



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 Solomon 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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$177,348	Project Grant:	\$5,676,454
Co-financing:	\$30,670,500	Total Project Cost:	\$36,524,302
PIF Approval:	February 21, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	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.	October 23, 2015 As at PIF stage.
	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.	October 23, 2015 As at PIF stage.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	September 14, 2012 There is no NGI.	October 23, 2015 There remains 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)
	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.	October 23, 2015 Additional info provided.
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	October 23, 2015 The overall grant request remains as at PIF stage.
	• 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.	October 23, 2015 The individual FA requests remain as at PIF stage.
	• 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 results framework?	September 14, 2012 Yes.	October 23, 2015 As at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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>	<p>October 23, 2015 FA objectives identified remain as BD1, CCM5, LD3 and SFM1.</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>	<p>October 23, 2015 Additional details of relevant strategies and plans identified in the ProDoc.</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>	<p>October 23, 2015 Interventions with capacity development elements are provided throughout the proposal including Output 1 in government and community management of PAs, Component 2 in sustainable land management practices and Component 3 in forest and carbon MRV systems.</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>	<p>October 23, 2015 The CEO Endorsement includes a developed listing of initiatives addressing biodiversity, conservation and improved forest management, SLM and land use planning and, REDD+, SFM and restoration.</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?		October 23, 2105 Cost effectiveness is centered around the development of activities which utilize the support of local communities to promote conservation, selection of sites with highest conservation value and building on national structures of knowledge and experience.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	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. November 06, 2012 Additional information provided. Cleared.	October 23, 2015 The project and the proposed interventions would benefit from some additional information on the issues facing each of the areas identified in terms of magnitude, severity and pace of impacts. The only figures available seem to be in the CO2 calculations, the proposal as a whole needs to justify much more clearly the damage/degrade situation it attempts to address in order to consider the interventions proposed and fully explain/assess the incremental reasoning. What are the findings from the PPG phase? 4th of February 2016: Provided, cleared
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	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-	October 23, 2015 Please provide additional information on the development of the trust fund and what the GEF support will be used for. Please indicate how GEF, IEO guidance on TF development has been taken into consideration. Please provide additional information on restoration efforts. What has PPG work identified in terms of current stocking/coverage and alternatives for restoration. What existing restoration

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>enacted 2004 Forests Bill and the threats from illegal and unregulated logging at 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>efforts are ongoing? How does the aim of 20k ha/yr compare to existing efforts? What processes are available that will allow 20k ha to be restored in the earliest years of the project?</p> <p>4th of February 2016 (cseverin): Annex 14 responds well to the request for additional information on the restoration efforts.</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</p>	<p>October 23, 2015 To be reconsidered with response from Q13. The carbon estimates are well received but why is the project not making use of FAO's well respected ExACT tool but rather a shorthand estimate? We would expect given the PPG efforts the FAO's own tool could be usefully employed. The proposed immediate results for avoiding deforestation, degradation and restoration require further explanation.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ambitious. Please revise. Carbon estimates “ can you please 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>Is it realistic that full cessation or completion can be expected in the very earliest stages of project implementation?</p> <p>4th of February 2016 (cseverin): Additional information included, 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>October 23, 2015 S-E benefits derived through local community involvement in project execution and capacity development. Approaches for incorporation of gender issues outlined in ProDoc.</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?</p>	<p>October 23, 2015 Key stakeholders and roles identified in ProDoc.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Are indigenous peoples impacted by the project, if so what safeguards will be in 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>October 23, 2015 Yes, major risks including climate change identified and methods of mitigation presented.</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>October 23, 2015 Key initiatives identified.</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>October 23, 2015 Yes</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		November 06, 2012 Additional details included. Cleared.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		October 21, 2015 The proposal remains close to that described at PIF. Amendments are supported with justifications.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		October 21, 2015 There is no NGI included in the project.
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	September 14, 2012 PMC is at 5%.	October 21, 2015 PMC remains 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.	October 21, 2015 Funding and co-finance appear adequate.
	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.	October 21, 2015 Co-finance is now at \$30,670,500 and includes \$1.4 million from CSO, \$1.8 from private sector and \$2.5 from multilaterals. Confirmation is available for all co-finance streams.
	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.	October 21, 2015 Co-finance from FAO remains as at PIF stage.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		October 23, 2015 TTs available.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		October 21, 2015 Budgeted M&E plan presented.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		October 23, 2015 STAP comments generally addressed but comments around rationale and GHG estimates are covered above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		October 23, 2015 Issues on GEBs, drivers (notwithstanding Q13) and coordination addressed.
	<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> <p>2/2013. PIF has been cleared for the April 2013 Work Program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Details of village level incentives. 2. Expanded details of TF development. 3. Impact prediction on reduction of D&D drivers. 4. Refinement of carbon estimates through PPG phase. 5. Expanded risk analysis and mitigation measures. 6. Plans for cross-Ministry collaboration 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		and coordination with other initiatives. 7. 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?		October 23, 2015 Details of progress included.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		October 23, 2015 Not at this stage. Address issues above. 16th of March 2016: CEO Endorsement recommended
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 14, 2012	October 23, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 20, 2012	
	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?	
	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.