



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

GEF ID:	4550		
Country/Region:	Samoa		
Project Title:	Strengthening Multi-sectoral Management of Critical Landscapes		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4536 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,736,363
Co-financing:	\$13,117,908	Total Project Cost:	\$17,854,271
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	

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?	06-09-2011 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	06-09-2011 UA: Yes. Endorsement letter signed by acting CEO, Mulipola Ausetalia Titimaea, dated May 5, 2011. 08-31-2011 UA: Re-submission includes a letter from the Ministry stating that it is their wish to combine all STAR resources into one SLM project.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	06-09-2011 UA: UNDP has been active in several small island nations to strengthen land and	

*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)
		resource management. The project's field of work is in line with the comparative advantage matrix of the GEF.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	06-09-2011 UA: Yes. Fit with country program is given. UNDP has 4 program officers based in the country office.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	06-09-2011 UA: Yes. Samoa intends to invest all its STAR resources into this SLM project, using the flexibility criterion.	
	• the focal area allocation?	06-09-2011 UA: Yes. Refer above.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	06-09-2011 UA: Yes. The project is aligned with the LD RBM framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	06-09-2011 UA: LD-3	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and	06-09-2011 UA: Consistent with Samoa's Strategy for Development (2008-2012) and Samoa's	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Action Plan to Combat Land Degradation and Mitigate the Effects of Drought (2006).	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	06-09-2011 UA: Yes, through national SLM information and communication strategy, institutionalized capacity building for government extension service.	
Project Design	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?	06-09-2011 UA: Not fully. The description in paragraph 11 is basically a list of different ongoing projects. Please elaborate in a way that (a) shows that a consistent package exists on which further GEF support can be built and that this package is adequately financed (please provide \$US figures for \$SAT as well), (b) clarifies in as much GEF-LDCF support contributes to the baseline package, and (c) better outlines the necessary incremental support by GEF that will complement the baseline projects' efforts - so far para 12 only states the project objective without elaborating on the incrementality to the baseline project. 08-04-2011 UA: Has been addressed.	
	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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>06-09-2011 UA: As mentioned above (#11), the incrementality of the project, in particular the incrementality of the activities planned under component 1, needs further elaboration.</p> <p>08-04-2011 UA: Has been addressed. However, in line with comment #12, PM questions the incrementality of GEF funding for component 1.</p> <p>08-31-2011 UA: Has been revised. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>06-09-2011 UA: Mostly. The proposed project is of interest, however, the PIF needs to be elaborated in order to provide a strong justification that a small island state like Samoa uses its entire STAR allocation for a SLM project. This justification needs to be developed by showing that (a) there is a solid baseline project package, and (b) that the previous GEF support has created pre-conditions for a focused engagement in SLM. In this context, the lessons learned of previous LDCF projects should be summarized and ways outlined on how they will be incorporated into the project.</p> <p>Working on the enabling framework for INRM (comp 1) and to develop and implement landscape management plans in 40 villages (comp 2) is a sound approach. However, please clarify</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>whether (a) capacity building in output 1.4 and 1.5 has already been done by the baseline projects or has been financed by previous GEF support and (b) capacity building and technical training would be necessary to achieve the objectives in component 2.</p> <p>Please explain abbreviations: REALU, PUM.</p> <p>08-04-2011 UA: The project framework is clear. However, in line with comment #12, GEF support should be used to create GEBs on the ground.</p> <p>08-31-2011 UA: Has been addressed. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>06-09-2011 UA: The following key GEBs are listed: - increased land cover with native species - increased vegetative cover, tree density, and canopy cover - increased carbon sequestration (above and below ground) GEF expects that during the PPG phase, baselines will be established and methodologies identified/introduced that allow monitoring and quantification of the GEBs, in particular carbon benefits during project implementation.</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?	06-09-2011 UA: Yes. Improved productivity of agricultural lands will be an important national socioeconomic benefits.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	06-09-2011 UA: Partly. Please elaborate on the role of the CSO in section B5. 08-04-2011 UA: Has been addressed.	
	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)	06-09-2011 UA: Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	06-09-2011 UA: Not fully. (1) It is understood that the project will be partly based on previous GEF support provided through the LDCF. What is lacking here is a concise paragraph that summarizes the lessons learned from ongoing/completed LDCF projects, how to incorporate them and avoid duplication of efforts. Further, it would be interesting to see to what extent the proposed LD project will benefit from the climate and vulnerability information on which earlier LDCF interventions build. (2) Section B6, para 29 is basically a list of ongoing activities. More important is to briefly outline how the project will coordinate with them, in particular with	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>AusAID's proposed Agroforestry and Tree Farming Project. In this context, is this project included into the indicative co-financing?</p> <p>08-04-2011 UA: Has been largely addressed. Please answer the second part of the earlier question: Is AusAID's Agroforestry and tree Farming project mentioned in the the PIF (para 11) included into the baseline funding or the co-financing?</p> <p>08-31-2011 UA: Has been clarified. Cleared.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	06-09-2011 UA: Yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>06-09-2011 UA: Yes - based on current guidelines, the management costs are appropriate. PMC are estimated with 8% of the project grant.</p> <p>08-31-2011 UA: Has been revised to 5.3%; please reduce to 5.0%. Please consider to increase GEF funding for component 2 to a round figure of \$4million and allocate</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the odd remainder to project management costs.</p> <p>09-01-2011 UA: Has been adjusted. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>06-09-2011 UA: As far as this can be assessed at PIF stage, this seems appropriate.</p> <p>08-04-2011: Based on the additional information provided in the resubmission, the Program Manager considers GEF funding of component 1 as not appropriate.</p> <p>08-31-2011 UA: Has been reduced to \$500,000 (22% of project grant).</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>06-09-2011 UA: (1) Please provide a brief explanation on the co-financing by the two bilateral partners. How and through which projects/programmes will co-financing be provided? (2) Please explore opportunities for increasing the co-financing amount, e.g. will the listed national government entities also provide co-financing in kind?</p> <p>08-04-2011 UA: Has been addressed. Still, the indicative co-financing needs further discussion.</p> <p>08-31-2011 UA: Has been revised.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	06-09-2011 UA: UNDP has indicated grant co-financing of \$617,000.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	n/a	
	• Convention Secretariat?	n/a	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	n/a	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	06-09-2011 UA: No. Please address the issues and clarification requests in this review. 08-04-2011 UA: No. Please address outstanding issues and clarification request in this review. The main issue is that funding / co-financing of the project, in particular of component 1 appears not to be appropriate. Please refer to the comments in the review. The project proponent might want to consider to reduce the total amount of GEF resources requested for this project and to reserve a certain amount of the total STAR allocation for other projects.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		08-31-2011 UA: No. Some minor adjustments are requested.	
		09-01-2011 UA: Yes. Adjustments have been made.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	GEF expects that during the PPG phase, baselines will be established and methodologies identified/introduced that allow monitoring and quantification of the GEBs, in particular carbon benefits during project implementation.	
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 09, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 04, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 31, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 01, 2011	
	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?	06-09-2011 UA: Mostly. - B1: Please check whether such types of assessments have already been made through previous GEF LDCF projects and/or baseline projects and avoid

		<p>duplications.</p> <p>- C5. This should be a focus of the PPG exercise. The PIF mentions that: "Samoa is exploring a variety of carbon crediting methodologies (e.g. CDM, REDD+, REALU, etc.) and revenue streams (e.g. Payment for Ecological Services [PES] for communities. These will be quantified during full project preparation". Please include the assessment of the feasibility and design of PES schemes into the PPG.</p> <p>08-04-2011 UA: Has been addressed.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>06-09-2011 UA: In general, the total PPG amount requested from GEF with \$136,364 and the total budget of the PPG with \$406,000 seems rather high. A final decision regarding its justification will be made based on the additional information and revisions requested (in both PIF and PPG).</p> <p>What is the source of co-financing?</p> <p>08-04-2011 UA: Has been clarified.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>06-09-2011 UA: No. Please revise PPG request accordingly.</p> <p>08-04-2011 UA: PPG approval pending PIF clearance.</p> <p>08-31-2011 UA: Please increase co-financing for the PPG. PPG co-financing amount would need to be brought in line with increased co-financing ratio of the project.</p>
	4. Other comments	<p>06-09-2011 UA: Table D: Same applies as in the PIF, Table D. Only LD should be listed as Focal Area, including the amount of other focal areas.</p> <p>08-04-2011 UA: Has been corrected.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 09, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 01, 2011

* 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.