

# National Programme Submission Form – Solomon Islands

---

UN-REDD PROGRAMME 5<sup>TH</sup> POLICY BOARD  
MEETING

---

4-5 November 2010  
Washington D.C., USA



# National Joint Programme (NJP)

## Submission Form to the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board

### 1. Policy Board Submission

Policy Board Meeting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No. 5	Inter-sessional Meeting <input type="checkbox"/>
Date of Meeting: 4-5 November	Date of Inter-sessional Decision:

### 2. National Joint Programme Summary

#### *Details of National Joint Programme*

Country	Solomon Islands
Programme <sup>1</sup> Title	Solomon Islands Programme: Support to Initial Readiness
Implementing Partner(s) <sup>2</sup>	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology

#### *Details of Participating UN Organizations' Representatives*

UN Resident Coordinator: <i>Name:</i> Knut Ostby	Contact details <i>Telephone:</i> +679 331 2500 <i>Email:</i> knut.ostby@undp.org
FAO: <i>Name:</i> José Antonio Prado <i>Title:</i> Director Forest Assessment, Management and Conservation Division	Contact details: <i>Telephone:</i> +393402521539 <i>Email:</i> JoseAntonio.Prado@fao.org
UNDP: <i>Name:</i> Shabnam Malik <i>Title:</i> Manager, Solomon Islands	Contact details: <i>Telephone:</i> +677 22747 <i>Email:</i> Shabnam.mallick@undp.org
UNEP: <i>Name:</i> Angela Cropper <i>Title:</i> Deputy Executive Director	Contact details: <i>Telephone:</i> +254 20 762 4020 <i>Email:</i> angela.cropper@unep.org

#### *Type of National Joint Programme*

Full NJP:	Initial NJP
<input type="checkbox"/> New Full NJP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Initial NJP
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation from an Initial NJP	<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation from previous funding
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain)

<sup>1</sup> The term "programme" is used for projects, programmes and joint programmes.

<sup>2</sup> Refers to National counterparts. List the lead entity first.

### 3. Executive Summary

The logging industry is the single most significant economic sector in the Solomon Islands; it contributes 67% of export earnings, and some 12-13% of total government revenue. As much as 50% of the employed workforce may be associated directly or indirectly with the forest sector. Officially, annual export earnings in 2007 were approximately USD 110 million, though this is likely to be a significant under-estimate, as it is known that not all of exports are accurately assessed.

Key governance issues preventing sustainable management of forest resources in the Solomon Islands include:

- Outdated and incomplete legislation. The main legislation governing the sector dates from 1969 and is inadequate to govern a vastly expanded industry. Provisions for duty remissions exist, from which logging companies have been major beneficiaries, while rarely complying with requirements to use these savings for reforestation or other works at community level
- Uneven application of the rule of law. Companies are rarely fined or suspended or face license cancellations despite generally poor (and sometimes illegal) logging practices. Timber license hearings, required under the Timber Resources Acquisition Process are sometimes held with minimal advance notification, effectively limiting participation.
- Incomplete enforcement. Smuggling and misclassification of products result in revenue loss; and therefore over-exploitation compared with actual revenue flows
- Inaccessibility and cost of legal proceedings, which act as a deterrent to seeking advice and compensation.
- Weak coordination and cooperation within and among customary ownership groups. Negotiations with logging companies are often conducted with and by the elite few within a community and little communication about the process with other tribal members; benefits (financial) accrue to only a few individuals and/or lower than expected royalties; .
- Weak formal governance structures. A combination of the preceding factors results in “elite capture” of a disproportionate share of total revenues.

This initial programme will directly contribute to **UNDAF Outcome 2**: “*National and regional governance systems exercise the principles of inclusive good governance, respecting and upholding human rights; and resilient Pacific island communities participate in decision-making at all levels.*” and to **UNDAF Outcome 4**: “*The mainstreaming of environmental sustainability and sustainable energy into regional and national policies, planning frameworks and programmes; and Pacific communities sustainably using their environment, natural resources and cultural heritage.*”

This programme responds to lessons learned from previous UN support to the Solomon Islands, as well as to lessons learned from other UN-REDD country programmes. The current UNDP CPAP is built on lessons learned from previous cycles of UN support to the Solomon Islands. Such lessons include the need to:

### 3. Executive Summary

- *Build stronger partnerships at the highest levels, including enhanced donor partnerships for improved resource mobilization; and*
- *Ensure national commitment to, and ownership of programmes by enhancing involvement of key stakeholders ... (UNDP CPAP 2008-2012, page 4)*

The **Objective** of this initial UN-REDD programme is “*to establish the necessary institutional and individual capacities required to develop full REDD+ readiness in the Solomon Islands*”. This Objective will be secured through three **Outcomes** and associated **Outputs**. These are:

**Outcome 1:** REDD+ readiness supported by effective, inclusive and participatory management processes. The initial programme will deliver this Outcome through the following two Outputs:

Output 1.1: A broad-based, multi-stakeholder national REDD+ working group

Output 1.2: Collated and analyzed forest resource data

**Outcome 2:** REDD+ stakeholders have a comprehensive understanding of the potential benefits and risks associated with REDD+. The initial programme will deliver this Outcome through the following two Outputs:

Output 2.1: A constituency-based education and awareness raising programme.

Output 2.2: A process to ensure the right of free, prior and informed consent for actions to be undertaken on REDD+

**Outcome 3:** Preliminary capacity developed for REL formulation and MRV. This will be achieved through two Outputs:

Output 3.1: REL and MRV capacity assessment

Output 3.2: Assessment of potential for regional cooperation on MRV

<b>4. National Programme Budget (UN-REDD Fund Source only)*</b>	
<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>National Total UNDP (\$)  Pooled funding on behalf of UNDP and FAO</b>
<b>Outcome 1:</b> REDD+ readiness supported by effective, inclusive and participatory management processes.	102,804
<b>Outcome 2:</b> REDD+ stakeholders have a comprehensive understanding of the potential benefits and risks associated with REDD+	238,318
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Preliminary capacity developed for REL formulation and MRV	121,495
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Programme management	51,402
<b>Sub-total</b>	514,019
<b>Indirect Support Costs</b>	35,981
<b>Grand Total (\$)</b>	550,000

NOTES: A breakdown of the budget allocations using the UNDG “harmonized input budget categories” must be provided to the UN-REDD Secretariat (for onward transmission to the Administrative Agent) with the signed NJP document. Please see Annex 1.

## 5. Secretariat Review

### *Submission Criteria*

(a)	Is the NJP consistent with the UN-REDD Programme Framework Document?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Has the UN Resident Coordinator been involved in submitting the NJP?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Is documentation of the in-country validation meeting(s) included?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Did the validation include the national government counterpart (or designate)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Did the validation include civil society/Indigenous Peoples representation as per the UN-REDD Operational Guidance <sup>3</sup> ?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(f)	Does the NJP comply with the required format ( <i>incl., cover page, results framework, etc.</i> )?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(g)	Does the NJP comply with UN-REDD Rules of Procedure and relevant Operational Guidance?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(h)	Is the required budget allocation provided (see section 3 above)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(i)	Are the Indirect Support Costs within the approved rate?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(j)	Is the Programme Summary completed? ( <i>for posting on website</i> )	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(k)	Is the Progress Report included? ( <i>for supplementary funding only</i> )	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>

If the answer is 'No' or 'Unclear' to any question, or further explanation is required, please provide here:  
 This is an Initial National Programme, therefore no validation meeting was held.

<sup>3</sup> In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways:

i. Self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements:

- Selected through a participatory, consultative process
- Having national coverage or networks
- Previous experience working with the Government and UN system
- Demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society/Indigenous Peoples organizations

ii. Representative(s) who participated in a UN-REDD Programme scoping and/or formulation mission and sit(s) on a UN-REDD Programme consultative body established as a result of the mission

iii. Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or Indigenous Peoples organizations (e.g. the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Programme Steering Committee)

## 5. Secretariat Review

### *Review Issues*

(l) Ownership of the NJP by government and non-government stakeholders

The government of Solomon Islands has been actively seeking opportunities to start REDD+ readiness activities and the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology has led the development of this proposal. Participation by other government and non-government stakeholders in developing the proposal is unclear, although future participation is included as part of outcomes 1 and 2.

(m) Level of consultation, participation and engagement

The document identifies relevant stakeholders for REDD+ in the Solomon Islands that would be consulted in the process of preparing the National REDD+ strategy. These stakeholders include relevant Ministries (Agriculture and Forestry), donors, and NGOs, including an NGO working on Indigenous Peoples issues. A participatory and consultative process to design a national REDD+ strategy is proposed through outcomes 1 and 2.

(n) Programme effectiveness, coherence with country strategies and other relevant initiatives, and cost-efficiency

The document has been designed in coherence with relevant countries strategies, and complements initiatives supported through the UN, bilateral cooperation, and NGOs. The initiatives are described in the document.

(o) Management of risks and likelihood of success

Risks are described in the document, but strategies to address them need to be incorporated prior signature in a risk log framework.

## 5. Secretariat Review

*Review Issues*

Other points:

## 6. Independent Technical Review

(a) Was an independent technical review undertaken?

Yes  No

If not, why not?

This is an Initial National Programme; therefore no independent technical review was conducted.

## 6. Independent Technical Review

### *Synthesis of Independent Technical Review*

## 7. Secretariat Response

- Provide comments and request re-submission to a future Policy Board meeting
- Provide comments to be addressed before forwarding to the next immediate Policy Board meeting
- Forward to the Policy Board (with comments if necessary) with a recommendation to fund specific portions or phases (including an inception phase) of the NJP
- Forward to the Policy Board (with comments if necessary) with a recommendation to fund the NJP.

### Explanation of Response:

The proposal by Solomon Islands is consistent with the UN-REDD Programme Framework document and the Programmes rules of procedure. Its implementation can support the Government on developing the basis of a REDD+ strategy. Thus, the Secretariat forwards the proposal to the Policy Board with a recommendation to approve the funding allocation request.

## 8. Decision of the UN-REDD Policy Board

Decision of the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board:

- Full NJP approved, as per budget allocation in Section 4
- Initial NJP approved, as per budget allocation in Section 4
- Approved with a revised budget of \$
- Approved with modification/condition
- Deferred/returned with comments for further consideration

Comments:

***Vincent Kasulu***  
***Director of Sustainable Development***  
***Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism, DRC***  
**Co-Chair, UN-REDD Programme Policy Board**

---

**Signature**

*5 November 2010*

***Veerle Vandeweerd***  
***Director, Environment and Energy Group, UNDP***  
**Co-Chair, UN-REDD Programme Policy Board**

---

**Signature**

*5 November 2010*

**9. Administrative Agent Review**

Action taken by the Administrative Agent: Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office, Bureau of Management, UNDP

Programme consistent with provisions of the UN-REDD Programme MDTF Memorandum of Understanding and Standard Administrative Arrangements with donors.

Administrative Agent:  
Bisrat Aklilu, Executive Co-ordinator, Multi-Donor Trust Funds  
Bureau of Management, United Nations Development Programme - MDTF Office

.....  
Signature

.....  
Date

## Annex 1: Standard Joint Programme Budget

CATEGORY	ITEM DESCRIPTION	UNIT COST	NUMBER OF UNITS	AMOUNT**
1. Supplies, commodities, equipment and transport				
2. Personnel (staff, consultants and travel)				
3. Training of counterparts				
4. Contracts				
5. Other direct costs				
<b>Total Programme Costs</b>				
Indirect Support costs***				
<b>GRAND TOTAL**</b>				

\*\* The AA requires only completion of 'AMOUNT,' 'Total Programme Costs,' Indirect Support Costs,' and 'GRAND TOTAL.' The Steering Committee may require additional details which can be included in this budget.

\*\*\* Indirect support cost should be in line with the rate or range specified in the Fund TOR (or Joint Programme Document) and MOU and SAA for the particular JP. Indirect costs of the Participating Organizations recovered through programme support costs is 7%.

All other costs incurred by each Participating UN Organization in carrying out the activities for which it is responsible under the Fund will be recovered as direct costs, in accordance with the UN General Assembly resolution 62/209 (2008 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review principle of full cost recovery).

Note: This budget format needs to be submitted for each Participating Organization's budget allocation within a National Joint Programme, in addition to the total budget for the entire Joint Programme.