



REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: LDCF

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Enhancing the resilience of tourism-reliant communities to climate change risks			
Country(ies):	Samoa	GEF Project ID: ¹	4585
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4566
Other Executing Partner(s):	Samoa Tourism Authority	Submission Date:	
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Programme (if applicable):	n/a	Agency Fee (\$):	195,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCA-2	2.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	2.1.1: Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks	LDCF	421,576	4,669,250
CCA-2	2.2: Increased adaptive capacity to climate change in development sectors	2.2.1: Vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	LDCF	1,528,424	12,619,250
Total project costs				1,950,000	17,288,500

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Increase the resilience of the tourism sector of Samoa through mainstreaming climate risks into tourism-related policy processes which guide the implementation of adaptation actions by tourism operators and tourism reliant communities.						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Mainstreaming and capacity Development	TA	1. Climate change adaptation mainstreamed into tourism-related policy instruments and public-private partnerships	<p>Output 1.1. Management plans integrating climate risks are developed in 6 Tourism Development Areas involving 20 villages.</p> <p>Output 1.2. Technical guide developed on climate resilient beach tourism management practices</p> <p>Output 1.3. Recommendations developed to internalize climate change considerations into existing micro-finance, grant and loan schemes to the tourism sector and feasibility of a climate risk transfer (insurance) mechanism</p>	LDCF	330,759	3,950,000
Implementation of adaptation measures	INV	2. Increased adaptive capacity to climate change and disaster risks of tourism-reliant communities	Output 2.1 Concrete adaptation actions in the management of coastal infrastructure, water resources, shoreline and tourism recreational activities are implemented in 6 Tourism	LDCF	1,437,605	11,900,000

			Development Areas involving 11 villages and at least 15 community-owned beach tourism operations, ensuring that both women and men participate in and benefit from these.			
			Output 2.2 Coastal tourism operators are connected to Climate Early Warning and Information system			
			Output 2.3 South-South transfer of tourism adaptation case studies between operators in Samoan TDAs, and counterparts in other SIDS			
Subtotal					1,768,364	15,850,000
M & E					64,960	150,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³					116,676	1,288,500
Total project costs					1,950,000	17,288,500

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Samoa Tourism Support Programme (STSP)	Government of Samoa	Parallel	13,600,000
Regular programme - Samoa Tourism Authority	Government of Samoa	In kind	88,500
Private Sector Support Facility	UNDP	Parallel	3,600,000
Total Co-financing			17,288,500

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	LDCF		Samoa	1,950,000	195,000	2,145,000
Total Grant Resources				1,950,000	195,000	2,145,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this

table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	174,450	1,728,849	1,903,299
National/Local Consultants	256,920	2,074,619	2,331,539

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update etc.

NA

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

NA

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

NA

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF

stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The baseline projects for this proposal have changed. Current baseline projects include:

1. Samoa Tourism Support Programme (STSP): This is the most significant baseline development intervention in the tourism sector on which LDCF resources will build. The STSP is designed to complement and augment the efforts of the Government of Samoa and the private sector to make tourism the leading economic sector in the country. STSP is aimed to: i) Strengthen tourism sector governance for better coordination of the implementation of the sector's development priorities; ii) Strengthen marketing and research to increase awareness and visitation to Samoa, and iii) support workplace development to assist the Samoan workforce to provide high levels of service. STSP will not invest in climate change-related issues in tourism. LDCF resources channeled through this proposal will address the gaps in STSP concerning the resilience of Samoa's policy instruments for the tourism sector, especially at the local level. LDCF funding will support the integration of climate change adaptation national policy to the local level planning and management process for the Tourism Development Areas (TDAs), and develop the necessary technical guidance, assuring this cascades timely and effectively through to local level decision-making and investment decisions on the ground. The STSP is a USD 16.5 million government initiative; it started implementation in 2012 and will allocate USD 13.6 million as co-financing of this LDCF proposal.
2. The Private Sector Support Facility (PSSF) managed by UNDP: This initiative assists the Ministry of Finance in supporting small- and medium enterprises to improve their performance and profitability. This includes the establishment of the facility itself, capacity development of the Ministry and potential grantees, and the provision of the grants. The facility has been used to provide support to tourism operators to recover from natural disasters like the 2009 tsunami; however, it has not been used to provide any support to undertake climate change adaptation actions. LDCF funding will provide the necessary review and adjustment of mandate, guidelines, and capacity development to accommodate proposals for adaptation actions. Through the PSSF project, UNDP provides USD 3.6 million as co-financing for this LDCF proposal.

The baseline projects that were included in the PIF (UNDP- supported Community Centered Sustainable Development Programme (CCSDP); Tsunami Early Recovery Project (ERP); and MDG Acceleration Project, are no longer included as baseline for this LDCF proposal, because these have been / are due to be closed.

- A. 5. [Incremental /Additional cost reasoning](#): describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated [global environmental benefits](#) (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The additionality of the LDCF project to the selected baselines is justified as follows:

For Component 1: LDCF resources will be used to integrate climate change adaptation in a number of local tourism management plans, building on guidance from STDP. The results, best practices, and lessons learned will be fed back to national policy processes and institutions so further revisions of national policy on tourism can be based on the local experiences. The management plans and methodologies developed will also serve as an example for replication in other areas in Samoa. Furthermore, LDCF funding will be used to develop technical guidelines on climate resilient beach tourism management practices targeting technical staff of relevant ministries, operators, and local contractors. These guidelines will serve as an input on the training programme of STSP.

For Component 2: In the baseline scenario, STSP and PSSF will work closely together on investing in tourism enterprise development. One of the main outputs of this partnership is achieving clarity over demand for continuation of a concessionary finance scheme. However, STSP is not planning to provide specific support to enterprises to access the PSSF or capital to PSSF for financing *climate change adaptation activities*. PSSF is already supporting the tourism sector through the provision of concessional grants to tourism operators and related services. However, to date, tourism operators have not submitted (and thus, have not implemented) tourism adaptation projects to the PSSF. With LDCF support, this element will be included as a window under the PSSF to take advantage of the network and structure already established by this Facility to work with tourism operators in Samoa. This LDCF project will avail up to \$300,000 through the PSSF (or a similar mechanism) to be delivered as small grants to tourism operators in each TDA (tentatively earmarking USD \$50,000 to each TDA) to develop and implement sound climate smart ideas at their own initiative. The details of this scheme are laid out in the Project Document, pg. 32 - 33. Another portion of LDCF resources will be used to demonstrate concrete on-the-ground adaptation measures, covering investments in material, machinery, equipment, logistics, etc. as described under Outcome 2 in Section 2.4 in the Project Document.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The key risks and assumptions for the project were considered having regard to a number of potential types of risks: political, regulatory, strategic, organizational, operational and financial. A detailed Risk Assessment Log Frame is included in Annex 10. An updated risk log will be presented to the Project Steering Committee during the project inception phase.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

UNDP will ensure that this LDCF proposal is closely coordinated with ongoing and under-preparation adaptation activities, either financed by GEF or other donors/agencies, so as not to duplicate activities in the country. Coordination and linkages to main projects in the country (AF and PPCR) are described below:

1. “Enhancing resilience of Samoa’s coastal communities to climate change” (Adaptation Fund): this project considers implementation of resilience measures of similar form to the LDCF (coastal protection measures, including beach replenishment, riparian and coastal vegetation planting; flood proofing infrastructure, integrated water resource management) however these do not specifically target small scale tourism operators and tourism reliant communities as is the case for the proposed LDCF project. The functional areas of TDAs cut across various political districts, and the LDCF project will support a coordinated effort along the district-based CIM Plan review supported by the AF-PPCR initiatives. The parallel scheduling of work will ensure that LDCF interventions will not duplicate those to be financed by the AF initiative – but add value for practical implementation of measures to the more vulnerable community members.
2. “Samoa Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience (PPCR) Strategic Programming”: PPCR will only fund part of Samoa’s adaptation costs. The programme will implement revised CIM Plans in conjunction with other related planning frameworks such as Sustainable Management Plans and Village Disaster Risk Management Plans in at least 16 districts, the eight adjoining the Apia – Airport road, and eight others, based on the CIM Plan review to be undertaken. In the eight or

more districts in other parts of the country (not adjoining the Apia – airport road), CIM plans would be selected based on vulnerability and cost effectiveness criteria being developed by the on-going prioritization exercise currently being carried out.

Complementarity of interventions will also be ensured in the broader national process of aligning the AF and WB-PPCR processes with that of the LDCF project. The coordination of these initiatives will be carried out based on existing mechanisms, such as the National Climate Change Country Team (chaired by MNRE), with the multi-donor contributions being well coordinated by the Aid Coordination Division, located in the Ministry of Finance, along with the stringent approval process of donor-funded initiatives by the Cabinet Development Committee. The function of NCCCT ensures coherence in the NAPA implementation process which relies on financing from multiple sources, including the LDCF. The National Executing Agency for the proposed AF project is also MNRE, therefore close collaboration between MNRE and the Samoa Tourism authority is guaranteed for synergetic implementation of the AF and LDCF projects. There is a close collaboration established between AF and PPCR programmes' teams and processes, involving government agencies, the UNDP, and the WB.

To develop close coordination and co-implementation arrangements between this project and the AF and PPCR programmes, the following institutional structure is proposed: a Project Steering Committee (a role to be undertaken by the Tourism Climate Change Taskforce (TCCT)), operational management by the Tourism Climate Change Project Unit (TCCPU), with support from the Technical Working/ Advisory Groups. This will assist in the harmonization of work plans (multi-year, annual and quarterly), pooling of technical assistance, the sharing of data and information and more efficient procurement processes.

For coordination efforts and complementarity with other related projects in the region, including other LDCF-funded projects, refer to Annex 7.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Key stakeholders with a major direct role in the project were identified and consulted at different stages during the project development phase to obtain their inputs and feedback for designing the project. The key national level stakeholders are the STA, the broader MNRE (through PUMA, Land Management, Met Office etc.) and various departments and agencies such as the MWTL, the LTA, the SWA, the EPC, the MWCS, MOF and the MAF. The STA will take the lead in coordinating with other stakeholders and overseeing the implementation of the project. Other major stakeholders include: the Samoa tourism industry (small-scale beach fale operators, hoteliers, attraction site operators and tourism reliant communities as well as the key associations such as the Samoa Hotels Association and Samoa Savaii Tourism Association and Government as well as development partners.

Strong engagement by Government representatives and tourism operators in the project implementation was a key message of the consultation process. The preparation team agreed on the need to ensure that consultations captured the full range of perspectives, including those of the Village Councils, minorities, absentee stakeholders and the less vocal groups and community members. The first round of consultations occurred in August 2012. An initial draft of the project document was developed from that first round of consultations and associated follow-up meetings and research. This draft document was then used in follow-up consultations and the Stakeholder forums in Upolu and Savaii. A table with the names and affiliations of relevant stakeholders and their respective contributions is provided in Table 2 below.

In the initial stages of project formulation, two well attended stakeholder workshops were held along with individual or small group consultations before and after both workshops. Notable priorities featured at these consultations were:

- Supporting the STA understand how adaptation plans are prepared (i.e. either through guidance on priorities and options, means to integrate with existing plans, developing local level adaptation responses (strategies and actions);
- Enhancing the Samoa Accommodation Standards to accommodate climate change provisions and assessment steps;
- Preparing guidelines on how to conduct Climate Change assessments on a regular with local operators;
- Training in conducting climate change impact and vulnerability assessments;
- Better understanding of the coastal, water resources and ecological systems - so the communities can use their knowledge in the protection measures and/or enhancement to build resilience;
- Need for practical advices and information on sea walls and alternative green solutions e.g. water harvesting, local drainage management and erosion and sediment controls;
- Institution of mechanisms so EIA and decision-making is more affordable and cost-effective for operators and reliant communities;
- Collective planning of tourism areas for long term ideas and agreements;
- Link decision-making for larger developments to existing processes, including for example EIA through PUMA to minimize bureaucracy and reduce costs;
- A gender analysis on the focus sector including review of capacities, identification of required actions and means to set up the appropriate institutional frameworks for gender mainstreaming and training in gender equality;
- Government technical staff to be involved in the climate change impact and vulnerability

assessments to be conducted as part of the rationale for the adaptation investment package designs.

STA (involving the TCCPU) has participated in the sector engagement workshop on CLEWS (organized through NAPA 1 ICCRAHS – LDCF project by MNRE Met Division and supported by NIWA) that took place in October 2012 in Apia. The event allowed tourism officers to familiarize themselves with CLEWS options and discuss sectoral data and information needs on climate and weather related features and suitable dissemination channels.

Stakeholders have made contributions to the preparation of this project document, including identification of: the ways climate variability and extreme events are already causing adverse impacts; the extant and anticipated climate-related risks to the sector and reliant communities; actions already at hand to cope and respond to current climate impacts; sounding out options for adapting to climate change; and the validation of the main components and activities of the proposed project. A final Stakeholder Participation Plan will be endorsed as one of the first activities at project inception.

Table 3. Stakeholders consulted and identified roles.

STAKEHOLDER	RELEVANT ROLES
Samoa Tourism Authority (STA)	Government agency in charge of tourism policies, tourism product development and destination promotions and marketing. STA will serve as the executing agency for this project
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE)	As the lead technical agency for climate change-related policies, MNRE’s prime function will be ensuring overall coordination of the project with other NAPA implementation processes and projects through the National Climate Change Country Team (chaired by MNRE), supporting the tourism sector tailored climate early warning system (through its Samoa Meteorological Division (SMD)).
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries	The Fisheries Division is involved in managing fishing reserves and the implementation of coral seeding activities.
Ministry of Works, Transport and Infrastructure (MWTI)	The government’s legislative, policy and regulatory agency for civil works, transport (including roads, land, air and marine) and infrastructure.
Land Transport Authority (LTA)	The corporate entity charged with the operationalizing of land transport in Samoa.
Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (MWCSO)	Government agency mandated to coordinate local development processes, involvement of communities and women. MWCSO will be involved in the community liaison for the planning and implementation of adaptation measures at the local level in the Tourism Development Areas.
Ministry of Finance (MOF)	Overall donor and aid coordination, supporting co-financing arrangements and programmatic linkages with other initiatives, making on-going linkages and updating the national policies outlined in the SDS, financial management of project funds and the monitoring of expenditures. Advising and coordinating for the

	assessment and capacity building activities related to finance and risk transfer options, particularly the use of PSSF for the small grants mechanism to be applied by the project.
Key industry associations (SHA, SSTA, Car Rentals Association)	Coordinating with tourism operators and advocating for the adoption of climate sensitive planning and policy frameworks, instruments and adaptation techniques.
NGOs (SUNGO, METI, WIDBI)	Linking with environmental and capacity building activities supporting communities in the tourism areas
Education institutions (NUS, APTC, USP)	Support the knowledge management activities of the project, integrate project experience in their tourism-related curricula and training programmes
CROP agencies (SPTO, SPREP, SPC, SOPAC, USP)	Supporting the adaptation implementation and policy processes through their technical and sectoral mandates, expertise and country support programmes. Support the South-South exchange and dissemination of lessons learnt and good practices generated by the project
World Tourism Organization (UNWTO)	Technical project documents will be communicated to UNWTO, the UN Agency serving as global platform for tourism policy and development matters, in order to broadly disseminate project results, and inform global tourism studies and policy processes related to climate change
UNDP	As Implementing Agency for this proposed project, UNDP provides its usual technical and operational oversight support throughout the project formulation and implementation phases. The assistance being provided is based on UNDP's extensive development assistance and climate change adaptation support programmes and projects with the Government of Samoa and collaborations with development partners in the region, through the UNDP Samoa MCO, Asia-Pacific Regional Centre in Bangkok, Pacific Centre in Suva and Head Quarters in New York.

Based on the table above, a final stakeholder involvement plan will be tabled for endorsement by the Project Steering Committee at the project inception workshop.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project focuses on expanding the resilience of natural and socio-economic systems in tourism-related operations and reliant community areas, enhancing livelihood strategies and providing support for communities to increase resilience against climate change related hazards. LDCF resources will directly benefit the population of at least 20 villages located in the 6 TDAs, involving approximately 500 households through the extended families, engaging women, men and youth. The project will indirectly benefit a broader population of 20 target villages, totalling 4.417 inhabitants. Public-private

partnerships achieved in Outcome 2 will benefit a broader range of tourism accommodation and service providers. Small grants available to tourism operators, along with training and guidance provided by PSSF will afford beneficiaries with climate-smart investment skills which will account for less reliance on beach oriented activities that are highly prone to adverse impacts from climate change, as well as a reduction in socio-economic losses.

Community-level activities will be designed using participatory and gender sensitive techniques, ensuring the active involvement of women, youth, and church groups and especially targeting staff of the community and family tourism operations, of which a considerable part is composed by women in both managerial, skilled and unskilled positions, through a range of jobs (reception, hospitality, catering, management, cultural activities, etc.).

Gender issues are of special importance to this project as they impact the sustainability of the interventions. These issues include access to infrastructure and ecosystem services, gender roles and responsibilities such as the use and maintenance of community and tourism facilities, food security, source of income and community health and wellbeing. The project aims to promote sustainable adaptation to climate change impacts, equal participation in decision making on the design and implementation of adaptation activities, equal distribution of resources and benefits and inclusiveness in order to enhance the resilience of tourism-reliant communities against the impact of climate risks and vulnerabilities. For a detailed gender analysis and component directly linked to this project, see Annex 8. Economic benefits associated with gender-inclusive interventions include, inter-alia:

- a) For women: the creation of employment sources for women and allowing access for them to wage earning activities (arts and crafts production, garment making, etc.); improved health for women and children through nutrition and balanced diet through vegetable gardening (this will provide source of food and protein lost as a result of seawall); Coastline re-vegetation programme: healthy ecosystems rehabilitated through seawall management will help replace coastal plants used for traditional medicine and provide coastal trees that provide raw materials for handicrafts production;
- b) For men: partnerships created between tourism operators and village men on income generation activities (village farmers to supply tourist operators with agricultural produce, village musicians to provide entertainment at tourist operators); technical skills provided to village men in the construction and maintenance of seawalls so that they may be employed on a regular basis to carry out this work.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Cost-effectiveness has been an overarching consideration in the work of the PPG team, given that for most of the Operators disposable cash for even the simplest form of adaptation measure are very limited. The development of TDA Management Plans and supporting Guidelines is on the premise that more strategic assessments and evaluations of creeping climate change pressures, enables holistic approaches to implementation with cost savings and efficiencies. Many of the stakeholders revealed and showed in practice that much of what they need is specific advice on present coastal dynamics and processes, and ideas on alternative means to address these pressures. During the early phase of consultations individual site visits occurred with specialists able to offer on-the-ground suggestions which were well accepted by the Operators. This provides a high level of confidence that Operators will be willing to invest and provide in-kind contributions, along with their family members and often the village community in the implementation of the adaptation measures.

The rapid V & A work (Annex 4) was supported with work on summarizing different approaches to adaptation planning and research on specific adaptation measures, including an overview of costs and suitabilities of the technologies (Annex 9). 132. Notwithstanding the above, the information availed in the VA report and indicative

cost summaries of different measures combined with further economic analyses (Annex 11: Economic Evaluation Report⁵), enabled the PPG team to canvass more for ‘Soft’ approaches to adaptation implementation planning and use of technologies. As demonstrated in the Economic Evaluation Report (also conducted during PPG phase), high-impact soft measures which could be undertaken by the project (including rainwater harvesting and storage, “green” coastal buffer works, beach replenishment and, disaster risk management and EWS for coastal tourist operators and communities) have a much higher economic rate of return (EIRR) – perform economically much better- in 9 TDAs combined, than hard alterations to infrastructure for services and building assets. The soft, ecosystem based options also support the function of tourist-use beaches, enhancing their aesthetic and natural appeal, as key resource base for the beach tourism operators, while providing ecosystem conservation benefits.

The Economic Evaluation Report provides a cost analysis of soft and hard adaptation measures in 9 TDAs. Main take-aways of this Report include:

- 1) soft measures perform economically well overall in most TDAs, and therefore it is recommended that these interventions (which include water harvesting and storage, installation of culverts on access roads, coastal “green” buffers; beach replenishment with “gree” buffers revegetation of coastal wetlands and coral reef protection; DRM and EWS) be pursued to the extent possible, in alignment also with the V&A results;
- 2) benefits in each TDA were measured in terms of adaptation’s potential⁶ to i) avoid damage of tourism assets from extreme events, ii) avoid tourism operators’ revenue losses due to interruptions in service due to extreme events, and iii) avoid loss of life in the course of extreme events. In this regard: 64% of the total benefit of *soft adaptation approaches* derives from reduction in fatalities due to improved risk management; 10% from rainwater harvesting; and 21% provided by green coastal protection and beach replenishment; the EIRR of all soft measures analyzed, combined, is 14.6% and the benefit/cost ratio is 1.2;
- 3) In contrast, the EIRR of the hard measures (as estimated in the Report) is only 1%, Benefit/Cost ratio is .32;
- 4) it is worth highlighting, however, that project cost estimates for hard measures and its associated climate risks should be re-evaluated as uncertainties are progressively reduced in the future. The climate change scenario on which the current economic analysis is based, will undergo revision as modeling and prediction capacity improve and climate impacts in Samoa become clearer.

Further project preparation work and improvements in the estimations of climate change in Samoa are likely to show that hard interventions can be more tightly focused on emerging threats and that their costs can be significantly reduced. Co-financing sources to this LDCF project can also account for the necessary financial leverage that is needed to pursue the selected hard adaptation measures under Outcome 2 (and as outlined in the V&A report). The figures above justify the aim of the LDCF project to pilot **a range and combination** of Protection, Accomodation, and Planned retreat options, focusing on the planning for and application of ecosystem-based (soft) adaptation options, and alternative engineering (hard) adaptation options, under Outcome 2. Costs and suitability of technologies of potential adaptation measures were discussed with the communities and stakeholders during initial consultations, and are reflected on Annex 9. Such options will be further studied and confirmed during LDCF project inception phase.

In terms of delivering cost-effectiveness as part of the project delivery, it should be noted that the technical guidance provided by the project, as well as the coordination with and complementarity of other ongoing

⁵ The 9 TDAs evaluated in this Economic Evaluation Report were identified as priority TDAs in the National Tourism Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for Samoa (NTCCASS) (2011- 2016) by Samoa Tourism Authority.

⁶ The net benefits of adaptation to the tourism sector in each of the nine TDAs are calculated over a 25-year planning period and from these, standard internal rates of return, B/C ratios, and NPV indicators have been derived.

investments in Samoa, will justify adaptation measures on the basis of their cost-benefit ratio. Tourism operations will only be encouraged to follow-up on the recommended measures that have a suitable return on investment over time.

The do nothing approach for Samoa is not plausible. The tourism sector is indisputably a core contributor to GDP and much of the future growth and stability of the Samoa economy depends upon tourism continuing to support livelihoods in the face of adverse global economic developments and other threats, such as natural disasters. The complete destruction of several coastal villages, and destruction of 20% of hotel tourism room capacity from the 2009 tsunami – is sufficient to suggest that pro-active protection, accommodation and planned retreat approaches are critically needed. According to the Final Report for Tourism done by KVA following the 2009 tsunami, the estimated costs of damages for these affected businesses at US\$30million with an estimation of reconstruction costs at US\$33.9million. Weather-related disasters will increase in frequency, as will destructiveness due to climate change, making adaptation to protect tourism from increasing climate risks extremely timely. The STA will continue to take a leading role in this process but will need support from the private sector, external agencies and donors, and the government if Samoa is to achieve a level of adaptation investment and effectiveness anywhere near that required.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

6. Monitoring Framework and Evaluation

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) in Apia with support from the UNDP Regional Coordination Unit (RCU). The Project Results Framework in Section 3 provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. These will form the basis of the project's Monitoring and Evaluation system. The following sections outline the principle components of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and indicative cost estimates related to some major M&E milestones are provided in Table 4.

Project Start:

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office, UNDP Regional Technical Advisors and other relevant stakeholders as necessary. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project and to plan the first year annual work plan. The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including:

- a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed. The stakeholder involvement plan will be finalized.

c) Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification in the Project Results Framework as well as recheck assumptions and risks.

d) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, including roles and responsibilities for different M&E functions, with a particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the Annual Project Report (APR) as well as mid-term and terminal evaluations. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.

e) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit, including UNDP project related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget rephasings.

f) Plan and schedule Project Steering Committee meetings. The first Project Steering Committee meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the Inception Workshop.

An Inception Workshop Report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the inception workshop.

First Annual Workplan:

After the Inception Workshop, the TCCPU will prepare the project's first Annual Work Plan (AWP), on the basis of the Project Results Framework. This will include reviewing the project's indicators, means of verification, assumptions and risks, imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise finalize the AWP with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected Outcomes for the project.

Quarterly Reporting:

Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. A UNDP risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS, and no less often than every six months where critical risks have been identified. Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR) will be prepared by the TCCPU and submitted to the UNDP CO for sharing with the UNDP Regional Coordination Unit.

Annual Reporting:

The Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements and is to be completed by the project in the prescribed report format by 1st August of each year. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lessons learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR

- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Annual Audit:

The Government of Samoa will provide the UNDP Resident Representative with certified periodic financial statements, and with an annual audit of the financial statements relating to the status of UNDP and LDCF funds according to the established procedures set out in the Programming and Finance manuals. The Audit will be conducted by the Office of the Auditor General of the Government of Samoa, or by a commercial auditor engaged by the Government. The project foresees an audit to be conducted at the end of the project by a recognized national firm. The project will be audited on a yearly basis for financial year January to December as per NEX procedures and GEF requirements. The National Auditor will conduct the audit. The STA shall also certify the yearly Combined Delivery Reports issued by UNDP based on financial statements prepared by the Project Accountant.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits:

UNDP CO and the UNDP Regional Coordination Unit (RCU), Bangkok will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Steering Committee may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/Back to Office Report (BTOR) will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Steering Committee members.

Mid-term of project cycle:

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (tentatively late 2014). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

End of Project:

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Steering Committee meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals.. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP Regional Coordination Unit. The Final Evaluation will provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Table 4: M&E Budget of the project

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO 	2,960	Within first 2 months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific support as appropriate and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	Continuous by project team	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by Project Manager ▪ Project team 	To be determined as part of Annual Work Plan prep.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (team) 	20,000	At mid-point of implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team, ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (mixed local/int. team) 	30,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Project manager and team 	Indicative cost per year: 3,000, total 12,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For LDCF supported projects, paid from IA fees (UNDP staff) and operational budget (government staff)	Yearly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 64,960	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Taulealeausumai Laavasa Malua	Chief Executive Officer GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	August 2, 2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu Officer-in-Charge, and Deputy Executive Coordinator, UNDP/GEF		April 10, 2013	Gabor Vereczi, Regional Technical Advisor	+685 27482	gabor.vereczi@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

See page 42 -44 of the project document. For AMAT, please see Excel spreadsheet attached to this document.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work programme inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

PIF Review Sheet dated 12 October 2011 asked for more details on mechanisms to avoid overlap and duplication with other initiatives, at CEO Endorsement. Please refer to pages 21 – 23 of the Project Document; pages 5 and 6 of this template, and Annex 7.

Please refer to Annex 15 on detailed responses to comments from Council on PIF

Response to the GEF Secretariat review on project proposal:

GEF Sec review comment	Response
<p>12. Cost effectiveness has not been sufficiently demonstrated. The comments from the German GEF Council member have not been effectively addressed. It is not an effective response to refer Section B.2 on the CEO Endorsement document, in response to the issues raised by the German Council member. Recommended Action: Please provide more details in response to the comments from the German council member on cost/benefits relationship.</p>	<p>The basis for this comment is the direct correlation of the total indicative co-financing identified in the PIF with the number of community tourism operators (CTOs) targeted in one particular output of the project (output 2.1). This correlation is not conducive in the project context for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conceptual idea behind the project is to take a community approach to resilience. Therefore, in terms of beneficiaries, the focus should be on the number of people in tourism-reliant communities, instead of the individual jobs provided by CTOs in these communities. LDCE resources will benefit the population of at least 20 villages located in the 6 TDAs, involving approximately 500 households (or 4.417 inhabitants) through the extended families, engaging women, men and youth. • While Output 2.1 focuses on some selected tourism-reliant communities and their CTOs for the piloting of on-the-ground measures, other outputs of the project address institutional strengthening of public-private partnerships in the tourism sector (e.g. finance and risk transfer mechanisms, technical guide, climate early warning system). These interventions are expected to benefit tourism businesses more broadly, including larger ones. The broad outreach in the tourism sector will be assured through the active engagement of private sector associations, such as the Samoa Hotel Association, or the Chamber of Commerce.
<p>27. Please submit the tracking tool</p>	<p>Please find attached the AMAT table</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁷

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 50,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
International consultant	35,000.00	21,000.00	14,000.00
Technical workshops	10,000.00	8,933.91	1,066.09
Communication, reports and travel	5,000.00	2,421.56	2,578.44
Total	50,000	32,355.47	17,644.53

⁷ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA