



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

GEF ID:	5122		
Country/Region:	Solomon Islands		
Project Title:	Integrated Forest Management in the Soloman Islands		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; LD-3; LD-3; CCM-5; CCM-5; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,676,454
Co-financing:	\$19,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,676,454
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Aru Mathias

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?	September 14, 2012 Yes. CBD signed 1992, CCD ratified 1999 and UNFCCC signed 1992.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	September 14, 2012 Yes. A letter from J Horokou dated April 20, 2012 is available.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	September 14, 2012 Yes. FAO has experience in SFM projects worldwide and existing GEF funded forest and natural resources projects in the region.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency	September 14, 2012 There is no NGI.	

*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)
	capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	September 14, 2012 Yes. The project will be managed through FAO's sub-regional representation in Samoa with technical backstopping from Rome.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	September 14, 2012 Yes	
	• the focal area allocation?	September 14, 2012 Yes. As at September 06, 2012 STAR resources remaining to be allocated stand at BD \$3.60, CC \$2 and LD \$0.65, the STAR allocation is flexible. Funds requested from the SFM/REDD+ incentive are within the 3:1 ratio. Please ensure Agency Fees in Project Identification and Table D match. November 06, 2012 Figures adjusted. Cleared.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF	September 14, 2012 Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	results framework?		
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>September 14, 2012 Yes. The project identifies BD1, CCM5, LD3 and SFM1. In Table A please insert the area of forests within parentheses in Output SFM/REDD+ 1.2</p> <p>November 06, 2012 Area included. Cleared.</p>	
	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?	<p>September 14, 2012 Yes. The project is in line with NBSAP objectives on PAs, the NAP objectives on land degradation, the NAMA objectives on LULUCF and REDD and post-logging forest strategies for the country.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>September 14, 2012 Capacity development is included in Components 2,3 and 5 however please provide some indication of the levels of funding invested in capacity building efforts and those implementing field-level activities. Also please explain if capacity building in relation to PA management is planned.</p> <p>November 06, 2012 Additional information provided. Cleared.</p>	
	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?	<p>September 14, 2012 Yes, details of baseline activities by SIG and partners are provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>September 14, 2012 Component 2 the overall goal of the Component is understood but the means through which this will occur is not clear. Please provide additional detail, in particular on 2.4 which seems to be where field level action is planned. Please describe the mechanisms to be used to effect change in management techniques and over what area. Component 3 Please explain how this complements activities planned in SI's REDD Readiness plans.</p> <p>November 06, 2012 Additional information provided. Cleared.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>September 14, 2012 Component 1 please provide some more detail on the conservation agreement and incentives envisaged for PA development. The project tries to address both forest loss and degrade. For forest loss Component 2.4 addresses agroforestry and small holders, but how is the project addressing conversion to other land uses at a larger scale such as palm oil? The PIF explains the problems with the un-enacted 2004 Forests Bill and the threats from illegal and unregulated logging at</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>unsustainable rates – how are these issues addressed so SFM can be implemented within the project area? Also does this effect the status and governance of new PAs? Please provide additional information on the development of the trust fund. What format will this take? How will GEF resources be used? Component 5 please provide a little more explanation of 5.2 community based forest management. Please explain how much of the GEF funding is directed to enhancing and increasing CBFM and how much to awareness campaigns.</p> <p>November 06, 2012 Additional information provided. Cleared. At time of CEO Endorsement expanded details on the village level incentives to be used and the format of the trust fund will be expected.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>September 14, 2012 The proposal appears to have very distinct components that are related to the individual FAs, please provide some explanation of how the individual FAs are working together to create synergies. Component 2.1 indicates reduction of drivers. Can any indication of the impact of the project on these be predicted? Component 2.2 the outcome –equal or better than baseline' does not seem very ambitious. Please revise. Carbon estimates – can you please</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>provide the figures used to calculate these?</p> <p>November 06, 2012 Can you please confirm the carbon measure is tC or tCO₂eq. It would be preferable to use the more conventional t CO₂ eq as the unit for carbon in the text. Also since the Carbon emissions avoided and sequestered are listed in other parts of the PIF would you consider to include Expected Outcome 3 for Objective CCM5 in Table A.</p> <p>Additional information provided. All other issues cleared. At CEO Endorsement clear impact predictions on reduction of drivers will be expected.</p> <p>November 20, 2012 Cleared.</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>September 14, 2012 Additional detail on the planned 'local income generating activities' (Page 12) are requested ' what is being planned is not clear either in the framework or the text.</p> <p>November 06, 2012 Additional details included, sufficient for PIF stage. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>September 14, 2012 CSOs such as TNC and WWF have been active within forests in SI. How are these efforts being capitalized? Are indigenous peoples impacted by the project, if so what safeguards will be in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>place?</p> <p>November 06, 2012 Cleared</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>September 14, 2012 The main risks are addressed sufficiently for PIF level and further details would be expected at CEO Endorsement; however please comment on the risks associated with existing situation regarding forest legislation and acknowledged weak governance.</p> <p>November 06, 2012 Cleared</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>September 14, 2012 Key initiatives identified. At CEO Endorsement clear plans for collaboration will be expected. Please make sure to have the proposed project make proper linkages and ensure coordination with the potential upcoming Ridge to Reef Programme and other regional activities.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>September 14, 2012 As community mobilization is important please provide some additional details of how CSOs will be involved at the field level. Cross-Ministry coordination will be an important element, by CEO Endorsement please ensure clear plans of how this will be achieved are available.</p> <p>November 06, 2012 Additional details included. Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	September 14, 2012 PMC is at 5%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	September 14, 2012 Generally yes, however we would like to ensure that within Components 2, 3 and 5 the majority of funds will be spent on field-level implementation. November 06, 2012 Addressed above. Cleared.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	September 14, 2012 Co-finance is \$19 million, giving a ratio of 1:3.36.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	September 14, 2012 FAO is supporting the project with \$1.5 million of which \$1 million is grant.	
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:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>September 14, 2012 Not at this stage, please address the issues above.</p> <p>November 07, 2012 Please address the carbon issue in Q15.</p> <p>November 20, 2012. This PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming work program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Details of village level incentives. Expanded details of TF development. Impact prediction on reduction of D&D drivers. Refinement of carbon estimates through PPG phase. Expanded risk analysis and mitigation measures. Plans for cross-Ministry collaboration and coordination with other initiatives. Clearly state the links with the Aichi Targets and demonstrate this through the choice of indicators. 	
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 Date (s)	First review*	September 14, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.