

Safeguarding Solomon Islands endemic and globally threatened biodiversity and ecosystem services from key threats, particularly invasive alien species and unsustainable land use practices (SAFE project)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10698

Countries

Solomon Islands

Project Name

Safeguarding Solomon Islands endemic and globally threatened biodiversity and ecosystem services from key threats, particularly invasive alien species and unsustainable land use practices (SAFE project)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

9/28/2020

Review completed by PM**Program Manager**

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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

10/20/2020

Yes.

10/7/2020

Yes, however LD Objective 2-5 should also be included to cover the activities in Component 1 which focus on LDN in the enabling environment, thereby addressing the ‘avoid’ in the LDN hierarchy response. Otherwise the LD elements are well aligned to the LD focal area. The UNCCD LDN and SIDS Technical Report provides further information the application of LDN in SIDS.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16 October 2020

The previous LD 1-1 allocation for enabling activities in Component 1 of US\$ 253,307 has been transferred to LD 2-5, together with a proportional adjustment in the co-financing.

Reference has been included to the UNCCD LDN and SIDS Technical Report, with further clarification of links to the LDN hierarchy response.

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

10/20/2020

Yes, thank you for the revisions. During PPG we encourage careful consideration of the various pieces and how to stitch together a project that will have transformative impact and not be too scattered. We understand with the challenges presented by COVID to planning that this may be difficult right now.

10/7/2020

No, please address the following:

This project is taking on a number of different activities, requiring many different “moving parts” and potentially consultants and people involved. Also because then only limited resources will be available for each area of work, it seems unlikely that significant change can be made (incremental over transformational). We ask that the project proponents consider streamlining activities.

The long and broad project objective which will be difficult to measure. It should be revised to make it more specific and targeted.

It would also be helpful to understand how this project will build upon and/or reinforce existing traditional systems of land management and government that promote sustainability.

Component 1: It seems odd to be trying to be mainstreaming LDN and biodiversity while promoting two different portals that would need to be maintained separately. Ideally, wouldn't this type of information be provided together? These would ideally be part of a multisectoral platform. In addition provisions for the sustainability and maintenance of these platforms needs to be included.

1.1 – An NBSAP committee seems fairly limited in scope. It may just be limited in the name or the name used in the PIF. Is it going to be so limited in its work?

Component 2: Please include Investment along with Technical Assistance to cover the field-based activities.

2.2 – Can you please describe or make provisions for or include planning for sustainability of these and other measures? IAS activities are often costly and even short gaps in funding or activities can cause the quick loss of good progress. It's not uncommon to see x-ray machines going unused at customs (perhaps because no one knows how to fix them) or other issues that show the importance of including sustainability in these areas.

Component 3 – This component makes a very significant assumption that with more information people will change behavior. This is a very significant assumption that often ends up not being true. In particular, increasing the value/efficiency of farmed lands can actually increase incentives to deforest/move into PAs. How will the project address this risk?

- Consideration should be made to collaborate/include/strengthen the extension services, farmers cooperatives and NGOs who can assist with activities after the project has ended.

-We note the number of targeted hectares for SLM- 14, 000ha, can you indicate how many farmers operate on these targeted areas.

3.4 – How will this be scaled up and how will sustainability be accounted for? Also, please discuss how adequate cost-benefit ratios will be ensured for the targeted IAS activities.

3.5 – Please review and use USAID's frameworks on conservation enterprise to help structure these activities. Each type of intervention needs a carefully considered theory of change for why and how it will benefit biodiversity. We acknowledge that there may be particular challenges in designing and developing these activities currently given the lack of tourism and other COVID impacts.

Component 4:

4.1 - Please include a testing and development phase for the communications strategy, how you will learn from similar efforts and how specifically it will support the outcomes of the project.

COVID- The integration of COVID impacts, risks and opportunities for green recovery throughout the PIF are well noted. Note that any activities geared towards green recovery should be within the mandate of GEF financing and are expected to deliver GEBs.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16 October 2020

The overarching comment around ambition and technical complexity is appreciated and well noted. Strong consideration was given to capacity for implementation of this project during PIF development along with the potential to build upon and leverage existing efforts and partnerships. The different thematic threads of the project have emerged through extensive consultations with government and other stakeholders, reflecting the government's priorities to address threats to biodiversity and land degradation in an integrated manner, which has led to the proposed multi-focal area project. Building off recent GEF investments that will strengthen forest management (GEF-5) and the PA system (GEF-6), this project will add targeted attention on the conservation of biodiversity at species level, on LDN enabling framework and the prevention and management of the significant threat posed by IAS. Reflecting the local context in Solomon Islands (e.g. smallholder subsistence farming interspersed in the landscape with local community conserved areas) and as reflected in recent GEF projects, this is closely linked to the promotion and uptake of SLM practices by local communities, and will be underpinned by the realization of sustainable livelihoods and incentives for these communities from SLM and nature conservation. On this basis, the multi-focal area approach to the project is considered an effective and viable delivery strategy.

However, further rationalization and adjustments have been made in response to this comment to streamline the project and better integrate its different technical areas for implementation efficiency:

- Streamlining of several elements in Table B, in particular: i) down-sizing the ambition of former Output 1.2 (blue/green economy) and integrating key parts as an activity under Output 1.1 that will now be operationalized through the multi-sector biodiversity mainstreaming committee strengthened under Output 1.1; ii) integrating Output 3.4 (demonstration of IAS avoidance, management and control) into Outputs 3.2 and 3.3 to give a more integrated and targeted approach to addressing IAS threats to biodiversity and land degradation rather than appearing as a separate work stream; iii) reducing project ambitions for a number of other Outputs. These changes have been reflected in Table B and the narrative for the project alternative strategy. Proposed activities will be further refined and prioritized during PPG, with a focus on ensuring implementation effectiveness and impact of investment.

- Re-emphasizing that the project will build on existing mechanisms wherever possible. This is a key part of the project approach and is now better emphasized across the PIF. For example, Component 1 now explicitly targets strengthening of an existing committee to take on a biodiversity mainstreaming function, and more clearly refers to existing information platforms that can be enhanced through targeted gap-filling – and better used through decision support improvements – rather than implying that new information infrastructure will be built. The project intends to leverage the existing strong GEF investment in biosecurity and IAS management in the Pacific, as far as possible using existing materials and lessons learned from other projects, including a number that are supported by UNDP as

GEF Agency. This offers opportunities to share international technical expertise and adapt existing resources, tools and best practices developed across the Pacific for use in Solomon Islands, rather than start afresh. Additional references have been added across the PIF of the intention to make use of materials and best practices from other initiatives.

Better emphasizing the partnerships and coordination that will underpin implementation efficiency. Along with strong coordination with other Pacific initiatives and projects on IAS matters, this includes the proposed partnership with the GEF-6 EREPA project across a range of technical areas to support efficiency and effectiveness in implementation, knowledge sharing and replication across respective demonstration land/seascapes and provinces. Text has been added to the Coordination section to summarize the project's intention to build off existing networks and experiences with related Pacific and national projects including practical measures such as sharing technical consultants and engagement in project governance. Furthermore, the PPG will explore in detail and incorporate lessons learned from previous GEF projects in Solomon Islands.

Rationalization of the proposed number of demonstration land/seascapes from 5 to 4, based on a further prioritization by MECDM against the selection criteria. The Central Solomon's Seascape has been omitted based on other upcoming project investment in this area by SPREP (knowledge exchange will still be progressed to promote cross-learning and replication of best practices between projects). In combination the size of some remaining landscapes has been increased to reduce the overall reduction in core indicator contributions from this change, covering a similar area (e.g. no change in area of landscapes outside of PAs, and omission of one community marine managed area) over a smaller number of functional landscapes. This will reduce the implementation costs and complexity of the project (e.g. requiring fewer field coordinators, less travel, fewer planning processes). Implementation feasibility has been added as an explicit selection criterion for land/seascape selection and will be examined in further detail at PPG stage when visits and local consultations can be undertaken. GEBs and GEF core indicators (including beneficiaries) have been adjusted accordingly to reflect the rationalization of project sites.

Addition of a project risk to address the multi-faceted technical nature of the project and the need to put in place appropriate mitigation measures and adaptive management mechanisms including, if necessary, measures to reduce the ambition level further at PPG stage should concerns over implementation feasibility come to light.

We have revised the Objective to be more concise/targeted and reflecting the focus of the project on reduction of key threats to biodiversity and ecosystems - but keeping it in line with STAP advice to be a "future state". The text now reads: "Solomon Islands indigenous species and ecosystems at reduced risk from invasive alien species, land degradation and unsustainable resource use as a result of effective government enabling and capacity, community participation and resilient blue/green livelihoods."

In terms of building upon and reinforcing existing traditional systems of land management and governance, the project will work with communities and Government in line with the traditional customary land ownership of Solomon Islands. One of the historically sustainable farming techniques practiced by Solomon Islanders for centuries is shifting cultivation. However, this practice has been affected by increasing population growth, access to land due to migration, climate change, monocropping etc. Most islanders use slash and burn methods with increasingly shorter fallow periods resulting in depletion of soil nutrients and soil organic matter. This is unsustainable and the government wishes to use its Land Use and Agricultural Policies to find ways to work with farmers to introduce more sustainable practices for local smallholder farmers, including through better use of traditional knowledge. The project will assist this process through enabling activities and capacity building in Component 1, with demonstrations in Component 3 and knowledge sharing in Component 4. We have reflected this more clearly in Output 3.3 and in the description of threats and context for the project.

Beyond these broader revisions, specific comments on each Component have been responded to as follows:

Component 1

· Integration of BD and LDN portals. Output 1.4 has been revised to better reflect existing work and investment to strengthen information management for biodiversity and natural resources. Output 1.4 now more clearly notes that the project intends to build upon existing ICT infrastructure and integration processes underway (e.g. through the GEF-6 EREPA project) rather than invest in new information management databases. This will help ensure sustainability of investment and facilitate better use of data by maintaining it all in one shared, integrated platform. Project effort will focus on targeted addition of data to this existing infrastructure (including collection of new data where critical gaps exist – as is still frequently the case in Solomon Islands) and use of the data to develop decision support tools such as species lists (e.g. priority species for protection, high-risk IAS species) and species conservation plans. The aim is to increase accessibility to – and use of – research and information about species, habitats and threats. Improved coordination and data-sharing protocols will be arranged with other sectors as needed to supplement existing agreements.

· Output 1.1. This output now refers to a multi-sectoral committee for biodiversity mainstreaming, better reflecting its intended broader mandate and cross-sectoral nature. The functions will include oversight of NBSAP implementation which provides strategic direction for biodiversity conservation and relies upon effective cross-sector integration and mainstreaming for overall success. Further, alignment to existing mechanisms has been better articulated and the output now references the intention to build on and strengthen the existing Environmental Advisory Committee which has a broad membership making it well-placed to evolve into a biodiversity mainstreaming platform. This committee works closely with the Protected Areas Committee, with which the EREPA project will closely work and will be an important linkage to retain and strengthen.

Component 2

· Investment is now shown for field-based Components.

· Output 2.2 has been elaborated to better define sustainability aspects and explicitly note that a sustainability plan will be developed for biosecurity investment. Provisions for sustainability of IAS investments include use of low-tech, low-maintenance equipment, incorporating maintenance costs of equipment into development/ recurrent budgets of MAL and exploring options for the recovery of costs for securing increased biosecurity at the main entry and exit ports, perhaps through revision of existing fees/levies as a potential financing mechanism. Further, the project support has been clarified to note the intention of providing low-tech, practical equipment to support basic biosecurity measures. At the four key international entry/exit ports, investment will include improvements to essential, low-maintenance equipment (e.g. binoculars, cameras and headlamps for monitoring of logging and cargo ships and ballast water discharge, back-pack sprayers, traps, freezers, personal protective equipment and potentially fumigation and IT equipment), based on a detailed assessment of capacity and equipment needs (and the ability to sustain such equipment) to be completed during the PPG phase. At key inter-island ports that represent a high-risk invasion pathway for IAS, project investment may focus on signage, education and awareness-raising for local communities and basic biosecurity and quarantine protocols. These insights are based on past IAS GEF investment at other countries in the Pacific and will seek to build off these experiences with project design and implementation.

Component 3

· This Component does make the assumption that more information (in parallel with related awareness, capacity and incentives) is a key requirement for achieving change in behavior particularly for SLM and we recognize that information provided in the absence of an appropriate framework could lead to unintended consequences. Therefore, the project is taking an integrated approach to demonstrate that through a framework of community planning, governance and management at land/seascape scale – including demonstrated feasible incentives for the uptake of SLM and biodiversity conservation – the linked issues of biodiversity loss, and threats from IAS and land degradation can be tackled in a way that delivers improved ecosystem services and therefore livelihoods and

wellbeing. Provision of additional information is not considered a solution in isolation. Awareness/attitudes will be measured, as will monitoring of LDN and biodiversity to provide key indicators for communities and government to assess progress. These indicators will all be integrated in the results framework. The original wording was a little simplistic and has been elaborated.

· Extension services: Thank you for the recommendation to collaborate/include/strengthen the extension services, farmers cooperatives and NGOs who can assist with activities after the project has ended. This is exactly what is proposed. The project emphasizes the importance of extension officers and NGOs as a target for capacity building in Output 1.4 and they have a key role in building community capacity, particularly to address land degradation and IAS in Component 3. We have re-emphasized the importance of these groups, and also of farmers cooperatives in Output 3.4 for sustainability of outcomes.

· Targeted hectares for SLM: The National Agricultural Survey 2017 estimates that there are 1,158,701 ha of agricultural holdings across Solomon Islands. Homestead land accounts for around 40% of total agricultural land, while other separate agricultural land (OSAL) accounts for the remainder. In most provinces, the profile of homestead land tends to be a combination of smaller parcels of less than one hectare as well as parcels between 10 and 20 hectares. The average homestead parcel size is around five hectares. The large majority of OSAL tends to be a combination of smaller parcels – generally fewer than four hectares. Roughly, the average parcel size of OSAL is 1.9 hectares. Solomon Islands is a highly agricultural society, with an estimated 92% of the total population, and 93% of households involved, in some way or another, in agricultural activities. In project provinces such as Western, Choiseul and Malaita Provinces up to 95% of the population is involved in agricultural activities. Therefore, a majority of the estimated population of the landscapes (estimated at an indicative 50,000 at PIF stage after adjustment to omit one landscape) could be involved in agriculture – perhaps 47,000-48,000. The project ambition at PIF stage is to engage around 20% of these in project activities as beneficiaries. We have mentioned this in the section on GEBs and beneficiaries. These estimates will be clarified during PPG stage based on detailed landscape definition and local consultations.

· Output 3.4 on IAS demonstration (now integrated into Outputs 3.2 and 3.3 to reflect the integrated approach of delivery in project seascapes/landscapes). Prioritization of IAS interventions will be informed by local stakeholder consultations during PPG and a focus on integrated risk management approaches and application of risk analysis based on level of biosecurity threat. Project investment will prioritize prevention and avoidance of biosecurity threats, and local uptake of effective biosecurity, quarantine, early detection and control measures to avoid establishment of new IAS and spread of existing IAS. Potential control of IAS may be considered where GEF investment can support technical demonstration and potential co-financing can support ongoing control measures to ensure eradication. Sustainability will be ensured by embedding ongoing management and control measures within the community rather than for example with outside contractors or government officers. Demonstration of IAS risk management and control will be integrated within delivery of biodiversity conservation and SLM on-ground measures, so that IAS tools remain clearly linked to GEBs and the reduction of IAS threats to these GEBs. Upscaling will be achieved through sharing of successful interventions through community exchanges and visits (Component 4) and through incorporating them into guidelines, training and extension programmes for promotion by MAL (for land degradation impacts) and MECDM and its NGO partners (for biodiversity impacts). These elements have been referred to under Outputs 3.2 and 3.3.

· Output 3.5 (now Output 3.4) Thank you for bringing to our attention USAID's Conservation Enterprise approach. We have added to the PIF that selection of livelihood opportunities will be guided during the PPG phase by this framework, guidance and lessons learned.

Component 4

· Output 4.1. We have proposed that the communications strategy and plan are developed in the first year of implementation based on an analysis of lessons learned from other projects across the Pacific (and from initial implementation of the proposed EREPA communications and outreach which will commence prior

to this project), and then tested. At the end of Year 2 the success of the strategy and plan will be evaluated (internally) and adaptive measures incorporated to improve delivery. This has been clarified in the description of the output.

Finally, on COVID-19 and green recovery, we welcome the support for the elements that have been included for green recovery in Components 1 and 3. We have clarified the requirement that such activities be within the mandate of GEF financing and are expected to deliver GEBS.

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

10/20/2020

Yes.

10/7/2020

No, a significant portion of the co-financing is investment mobilized. Is this funding directly meant to support the achievement of the objectives of this project? Will financing from these sources be used on this GEF project? It would be useful to clarify the nature of the co-financing and how it is expected to be used in the project.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16 October 2020

The indicative co-financing at PIF stage has been further elaborated. In accordance with GEF co-financing guidelines, government investment outside of recurrent budgets has been classified as 'investment mobilized'. For MECDM and MAL, these figures are based on estimated development budgets (i.e. not recurrent operating budgets) for the duration of project implementation for: biological conservation work programmes and IAS control in the country, native species conservation, rehabilitation, and protection (MECDM); implementation of agricultural technical work programmes including non-recurrent investment in extension offices in demonstration provinces (MAL). This parallel investment by government is expected to be directly aligned to the objective and outcomes of the project and includes investment in the demonstration landscapes in which the project will be operating (e.g. investment to put in place biosecurity controls and physical

farming cleanliness measures to manage IAS in the demonstration landscapes). While the Ministry of Forests and Research has a development budget for the forestry and research unit, to be more conservative at PIF stage, this investment mobilized has now been omitted counting only the in-kind commitment for staff and technical support including through the large forestry extension networks that operate across all provinces. This increases the feasibility of obtaining this co-financing commitment at CEO Endorsement stage. This information and update is reflected in the PIF.

A similar approach has been applied to donor-funded projects where a grant project with a defined start and finish has been classified as investment mobilized. A brief statement on the alignment of donor-funded projects has been added to the PIF. Again, this is based on parallel investment including expected investment in the demonstration land/seascapes. The co-financing estimates have been based on a rough assessment of project implementation timeframes and budgets to account for overlapping years of implementation. However, to be more conservative and in case of work plan shifts across countries, the estimate for regional project co-financing investment in aligned activities in Solomon Islands has been reduced. Further, the proposed co-financing from JICA investment in forest management has been omitted due to the less central alignment to the project (although the project will still aim to coordinate with this project to share lessons learned and approaches). The list of projects shown outlines the intention that this project will seek to coordinate with and align investment with other related projects and initiatives. Consultations to support the obtaining of formal co-financing letters will be progressed during the PPG phase. Indicative co-financing figures have been updated across the respective tables in the PIF.

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response
The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response
The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
NA

Agency Response
The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response
Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/22/2020

Yes.

10/7/2020

No. We're surprised that lack of resources is not listed as a barrier which this project is seeking to address. We also question whether encouraging the use of fertilizers, "improved" seeds and other agricultural innovations are something that we would want for global environmental benefits (as implied in the text on the last barrier). We note the challenges mentioned about forest loss, however, please provide further information on how the targeted agricultural landscapes are suffering from land degradation specifically and what are the drivers of the land degradation.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16 October 2020

Inadequate resources are indeed a barrier to biodiversity conservation, IAS and SLM in Solomon Islands and is referred to in several of the barriers. We prefer not to include it as a separate barrier in its own right because of its fundamental and integrated nature. The project approach is to address the lack of resources by improving efficiency and effectiveness through better coordination, regulations and decision-support tools, capacity, awareness, incentives, through raising awareness and efforts of other sectors to reduce harm to biosecurity and land, and through tackling issues through community-based approaches for longer-term sustainability. However, we have revised the text to ensure that lack of resources is addressed more explicitly in the existing barriers.

The reference to “use of fertilizers, “improved” seeds” was a poor use of wording in the barriers, which we have now addressed. The proposed SLM measures are detailed in Output 3.3.

Better elaboration of the project landscapes in terms of agricultural land use has been added to the PIF under Output 3.3, along with a description of land degradation drivers at landscape level to the threats section. The project landscapes are a combination of existing plantations and small-scale farms where a mixture of subsistence cash crops are grown. They include some agro-forestry, cocoa, kava, and coconut plantations and some perennial cropping systems. All of the targeted landscapes are suffering from land degradation due to the following: continuous farming in the same area; climate change and climate variability; IAS; altered traditional agricultural practices such as ‘slash and burn’ which have become unsustainable due to intensification. More detailed landscape-specific information on land degradation will be collected during the PPG phase.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2020

Yes. The ToC is sufficient for now. However, during PPG it will be important to articulate and understand the assumptions of the internal logic of the project such as demonstrated in USAID's conservation enterprise work.

10/7/2020

No, the narrative on the ToC is noted and provides some understanding of the integrated nature of the challenges and consequently the integrated project. However, the approach seems to work backwards from the project objective, outcomes and outputs rather than laying out assumptions and considering different pathways. Reference to the STAP paper should be made here.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16 October 2020

Additional narrative and an indicative TOC schematic have been added to the PIF to clarify the TOC including different pathways and assumed links to help transition from current state to the desired state. This helps better explain the choice for the project strategy to apply an ecosystem-based approach that promotes sustainability across land/seascapes and with strong vertical and horizontal coordination, recognizing that biodiversity conservation, IAS and land degradation are fundamentally inter-connected and can only be successfully tackled by addressing them simultaneously in ways that deliver benefits to local communities. The TOC will be developed more fully during the PPG phase.

We have added a number of explicit assumptions that will underlie successful project delivery.

Reference has been added to the STAP primer on TOC.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/7/2020

Yes.

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/22/2020

Yes, thank you for the additions.

10/7/2020

No, the details provided are relatively general. Please provide specific details on how the project has included mechanisms/steps to facilitate endurance of outcomes and scaling out beyond the target areas.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16 October 2020

We have provided further detail in the relevant sections of the PIF, explicitly linking back to project outputs and explaining some of the main proposed mechanisms and opportunities for innovation, sustainability and scaling up. These will be designed in detail during the PPG phase, including through consultation with other projects and initiatives to ensure alignment and coordination in scaling up and replication mechanisms, most particularly through the GEF-6 EREPA project and the thematically-aligned donor-funded projects listed as potential co-financers.

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

10/7/2020

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/7/2020

No, please provide greater information specific to the project context.

Agency Response

UNDP Response 16 October 2020

Additional information on the key gender differences that exist in the use and access of biodiversity and natural resources and participation in sectors such as agriculture and fisheries has been added to the PIF. In Solomon Islands the situation can vary depending on cultural context and between provinces. The specific situation in each project demonstration land/seascape will be assessed in detail during the PPG stage as part of the gender analysis and detailed information used to identify opportunities for the gender mainstreaming plan.

Additional information has been added on the proposed gender mainstreaming mechanisms including reference to existing efforts that will be built upon. The project will work closely with the Ministry of Women, Youth, Children and Family affairs, supporting its division focusing on women affairs in development and related women's programmes in aspects related to biodiversity, IAS management and particularly SLM so as to empower women in the agriculture sector. A

Women in Agriculture service already exists in MAL, with networks in the provinces. The project will strengthen this service through information sharing, trainings and building a network of champion women in the agriculture sector recognizing the key role of women in agriculture in the Solomon Islands. At the subnational levels market vendors have been established under the Markets for Change Programme implemented by UNWOMEN and these could play a major role in sharing agricultural produce from SLM in the markets in Honiara, Gizo (Western Province) and Auki (Malaita). A number of successful initiatives with women have also been initiated by NGOs and these will be reviewed during the PPG to identify best practices and areas for additional investment and strengthening.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/22/2020

Yes.

10/7/2020

No, please include more information specific to this project.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16 October 2020

The text on private sector engagement has been elaborated to outline specific opportunities linked to the different Components and Outputs, including in NISSAP implementation (e.g. industry as vectors of IAS spread, role in voluntary compliance under banner of biosecurity is everyone's responsibility, and as potential contributor to biosecurity revenue through fees and charges), livelihood activities (e.g. local food market vendors and ecotourism as tourism recovers post-COVID) and in engagement of SME across agricultural supply chains. More detailed information on the specific opportunities in each demonstration land/seascape will be identified during the PPG phase. The establishment of private sector partnerships and securing of private sector co-financing will be given high priority during the PPG and the tasks allocated to a specific consultant with experience in private sector engagement/partnership development.

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

10/22/2020

Yes, thank you for completing this.

10/7/2020

No, please include how this project, which has substantial agriculture components, will address the risk of extreme weather that disrupts timelines.

Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:

- a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).
- b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.
- c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).
- d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

(<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>)

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 16 October 2020

A pre-screening assessment of climate change risks has been prepared and added to the Risks section in accordance with the STAP guidance on climate risk screening.

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/7/2020

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/7/2020

Yes.

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

NA

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

10/26/2020

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

10/7/2020

No, please revise and resubmit.

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

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/7/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The Solomon Islands is home to significant endemic marine and terrestrial biodiversity. As part of the Coral Triangle, Eastern Melanesia Biodiversity Hotspot and many other designations. At the same time, aggressive natural resource exploitation for timber and mining with few controls has led to major and ongoing loss of biodiversity and land degradation. Traditional systems of tenure and land management provide important protections but also have been exploited by unscrupulous timber and mining companies resulting in the complete destruction of forests and loss of the possibility of productive lands, destroying terrestrial biodiversity and with dramatic impacts on the highly diverse marine environment as well.

This project will result in indigenous species and ecosystems at reduced risk from invasive alien species, land degradation and unsustainable resource use as a result of effective government enabling and capacity, community participation and resilient blue/green livelihoods. It will be achieved by: strengthened inter-sectoral governance, capacity and strategies to mainstream biodiversity and LDN and support a nature-based economic pathway; comprehensive IAS framework for early detection, control and management identifies and prioritizes highest-risk invasion pathways to safeguard natural and production systems from IAS; and community participation and improved livelihoods from a nature-based economic pathway that supports biodiversity conservation and reduces threats from IAS and land degradation.

Innovation, sustainability and scaling-up: This project will work to bring innovation at the high level in promoting integrated thinking and approaches to sustainable development across government and different government bodies. At the same time, the project will work to develop and implement citizen science as an approach to overcome the challenges of monitoring in remote places. This project has a strong focus on working through and building upon existing programs, entities and capacity. This will help promote sustainability and scaling-up particularly in the areas of livelihoods.

This project will result in: the improved protection of 48,128 ha of protected areas (terrestrial: 22,000 ha; marine: 26,128 ha); the improved management for biodiversity of 34,000 ha of productive lands; and reduced emissions of 667,729 metric tons of CO₂.