

Enhancing integrated sustainable management to safeguard Samoa's natural resources

Review PIF 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

10/12/2019

Review completed by PM

4/9/2020

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, this project would likely be better described as a biodiversity mainstreaming and IAS project.

12/31/2019

Yes. Thank you for the revisions to the project.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, there are significant issues with this project.

Component 1:

- 1.2 - The activities related to pesticide management and waste management are not eligible for STAR funding.
- 1.3 and 1.4 - This training appears to be principally a reactive measure rather than proactive and preventative. The focus on CRB is not eligible.

Component 2:

- 2.1 - The case has not been made (except briefly at the end) for why these 4 catchments were selected.
- 2.1 - It is unclear why a catchment approach is truly needed. If much of the administration and organization occurs at the district level, catchment organization may not be effective or sustained in the long term.
- 2.2 - Adaptation is also considered a local environmental benefit. The basis and logic for undertaking this work is, therefore, weak. How would the project ensure that such maps were actually taken up and used? What is the objective of doing this work?
- 2 - The GEF cannot support waste management monitoring systems. In general, we would want to be supporting the actions on the ground or establishing systems for them rather than potentially complicated monitoring systems that don't have implementation activities to actually change the results.

Component 3:

3 - Mangrove restoration - There is not justification for why these mangroves will be restored or a system for deciding where to work. Please note that as restoration is quite expensive, we require a strong justification for the global biodiversity benefits of any restoration work.

3 - LD 1-1 has been selected but the relevant core sub- indicator has not been completed and it is not clear what land rehabilitation or SLM measures will be carried out. Table B and the project description would need to include specific information on the productive landscapes they are working in, the SLM activities that will be carried out, the number of farmers to benefit and hectares of land that would have improved management. We would also expect an indicator in Table B that would measure improvement of income for farmers.

3 - It is unclear how these actions will "safeguard natural ecosystems".

3.2 - How will the supported activities be selected?

3.2 - Has piloting not already been done with *Merremia* control? If it has and wasn't successful, why will this intervention be different?

3.2 - Herbicide and pesticide management and in particular tracking is not eligible. Supporting the establishment of farming practices that mainstream biodiversity and/or reduce land degradation that result in reduced agrochemical use could be, but not just the tracking of the chemicals.

3.3 - Waste management is not eligible.

3.5 and 3.6 - CRB control is not eligible.

12/31/2019

No, while this project has been changed substantially to make most the activities eligible, there are still a few issues that remain.

- Sustainability of IAS investments - Much IAS work is rather costly to implement and even short lapses in activities such as customs inspections can have significant consequences. How will this project ensure long term funding for things such as equipment maintenance?

During PPG, please carefully consider the following:

- Eligibility of IAS activities - Please remember the requirements and approach of the GEF strategy when designing the activities of the project.

- Mobile app - The project proposes developing a mobile app. While we think that there can be effective apps for projects, it is important to properly scope the cost, usability, maintenance, etc for such an app to ensure that it is a good use of resources. It would make sense to find a way to join efforts with other PICs on the

development, use, and maintenance of an app. Perhaps through the regional SPREP IAS project, FSM and Fiji GEF-6 projects or others, there could be an opportunity for the sharing of the cost as well as more potential users.

- Restoration - Please note that restoration for biodiversity purposes needs to meet a high bar under the GEF-7 strategy. Please keep this in mind as sites are selected (such as within KBAs) and approaches are chosen (such as piloting techniques with plans for scaling up around the country).

3/6/2020

Yes. Thank you for the revisions and noted issues to address during PPG.

We would be interested in learning more about the app from GEF-5, how it's been functioning, and lessons learned for other countries. Also, Antigua and Barbuda's SIRF fund might be an interesting model to learn from for Samoa's green fund.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, we note the very low co-financing from UNDP on this project. We're also surprised to see no co-financing from customs authorities, which even if small would reflect buy-in. Also no co-financing from other donors or NGOs/CBOs. Reference is made to a WB project. Is that the source of the first line of investment mobilized?

12/31/2019

Yes. The co-financing is acceptable for now. We would like to see greater investment from the agency in this project at CEO Endorsement.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes. Samoa is fully flexible.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, if the project is going to work on land degradation there should be hectares in indicator 4 on SLM.

12/31/2019

No, please note that if the project is going to report on protected area hectares, there must be a METT done and scores need to improve. While we don't need the scores at PIF, it does not appear as though the project will be doing more than IAS work in those PAs and maybe METTs won't be completed for these areas.

3/6/2020

Yes. If a METT can't or shouldn't be completed, the hectares can be reported as mainstreaming.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, this project does not provide justification for how the project activities will address the threats to globally significant biodiversity in Samoa. For instance, the PIF states that bringing in new agricultural breeds is "diversifying" the genetics of agriculture in Samoa. Meanwhile other GEF work has been to conserve the unique genetics of crops in Samoa. Either way, that activity would not be considered eligible for GEF support. The threats to biodiversity are rather generic and not being addressed by the project. It is therefore quite a jump to the barriers to be addressed. An improved examination of threats may help justify some of the proposed activities.

12/31/2019

Yes. Thank you for the edits.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, this project does not adequately explain the context of the CIMs and what is on-going. There is reference to a WB project working on this issue at the end but it is not mentioned as baseline. It is unclear how the GEF-5 has set the stage for the GEF-7 project.

- There is very little information on the land degradation and land use planning problems, causes and barriers to improvement in the section on the Description of problems and root causes. Additional information is needed.

-

- 12/31/2019

-

- Yes. However, while we appreciate the clarifications, it is odd that the WB and AF-UNDP projects are not mentioned in the baseline description.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No.

Component 1:

- IAS - Please review the GEF-7 Biodiversity Strategy on IAS for guidance in this area. The GEF is focused on IAS and it is unclear why the project is choosing IS as a point of focus or even what exactly the difference is. Beyond this, as stated in the upstream review the GEF focuses on a holistic, risk prevention approach rather than ongoing management.

- The global significance of addressing CRB has not been justified and those activities cannot be supported.

- Merremia - We had been under the impression that Merremia would be one of the feedstocks for the biogas digester described as receiving support in GEF-6 based on pilots undertaken by SGP. It would be good to have information on the impact of this species. However, given the extent of Merremia it is difficult to see how the activities proposed here will make a significant difference in its control. There are existing pilots of control of this species.

- Communications are important, but must be targeted and tested and part of a larger initiative.

Component 3

- Agrochemical management needs justification specifically for biodiversity mainstreaming purposes. As described here, it is not eligible.

- Waste management is not eligible for GEF support.

12/31/2019

Yes. However, during PPG please keep the strategy in mind and avoid activities that will not be eligible to avoid issues at CEO Endorsement.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, it's unclear what the benefit of the GEF approach is.

12/31/2019

Yes, thank you for the updates.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, it is not clear how this work relates to the stated GEBs on PA management.

12/31/2019

Yes, however it is not clear that the project will be working on PA management in ways that will be picked up by the core indicator on protected areas.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, there is potential. However, the various revisions requested need to be incorporated to address this issue.

12/31/2019

No, we would like to see more emphasis on sustainability related to the IAS investments.

3/6/2020

Yes. Thank you for the revisions. While we understand that one GEF project cannot make IAS activities sustainable, it is important to take steps in that direction as this project is now doing.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, the document identifies stakeholders but does not explain past engagement.

12/31/2019

Yes, thank you for the edits.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, it would be good to consider the private sector more broadly including farmers and fishers.

12/31/2019

Yes. During PPG, it will be very important to involve private sector from the beginning both the larger importers and others relevant for IAS as well as local farmers and fishers and relevant organizations.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, it does not discuss climate risks apart from IAS. Also, this section will likely need to be edited based on revisions to the document.

12/31/2019

Yes, thank you fro the edits.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes. However, we encourage the agency and country to look into alternative options during PPG.

As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No, as the LDFA is very much underpinned by the LDN agenda, the project would need to demonstrate how it is assisting the country to fulfill it's LDN targets or with the target setting process.

12/31/2019

Yes.

-

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Agency Response

4/8/2020 UNDP

The 100 ha of mangrove restoration has been removed from the core indicators in the Portal.
Co-financing details have been revised as per below (see table C, page number 5 of the PIF)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount (\$)
Beneficiaries	Scientific Research Organization of Samoa (SROS)	In Kind	Recurrent Expenditures	100,000
Country Government	Ministry of Finance (Civil Society Support Programme-CSSP Project)	In Kind	Recurrent Expenditures	100,000

As requested, SESP is now included in the resubmission package

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/24/2019

No. We encourage the agency to discuss potential revisions to this project with the GEF Secretariat.

12/31/2019

No, we appreciate the numerous revisions and the project is much improved. There are a few issues that remain.

4/6/2020

No, while the project is close to ready please address the following issues:

- Please remove the 100 ha of mangrove restoration from the core indicators in the Portal. During PPG, the project can consider if there are certain sites that meet the requirements for restoration.
- Co-financing: Please use the name of the entity that provides the co-financing, rather than the name of the project with which it is associated. In addition, here it seems that has been mistakenly identified as “government” co-financing.
- SESF: Please attach that checklist and or indicate more clearly the preliminary overall risk classification of the project as well as the types and risk classification of any identified risks and impacts including any preliminary measures to address identified risks and potential impacts.

4/9/2020

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Samoa is a small island country with two main islands of volcanic origin. Like many SIDS, Samoa struggles with invasive species, food security and protection of their native biodiversity both terrestrial and marine. The invasion of the coconut rhinoceros beetle dramatically reduced coconut production in just one year - an important crop for export and food security. Unsustainable agricultural practices contribute to land degradation and siltation and agrochemicals also impact near shore coral reefs and make them less resilient to other threats. With support from other donors, Samoa has been developing catchment management plans which are not

based on administrative boundaries. This project will support the piloting of the implementation of these plans in catchments of high importance for biodiversity (KBAs, protected areas, and/or key reefs).

This project will equip and empower local communities to safeguard Samoa's indigenous species, natural ecosystems and food production systems from Invasive Alien Species (IAS) and unsustainable land use practices. The project will have components on enhancing institutional and technical capacity in safeguarding indigenous species, natural ecosystems and production systems from IAS; demonstrating integrated management of catchments from ridge to reef to safeguard indigenous species, natural ecosystems and food production systems from IAS and unsustainable land use practices; and gender mainstreaming and knowledge management.

The project will support innovation, sustainability and scaling-up. The catchment management approach has been developed but needs to be implemented. The IAS work includes establishing management and control systems that will provide biomass for the energy plant supported under GEF-6, which will support the long term sustainability of these activities. Samoa is also exploring the creation of a green fund which this project could help in its establishment and sourcing of revenue. The GEF project will target catchments of high biodiversity value to implement this approach, which can be scaled up to the many other catchments in the country.

This project will result in the improved management of 5,676 hectares of protected areas (5,495 ha terrestrial and 181 ha marine), improved management of productive lands and seas for biodiversity of 59,804 hectares (including 15,553 ha of terrestrial KBAs and 5,292 ha of marine KBAs), improved policy and strategies to address invasive species, and restoration of 100 hectares. The project is estimated to have 26,610 beneficiaries (13,514 men and 13,096 women).