



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5581		
Country/Region:	Solomon Islands		
Project Title:	Community Resilience to Climate and Disaster Risk in Solomon Islands Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	112613 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$7,305,900
Co-financing:	\$7,348,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,653,900
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Bonizella Biagini	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Solomon Islands as a least developed country is eligible to receive resources.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A letter is on file from the operational focal point.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	The resources are available for the Solomon Islands under the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>Technology Transfer)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>The project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework and strategic objectives, however Table A refers CD-2, and SGP, which do not seem appropriate for this type of project as the request is for resources from the LDCF.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please remove the reference to CD-2, and SGP in Table A of the PIF document.</p> <p>Update October 23rd 2013.</p> <p>Cleared. The relevant changes have been made</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>The project is consistent with the NAPA of Solomon Islands. It is also consistent with the National Development Strategy of Solomon Islands.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Further information needs to be provided on the baseline projects. While there is an effective description of the baseline scenario and situation, additional information should be provided on the baseline projects and how the LDCF resources will build on the baseline projects. For example on page 8 of the PIF in the discussion on component three no information is provided on the baseline situation to justify the LDCF investments.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Recommended Action: Please provide additional information on the exact activities of project being financed by the Japan Policy and Human Resource (PHRD) Fund and the Global Fund for Disaster Resilience .</p> <p>Update October 23rd 2013.</p> <p>Cleared. The relevant changes have been made</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>No the outcomes and outputs in the project framework are not clear, sound and appropriately detailed. The outputs for component 3- Community based climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction investments- are not appropriately detailed. There is a reference to climate proofing of public assets. Some idea of the actual investments to be undertaken should be presented in the PIF.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please give some examples of the type of investments and activities which will be financed by the LDCF.</p> <p>Update October 23rd 2013.</p> <p>Cleared. The relevant changes have been made. Examples of the types of investments to be made have been provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The baseline projects have not been effectively described. The baseline projects need to be described in detail to assess effectively the adaptation benefits and incremental reasoning. Please see Box 6.</p> <p>Update October 23rd 2013.</p> <p>Cleared. The relevant changes have been made. The adaptation benefits can be identified.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Please provide information on the civil society organizations, that will be involved in the project.</p> <p>Update October 23rd 2013.</p> <p>At CEO Endorsement please provide additional information on the civil society organizations that will be involved in the project.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes the project takes into account potential risks and proposes mitigation measures.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is consistent and coordinated with other related initiatives in the Solomon Islands and the Pacific.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	Please see Box 7. Once information is provided on the examples of the investments, then a determination can be made on innovation, sustainability and the potential for scaling up. Update October 23rd 2013. The project has the potential for scaling up. The proposed investments will be sustainable given the capacity building which is associated with the project.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Please see box 7. Once examples of the types of investments and climate proofing activities to be financed, then a determination can be made on whether the GEF funding and co-financing is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Update October 23rd 2013.</p> <p>Cleared. The GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>No the cofinancing is not adequate, given the role of the GEF Agency in this project. The ratio of GEF finance to cofinance is 1:0.83 Please clarify the type of cofinancing which is be provided by GFDRR.</p> <p>Update October 23rd 2013.</p> <p>Cleared. The cofinance is now adequate.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>The funding level for project management is appropriate.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>No PPG is requested for this project.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance. Please address issues in boxes, 4,6,7,8,10 13,16 and 17.</p> <p>Update October 23rd 2013</p> <p>There have been several informal consultations with the World Bank, on this project, and the changes to the project proposal have addressed the issues in boxes 4,6,7,8,10 13,16 and 17.</p> <p>The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	September 18, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	October 23, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**