatu's national development context is not necessary at this stage nor in this section (while we understand it can be part of the implementing agency's Project Document).
- Section 2.2. We note that it should say Biennial Update Report to Biannual. Please make this change throughout. Paragraph 11 is inconsistent with what is presented in the table 2, which shows only energy was reported. Please revise.
- Overall the section describes the institutional arrangement used for the SNC. However, figure 5 illustrates the proposed composition of the TWGs. Please provide an explanation on this proposed structure and how that links with the broader institutional arrangement currently in place.
- Table 8 in section 2.9 is unclear and not very helpful in this section. The column titled "ETF requirements" does not make reference to the MPGs of the ETF but rather a general list of desired outcomes. This table (revised) could instead be placed under the section "incremental reasoning" after the alternative scenario has been described.

6/15/2021: We apologize for that typo. Comments above cleared. We note that Fig. 3 seems to have been pasted twice.

## Agency Response

Secretariat's reference to **Vanuatu** is to be replaced with **Solomon Islands**

- **Section 2.1** has been revised to streamline and summarise the relevant information as shown in paragraphs 7&8 and the original paragraph 9 is removed.
- **Section 2.2.** Thanks for the observation. Biennial Update Report (BUR) is first used in paragraph 5 after which throughout the PIF, BUR is used. To be consistent with Table 2, paragraph 10 has been revised stating that the First National Communication reported GHG emissions from the energy sector only. Accordingly, Table 2 is revised to show the GHG emissions using the top-down and bottom-up approach as estimated under FNC. Please see Table 2.
- Thanks for the observation. An explanation has been provided on how the proposed structure links with the broader institutional arrangement in paragraph 31
- Thanks for the suggestion. A revised version of Table 8 is included under "incremental reasoning" in paragraph 79

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please address comments below:

Component 1

- Please clarify which aspects of the ETF outcome 1.1 covers (i.e. GHG inventory, NDC tracking, adaptation and support needed and received).

- Please clarify why the institutional arrangement around climate finance tracking is treated separately and how the two ETF coordination bodies would coordinate. Please clarify as well if climate finance refers to domestic public finance only (i.e. budget tagging), or does it include domestic private sector and/or international climate finance.

Component 2

- Based on the description provided, it is not fully clear which (or if all) of the outcomes cover all the sectors mentioned ? energy, AFOLU and waste. Please clarify. If the approach is to cover all sectors, we would encourage a piloting approach to test what may work.

- Please clarify the difference between Deliverable 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1 and 2.1.2.4.

- It is not clear from the description if the inventory working groups (deliverable 2.1.1.2) are the same and how they relate to the thematic working groups mentioned in Figure 5. Please clarify.

- For output 2.1.3, based on the national circumstances consider developing training in coordination with a national/regional institute/university, and consider training of trainers model to ensure long-term sustainability of these sessions.

Component 3

- Please clarify if this component aims to track all prioritized adaptation sectors or whether it will pilot some sectors (and if so which).

6/15/2021: Comments above have been addressed.

Agency Response

**Component 1**

- Outcome 1.1 will focus on GHG inventory and NDC mitigation action tracking aspects of ETF requirement. Please see paragraph 67



- An explanation regarding the institutional arrangement around climate finance tracking is provided. Please see paragraph 70

### **Component 2**

- Thanks for the comment and suggestion. Component 2 will focus on AFOLU and energy sectors as a pilot approach. The associated justification for considering AFOLU and Energy sectors under a pilot approach is provided in paragraph 72

- Additional information on differences between deliverables 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.2.1, and 2.1.2.4 are provided. Please see paragraphs 72 and 73

- Yes, the indicated inventory working groups and TWG-2 are the same. The TWGs are proposed, but not yet operational. Under this CBIT project, the inventory working groups will be operational. This GHG inventory thematic working groups will be subdivided as AFOLU, and Energy (in the future based on the lessons learned, Waste and Industry sector GHG inventory group will be also developed). Please see paragraph 72

-Thanks for the suggestion. The training modality has been incorporated into the relevant output in order to sustain the capacity development process undertaken in the project. Please see paragraph 75

### **Component 3**

Component 3 aims to track Agriculture and Forestry sectors. Please see paragraph 76

#### **4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Yes the project is aligned with the CCM strategy.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: See comment above about Table 8. It would be better placed in this section.

6/14/2021: comment cleared.

Agency Response -Thanks for the suggestion. The revised version of Table 8 is presented under "incremental reasoning". Please see paragraph 79

**6. Are the project?/s/program?s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Yes

Agency Response

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please strengthen this section with specific information relating to each of the three (innovation, sustainability and scaling up) goals.

6/14/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response - Thanks for the suggestion. The three sections (innovation, sustainability, and scaling up) have been strengthened. Please see paragraphs 83,84, and 85

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project?/s/program?s intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Yes

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: No. Please clarify which stakeholders have been engaged to date and how. Please revise answers to the section " **Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase** " based on the answer to this comment.

6/14/2021: Comment cleared.

#### Agency Response

- The stakeholders consulted during the PIF stage are elaborated and revision is made to the response in the section "Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase". Please see paragraph 86  
**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Yes.

#### Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Yes, specific stakeholders from the energy sector have been identified; how about from the AFOLU sector?

6/14/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response - Private sector stakeholders of AFOLU have been added in paragraph 91

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please add a summary of the climate-screening in the table. Please also consider including high staff turnover as a risk.

6/14/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response -Thanks for the suggestion. Climate risk and high staff turnover risk are added to Table 10. Please see the last two rows of Table 10

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please add a description for coordination with the CBIT Global Platform and the two global FAO CBIT projects as relevant.

6/14/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response -Coordination modalities with the CBIT Global Platform and the two global FAO CBIT projects are elaborated in paragraph 99

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please add reference to how the project is aligned with Vanuatu's NDC.

6/14/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

- Reference to **Vanuatu** is to be replaced with **Solomon Island**

- The project's linkage with the Solomon Island NDC is presented in paragraph 101

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: An ESS is provided. Please summarize the findings (assessed as low risk) and measures to be taken in this section.

6/14/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response The findings of the ESS are summarised in paragraph 103

**Part III ? Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country?s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Yes, the OFP has endorsed the project.

Agency Response

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

#### **GEFSEC DECISION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/1/2021: Please address comments above.

6/22/2021: Letter of Endorsement does not specify who the Executing Partner will be. However, in Portal it shows the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Management and Meteorology as the Executing Partner. In the PIF, however, it says that FAO will be who will prepare and implement the project. Please either (i) leave the executing partner section blank to be confirmed at CEO endorsement both under Project Information and in Section 6 ? Coordination; or (ii) get an email from the OFP that confirms the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Management (MECDM) as the Lead Executing Agency and upload the email in the Documents tab; or (iii) get a new Letter of Endorsement that specifies the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Management (MECDM) as the Lead Executing Agency.

7/9/2021: New LOE has been submitted that specified the MECDM will lead in execution. Cleared.

All other comments have been addressed.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Review Dates**

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/1/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/14/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/22/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/9/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**