2025

Project Implementation Report (PIR)

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Safeguarding Solomon Island's biodiversity (SAFE)

Basic Data ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Key project dates ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Overall ratings ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Development Objective Progress ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Finance/Co-Finance ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Implementation Progress ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Project Governance ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Ratings and Overall Assessments ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Minor Amendments ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Gender ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Risk Management ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Knowledge Management & Communications ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Annex - Ratings Definitions ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

A. Basic Data

Project Information	
UNDP PIMS ID	6566
GEF ID	10698
Title	Safeguarding Solomon Island's biodiversity from key threats
Country(ies)	Solomon Islands, Solomon Islands
UNDP Technical Team	Ecosystems and Biodiversity
Management Arrangements	CO Support to NIM
Project Implementing Partner	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM)
Joint Agencies	*(not set or not applicable)*
Project Type	Full Size
Implementation Status	2nd PIR
GEF Fiscal Year	FY25
Trust Fund	GEF Trust Fund

Project Description
The biological diversity of Solomon Islands is critical to the people of Solomon Islands in that it has shaped human wellbeing for centuries. The predominantly subsistence lifestyle that characterizes the Solomon Islands economy is underpinned by the country's heavy reliance on its biological diversity. The importance of biodiversity as the basis for the people's livelihood and wellbeing is therefore well understood and it is recognized that without biodiversity the country also loses its aesthetic, spiritual and educational values and significance, which are integral to our wellbeing and traditional way of life. Thus the maintenance of watershBUeds, marine environment and water quality, soil retention and erosion control, provision of critical habitat for fauna, climate regulation, nutrient cycling and the pollination of plants are just a few of the essential ecological services that are essential to the islanders. Nonetheless, there is growing realization that the country's biodiversity is also under increasing pressure from multiple sources of threats, for example, from habitat loss, land degradation, overexploitation, invasive alien species and climate change. These pressures can be devastating for the health of the country's biodiversity and, therefore its livelihood and wellbeing. The GEF project is thus timely, as it intends to help the Solomon Islands in safeguarding its indigenous species and ecosystems from invasive species, halt land degradation and restore degraded areas, control unsustainable resource use and climate-induced risks through a holistic and integrated landscape-seascape management approach through effective government enabling and capacity, community participation and development of resilient blue/green livelihoods. The project recognizes that these land and seascapes of the Solomon Islands underpin the lives and

livelihoods of a large number of local communities and that implementation of a coherent and integrated strategy to promote improved measures for prevention and management of invasive alien species, land and marine degradation and unsustainable use of its natural resources is an integral part of the solution. The project objective to ensure that Solomon Islands indigenous species and ecosystems are at reduced risk from invasive alien species, land degradation and unsustainable resource use as a result of effective government enabling and capacity, community participation and resilient blue/green livelihoods. This is to be achieved through four interrelated and mutually complementary Components that are focused on addressing barrier. The four Components of the project are:

Component 1: Enabling framework for safeguarding biodiversity, combating land degradation and securing a nature-based economy

Component 2: Comprehensive risk management approach to address IAS threats to biodiversity and land degradation

Component 3: Community-based integrated ecosystem management and threat reduction at land/seascape scale

Component 4: Knowledge management, awareness, M&E and gender mainstreaming

Project Contacts	
UNDP BPPS Technical Advisor	Ms. Tharuka Dissanaike (tharuka.dissanaike@undp.org)
UNDP BPPS Programme Associate	Ms. Nittaya (Nid) Saengow (nittaya.saengow@undp.org)
UNDP BPPS SES Technical Advisor	Ms. Kate Walker (kate.walker@undp.org)
Project Manager/Coordinator	Jennifer Kilua (jennifer.betina.kilua@undp.org) Mr. Muhammad Sohail (muhammad.sohail@undp.org)
UNDP Country Office Programme Officer	Barnabas Bago (barnabas.bago@undp.org)
UNDP Country Office Deputy Resident Representative	Ms. Raluca Eddon (raluca.eddon@undp.org)
UNDP Regional Bureau Desk Officer	Ms. Rany Pen (rany.pen@undp.org)
GEF Operational Focal Point	*(not set or not applicable)*
Project Implementing Partner	*(not set or not applicable)*
Other Partners	*(not set or not applicable)*

B. Key project dates

Project duration	72 months
PIF Approval Date	Dec 11, 2020
CEO Endorsement Date	Jun 17, 2022
Project Document Signature Date (project start date):	May 25, 2023
Date of Inception Workshop	Apr 10, 2024
First Disbursement Date	Apr 26, 2024
Expected Date of Mid-term Review	May 25, 2026
Actual Date of Mid-term Review	*(not set or not applicable)*
Expected Date of Terminal Evaluation	Feb 25, 2029
Original Planned Closing Date	May 25, 2029
Revised Planned Closing Date	*(not set or not applicable)*

C. Overall ratings

Overall DO Rating	Moderately Satisfactory
Overall IP Rating	Unsatisfactory
Overall Risk Rating	low

D. Development Objective Progress

It is mandatory for all reported progress to be substantiated by evidence. Please upload evidence files for each objective/outcome via the DO PROGRESS section in the online PIR platform. If there is no evidence to upload, the Project Manager is required to provide an explanation.

Description					
Objective **Solomon Islands indigenous species and ecosystems at reduced risk from invasive alien species, land degradation and unsustainable resource use as a result of effective government enabling and capacity, community participation and resilient blue/green livelihoods.**					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at Jun 30, 2024**	**Cumulative progress since project start as of Jun 30, 2025**
Indicator 1: Mandatory GEF Core Indicators 1: Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Hectares)	METT baseline scores: Western Biosphere Reserve (15,290 ha) – 42 Maliata Highlands (2,000 ha) – 20 Solomon Tubi Forest Reserve (10,074 ha) - 27	At least 27,364 ha of terrestrial protected area under improved management with 10 point increase from baseline values	At least 27,364 ha of terrestrial protected area under improved management with at least 20 point increase from baseline values	The baseline established during the PPG remains as is in 2023. However, the SAFE project and UNDP have developed an engagement plan to conduct a stock take of current status of all baselines and update the implementation plans for 2025.	As reported in 2024, UNDP planned to conduct a stock take of current status of all baselines through mapping and marking zones in the project area. In continuation, the project launched RFP in Q1 2025 to start with mapping and zonation of the selected landscapes and seascapes in the five provinces. As of now, the technical evaluation of the RFP has been completed awaiting financial evaluation and awarding contract to the consulting firm. The expected timeline to complete this exercise is by the end of 2025/beginning of 2026. This is important to note that the project took a late start, however, it is now gaining momentum (starting 2025) with speedily expediting activities that lagged in the previous years. Keeping in view the initiation of

					ongoing work in 2025, the progress is set to be "on-track".
Indicator 2: Mandatory GEF Core Indicators 2: Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Hectares)	METT baseline scores: Temoto seascape (20,400 ha) – 29 Western Biosphere Marine Reserve (14,800 ha) – 32 Lau Lago (4,200 ha) - 29	At least 39,400 ha of marine protected area under improved management with at least 10 point increase from baseline values	At least 39,400 ha of marine protected area under improved management with at least 20 point increase from baseline values	The baseline established during the PPG stage remained during this reporting period. At the time of this report, a detailed plan to engage with the respective responsible parties to update the baseline and develop an implementation plan for 2025 onwards was being developed.	-same as Indicator 1 above- The consulting (once onboarded) firm will determine the baseline for both landscapes and seascapes in five provinces, i.e. the project area.
Indicator 3: Mandatory GEF Core Indicators 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (Hectares) (including seascapes and landscapes) includes: CI 4.1 Area of landscape under improved management to benefit biodiversity – 61,829 hectares CI 4.3 Area of landscapes under SLM in production systems – 14,429 hectares	No concerted efforts currently exist at landscape/seascape level that enables integrated and holistic natural resources use practices	At least 22,000 hectares of production landscapes under improved management practices, including: CI 4.1: 20,000 hectares under improved management to benefit biodiversity and CI 4.3: 2,000 hectares under SLM in production systems	At least 76,258 hectares of production landscapes under improved management practices to benefit biodiversity (61,829 ha) and under SLM (14,429 ha) as measured by (i) commitment of local communities to implement improved conservation and land use practices; (ii) technical	. All the data captured in this indicator remains valid and will be further updated in 2025. The training and monitoring systems will commence later in the year once the Provincial Coordinators are on board in October 2024.	As stated above against Indicator 1 and 2, the mapping and zonation exercise will be completed by the year end enabling to determine the baselines. This exercise, in turn, will enable the project to determine improvement in biodiversity conservation and integrated natural resource management as the project moves ahead in subsequent years with implementation on the ground.

			support and training being delivered to communities; (iii) monitoring system in place to monitor improved outcomes		
Indicator 4: Mandatory GEF Core Indicators 6: Greenhouse gas emission mitigated (tCO2e)	Currently limited or no efforts to assess carbon values	Monitoring system and methodology established for monitoring and staff trained	819,118 (tCO2e) mitigated over 20 year period	The baseline for this indicator was assessed during the PPG but will need to be verified to set targets determined through consultations. Consultant will be recruited to lead this in year 2 and will be completed in 2025	The said exercise, once completed, will provide guidance on assessing carbon values.
Indicator 5: Mandatory GEF Core Indicators 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment	Current number not available, however, some IAS and SLM related training and extension services available, but no wide spread and comprehensive actions being implemented	At least 2,000 persons directly benefiting from GEF investment (at least 50% women)	At least 18,238 persons directly benefiting from GEF investment (At least 50% women)	The recruitment of respective consultants is in process. Once onboard the consultants will develop the National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP) for Solomon Islands as well as the National Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) Strategy and the National Emergency Response Plan(s) or ERP(s) for the specific high-risk taxon. These frameworks, once finalized, will be a baseline and/or foundation towards undertaking IAS-related training and extension services as well as implementation of comprehensive actions towards control of IAS.	The project has recruited provincial coordinators as well as community liaison officers to support implementation of the project activities in five provinces. Likewise, the project has announced a 'call for proposals' inviting local and international NGOs to submit bids for the community-based interventions benefitting local populations through sustainable use of the natural resources. The proposals have been received and IP is in process of evaluation to select appropriate NGO/firm with relevant

					experience to execute community-based project interventions. Once this exercise is completed, the project will be able to report the exact number of beneficiaries in the forthcoming PIR.
The progress of the objective/outcome can be described as:	**On track**				
Evidence uploaded:	YES				
Outcome 1 **Outcome 1.** **Strengthened inter-sectoral governance, capacity and strategies to mainstream biodiversity and LDN and support a nature-based economic pathway**					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at Jun 30, 2024**	**Cumulative progress since project start as of Jun 30, 2025**
Indicator 6: National coordination mechanisms for implementation of NBSAP, including (i) IAS prevention and management (ii) promotion of sustainable land management and (iii) promotion of blue/green economy	Existing Environmental Advisory Committee not fully operationalized to support mainstreaming of biodiversity across sectors including through the	Existing EAC strengthened with new mandates and working arrangements for improving coordination and mainstreaming biodiversity across	EAC fully operational and functional and actively support mainstreaming biodiversity across key sectors as measured by: (i) number of key sectors	No change in the current status of the EAC however a desk review of the existing coordination mechanism is in progress to propose a suitable arrangement considering all existing arrangements. The development of the national frameworks mentioned in Indicator 3	The project had developed TORs for TA assistance provision to the Govt of Solomon Islands. However, there is a bill in the cabinet being discussed, which, might result in abolishment of the EAC. Hence, upon advice of the MEDCM/IP the proposed work has been put on hold. The alternative will be discussed with

	promotion of resilient blue/green development pathways	all key sectors	participation; (ii) number of annual meetings; (iii) number of mainstreaming decisions made and acted upon	will provide opportunities to revive the existing Environmental Advisory Committee.	IP and other stakeholders during the planned 'Strategic Planning Workshop' tentatively planned to be organized during August 2025".
Indicator 7: National capacity for integrated natural resources management in key sectors increased as measured by UNDP capacity development scorecard baseline value for (i) Biodiversity Conservation and PA management = 16 and (ii) SLM = 7	a cross-sector biodiversity mainstreaming committee will be operationalized, with the aim to strengthen the	At least 5 point increase in national capacity for biodiversity conservation/PA management and sustainable land management i as measured by UNDP capacity development scorecard	At least 15 point increase in national capacity for biodiversity conservation/PA management and sustainable land management in as measured by UNDP capacity development scorecard	This will be implemented in 2025 onwards when the coordination mechanism is established and actively conducting its duties.	Starting 2025, the project prioritized expedited action on Outcome 2, and 3. Progress on Outcome 1 remains relatively slower due to softer nature of the activities. However, with implementation of activities under the Outcome 2 & 3, the indicators under Outcome 1 will start moving on the chart.
Indicator 8: Number of plans and tools for conservation of globally threatened and endemic species, IAS and sustainable land management operationalized across sectors	BSI has a national IAS strategy (2020-2030); MFMR has a national aquatic biosecurity plan focused on aquaculture, but tools and training limited	Assessment and validation of usefulness of existing tools and measures to strengthen use of existing tools or promotion of new tools; staff trained in use of tools and monitoring of applications initiated	At least 5 plans and tools for conservation of globally threatened and endemic species, IAS and sustainable land management developed or improved and actively being used	Finalized TORs and initiated recruitment to contract experts to conduct a biosecurity system wide assessment inclusive of existing and future capacity, training, resource needs, protocols, regulations and legal drivers to support biosecurity actions in Solomon Islands. Through the same engagement, a review and update of the Biosecurity Solomon Islands Strategy will be undertaken.	An International Consultant (IC: BSI Assessment) has been recruited to initiate assessment of the existing tools; and enhance national capacities. The international consultant is expected to support the Govt of Solomon Islands in: 1. Updated Biosecurity Solomon Islands (BSI) Strategy 2. Sustainable financing strategy for safeguarding biodiversity from IAS

					(biosecurity) and technical guidance for the development of two demonstration ports of entry for enhanced biosecurity protocols
The progress of the objective/outcome can be described as:	**Off track**				
Evidence uploaded:	YES				
Outcome 2 **Outcome 2.** **Comprehensive IAS framework for early detection, control and management identifies and prioritizes highest-risk invasion pathways to safeguard natural and production systems from IAS**					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at Jun 30, 2024**	**Cumulative progress since project start as of Jun 30, 2025**
Indicator 9: The National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan are finalized, strengthened and implemented	No NISSAP exists, except for a preliminary draft that has not be acted upon for years	NISSAP completed and approved as a plan to address all IAS related issues in the country. Coordination arrangements for NISSAP implementation established with timetable for delivery of key	NISSAP is updated during life of the project and that update is comprehensive and serves as a 'road map' for all sectors to follow throughout the country.	The draft TORs to recruit the International and National Invasive Species Consultants to review and update the National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP) have been finalized and submitted to procurement unit to facilitate recruitments. The PMU is fast tracking recruitment of the International Consultant through the UNDP GPN-Roster, whereas for the National IAS Consultant, the recruitment request has been submitted to the procurement	The activity under NISSAP is being discussed with MECDM. The activity is planned to be completed by the end of 2025.

		actions		unit and it's anticipated that the expert will be on board by September 2024.	
Indicator 10: National capacity for biosecurity increased to prevent incursions of new IAS organisms into the country as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard (modified for IAS) with baseline score of 7	Current national biosecurity capacity is limited to several of the major international ports and is mostly focused on agricultural pests	By mid-term, these efforts would be expanded to all international ports as well as several (2) domestic transit points to provide at least 5 point increase in Capacity Scorecard baseline	Biosecurity screening and prevention activities well developed at all international ports and be inclusive of all potential IAS for terrestrial, freshwater and marine systems and biosecurity at domestic demonstration transit points be solidified and lessons learned being expanded to other domestic transit ports through a prioritized effort to provide at least 15 point increase in Capacity Scorecard baseline	TORs to recruit an expert to support the Ministry of Agriculture (MAL) and Livestock review Solomon Islands "Biosecurity Act 2013 (No.3 Of 2013) and Biosecurity Regulations 2015" are finalized and approved by MAL. PMU has initiated the recruitment process of the recommended expert by MAL, who is expected to be engaged before the end of August 2024. On a similar note, discussions with MAL have been initiated on the specific biosecurity monitoring equipment/items that will be required in Solomon Island context and the procurement process for these is expected to be initiated in August 2024.	The project has supported the Biosecurity Department of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL) with provision of specialized equipment to strengthen the Biosecurity measures on international and domestic ports. In this context, the project procured a fumigation chamber to be installed at Noro port in the Western province, which will help biosecurity screening and prevention activities at the port.
Indicator 11: No increase in established high-risk IAS threatening biodiversity and ecosystem services	Although some capacity exists for EDRR, there is likely no planning document for EDRR and there is	EDRR plan developed with at least one or more ERPs Response team	No increase in established high-risk IAS in project locations	TORs to recruit an International Expert to develop the National Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) Strategy and the National Emergency Response Plan(s) or ERP(s) for specific high-risk taxon have been finalized and shared	Due to the unavailability of relevant capacities to develop EDRR and ERP, the activity was put on hold. The project will advertise or go head-hunting to recruit specialist(s) going forward, which shall be reported in the

	limited information on how information regarding pest reports are handled	established at national level Invasive Species Emergency Response Plan approved and simulation training conducted on a few key species. Project Provinces have trained response teams		with roster manager to have the consultant recruited through the UNDP GPN roster. The first set of candidates identified via the roster are not available and efforts are further being taken to solicit more CVs for further evaluation	PIR.
The progress of the objective/outcome can be described as:	**On track**				
Evidence uploaded:	YES				
Outcome 3 **Outcome 3.** **Community participation and improved livelihoods from a nature-based economic pathway that supports biodiversity conservation and reduces threats from IAS and land degradation.**					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at Jun 30, 2024**	**Cumulative progress since project start as of Jun 30, 2025**
Indicators 12: Area of Marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity	No concerted efforts currently exists at landscape/seascap	At least 20,000 hectares of marine habitat under improved	At least 110,039 hectares of marine habitat under improved	This will be implemented when the provincial coordinators are onboard	The project has recruited provincial coordinators. Further, as stated under Objective Indicator 1 above, the project is in the process of hiring services of

	e level that enables integrated and holistic natural resources use practices	management practices,	management practices as measured by: (i) commitment of local communities to implement improved conservation and resource use		national/international NGOs/firms with relevant experience to execute community-based conservation interventions. Once this exercise is completed, the project will be able to report on the hectarage of landscapes/ seascapes in the forthcoming PIR.
Indicator 13: Number of species actions plans developed and approved (could include single species, species groups or critical ecosystems)	Currently there are no detailed national species plans	Stakeholder consultations completed to identify a priority list of species (and critical ecosystems) for which actions plans need to be developed and a timeline for their preparation 2-3 species and/or critical habitats identified for action plan preparation and draft actions plans under government review (Possible options to be formalized could include the parrot fish group, butterfly fish group	At least 2-3 species and/or critical ecosystem actions plans developed and approved by government and a timetable agreed to action implementation. Implementation of at 25% of the identified priority actions for each plan initiated	This will be implemented once the provincial coordinators on board	The project has signed letter of agreement (LoA) with SINU to undertake relevant activities under this Indicator. The PMU is in process to advance funds to SINU (RP) and expedite stakeholder consultations as well as developing species actions plans with support from provincial coordinators, central & provincial governments and international consultants.

		and coral reef ecosystem)			
Indicator 14: - Key species and habitats for globally threatened species enhanced and populations maintained Potential list of species groups such as Rabbit fish and parrot fish and Sturgeon fish and Tubi tree (Xanthostemon melanoxylon,), Gizo White-eye Zosterops luteirostris, White-throated Nightjar Eurostopodus mystacalis, Giant rat Vikas, Solomys vikas and Rhipidura malaitae. Selection of species will be based on agreed criteria to be determined by the Environment Advisory Committee. Potential criteria might include: currently vulnerable to decline or even extinction; or species with an observed, significant decline in occupied area; the appearance of new threats or intensification or accumulation of existing threats, or all these; significant habitat loss or fragmentation; when a species or populations face an imminent major threat in the form of the predicted arrival of devastating disease or alien	Limited baseline information available. Baseline for selected species will be established in the inception phase of project implementation	Species populations and habitats stable or improved	Species populations and habitats stable or improved	Progress against this indicator will become more evident from 2026 onwards once all protected areas are actively monitored and baseline established	This activity is sequential in nature and is in the pipeline, which will be covered once SINU initiates it SAP interventions.

invasive species; a population subject to significant harvesting or impacted by climate change, etc.					
Indicator 15: Number of smallholder new farms adapting sustainable land management and climate smart agricultural techniques, resulting in avoided degradation of forests, land and coastal ecosystems.	Limited number of land users employing SLM techniques, including composting and a very poor interpretation of agroforestry. Baseline will be determined at inception phase when community planning and mapping is initiated	At least an additional 250 number of smallholder farms adopting sustainable land management and climate smart agricultural techniques, resulting in avoided degradation of forests, land and coastal ecosystems	At least an additional 1,000 number of smallholder farms adopting sustainable land management and climate smart agricultural techniques, resulting in avoided degradation of forests, land and coastal ecosystems	This will be done in 2025 and will be implemented alongside with other component activity.	This activity is in the pipeline, and shall be reported in the forthcoming PIR
The progress of the objective/outcome can be described as:	**On track**				
Evidence uploaded:	YES				
Outcome 4 **Outcome 4.** **Increased project impact, replication and upscaling through enhanced awareness and knowledge management**					

Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Midterm target level	End of project target level	Level at Jun 30, 2024	Cumulative progress since project start as of Jun 30, 2025
Indicator 16. Percentage of sampled project stakeholders aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of IAS and unsustainable land management practices, disaggregated by gender as measured by Knowledge, Aptitudes and Practices (KAP) surveys	Coordinated outreach on conservation threats and biosecurity lacking. Limited awareness of impact IAS among the general public. Baseline KAP surveys to be undertaken in Year 1. Followed by surveys at mid-term and end of project	At least 25% of sampled project stakeholders (50:50 men and women) aware.	At least 50% of sampled project stakeholders (50:50 men and women) aware.	This activity will pick up pace once provincial-level initiatives commences with active advocacy for gender-disaggregated data.	Since the project recently gained momentum and is mainly focused on Outcome 1,2 and 3, progress against Outcome 4 will sequentially follow. However, the project considering IC to be tasked with developing KAP surveys, among others. Alternatively, the same task (KAP survey) will be included in the TORs of the NGOs which will soon be onboarded for the community-based livelihood interventions to start with the project sites in Malaita (and followed in other provinces).
Indicator 17. Number of project best practices and lessons (including on gender and youth mainstreaming and socio-cultural benefits) are accessed and applied throughout the Solomon Islands	A few best practices and lessons available, but currently limited resources do not exist for their implementation.	At least 5 project best practices and lessons (including on gender and youth mainstreaming and socio-cultural benefits) being accessed and documented	At least 10 project best practices and lessons (including on gender and youth mainstreaming and socio-cultural benefits) are accessed and applied throughout the Solomon Islands	Best practices and lessons in the targeted sites will be captured once implementation at the field level is fully operational. 2025 report will capture relevant information.	-as above-
Indicator 18: Number of initiatives that demonstrate participation and knowledge exchanges in Pacific	Very limited participation and knowledge exchanges in	Linkages for participation and knowledge exchange	At least 10 initiatives undertaken that demonstrate active	This is ongoing and will be further enhanced by this project.	-as above-

biodiversity, IAS and SLM platforms	Pacific platforms.	established in at least three Pacific biodiversity, IAS and SLM platforms established	participation and knowledge exchange in Pacific biodiversity, IAS and SLM platforms		
The progress of the objective/outcome can be described as:	**Off track**				
Evidence uploaded:	YES				

Action plan

Off-track objective/outcome	Action(s) to be taken	Responsible party/ies	Due Date
Outcome 1	A strategic planning workshop is scheduled for August 2025. This workshop will engage multiple stakeholders to re-design outputs under Outcome 1 as required, responding to strategic and political directions and changes to government policies. The UNDP capacity score card will be applied at mid-term. Activities to improve the capacity scores will be discussed at this workshop.	IP CTA UNDP CO	Dec 31, 2025
Outcome 4	These activities will resume in the 2026 work plan, once the other outputs are delivering results that can be captured and showcased. However, the recommendation is also to invest in targeted communications to improve stakeholder collaboration and engagement, deliver safeguards-related messaging and information on the GRM in proposed project field locations.	PMU CTA	Mar 31, 2026

E. Finance/Co-Finance

Cumulative disbursement as of Jun 30, 2025: **Disbursement for the FY 2025 period is an estimate as books for UNDP Q2 2025 are not yet closed.*	468,925

Key Financing Amounts

PPG Amount	200,000
GEF Grant Amount	9,212,358
Co-financing	21,740,000

F. Implementation Progress

Project Manager: Please provide comments on delays with outputs/activities during the period 1 July 2024 through 30 June 2025. If there were no delays, please indicate 'not applicable'.

The project has faced a series of operational and institutional challenges that have significantly impacted its ability to deliver results since 2024. While the project has shown signs of recovery in 2025, progress remains below the expected trajectory. Below is a brief outline of the achievements, areas of concern, underlying reasons, and remedial actions being taken to realign the project.

1. Achievements Since 2024

Despite setbacks, the project has made the following progress since 2024:

- Development of key technical and procurement documents including TORs, and activity plans, which formed the basis of the 2025 Annual Work Plan (AWP).

- Recruitment and onboarding of new technical personnel (e.g. CTA) to stabilize the operational core.

- Since April 2025, the project has recorded 35% delivery against its AWP2025 (US$ 2.19 million) marking a substantial improvement compared to the previous year.

- Re-engagement with national and provincial stakeholders has begun, setting the groundwork for coordinated implementation.

2. Lack of Progress Since 2024

However, the overall delivery in 2024 remained extremely limited. Only 2% delivery was achieved for the entire calendar year. The critical field-level interventions (e.g., invasive alien species control, community-based resilience work) did not commence; and planned collaborations with ministries and provincial governments stalled due to a lack of continuity and coordination. Moreover, procurement of key services and consultants was significantly delayed or not initiated.

3. Reasons for Underperformance

Several internal and external factors contributed to the project's underperformance including the following:

- High staff turnover was the single most disruptive factor. The Project Manager, Chief Technical Advisor, and multiple Provincial Coordinators resigned during 2024, leaving operational gaps with no immediate replacements.

- The project lacked a permanent CTA from late 2024 until March 2025, during which time strategic guidance and coordination suffered.

- Fragmented institutional coordination, both at the national and provincial levels, made it difficult to advance activities that required multi-stakeholder engagement.

- Limited oversight and adaptive management, due to the absence of consistent technical leadership, prevented timely course corrections.

- Delays in procurement, both due to staff gaps and administrative constraints, further contributed to the slow start.

4. Challenges Currently Affecting Progress

As of mid-2025, several residual and emerging challenges persist:

- Continued staffing gaps: The recent resignation of the Project Manager (June 2025) and one Provincial Coordinator have once again affected planning and delivery capacity.

- Low absorptive capacity of implementing partners and subnational institutions, especially in remote provinces, limits the pace of implementation.

- Compressed timeline for tranche liquidation: The requirement to show significant delivery progress in 2025 adds further pressure on the team, especially in the context of backloaded implementation. The project team is facing dual pressure, i.e. expedited delivery against the ambitious AWP2025 target as well as covering for the last two years' backlog where the project couldn't deliver set targets.

- Project visibility and stakeholder confidence: Past underperformance has led to hesitancy among some partners, requiring renewed trust-building and communications efforts. i.e. SINU, provincial governments and some communities.

5. Remedial Actions Proposed / Underway

To address the above challenges and accelerate delivery in the second half of 2025, the project has adopted the following corrective measures:

- Reactivation of technical leadership: A full-time CTA has been re-hired since April 2025, ensuring strategic oversight, day-to-day guidance, and coordination.

- Ongoing recruitment of a new Project Manager and Provincial Coordinator to restore full staffing and management capacity.

- Fast-tracked procurement: With updated TORs and specifications in place, critical services and consultants are now being mobilized under Q3 procurement pipelines.

- Multi-year implementation roadmap being planned through a national strategic planning workshop (planned for August 2025), with defined outputs, budgets, and institutional responsibilities.

- Enhanced coordination with MECDM and UNDP to streamline reporting, disbursement, and partner engagement to avoid further slippage.

- Field deployment and visibility: Site-level activities are being planned through NGOs for launch in Q3 (IAS control, community awareness, ecosystem restoration), which will also serve as confidence-building milestones.

CO Programme Officer: Please include specific measures to manage the project's implementation performance

The Project is in the process of contracting a new Provincial Coordinator for Choiseul Province and recruitment process for a new Project Manager has been initiated. These two positions are critical to ensure the current implementation momentum is maintained and improved.

There is plan to have a national stakeholder consultations workshop in August 2025 to work on a multi-year AWP and get it through the internal approval process so that implementation momentum is maintained across multiple AWPs. Implementation gaps in the initial years (2023-2024) will be factored into the multi-year AWPs.

BPPS RTA: Please include specific measures to manage the project's implementation performance.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS

My rating for implementation progress is Unsatisfactory (U) for this PIR. The annual work plan for 2025 has a formidable budget of over USD 2 million, however as at 30 June 2025, the progress was less than 10% of the planned budget.

While many of the implementation bottlenecks that plagued the project last year have been addressed or under review currently, and implementation has picked up significantly this year (from barely reaching USD 38,000 at the end of 2024 to over 450,000 by June 2025, noting also that UNDP accounts for the Q2 is not closed by the time of the PIR report) there remains a significant gap between actual and planned disbursement. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and/or management of critical risks are off track with major issues and/or concerns. The workshop planned for Q3 is expected to support the PMU, IP and UNDP CO to develop an acceleration plan and review the implementation modality as recommended in the previous PIR and in my BTOR of October 2024.

Financial delivery remains significantly off track with the project's cumulative expenditure around 5% of the total budget. The PMU capacity has significantly improved and IP engagement is also higher in the reporting year. However, the project saw staff turnover in 2025 as well as in preceding years. The Project Manager vacated the post in June, necessitating the recruitment of a new PM. The CTA finally coming on board is considered a significant positive development for this project. The CTA comes with previous UNDP and GEF experience that helps the project immensely. The project is also on the path to recruit some strong technical capacities specifically for the biosafety and safeguards components.

It was noted during the oversight mission in 2024 that PMU and IP capacity to conform to GEF reporting and UNDP financial standards were weak. This has been mitigated to some extent by the onboarding of a strong CTA. However, the new project manager, finance and admin officer, provincial coordinators and liaison officers and National Project Director (IP) will require training in GEF project cycle, AWP preparation and reporting, UNDP financial and administrative systems, GEF reporting requirements etc. The project also requires a monitoring and safeguards officer; and a communications expert to join the team. These positions remain vacant, affecting the deliverables under these result areas.

The positive note is that project implementation is on an upward trajectory in 2025, supported by a strong CTA and CO management team. There is renewed effort to bring on board national and regional partners with the requisite capacity to support deliver this project on the ground. On a positive note, as the project has a longer implementation duration of six years, with corrective actions and timely measures in 2025, the project could be on solid ground by the Mid-Term Review (MTR) in May 2026.

For better implementation progress, the RTA advised to consolidate field locations to 2-3 from the current list of 5-6 widely dispersed sites. Given the logistical challenges encountered in Solomon Islands' implementation context and the remoteness of some of these locations, this recommendation is to ensure the PMU is concentrating efforts on just a few field locations in the next two years.

The project has taken up the recommendation that it should enter a brief planning stage in 2025 with the new CTA to finalise site selection, baseline establishment, and discuss potential revisions to the results framework's indicators and targets. This Q3 meeting is expected to yield an acceleration plan for the entire project and each outcome area.

1. Strengthen PMU capacity and mitigate risk of staff turnover. The UNDP CO and IP to discuss

ways to fulfill all PMU positions as soon as possible, and put in place an action plan to mitigate staff turnover, especially in key positions. This could include, hiring or nominating (by the IP) a deputy PM position, procuring a range of technical advisory services that last over the entire project duration, procuring the services of third-party partners to fulfill field coordination and implementation, and provide other services to the project such as gender mainstreaming and communications. The project requires a monitoring and safeguards officer to come on board immediately.

2. Capacitate the IP and RPs: The project should invest in capacity building of the MECDM, MAL and other partners to improve process-related knowledge and project related technical direction/ outcomes. This is essential that all partners are clear on the objectives of the project vis-à-vis their own organizational outlook/ priorities. The new project manager, finance and admin officer, provincial coordinators and liaison officers and National Project Director (IP) will require training in GEF project cycle, AWP preparation and reporting, UNDP financial and administrative systems, GEF reporting requirements etc once these positions are fully board. The RTA and DRR should work out a plan for this training with the new head of RCC. This will support better coordination with MECDM and UNDP to streamline reporting, disbursement, and partner engagement to avoid further slippage.

3. Seek third-party delivery options: This has been reiterated in the last PIR and the mission BTOR of the RTA in October. Due to the limitations in government absorptive capacity and the difficulty in sourcing and retaining suitable staff, third-party delivery options are highly encouraged. However, this may require a re-assessment of UNDP CO support to the project, and how the overhead costs of this increased CO support will be met.

4. Strengthen technical oversight and collaboration: Setting up of a second tier of technical oversight -a technical oversight committee- is recommended under the CTA to direct the project's implementation in the correct technical direction to achieve the objectives set out in the initially approved project document. This can consist of the NPD, CTA and a range of partners engaged in the project, stakeholders and community groups.

5. mplementation should be confined to one or two sites in the next 12-18 months: Due to the remoteness of some of the islands that are selected for piloting, logistical and human resource constraints, it is highly recommended that field implementation is confined to just one or two sites for the next 12-18 months and then, with lessons learnt and strengthened partnerships, field sites are expanded and increased systematically.

6. Project visibility and awareness should be increased: A low-hanging fruit and something the project can easily achieve with the engagement of a third-party national or international service provider. Increasing visibility, ensuring stakeholders are on board, close collaboration with responsible parties, showcasing the environmental issues that are being tackled by the project, supporting biosecurity awareness and education on social media.. these are easily achievable and low-hanging commitments that the project can make.

7. Update the stakeholder engagement plan, safeguards plans and gender action plan: These actions, guided by the UNDP safeguards advisor, should be prioritized as it is critical to update these plans in parallel to planning field implementation. Budgets should be allocated for safeguarding actions, stakeholder engagement and involvement, and to implement critical gender mainstreaming actions embedded in the project strategy.

8. Early finalization of multi-year workplans and secure ASL for 2026: It is highly recommended that the PMU and UNDP/IP work in tandem to finalise the AWPs for 2026 and ensure that ASL is secured early. This will avoid delays in transfers to IP and RPs, ensuring seamless implementation of the multi-year work plan.

9. Prepare for MTR: It is recommended that the project look at key outcome areas that can be prioritized and strategically implement key actions to demonstrate progression in development

outcomes that can be measurable at the time of the MTR in mid-2026. Please see specific recommendations to improve progress on development objectives below:

Outcome 1 on Strengthened inter-sectoral governance, capacity and strategies to mainstream biodiversity and LDN and support a nature-based economic pathway: The project should initiate a design workshop for the coordination mechanism, even if the EAC will be abolished, there needs to documented process on establishing an alternate coordination mechamism. For the short term, this could even be the technical advisory committee of the project. The PMU needs to record all concrete steps and discussions on the establishment and functioning of this committee. Capacity scorecards should be completed for the key government and non-governmental responsible parties by end of 2025, establishing the new baselines for capacity development and a capacity development plan put in place, and this should include process-related capacities including GEF and UNDP procedures.

Outcome 2 on Comprehensive IAS framework for early detection, control and management identifies and prioritizes highest-risk invasion pathways to safeguard natural and production systems from IAS: Ensure a draft NISSAP is available by MTR and that the NISSAP updating process is defined and stakeholders are fully consulted. To develop the EDRR for biosafety, it is strongly recommended that the project discusses options with the MAL (Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock) to cooperate with other development partners -such as Australian Aid- already active in the field of biosecurity to support.

Outcome 3 on Community participation and improved livelihoods from a nature-based economic pathway that supports biodiversity conservation and reduces threats from IAS and land degradation: With the ongoing work, CTA engagement and provincial coordinators, the project should be able to demonstrate spatial planning, stakeholder consultation, required government approvals, community moblisation, partner scoping and capacity assessment of such partners, awareness raising in the local areas etc for selected 1 or 2 sites as recommended above. Biodiversity profiles, species management plans for critical and globally significant species should be available with practical plans for improving their habitat and population stability. Safeguards related assessments and gender action plans should be mainstreamed and with capacity building for safeguards and gender mainstreaming done for provincial PMU staff and other partners, including local government.

Outcome 4 on Increased project impact, replication and upscaling through enhanced awareness and knowledge management: A simple KAP (knowledge, attitudes and practices) survey should be carried out with the partner organisations in the field locations and other project areas. The results of the KAP survey should lead to targeted communications material being developed and disseminated among the key stakeholders to overcome knowledge gaps, improve practices at community and organizational levels.

G. Project Governance

1) Please enter the dates of Project Board meetings during the reporting period (1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025)
2024-10-28
2024-08-26

H. Ratings and Overall Assessments

Role	2025 Development Objective Progress Rating	2025 Implementation Progress Rating
UNDP BPPS Technical Advisor	Moderately Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Role	2025 Overall Assessment
UNDP BPPS Technical Advisor	INTRODUCTION This is the second PIR for this Solomon Islands' project with the development objective of reducing risk to indigenous species and ecosystems from invasive alien species, land degradation and unsustainable resource use through effective government enabling and capacity, community participation and resilient blue/green livelihoods. Progress toward Development Objective is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) due to two outcomes being off-track, while Implementation Progress is rated Unsatisfactory (U) due to the very low level of financial progress reported in the last year. While there is some positive progress from the serious delays and lack of implementation capacity reported last year, the project is still behind its development objective and implementation progress. This includes finalising baselines for key indicators and site selection for demonstration, updating the safeguards and gender action plans, forging strong partnerships for field-based implementation, and setting up the governance architecture for managing and monitoring the different outputs of the project. During Year 1 the project faced many implementation challenges, including high staff turnover at the PMU. Staffing issues continued to plague the project- the project manager leaving for other employment after just one year in the job requiring a new recruitment process which is currently ongoing. The project finally filled the vacancy for a CTA in April 2025. A new project manager has just been recruited. Due to the high turnover of personnel supporting the project, cumulative financial delivery and timing of key implementation milestones are off track. DO PROGRESS At the objective level, the project has no results yet to report. The PMU, with UNDP support, launched a request for proposals (RFP) in early 2025 to start mapping and zonation of selected landscapes and seascapes in the five provinces where the project hopes to directly intervene. The technical evaluation of the RFP is complete and awaiting financial evaluation and awarding. This will enable the project to develop strong baselines to report against the objective level indicators, to ensure that site selection is supported with evidence, provide data for carbon estimation and that criteria for beneficiary selection is based on site-level information and beneficiary expectation. It is expected that once these baselines are confirmed and validated, the momentum on implementation will accelerate with the new PMU and reporting of actual objective level progress can begin in 2026. Outcome 1 on Strengthened inter-sectoral governance, capacity and strategies to mainstream biodiversity and LDN and support a nature-based economic pathway,

	the project's progress is off-track. While the project tried procure the technical assistance needed to operationalize and strengthen the EAC (Environmental Advisory Committee) as required in the project's results framework, there is a bill currently being discussed in the cabinet that may result in abolishing this very EAC. The IP has therefore proposed that the project hold off this technical assistance until further clarity is received on how the government will replace the functions of the EAC. As reported last PIR, this has implications on achieving the other outputs under this outcome- which are to improve institutional capacities for implementing integrated natural resources management in key sectors focused on biodiversity conservation, protected areas management and sustainable land management; and to develop and deploy plans and tools for conservation of globally threatened and endemic species, sustainable land management and importantly, the management of IAS in Solomon Islands. Therefore, all outcome-level indicators under Outcome 1 have scant progress to report. Outcome 2 is the availability of a comprehensive IAS framework for early detection, control and management which identifies and prioritizes highest-risk invasion pathways to safeguard natural and production systems from invasive species. This outcome reports significant progress from last PIR. The activity under NISSAP updating is planned to be completed by the end of 2025. Meanwhile, the capabilities of the Biosecurity Department of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL) were significantly improved by providing specialized equipment -such as a fumigation chamber at Noro Port in the Western province- to international and domestic ports. The outcome is currently reported as being on-track to achieve mid-term targets. Outcome 3 demonstrates progress in two of the four indicators. This outcome is expected to achieve improved livelihoods from a nature-based economic pathway that supports biodiversity conservation and reduces threats from invasive species and land degradation through community participation. This outcome is more complex to deliver upon, but arguably the most important outcome of the project that will serve to achieve many of the core indicators of this project. With strong technical leadership from the IP- Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM) and technical direction of the CTA, the project will be holding a strategic planning workshop in Q3 to enable the planning of many outputs of the project, but mostly the roll-out of outputs under Component 3. The project will procure the services of non-governmental organizations with relevant experience to execute community-based conservation interventions. With the information generated through the surveys undertaken to inform the baselines, and the information gathered in the field by these organisations, the project will be able to report on the hectarage of landscapes/ seascapes in the forthcoming PIR. The project, through months of negotiation, has finally reached an agreement with SINU to expedite stakeholder consultations and develop species action plans that will support the achievement of Outcome 3's specific indicators. Outcome 4, which aims to ensure increased project impact, replication and upscaling through enhanced awareness and knowledge management is off track. There have still not been any major activities carried out in year 2 of the project. The CTA is expected to lead the KAP (knowledge, attitudes and practices) survey

	that will help determine change in awareness of conservation threats and adverse impacts of IAS and unsustainable land management practices and improve practices across a wide range of stakeholders including government agencies, sub-national governments, communities and environmental organisations. The results of the KAP survey will be used to support the design and delivery of outputs in Component 1, 3 and 4. Therefore, the project should procure strong communications and knowledge management capacity to the PMU, which is currently lacking. The project, which has a significant budget for communications, outreach and community engagement, should begin developing material for branding and awareness among the key stakeholders, creating targeted communications packages for the different provinces and making sure the KAP survey is carried out in 2025 to inform future knowledge management activities of the project, that are expected to lead to attitude change in communities, national and sub-national government agencies, private sector and other key stakeholders. Of the four outcomes, two are on track and two are off track, while the project objective itself is on track. Follow-up actions plans have been discussed in detail between the project team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, and myself as RTA. These will be validated in the strategic planning workshop in Q3 in Honiara engaging counterparts from all government agencies and non-governmental stakeholders both at national and provincial level. During an oversight mission to the project in October 2024 it was proposed to reduce the number of sites where actual field investments would be made due to time constraints and logistical challenges in working in five spread-out island provinces. This decision should be made on some established and agreed criteria and endorsed by the Project Board. Evidence of the limited progress to date has been uploaded on the PIR platform and this includes BTOR of RTA oversight mission in 2024, TORs of key procurements and recruitments and Project Board minutes. RISK MANAGEMENT As in the first year, the project encountered multiple critical operational risks. These relate to IP capacity, high turnover of PMU staff, challenges in securing technical assistance including the Chief Technical Advisor, UNDP CO capacity, staffing shortages, and external risks like the Pacific Games in the Solomon Islands in late 2023. Managing these risks has been a multi-level endeavor. The PMU and CO have engaged in several discussions with the regional team—RPA and RTA—regarding their risk mitigation strategies and treatments. Given the unsatisfactory PIR rating in 2025 and the issues reported therein, the RTA undertook an oversight mission to Solomon Islands when the new UNDP Deputy Resident Representative came on board in Q3 2024. During the mission the RTA met with possible partners/responsible parties to deliver project components, the IP and RPs to the project, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and with other development partners (AusAid/ EU/ Embassy of Japan) working in biosecurity and community-based development programmes. Moving forward with the project's implementation, it is advised to hold at least

	quarterly risk discussions among the UNDP CO, Bureau, and PMU, and to promptly report any new or unresolved risks to UNDP senior management and IP. The Safeguards Advisor has highlighted that this project carries a significant risk rating for safeguards and must implement various safeguard-related assessments and actions, including a grievance redress mechanism (GRM). The RTA and SES Advisor will spearhead support for the PMU and UNDP CO in incorporating safeguard-related risk treatments into the forthcoming annual planning cycle. PROJECT GOVERNANCE Two Project Board Meetings were held in 2024. None in the first six months of 2025. The Board Meetings were focused on financial delivery and implementation issues, staffing gaps and site selection for implementation. The project governance is satisfactory at the project board level. It is recommended to hold more frequent meetings of a smaller working group to accelerate implementation. GENDER AND KNOWELDGE MANAGEMENT There is very little progress in implementing the gender action plan. Currently, there is no knowledge management expertise in the PMU and therefore a knowledge management plan has not been developed or implemented in this reporting period. COFINANCE The project has not reported on a cofinancing value. The total cofinancing for the project remains unchanged at USD 21.74 million. The project is supported by the MECDM (the IP) and MAL (key RP) with staff, equipment, space for office and transport for project activities as co-financing commitment. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS My rating for implementation progress is Unsatisfactory (U) for this PIR. The annual work plan for 2025 has a formidable budget of over USD 2 million, however as at 30 June 2025, the progress was less than 10% of the planned budget. While many of the implementation bottlenecks that plagued the project last year have been addressed or under review currently, and implementation has picked up significantly this year (from barely reaching USD 38,000 at the end of 2024 to over 450,000 by June 2025, noting also that UNDP accounts for the Q2 is not closed by the time of the PIR report) there remains a significant gap between actual and planned disbursement. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and/or management of critical risks are off track with major issues and/or concerns. The workshop planned for Q3 is expected to support the PMU, IP and UNDP CO to develop an acceleration plan and review the implementation modality as recommended in the previous PIR and in my BTOR of October 2024. Financial delivery remains significantly off track with the project’s cumulative expenditure around 5% of the total budget. The PMU capacity has significantly

	improved and IP engagement is also higher in the reporting year. However, the project saw staff turnover in 2025 as well as in preceding years. The Project Manager vacated the post in June, necessitating the recruitment of a new PM. The CTA finally coming on board is considered a significant positive development for this project. The CTA comes with previous UNDP and GEF experience that helps the project immensely. The project is also on the path to recruit some strong technical capacities specifically for the biosafety and safeguards components. It was noted during the oversight mission in 2024 that PMU and IP capacity to conform to GEF reporting and UNDP financial standards were weak. This has been mitigated to some extent by the onboarding of a strong CTA. However, the new project manager, finance and admin officer, provincial coordinators and liaison officers and National Project Director (IP) will require training in GEF project cycle, AWP preparation and reporting, UNDP financial and administrative systems, GEF reporting requirements etc. The project also requires a monitoring and safeguards officer; and a communications expert to join the team. These positions remain vacant, affecting the deliverables under these result areas. The positive note is that project implementation is on an upward trajectory in 2025, supported by a strong CTA and CO management team. There is renewed effort to bring on board national and regional partners with the requisite capacity to support deliver this project on the ground. On a positive note, as the project has a longer implementation duration of six years, with corrective actions and timely measures in 2025, the project could be on solid ground by the Mid-Term Review (MTR) in May 2026. For better implementation progress, the RTA advised to consolidate field locations to 2-3 from the current list of 5-6 widely dispersed sites. Given the logistical challenges encountered in Solomon Islands' implementation context and the remoteness of some of these locations, this recommendation is to ensure the PMU is concentrating efforts on just a few field locations in the next two years. The project has taken up the recommendation that it should enter a brief planning stage in 2025 with the new CTA to finalise site selection, baseline establishment, and discuss potential revisions to the results framework's indicators and targets. This Q3 meeting is expected to yield an acceleration plan for the entire project and each outcome area. 1. Strengthen PMU capacity and mitigate risk of staff turnover. The UNDP CO and IP to discuss ways to fulfill all PMU positions as soon as possible, and put in place an action plan to mitigate staff turnover, especially in key positions. This could include, hiring or nominating (by the IP) a deputy PM position, procuring a range of technical advisory services that last over the entire project duration, procuring the services of third-party partners to fulfill field coordination and implementation, and provide other services to the project such as gender mainstreaming and communications. The project requires a monitoring and safeguards officer to come on board immediately. 2. Capacitate the IP and RPs: The project should invest in capacity building of the MECDM, MAL and other partners to improve process-related knowledge and project related technical direction/ outcomes. This is essential that all partners are clear on the objectives of the project vis-à-vis their own organizational outlook/ priorities. The new project manager, finance and admin officer, provincial coordinators and liaison officers and National Project Director (IP) will require training in GEF project cycle, AWP preparation and reporting,

	UNDP financial and administrative systems, GEF reporting requirements etc once these positions are fully board. The RTA and DRR should work out a plan for this training with the new head of RCC. This will support better coordination with MECDM and UNDP to streamline reporting, disbursement, and partner engagement to avoid further slippage. 3. Seek third-party delivery options: This has been reiterated in the last PIR and the mission BTOR of the RTA in October. Due to the limitations in government absorptive capacity and the difficulty in sourcing and retaining suitable staff, third-party delivery options are highly encouraged. However, this may require a re-assessment of UNDP CO support to the project, and how the overhead costs of this increased CO support will be met. 4. Strengthen technical oversight and collaboration: Setting up of a second tier of technical oversight -a technical oversight committee- is recommended under the CTA to direct the project's implementation in the correct technical direction to achieve the objectives set out in the initially approved project document. This can consist of the NPD, CTA and a range of partners engaged in the project, stakeholders and community groups. 5. mplementation should be confined to one or two sites in the next 12-18 months: Due to the remoteness of some of the islands that are selected for piloting, logistical and human resource constraints, it is highly recommended that field implementation is confined to just one or two sites for the next 12-18 months and then, with lessons learnt and strengthened partnerships, field sites are expanded and increased systematically. 6. Project visibility and awareness should be increased: A low-hanging fruit and something the project can easily achieve with the engagement of a third-party national or international service provider. Increasing visibility, ensuring stakeholders are on board, close collaboration with responsible parties, showcasing the environmental issues that are being tackled by the project, supporting biosecurity awareness and education on social media.. these are easily achievable and low-hanging commitments that the project can make. 7. Update the stakeholder engagement plan, safeguards plans and gender action plan: These actions, guided by the UNDP safeguards advisor, should be prioritized as it is critical to update these plans in parallel to planning field implementation. Budgets should be allocated for safeguarding actions, stakeholder engagement and involvement, and to implement critical gender mainstreaming actions embedded in the project strategy. 8. Early finalization of multi-year workplans and secure ASL for 2026: It is highly recommended that the PMU and UNDP/IP work in tandem to finalise the AWPs for 2026 and ensure that ASL is secured early. This will avoid delays in transfers to IP and RPs, ensuring seamless implementation of the multi-year work plan. 9. Prepare for MTR: It is recommended that the project look at key outcome areas that can be prioritized and strategically implement key actions to demonstrate progression in development outcomes that can be measurable at the time of the MTR in mid-2026. Please see specific recommendations to improve progress on development objectives below: Outcome 1 on Strengthened inter-sectoral governance, capacity and strategies to mainstream biodiversity and LDN and support a nature-based economic pathway: The project should initiate a design workshop for the coordination mechanism,

	even if the EAC will be abolished, there needs to documented process on establishing an alternate coordination mechamism. For the short term, this could even be the technical advisory committee of the project. The PMU needs to record all concrete steps and discussions on the establishment and functioning of this committee. Capacity scorecards should be completed for the key government and non-governmental responsible parties by end of 2025, establishing the new baselines for capacity development and a capacity development plan put in place, and this should include process-related capacities including GEF and UNDP procedures. Outcome 2 on Comprehensive IAS framework for early detection, control and management identifies and prioritizes highest-risk invasion pathways to safeguard natural and production systems from IAS: Ensure a draft NISSAP is available by MTR and that the NISSAP updating process is defined and stakeholders are fully consulted. To develop the EDRR for biosafety, it is strongly recommended that the project discusses options with the MAL (Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock) to cooperate with other development partners -such as Australian Aid- already active in the field of biosecurity to support. Outcome 3 on Community participation and improved livelihoods from a nature-based economic pathway that supports biodiversity conservation and reduces threats from IAS and land degradation: With the ongoing work, CTA engagement and provincial coordinators, the project should be able to demonstrate spatial planning, stakeholder consultation, required government approvals, community moblisation, partner scoping and capacity assessment of such partners, awareness raising in the local areas etc for selected 1 or 2 sites as recommended above. Biodiversity profiles, species management plans for critical and globally significant species should be available with practical plans for improving their habitat and population stability. Safeguards related assessments and gender action plans should be mainstreamed and with capacity building for safeguards and gender mainstreaming done for provincial PMU staff and other partners, including local government. Outcome 4 on Increased project impact, replication and upscaling through enhanced awareness and knowledge management: A simple KAP (knowledge, attitudes and practices) survey should be carried out with the partner organisations in the field locations and other project areas. The results of the KAP survey should lead to targeted communications material being developed and disseminated among the key stakeholders to overcome knowledge gaps, improve practices at community and organizational levels. --- IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

	This project has been an unfortunate victim to the lack of knowledge transfer between project development and implementation. Institutional memory and technical information generated during the PPG period have not been seamlessly integrated into the implementation phase. This is an issue that affects many GEF projects, but in this case the issues associated were amplified due to the gap between project development and PMU recruitment, turnover of staff at both country office, and later the recruited PMU, the lack of engagement of the IP in the PPG- which have all contributed to the lack of knowledge transfer between these key stages of the project cycle. To mitigate this, the RTA discussed the results framework with the new CTA and PM in May 2025. In addition, the planned strategic planning workshop will be able to bridge the gap in knowledge transfer and engage stakeholders who have been left out of the implementation 'loop' since the PPG phase ended. The UNDP CO and IP believe that the project is too complex -both technically and institutionally, spread across five provinces in a country with many logistical challenges. In the Solomons, there are very few options available for implementation support outside of the government structure. The country office is seeking partners to support the IP to deliver the project more effectively, especially Component 3 which supports field-level action to manage invasives and promote livelihoods that are nature-friendly. Discussions have been initiated with SINU (Solomon Islands National University) to deliver certain technical components related to the policy/ regulations and invasives management standards and the updating of the NISSAP (National Strategy for Invasive Species) It is noted that UNDP CO in the Solomon Islands' is providing increased implementation support to expedite progress. This support needs to be re-evaluated and an agreement with the IP on the (enhanced/expanded) execution support services required by the project is necessary. Any amendments to the originally approved support services, as detailed in the LOA annexed to the project document, will necessitate re-approval from the GEF. Several residual and emerging challenges have been noted by the CO and PM which may affect future implementation progress. These include; Continued staffing gaps: The recent resignation of the Project Manager (June 2025) and one Provincial Coordinator have once again affected planning and delivery capacity. Staff turnover may continue to be a problem. Project visibility and stakeholder confidence: Past underperformance has led to hesitancy among some partners, requiring renewed trust-building and communications efforts. i.e. SINU, provincial governments and some communities. Low absorptive capacity of implementing partners and subnational institutions, especially in remote provinces, limits the pace of implementation.
UNDP Country Office Programme Officer	The Project is in the process of contracting a new Provincial Coordinator for Choiseul Province and recruitment process for a new Project Manager has been initiated. These two positions are critical to ensure the current implementation momentum is maintained and improved.

	It has been planned to have a national strategic planning stakeholder consultations workshop in August 2025 to review implementation progress leading up to the project's scheduled MTR in 2026. The Planning workshop will bring together key stakeholders from the national government, provincial government, NGOs, civil society organizations and community representatives and will facilitate on the Project's work on a multi-year AWP and get it through the internal approval process so that implementation momentum is maintained across multiple AWPs. Implementation gaps in the initial years (2023-2024) will be factored into the multi-year AWPs. The IP (MECDM) has also requested the project if additional administrative support can be secured to support project specific administrative matters including procurement, payments, FACE Form and liquidation. ----
Project Manager/Coordinator	The project has been facing numerous challenges since its inception including frequent staff turn-over (PM, CTA and provincial coordinator) until the end of 2024. Also, very recently again, the project manager and one of the provincial coordinators resigned leaving behind another layer of challenges in addition to the backlog that the current team is striving to resolve. These challenges led to a very meagre rate of project delivery, i.e. 2% in 2024. However, the project CTA was onboarded in April 2025 and assigned the role of project manager to one of the provincial coordinators on interim basis. The project has now picked the pace and steadily improved the delivery rate, i.e. 18% against the approved AWP2025 by first week of July. This steady but consistent improvement demonstrates good results expected by the year end. ----
GEF Operational Focal point	----
Project Implementing Partner	----
Other Partners	----

I. Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.

CO Programme Officer: Please mark each category for which a minor amendment occurred during this reporting period (1 July 2024- 30 June 2025).

For each category that is marked, please provide a brief description of the change that occurred in the associated text box. You may attach supporting documentation, as appropriate.

The purpose of this section is to capture adaptive management and measure project proactiveness, an indicator outlined in paragraph 70 of the GEF-8 Policy Directions available here.

A) Results Framework
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to the 'Results framework'
(not set or not applicable)
B) Components and cost
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'Components and cost'
(not set or not applicable)
C) Institutional and implementation arrangements
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'Institutional and implementation arrangements'
(not set or not applicable)
D) Financial management
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'Financial Management'
(not set or not applicable)
E) Implementation schedule
Yes
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'Implementation schedule'
the 2025 AWP captures/includes key activities that were scheduled in 2024 AWP but are not implemented in 2024.

F) Executing Entity
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'Executing Entity'
(not set or not applicable)
G) Executing Entity Category
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'Executing Entity Category'
(not set or not applicable)
H) Minor project objective change
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'minor project objective change'
(not set or not applicable)
I) Safeguards
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'Safeguards'
(not set or not applicable)
J) Risk Analysis
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'Risk Analysis'
(not set or not applicable)
K) Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%
No
Provide a description of the change to GEF project financing up to 5%
(not set or not applicable)
L) Co-financing
No
Provide a description of the change(s) to 'Co-financing'
(not set or not applicable)
M) Location of project activity

No
Provide a description of the change(s) to project location activity
(not set or not applicable)
Please provide a description of other types of minor amendments that do not fall under any of the above categories. For example, minor changes to the project's Gender Action Plan and/or gender activities can be captured here.
No other types of minor ammendments

J. Gender

Progress in Advancing Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

1) Please review the project's Gender Analysis and Action Plan. If the document is not attached or an updated Gender Analysis and/or Gender Action Plan is available please upload the document below or send to the Regional Programme Associate to upload in PIMS+. Please note that all projects approved since 1 July 2014 are required to carry out a gender analysis and all projects approved since 1 July 2018 are required to have a gender analysis and action plan.
PIMS_6566_Annex_11_Gender_Analysis_Gender_Action_Plan_Final _22-Jan-2022_1.docx
Quantum Gender Marker Rating
GEN2: gender equality as significant objective
2) Please indicate in which results areas the project is contributing to gender equality (you may select more than one results area, or select not applicable):
Contributing to closing gender gaps in access to and control over resources: No
Improving the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance: Yes
Targeting socio-economic benefits and services for women: Yes
Not applicable: No
3) Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and the empowerment of women. **Please explain how the results reported addressed the different needs of men or women, changed norms, values, and power structures, and/or contributed to transforming or challenging gender inequalities and discrimination.**
N/A
4) Please describe how work to advance gender equality and women's empowerment enhanced the project's environmental and/or resilience outcomes.
N/A

K. Risk Management

A) Overall Risk Management

BPPS RTA: Please discuss the risks flagged in the Quantum project Risk Register and the VF Risk Dashboard in PIMS+ with the CO and then provide an assessment of project risk management undertaken during the reporting period. Document actions, agreed with the CO, to address all project risks in the coming year.
As in the first year, the project encountered multiple critical operational risks. These relate to IP capacity, high turnover of PMU staff, challenges in securing technical assistance including the Chief Technical Advisor, UNDP CO capacity, staffing shortages, and external risks like the Pacific Games in the Solomon Islands in late 2023. Managing these risks has been a multi-level endeavor. The PMU and CO have engaged in several discussions with the regional team—RPA and RTA—regarding their risk mitigation strategies and treatments. Given the unsatisfactory PIR rating in 2025 and the issues reported therein, the RTA undertook an oversight mission to Solomon Islands when the new UNDP Deputy Resident Representative came on board in Q3 2024. During the mission the RTA met with possible partners/responsible parties to deliver project components, the IP and RPs to the project, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and with other development partners (AusAid/ EU/ Embassy of Japan) working in biosecurity and community-based development programmes. Moving forward with the project's implementation, it is advised to hold at least quarterly risk discussions among the UNDP CO, Bureau, and PMU, and to promptly report any new or unresolved risks to UNDP senior management and IP. The Safeguards Advisor has highlighted that this project carries a significant risk rating for safeguards and must implement various safeguard-related assessments and actions, including a grievance redress mechanism (GRM). The RTA and SES Advisor will spearhead support for the PMU and UNDP CO in incorporating safeguard-related risk treatments into the forthcoming annual planning cycle.

B) SES Implementation

2b) Provide an update on progress, challenges and outcomes related to stakeholder engagement based on the description in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval.
Stakeholder engagement plan was formulated at the PPG stage, which is yet to be reviewed and, if required, updated.

L. Knowledge Management & Communications

The **Project Manager** must complete the three questions below.

1) Please provide progress on the implementation of the project's Knowledge Management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval. If there is no KM approach/strategy, please comment on how the project is capturing and disseminating best practices and lessons learned.
The project has recently recruited an international consultant to draft the KMC strategy; which is yet to be delivered. Moreover, as mentioned above, the best practices of the project interventions will be compiled once the project hits the ground during this forthcoming reporting period.
2) Please provide URLs specific to this project in the relevant field below. Please categorize the URLs appropriately (for example: project websites, social media sites, media coverage, etc.)
https://solomons.gov.sb/mal-and-undp-reaffirm-commitment-to-agricultural-revitalization-and-national-development/#:~:text=The%20Ministry%20of%20Agriculture%20and%20Livestock%20%28MAL%29%20this,path%20toward%20agricultural%20revitalization%20in%20the%20Solomon%20Islands.
3) In the PIR platform, please upload any supporting files, including the project's Communications Strategy, photos, videos, stories and other communication/knowledge materials.
PO_10338213_3.pdf

M. Annex - Ratings Definitions

Development Objective Progress Ratings Definitions

(HS) Highly Satisfactory: Project is on track to exceed its end-of-project targets by project closure. The project can be presented as 'outstanding practice'.

(S) Satisfactory: Project is on track to achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure and any minor challenges are being addressed through an adaptive management plan. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.

(MS) Moderately Satisfactory: Project is on track to achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure and minor challenges can be addressed if an adaptive management plan is promptly put in place.

(MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is expected to only partially achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure. Project results might still be achieved by project closure if adaptive management is undertaken immediately.

(U) Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is expected to only partially achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure. Project results might be partially achieved by project closure if major adaptive management is undertaken immediately.

(HU) Highly Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is not expected to achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure and adaptive management is not expected to materialize.

Implementation Progress Ratings Definitions

(HS) Highly Satisfactory: Implementation is exceeding expectations. Implementation of all outputs/activities is fully on track, proceeding as planned, The implementation of the project can be presented as 'outstanding practice'.

(S) Satisfactory: Implementation is proceeding as planned with minor challenges that are being addressed. Implementation of all outputs/activities is on track with minor deviations The implementation of the project can be presented as 'good practice'.

(MS) Moderately Satisfactory: Implementation is proceeding as planned with minor challenges that have not yet been addressed. Implementation of most outputs/activities is on track with minor deviations.

(MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory: Implementation is not proceeding as planned and faces implementation challenges. Implementation of many outputs/activities is off track Implementation progress could be improved if adaptive management is undertaken immediately.

(U) Unsatisfactory: Implementation is not proceeding as planned and faces major implementation challenges. Implementation of most outputs/activities is off track.

(HU) Highly Unsatisfactory: Implementation is seriously under-performing. Implementation of all outputs/activities is severely off track.