



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

GEF ID:	5045		
Country/Region:	Solomon Islands		
Project Title:	Integrating Global Environment Commitments in Investment and Development Decision-making		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4928 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$850,000
Co-financing:	\$1,317,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,167,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Tom Twining-Ward, UNDP Green-LECRDS

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?	Yes. Solomon Islands ratified the CBD on 3 October 1995, Solomon Islands ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) on 28 December 1994, and the UNCCD on April 19, 1999. Cleared 7/25/2012	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, with letter from OFP dated April 20, 2012. Cleared 7/25/2012	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. Cleared 7/25/2012	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. Cleared 7/25/2012	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA. 7/25/2012	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, cross-cutting capacity development allocation. Cleared 7/25/2012	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA.7/25/2012	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA. 7/25/2012	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA. 7/25/2012	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>Throughout the PIF, the focus is on activities within the REDD+ strategy. However, the links to the GEF Focal Areas are not clearly stated. In addition, it is not clear how focusing on REDD+ activities will permeate through the 3 conventions. More information is requested. 7/25/2012</p> <p>Some information is provided. However, it is not clear how activities will be contributing to cross-cutting capacity development and what kind of tangible results will be achieved. Results should be identified in the table B and in the text of the PIF. Please identify level of baseline using CD indicators. Additional clarification is requested. 09/30/2012</p> <p>The revised PIF contains more details</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>about the relationship between the REDD+ project and the outcomes of the CCCD project as it contributes to meeting the objectives of the Conventions. However, the project targets two objectives of the CCCD, CD2 and CD3, and this needs to be appropriately captured in Table A of the PIF. In addition, the corresponding budget should be adequately disaggregated. Thus, Table B will be more in tune with Table A. Please divide the Focal Area outcomes and outputs and put them under CD2 and CD3. correspondingly. Current outputs d) and 2) belong to CD2. Additional information is requested. 1/17/2013</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>Somewhat. See above. Additional information is requested. 7/25/2012</p> <p>Additional information is provided, however, it seems that there is very strong linkage to REDD+ activities and they are somewhat not clearly linked with CD goals and objectives. It seems that there is already linkages and communication system in place, so the need for GEF intervention should be more clearly identified. Additional changes/clarification is requested. 9/30/2012</p> <p>Information provided in the revised PIF is clear. This is not a REDD+ project but uses the current UN REDD+ programme as a baseline. Cleared 1/17/2013</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	The project is consistent with the NCSA completed in 2008. the country's National Environmental and Capacity Development Action Plan (NECDAP), the NAPA and the NBSAP. Cleared 7/25/2012	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Somewhat clear. However, there's no clear indication of how many government staff and other stakeholders will be positively influenced by the project and how the outcomes will be sustained in the future. Additional information is requested. 7/25/2012 Reference to stakeholders involved in the training was provided. Funding for this training will come also from other non-GEF sources. Actual numbers will be specified during PPG phase. Cleared 1/17/2013	
Project Design	11. 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?	Somewhat. However it is not clear what the current situation in the country is in terms of mechanisms in place to coordinate the implementation of conventions, to track and report changes and develop/implement necessary response measures if needed. Additional information is requested. 7/25/2012 Some information is provided. However, baseline should be provided with CD indicators. It is also not clear what is current capacity of staff and institutions to implement Rio conventions. Additional info is requested. 9/30/2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Adequate explanation is given. The project outcomes will be measured by the 15 cross-cutting capacity development indicators as per the Monitoring Guidelines of Capacity Development in GEF Projects (2010). Further, the PIF includes a table that summarizes additional information on the GEF increment over the baseline project. An assessment of the baseline indicators will be conducted at PPG stage. Cleared 1/17/2013</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>To some extent. However, a 1:1 ratio of cash co-financing is necessary. Additional information is requested. 7/25/2012</p> <p>Some information is provided, however, details on tangible should be provided. Additional clarification/information is requested 9/30/2012</p> <p>Adequate information provided. At PPG Stage the distribution of co-financing amongst the activities will be negotiated. Cleared. 1/17/2013</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>To some extent. However, it is suggested that the components be divided into two: Institutional Capacity Development, which encompasses the first three expected outputs, and then a</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>second component related to communications/information dissemination, which is related to the last two expected outputs. Additional information requested. 7/25/2012</p> <p>Additional information is provided, however the framework of the PIF is not sufficiently clear. It is not clear why the project is so strongly focused on REED+ and with few details on capacity needs and identifying relevant means and ways to address capacity needs. It is not clear why for training 17 staff and stakeholders there is a need for 500K GEF financing and 700K in co-financing. Please revise the document. 9/30/2012</p> <p>The revised PIF clarifies that the \$500,000 in training does not all come from the GEF funding. The REDD + focus is due to the fact that the REDD+ project serves as the baseline upon which the CCCD activities will be built. The REDD+ framework will be strengthened and leveraged and the GEF funding will be used to expand the institutional capacities to create economies of scale to implement the conventions in a synergistic way. Cleared 1/17/2013</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Somewhat. However, the global environmental benefits (GEB) that the project will contribute to are not described. Additional information is requested. 7/25/2012</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Not sufficient clarification is provided. It seems that assumptions applied are not reasonable. Please make necessary changes. 9/30/2012</p> <p>Clarifications are provided. Further detail as to the incremental cost analysis will be undertaken at the project document preparation phase. Cleared 1/17/2013</p>	
	<p>16. 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>Somewhat. However, the explanation about how these dimensions will influence the achievement of GEB is not clear. Additional information is requested. 7/25/2012</p> <p>Most of them provided, however incremental reasoning should more tangible focused on impact on the ground. 9/30/2012</p> <p>Further details about impacts will be disaggregated and clarified at the project document preparation phase. Cleared 1/17/2013</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>To some extent. A mention of the roles of CSOs, Women groups and CBOs in raising awareness is made, but the mechanics are not explain. Additional information is requested. 7/25/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 9/30/2012</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes. Cleared 7/25/2012</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Cleared 7/25/2012	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes. Cleared 7/25/2012	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 7/25/2012	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Yes. Cleared 7/25/2012</p> <p>Somewhat. Once the components are split it will be easier to see how adequated the funding and co-financing are. Additional information requested as per No. 14 above. 7/25/2012</p> <p>Some information is provided, however, it seems that co-financing is not coming really from implementing partners, especially from recipient of this support. It is not clear why government is not committing any cash co-financing and their role is not clear. It seems that some co-financing is counted from another already ongoing projects and it is not coming directly for this project. Please revise. 9/30/2012</p> <p>A higher commitment from the government in terms of co-financing is expected. Please make best efforts to increase government co-financing both</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		in-kind and cash. Additional information is requested. 1/17/2013	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Cash co-financing from should be substantially increased to meet requirements. Additional information/changes are requested. 7/25/2012 Revised, however, nature of co-financing is not clear. Please identify cash co-financing from the government and and to which elements of the project it will be used. 9/30/2012 Issue has not been resolved. Government should contribute cash and kind co-financing in a higher degree. Additional information is requested. 1/17/2013	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Somewhat. See comment about cash co-financing. Additional information is requested. 7/25/2012 Co-financing is reconsidered, but seems only as parallel. So, it is not clear how is it relevant to objectives and different components of the project. Additional clarification is requested 9/30/2012 Clarification provided is not sufficient. Parallel co-financing is not part of the c-financing policy of the GEF. Operational Programs were in effect in GEF3. Please provide information 1/17/2013	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet but could be if necessary changes/clarifications are provided. Additional information is requested. 7/25/2012</p> <p>Additional clarification/information and revisions are requested. 9/30/2012</p> <p>Please provide additional clarifications and information as per noted above under items # 7, 24, 25 and 26.</p> <p>In addition, please revise the agency fee to a maximum of 9.5% as per the new policy. 1/17/2013</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 26, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 30, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 17, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes, Cleared 7/25/2012
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes. Cleared 7/25/2012
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not yet, until PIF is cleared. 7/25/2012 Not yet, until PIF is cleared. In addition, please review the Agency Fee to reflect the new policy of a maximum of 9.5% of GEF funding. 1/17/2013
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.