



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9846		
Country/Region:	Solomon Islands		
Project Title:	EREPA - Ensuring Resilient Ecosystems and Representative Protected Areas in the Solomon Islands		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,918,364
Co-financing:	\$8,510,000	Total Project Cost:	\$13,428,364
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Solstice Middleby

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>No. Please address the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As this is an MFA project, please list it as an MFA in the first table (not biodiversity). 2. The project needs to have SMART indicators identified. This could be done in italics in Table B. 	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>3. Given the relative amounts of resources devoted to the different focal areas, it seems that for biodiversity the areas should be: BD-1 Programs 1 and 2 and then BD-4 program 9. Program 2 is specifically aimed at the expansion of PAs, which is the aim of component 2. As the project stands invasive species appear to only be a part of component 1.2.2, so that can simply be considered mainstreaming. If IAS work is a substantial component and thus should remain separate, please ensure that there is a strong justification for site selection and activities undertaken in line with the Biodiversity Strategy at PPG. In particular, please focus on the long term sustainability of such activities.</p> <p>4. KBAs - Program 2 does specify that the expansion should occur within KBAs. Much of the land in the Solomons is KBAs. Can you please include a map showing the KBAs as well as the areas where this project will be working? We know that a community-based process cannot be controlled precisely but the extent of KBAs in Solomons should make it possible.</p> <p>August 9, 2017</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Please include where the project will be working on the map and the relevant KBAs - this does not have to be a high quality graphic design just something that people can use to locate project activities in comparison to biodiversity priorities. Otherwise thank you for the revisions.</p> <p>Please note that Annex III of the Biodiversity Strategy outlines the criteria for GEF support for new protected areas, which are aligned with the KBA criteria (as those were still being finalized at the time of the publication of the BD Strategy).</p> <p>September 18, 2017</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the additional maps, they are very helpful.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>No. While this section does not need to be extensive, it should be specific to this project and focus on GEF-related conventions. The response on the NAP appears to discuss the GEF-5 project not this one. The description of the NBSAP, NCSA, and NPFE should include how the activities in this project relate to the activities and priorities outlined there.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>August 9, 2017</p> <p>Yes. However, at CEO Endorsement please focus on how this project will implement on-the-ground activities that are priorities based on the relevant documents. The project should align with the reports rather than support the creation of future reports.</p>	
Project Design	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>No. Please include more on the long term sustainability of project activities.</p> <p>August 9, 2017</p> <p>Yes. At CEO Endorsement, please ensure that sustainability (i.e. their continuation beyond the life of the project) is emphasized.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>No. The GEF's goal is not to be incremental to other GEF projects, but rather to on-going or upcoming initiatives of the government or others. Therefore, please revise the project to look for other initiatives that are not GEF funded.</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>August 10, 2017</p> <p>Yes. During PPG, please continue to seek out existing and new programs that the project can leverage, particularly efforts made by institutions outside of the traditional environmental partners.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Overall, many of the outputs are not worded clearly. Please put the main point upfront. For example, the point of 2.2.2 is to create a PA financing plan not the costing study.</p> <p>Please address the following:</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.1.1 - The description of this component contains a number of activities including the institutional arrangements, policies and regulations and training. Please separate or provide greater clarity about the relationship among these activities. - 1.1.2 - How will this: Build on existing data? And, be accessible and used by relevant institutions? Please include the practical purpose of this data collection as this should guide 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the activities undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.1.3 - Please include more information about how this database will be managed and maintained during and after the end of the project (which department or ministry) and how the more widespread use beyond just the ministry of the environment of the database will be achieved. - 1.1.4 - The GEF typically provides very limited support for awareness campaigns and only with a specific purpose of being key to the success of other components. Please focus on the linkages to other components. - 1.1.5 - What is the relationship of these plans in size and location to the other activities described in this project? We understand that the exact locations will be selected during PPG. - 1.2.1 - The GEF commonly supports alternative livelihood/community-based mainstreaming activities. However, typically the incentive for participation is increased incomes generated in a sustainable way, so it's unusual to see the need for additional incentives. 1. Why will additional incentives be required? 2. Who will be paying for them? 3. How will such incentives be maintained after the project? 4. How will the project avoid creating the belief that people should be paid for such activities and, thus, 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>people won't undertake them without payment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.2.2 - What biodiversity criteria will be used to select sites for these activities? - 1.2.3 - Why is this focused on supplementary income not primary? <p>Component 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.1 - It may be helpful to reformulate 2.1.1 - 2.2.1 and their descriptions to provide a logical explanation of the activities to be undertaken and their relationship. - 2.1.2 - Please list the minimum number of hectares rather than the maximum. We understand that this will be an estimate at this point. Are these the same areas as in 2.1.1? If so, this might be an indicator for that component or it would be good to clarify this. - 2.2.1 - The formulation of this outcome is confusing. Please clarify the actual activities. Are the rapid biodiversity assessments here different from those in 2.1.1? - 2.2.2 - No need to limit the PA needs assessment to 5 years. It would probably be more helpful to consider at least a 10 year time horizon and account for annual and periodic recurring costs (e.g. replacing the roof on a ranger station or buying a new 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>vehicle). Unfortunately, it's unlikely that the full needs of the PA will be able to be funded, so please only include the last sentence if you are confident this can be achieved.</p> <p>- 2.2.3 - We would generally not describe the activities outlined here as "conservation incentive mechanisms". The most common conservation incentive mechanism is payments for ecosystem services where people are paid not to do something rather these activities sound like the alternative livelihoods/mainstreaming in productive practices described in 1.2.1. Please explain the relationship of these components.</p> <p>- 2.2.4 - Please clarify this activity. Does this mean that management plans have been developed and implemented for the new PAs? Some of these activities might fit better on the management plan outcome. Meanwhile, other activities are focused on learning and knowledge management which isn't part of the outcome as written.</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>- 3.1.1 - Please explain how this data will be used beyond simply site selection. There needs to be a strong argument for the purpose of data collection (in this and other</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>components) for the delivery of GEBs.</p> <p>- 3.1.3 - Please clarify if this is a train-the-trainers type of model, so extension staff then train the landowners or otherwise. Also, how do health and nutrition deliver GEBs or is it an opportunity to build on existing training programs?</p> <p>Minor comments: The GEF-5 project is called Ridge-to-Reef.</p> <p>August 10, 2017</p> <p>Yes, thank you for the many edits.</p> <p>To clarify, we agree with the need to provide the structures, training, access to capital, markets etc for sustainable livelihood activities. It's important to focus on those type of barriers to create sustainable outcomes.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>Minor revision needed - Please check the boxes in the PIF in these sections. Working with UN Women is very welcome, is there potential to build on some of their activities could serve as a baseline or co-financing?</p> <p>August 10, 2017</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes. There is actually an additional \$4,517 in the biodiversity allocation for the Solomons that we would encourage this project to use if it is in-line with country priorities.</p> <p>August 10, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>June 13, 2017</p> <p>The PIF is not being recommended for clearance at this time. Please feel free to reach out to the GEF Secretariat with questions.</p> <p>August 10, 2017</p> <p>The increase in budget requires an</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>updated endorsement letter. Please submit this and the map. Otherwise, the project is ready for technical clearance.</p> <p>September 18, 2017</p> <p>This program manager recommends this project for CEO clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	July 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 10, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 18, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council • Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.