



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4585		
Country/Region:	Samoa		
Project Title:	Enhancing the Resilience of Tourism-reliant Communities to Climate Change Risks		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4566 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-2; CCA-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,950,000
Co-financing:	\$17,288,500	Total Project Cost:	\$19,288,500
PIF Approval:	December 02, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Gabor Vereczi

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Samoa is a Least Developed Country and is eligible to receive resources from the LDCF	Samoa is a least developed country and is eligible to receive resources.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	The operational focal point has endorsed the project and a letter is on file	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	The comparative advantage of UNDP is clearly described and supported. UNDP has a long track record working with the Government of Samoa on disaster risk and vulnerability reduction efforts in tourism -reliant coastal areas. UNDP is currently working with the Government of Samoa on a number of adaptation related projects	UNDP has a comparative advantage for this type of project.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The project fits into the Agency's program and staff capacity in country.	The project fits into the Agency's program and staff capacity in country.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	The resources are available for Samoa under the principle of equitable access. Samoa has the following projects which are financed from the LDCF (i) Integrating Climate Change Risks into the Agriculture and Health Sectors in Samoa-GEF Amount: \$2,000,000 (ii) Integration of Climate Change Risk and Resilience into Forestry Management (ICCRIFS) GEF Amount: \$2,400,000	The resources are available in the LDCF for this project under the principle of equitable access.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The project is effectively aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	The project is effectively aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	The LDCF/SCCF objective increasing adaptive capacity is identified	The LDCF/SCCF objective increasing adaptive capacity is identified.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	The project is consistent with the NAPA of Samoa, and is priority number 9 in the NAPA. The project fits into the overall programmatic approach of the Government of Samoa to address climate change risks and adaptation as outlined in its Strategy for the Development of Samoa (SDS), Second National Communications, National Climate Change Policy, as well as the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006-2015	Yes. The project is consistent with the NAPA of Samoa.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The proposal articulates how the capacities will be developed in the project. LDCF resources will be used to further strengthen the effectiveness of policy instruments and related institutional and technical capacities within the process of mainstreaming climate and disaster risks into the Samoa Tourism Development Plan. LDCF resources will be used to prepare integrated and climate-sensitive management plans for 4 Tourism Development Areas, involving at least 9 villages and 15 community-owned tourism operations, as well as the broader communities in the villages. The capacities of these villages will be enhanced to cope with a changing climate, and will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes	The proposal clearly articulates how the capacities developed will contribute to the sustainability of the project outcomes. The project will strengthen policy instrument and enhance institutional and technical capacities.
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	The description of the baseline projects is reliable. Baseline projects described are the UNDP Community-Centered Sustainable Development Programme (CCSDP), the Tsunami Early Recovery	The baseline for the projects have changed as a result of the PPG phase. The baseline projects are now the Samoa Tourism Support Programme (STSP) and the Private Sector Support

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>Project (ERP) and Tourism Tsunami Rebuilding Programme</p> <p>The CCSDP is a sub regional programme to foster the development and implementation of sustainable village development plans through the facilitation of participatory planning processes. CCSDP started in 2008 and has been aligned with ERP following the 2009 tsunami disaster event. It has facilitated so far the development of 24 village plans.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The Tourism Tsunami Rebuilding Programme (TTRP) is funded by NZAID and through the UNDP the Tsunami Early Recovery Project.</p> <p>The CCSD-ERP and TTRP projects are especially relevant to the South East Upolu (Lalomanu and Saleapaga villages) and North-West Upolu (Manono Island) Tourism Development Areas, which have suffered from the 2009 Tsunami disaster and have been receiving assistance for recovery efforts. This proposed LDCF project will build on and further enhance the experience developed through CCSDP, ERP and TTRP through integrating climate risk and resilience considerations, and replicating them in tourism areas that were not impacted by the 2009 Tsunami.</p>	<p>Facility (PSSF) managed by UNDP.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The PSSF is managed by UNDP and the initiative assists the Ministry of Finance in supporting small- and medium enterprises to improve their performance and profitability.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide more details in response to the comments from the German council member on cost/benefits relationship.</p> <p>Update April 23rd 2013</p> <p>The clarifications that UNDP have provided are satisfactory</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Yes the activities to be financed using LDCF resources are based on additional reasoning</p>	<p>Yes the activities to be financed using LDCF resources are based on additional reasoning.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>There is a need for a further clarification on the component 2, which is mixture of technical assistance and investment. The technical assistance and investment sections of component 2 need to be separated into individual components.</p>	<p>The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the additional benefits is sound and appropriate</p>	<p>The applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the additional benefits is sound and appropriate</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	There is a clear description of the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project. There is also a clear description of how the delivery of the socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions support the achievements of the additional benefits.	There is a clear description of the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, and how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of additional benefits.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Public participation is taken into consideration in the project proposal.	Public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, is taken into consideration in the project.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	The project takes into account potential major risks, and provides sufficient mitigation measures.	The project takes into account potential major risks and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Further clarification is requested as it relates to the coordination. There are other GEF LDCF investments in Samoa, along with PPCR and a potential adaptation fund project. It needs to be clear that there will be no overlaps, or duplication of effort with the projects. A table showing the specific activities of all the projects should be provided to demonstrate there is no overlap, duplication of effort and effective coordination with the adaptation projects in Samoa.	The project is consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project execution arrangements are adequate.	The project execution arrangements are adequate.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Although the baseline projects have changed the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The funding level for project management is appropriate at approximately 9.49% of the total project costs, however the pro rata ratio of GEF-LDCF project management cost, co-finance project management costs (1:1.62) is not the same as the pro rata ratio of total GEF-LDCF total project cost, total cofinance (1:2.41). These ratios need to be approximately the same.	The funding level for project management cost is appropriate.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The funding and cofinancing per objective is appropriate to achieve to expected outcome and outputs	The funding and cofinancing per objective is appropriate to achieve to expected outcome and outputs.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Cofinancing should be confirmed at CEO endorsement . The adaptation fund should not be used as cofinancing.	Confirmation letters for co-finance are on the file
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. The cofinancing which the agency is bringing is in line with the role of the agency	The cofinancing which the agency is bringing is in line with the role of the agency.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Please submit the tracking tool
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		The proposal includes a budgeted M&E plan.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? • Convention Secretariat? 		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		The response to the council comments is not adequate. Please refer to Box 12 on cost effectiveness.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance at this stage.</p> <p>There is a need to separate the technical assistance and investment sections of component 2 of the project, into separate components. Further clarification is needed to ensure that there is no overlap or duplication in this project with other related GEF LDCF, AF and PPCR activities in Samoa.</p> <p>The pro rata ratio of GEF-LDCF project management cost, co-finance project management costs (1:1.62) is not the same as the pro rata ratio of total GEF-LDCF total project cost, total cofinance (1:2.41). These ratios need to be approximately the same.</p> <p>Update October 12th 2011</p> <p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance. Further clarification is requested as it relates to the Adaptation Fund proposal and this proposal. In the table in Section B6, it is stated that the Adaptation Fund Resources can be used as cofinancing for the proposed LDCF project. The Adaptation Fund cannot be used as cofinancing for this project.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The areas proposed for the LDCF investment in this project, and the activities appear to overlap with the Adaptation Fund proposal. The proposed activities for the LDCF investment in the pilot areas include, climate resilient water management technologies, and shoreline protection measures. For the adaptation fund proposal, there are similar activities. Further details need to be provided on the location of the project sites as it relates to the adaptation fund, and the specific activities. Consideration could be given to submitting a detailed map of the relationship between the pilot adaptation fund sites and the proposed site for the LDCF investment.</p> <p>Update November 22 2011</p> <p>The project is recommended for PIF clearance. Discussions with UNDP have clarified the issues related to overlap and duplication. Further details on mechanisms to avoid overlap and duplication will be included at CEO Endorsement. The PPG is also recommended for clearance</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		Yes , the agency included information on the status of the PPG.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		CEO endorsement is not recommended. Please address issues in

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			box 12 and 27. Update April 23rd 2013. The relevant clarifications have been provided and the tracking tool submitted. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 22, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 12, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Clarification is required on component 1(b) which is identification of current and projected climate change risks in forest areas. The title of this sub component does not match with the description of the activities associated with the component. Further there needs to be clarification on the activity which will provide a detailed description of expected project implications on existing institutional /policy/legislative frameworks in forest areas. As the project is to enhance resilience of tourism reliant communities, it may be more appropriate to focus on tourism areas, rather than forest areas
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The itemized budget is justified
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	The PPG will be considered for approval upon successful clearance of the PIF. Update November 22 2011 The PPG is recommended for approval.

	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.