

Enhancing integrated sustainable management to safeguard Samoa's natural resources

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10410

Countries

Samoa

Project Name

Enhancing integrated sustainable management to safeguard Samoa's natural resources

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/14/2022

Review completed by PM

4/25/2022

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/25/2022

Yes.

4/4/2022

No, please change the co-financing type for all the government resources to "public expenditure".

Agency Response

Agency Response 15/4/2022

The co-financing terminology has been adjusted to fully align with GEF Guidelines on Co-financing (see Table C of GEF CER for details).

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/25/2022

Yes.

4/4/2022

No, please provide some information separating the different activities funded by the PPG.

Agency Response

Agency Response 15/4/2022

This has been done (see Annex C of the CER for details)

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/25/2022

Yes, thank you for the revisions. The comment may not have been clear, so we will restate. However, the changes made to the document seem to reflect this perspective.

Let's separate two concepts -

Databases - In this context, a database can be something as simple as a spreadsheet. However, it would be good to start by pulling information from existing sources and updating as necessary. It seems likely that it will be about adding information as previously invasive species in the region are still mostly likely an invasion threat and basic information would be correct. Therefore, regional databases as well as existing national information would be a good starting point to use resources efficiently but there is logic to include Samoa-specific information. However, it would be good to share this compiled information and find ways to collaborate with other countries and territories (such as American Samoa) on these efforts as described.

Apps - Much like how a database colloquially could be many different things, the definition of an app we used is a program for a mobile phone. It does not appear that the project will be supporting an app specifically. Apps require significant upfront costs as it's not simply about creating an app, but something that works well and in low/no data situations. Therefore, we strongly encourage projects to work with existing apps rather than creating one from scratch. Given available budget, working with an existing app (which is responsible for all the security and operating system updates) is preferable and comes with real added value in the case of iNaturalist.

4/4/2022

No, please address the following:

- Creation of new programs, databases, interfaces, etc - This project proposes to undertake a number of new data collection activities in addition creating various new programs. It seems that much of this information and effort should have already been undertaken at a regional level or for other PSIDS. It would be a better use of resources to build from that work and experience. How will the project do this? In addition, for IAS reporting we suggest that the iNaturalist platform and app be considered as it is managed and maintained already by an NGO meaning that responsibility and cost could be managed by others. New Zealand has been working on special version which may have more of a focus on IAS that could be a good fit for Samoa perhaps with tweaks.

- Partnerships - It was a surprise to not see the PRISSMS project or other national PSIDS projects in the partnerships. Please include this information.

- Mainstreaming - The description of some of the catchment specific activities make it sound like the IAS activities are being done in a vacuum rather than as part of a larger mainstreaming effort. It could help to clarify this.

Agency Response

Agency Response 15/4/2022

Thank you for the comments

The project will certainly support feeding national information to relevant regional and global dbs as a complementary approach to establishment of a national system, but not as substitute for it. While, we agree that it would be appropriate to use existing regional data collection and management systems (and apps) to economize on the use of resources, we also think that (i) regional databases are generally not updated regularly and/or can miss significant bodies of work from local levels including the work of localized government efforts such as those which may be done by agricultural, environmental and other government agencies within the country of concern; (ii) regional databases can only be comprehensive to the extent these are regularly updated and fed information from national systems; (iii) public data bases including apps such as that mentioned have their use and place, to coordinate and fine tune planning, resource engagement and utilization, etc. but a country ideally would need to have a pest database which they can build, modify, maintain, regularly update and utilize to support best use of resources across sectors; (iv) other types of resources, including some apps may have restricted utilization due to lack of technical materials to access or high costs of data and other services; (v) what is more, dbs may also have limited vetting of information added potentially resulting in incorrect materials being added. In summary, we believe that, for a country like Samoa, having its own database systems would be of immense and

practical use as it could be maintained and updated regularly as well as include local level information from its sector agencies and the information in such databases could be validated. In 1) establishing the national systems, the intent is to build on, complement and link/partner with the regional dbs. (see Section 6 'Project Objective' of GEF CEO ER on Page 24)

2) Kindly note that the partnership with SPREP PRISMSS is now mentioned in Table 5 'Stakeholder Engagement Plan' of the CER (as Table 3) and in Table 4: 'Partnerships and Complementarity with Other Initiatives' in UNDP's ProDoc.

3) We fully agree that activities at the catchment or local level must be planned and implemented in a very integrated manner. For this reason, the project seeks to achieve improved prevention and management of IAS and associated management of land and marine conservation using a Ridge to Reef approach for which the building blocks are already in place. Namely, a comprehensive local level Community Integrated Management (CIM) planning process that already exists for the entire country to which district authorities and communities have signed up. The CIM planning approach emphasizes a whole of government approach for planning and management, taking into consideration an integrated ecosystem-based adaptation approach and the ridge to reef concept that involves all major sectors in the country. The CIM planning process is a Partnership between the Government of Samoa and the villages within the plan. The Plan area starts from the ridge extending to the reef broadly covering four thematic areas; Infrastructure; Environment and Biological Resources; Livelihood and Food security under a community governance system, where both partners have responsibilities for issues and solutions and the Plan gives an integrated approach to the provision of services and improvement of resilience now and in the future.

As part of the broader mainstreaming approach, beyond the demonstration catchments, the project is designed to provide demonstration models for up-scaling. In particular, capacity building, awareness creation and the development of best practices will support up-scaling.. The project's investment component will seek to develop synergies among rural development actors and programs (e.g., CIMPs, District Development Plans and Village Development Plans) with an objective of raising additional emphasis on IAS will expand current models of sustainable resource use and alternative livelihood activities within and outside of the targeted landscapes. (see Section 5 'Project Strategy' GEF CEO ER (page 23))

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/4/2022

Yes, but it would be helpful to have this elaborated a bit more.

Agency Response

Agency Response 15/4/2022

As suggested, the elements of private sector engagement have been further elaborated. (See Section 4 of GEF CER (pages 44-45) and Table 5 Stakeholder Table on (pages 40-44) and Annex 7 of UNDP Project Document (SEP))

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/25/2022

Yes.

4/4/2022

No, please see comments above.

Agency Response

Agency Response 15/4/2022

As mentioned above, the partnership with SPREP PRISMSS is now mentioned in Table 5 of Stakeholder Engagement Plan of the CER and in Table 4 of UNDP's ProDoc.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/25/2022

Yes, thank you for the addition.

4/4/2022

No, please provide a few sentences linking to specific content of the NBSAP.

Agency Response

Agency Response 15/4/2022

This is now updated to show linkages between the GEF 7 project and NBSAP targets. (See Section 7 (page 53) of GEF's CER)

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/25/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/19/2022

Yes. Thank you for these edits.

5/2/2022

No, please address the following:

- a. The protected area WDPA IDs remain blank under Core Indicator 1.2 and METT scores are missing under Core Indicator 1.2. Please add those, as these are mandatory at CEO Endorsement stage.
- b. The protected area WDPA IDs remain blank under Core Indicator 2.1 and METT scores are missing under Core Indicator 2.1. Please add those, as these are mandatory at CEO Endorsement stage.
- c. Please include the target for indicator 3 Area of land restored, in the results framework (annex A).

Agency Response

UNDP, 05/10/2022

- a. The protected area WDPA IDs under Core Indicator 1.2 were originally included in the GEF Core Indicator Worksheet, with the exception of Asau-Falelima NP and Falealupo Community Conservation Area, which -art the time of submission- could not be found in the WDPA site, these are now included in the worksheet as they became available. Note that METT scores are also uploaded in the portal (see Table F and Annex A of the GEF CEO ER and the GEF Core Indicator Worksheet / Annex 11 of UNDP's ProDoc for details)
- b. The protected area WDPA IDs under Core Indicator 2.2 (*not 2.1*) were included in the original submission and in the GEF Core Indicator worksheet, with the exception of the Conglomerate of Community Fish Reserves. The Conglomerate of Community Fish Reserves includes around a dozen small CFRs that cover a total of 181 hectares and have not been individually (or collectively) given a WDPA ID. To the extent it is practical, efforts will be made during project implementation to try to pursue WDPA IDs, for at least the larger CFRs. Also, note that METT scores are added for the Safata MPA, but METT scores for the conglomerate of community fish reserves (consisting of around 12 small CFRs) will be assessed early in project implementation to the extent it is considered as feasible, in particular for the larger ones (see Table F and Annex A of the GEF CEO ER and the GEF Core Indicator Worksheet / Annex 11 of UNDP's ProDoc for details)
- c. Indicator 8 now includes GEF Core Indicator 3, which has been slightly modified to reflect area of forest and forest land restored (Indicator 3.2) rather than area of land restored (Indicator 3.1) (See Tables B, E and 4, the description of output 2.2, Annex A

and Annex F of the GEF CEO ER and the Project Results Framework and Monitoring Plan of UNDP's ProDoc for details).

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/4/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/25/2022

Yes.

4/5/2022

No, please respond to Germany's comments and make the needed edits.

Agency Response

Agency Response 15/4/2022

Please note that Germany's comments were addressed in the original submission. We think this may be a portal glitch. Responses to Germany comments are available in Annex B of GEF CER (last two rows of the table).

GEF Council Comments – Germany		
<p>Germany would like to request that the project proposal takes into account some of the existing local structures and organizations addressing invasive alien species. Firstly, the regional organization SPREP, located in Samoa, has one of the most comprehensive programs on Invasive Alien Species and should be closely involved in project implementation. The current proposal does not emphasize their roles sufficiently. Secondly, the Pacific Invasive Species Partnership (PIP) is the overarching regional coordination body for authorities</p>	<p>It will be at the determination of the country what particular entities provide support for this project. SPREP has extensive resources for IAS management and training, and it would be reasonable to consider partnering with SPREP for various elements within the project, and specifically with technical training aspects in terms of IAS management.</p> <p>As a long-term member of PIP, potential support that member countries may be able to avail of. SPREP is linked to the PIP and can likely</p>	<p>Refer Table 4 of UNDP project Document for partnership arrangements</p>

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/5/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/5/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/5/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/19/2022

Yes.

5/2/2022

No, please address the issues raised in the question on annexes and resubmit.

4/5/2022

Not at this time, please revise and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/5/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations