



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

GEF ID:	5417		
Country/Region:	Samoa		
Project Title:	Economy-wide integration of CC Adaptation and DRM/DRR to Reduce Climate Vulnerability of Communities in Samoa		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5264 (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-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$12,322,936
Co-financing:	\$183,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$195,522,936
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Pradeep Kurukulasuriya

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	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.	
Resource Availability	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	An endorsement letter from the operational focal point is on file.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	• the STAR allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the focal area allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	The resources are available under the principle of equitable access.	
Resource Availability	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	The project is aligned with the LDCF results framework and strategic objectives.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	The project is consistent with the country's NAPAs. The project focuses on implementing activities 1, 5 and 7 of Samoa's NAPA, i.e securing community water resources, agriculture and food security sustainability and coast infrastructure for highly vulnerable districts.	
Project Design	<p>6. 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?</p>	Yes the baseline projects are sufficiently described.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	The components, outcome and outputs in the project framework are clear, but there is a need for more detail, as it relates to component 2 of the project, enhanced	

		<p>responders of climate induced hazards. There is the potential for overlap with GEFPMIS #4585 Enhancing the Resilience of Tourism-reliant Communities to Climate Change Risks.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please use the PPG process to provide detailed information on the project sites and ensure that there is no overlap or duplication with GEFPMIS #4585- Enhancing the Resilience of Tourism-reliant Communities to Climate Change Risks, and other related projects in Samoa. By CEO Endorsement please make sure there is no overlap with all related ongoing activities in Samoa, including the PPCR investments.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The adaptation benefits have been identified and the additional reasoning is sound and appropriate.</p>	
	<p>9. 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?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Information is provided on the role of public participation, including CSOs, and the relevant roles in the project.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g.,</p>	<p>The project takes into account potential major risks, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures.</p>	

	resilience)		
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is consistent with other projects and initiatives, however please see comment in Box 7 to ensure there is no duplication and overlap.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	The project has capability for scaling up. The investments in this project may not only be replicated in other SIDS in the region, but also, can catalyse further investments that will help scale up this nation-wide approach. Sustainability has been built into the project by a strong emphasis on institutional and capacity development.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs	

	17. <u>At PIE</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	The indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated is adequate. The amount of cofinancing that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role of the Agency.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The funding level for project management cost is appropriate.	
	19. <u>At PIE</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	A PPG is requested and the amount requested is adequate for the level of funding requested and the project design.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			

Recommendation at PIF Stage	being recommended?		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please ensure that by CEO Endorsement there is no duplication or overlap with ongoing activities in Samoa.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	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.**