



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening multi-sector management of critical landscapes (SMSMCL)			
Country(ies):	Samoa	GEF Project ID: ¹	4550
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4536
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE), Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF), Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (MWCSO)	Submission Date:	20 May 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	MFA (LD+IW ²)	Project Duration(Months)	60 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> 	Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods	Agency Fee (\$):	489,545

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK³

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
LD 3: Reduce pressures on Natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape	Outcome 3.1: Enhanced enabling environments between sectors in support of SLM.	Government agencies collaborating on SLM initiatives across sectors and at multiple scales	GEF	500,000	2,300,615
	Outcome 3.2: Good management practices in the wider landscape demonstrated and adopted by relevant economic sectors.	Information on SLM (wider landscape) technology and good practices disseminated	GEF	4,010,822	18,634,981
IW-1: Catalyze multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in transboundary surface and groundwater basins while considering climatic variability and change	Outcome 1.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency, sustainable fisheries with rights-based management, IWRM, water supply protection in SIDS, and aquifer and catchment protection	Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments	GEF	151515	2,070,554
Sub-total				4,662,337	23,006,150

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² This project has included IW resources allocated to Samoa as a part of Pacific Ridge to Reef programme

³ Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

Project management cost				233,117	1,210,850
Total project costs				4,895,454	24,217,000

As noted in the OFP endorsement letter for the project PIF, this project uses the STAR flexibility mechanism of GEF-5 resources, and the total of US\$ 2,361,996 of BD STAR allocation and US\$1,944,030 CCM STAR allocation are also being channeled to the LD focal area for LD-3 inclusive of the corresponding contribution of each focal area to Project Management cost and IA fees (see shown in Table D). Additionally, 175,000 USD from the global International Waters funds have been added to this project under the Pacific Ridge to Reef Programme, thereby making it effectively an MFA.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<p>Project Objective: To strengthen local capacities, incentives and actions for integrated landscape management in order to reduce land degradation and greenhouse gas emissions and promote nature conservation whilst enhancing sustainable local livelihoods; <i>Critical landscapes of over 160,000 ha under integrated SLM management by local communities, where indices of ecosystem health, diversity and condition remain the same as baseline or improve and is mainstreamed into local development plans (forest and tree cover; maintenance of wetlands; no net increase of agricultural land under mono cropping)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area under vegetative cover increased 24,430 (with average tree density of 111 trees/ ha) • 128000 ha of forest cover (under effective management – including no net loss due to land use conversion) • 5000 households’ incomes increase by 10% on average by project end through increased land productivity • Avoided emission of 689333 CO₂-eq for 4 years and sequestration of store additionally 10,755 tCO₂eq. 						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Communities and farmers are able to undertake and benefit from integrated land and water management on their traditionally owned lands (composed of different ecosystems and agriculture, fisheries and livestock production systems)	TA /IN V	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of certified organic farmers/farms increased by 30% from a baseline of 606⁴ 2. 50% increase in the density and diversity of native tree species in cyclone damaged landscapes around Apia covering 3314 ha 3. 55000 ha of natural forests, riverine areas and wetlands under protection and management in the production landscape under community land use plans (forest and tree cover maintenance; maintenance of wetlands; no net increase of agricultural land under mono cropping) 4. At least 5000 farmer households adopting at least one or more soil / water management and conservation practices on agricultural lands covering 18000 ha 5. Increased water quality as a consequence of enhanced watershed management and water source protection, with at least 50% of the project sites report on increased water quality by the end of the project – 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Increased land productivity and benefits at farmers’ household level through adoption of sustainable land and water management 1.2: Participatory village action plans formally agreed between local community leaders and the government and implemented through community participation, leading to improved SLM over traditionally owned landscapes 	GEF	4,162,337	20,705,535

⁴ Women in Business (WIB)

		<p>including <i>E. coli</i> levels within national standards; and additional parameters of nutrient loads (such as nitrogen) are also within acceptable international standards</p> <p>6. 50% Per cent of Livestock relocated to optimal grazing areas away from critical riparian areas (Estimated 30000 livestock in target areas, covering around 2500 ha⁵ at baseline)</p> <p>7. At least 50 villages have developed plans integrating SLM with the participation of 15000 community member including men, women and young</p> <p>8. At least 40% of the communities are able to report on increased knowledge on SLM through access to national SLM system, audio-video materials and trainings</p>				
2. Strengthened national enabling environment to promote integrated landscape management through local households and communities.	TA	<p>9. Soil management and conservation manual developed including SLM practices for agriculture, forestry and water resources management targeting local communities available in local language</p> <p>10. Land Resource management legislation developed and national land use policy updated; Update the Agriculture Sector Plan 2011-2016 strengthened to mainstream SLM approaches and management practices; policies on mining (including sand mining) strengthened or developed</p> <p>11. Develop formal guidelines for sustainable land management under village development plans under PUMA Act increased capacities for INRM as measured by an increase in the score of the GEF LD Tracking Tool Enhanced cross-sector enabling</p>	<p>2.1: Strengthened frameworks to promote locally appropriate SLM through multi-sectoral approach, including technology transfer and information dissemination systems</p> <p>2.2 Systematic national capacity enhancement on SLM for policy makers, communities, private sector, and NGOs</p>	GEF	500,000	2,300,615

⁵ To be confirmed at project start

		<p>environment for integrated landscape management (from 3 to 5)</p> <p>12. By the end of the project a formal institutional coordination mechanism has been established including all relevant ministries to ensure integration of SLM in all sectors to manage multiuse landscapes through combined efforts, shared technical</p> <p>13. 200% increase in the involvement of private sector, civil society and others in promoting SLM in partnership with the government.</p> <p>14. National SLM information system in line with information system for national Environment Management Strategy established and managed by MNRE</p> <p>15. at least 100 staff from MNRE, MAF, MWCSC have completed the SLM training , tailored for Samoa and including carbon accounting from LULUCF</p> <p>16. at least 1 SLM long term course has been institutionalized at an University in Samoa</p>				
Subtotal			GEF	4662337	23,006,150	
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁶			GEF	233,117	1,210,850	
Total project costs				4,895,454	24,217,000	

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

Please include letters confirming co financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Finance	Grant	23,000,000
		In-kind	600,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	617,000
Total Co-financing			24,217,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY ⁷

⁶ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

⁷ Please note that Samoa is applying the flexibility rule and using all GEF 5 STAR resources for LD

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF	Biodiversity	Samoa	2,147,269	214,726	2,361,995
UNDP	GEF	Climate Land	Samoa	1,767,300	176,730	1,944,030
UNDP	GEF	Degradation Change	Samoa	821,794	82,180	903,974
UNDP	GEF	International Waters	Global	159,091	15,909	175,000
Total Grant Resources				4,895,454	489,545	5,384,999

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 (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	445,000	600,000	1,045,000
National/Local Consultants	905,000	800,000	1,705,000

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁸

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

When the project PIF was submitted to the GEFSEC in 2011, it was consistent with Samoa’s Strategy for the Development of Samoa (SDS) (2008-2012). In the submitted project document, the project is aligned with the subsequent cycle of the country’s Strategy for the development of Samoa (SDS) 2012-2016, which continues to pursue the same vision emphasized in the SDS 2008-2012 – to achieve *an improved quality of life for all*. The importance of sustainable land use management practices through prudent utilization of lands and land-based resources in accordance with land resource potential and vulnerability has also been emphasized by this new national strategy. Please refer to section 1.5 “Policy and Legislative Framework For SLM” of the UNDP-GEF project document for more details.

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

In addition to the alignment of the project to the GEF-5’s LD3 as proposed in the project PIF, this project is also now aligned to the IW 1, Objective 1.3. Samoa has endorsed its participation in the GEF-5 programmatic approach “Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods”, and hence Samoa would like use IW global resource to this project. This project will, under Component 1, support integrated water resources management and assist communities in planning local actions to reduce water pollution from household and domestic animals’ waste. It will also assist the government’s capacity building on water quality monitoring and the analysis and dissemination of such water quality data to inform community action plans to improve water quality management. Thus the project has some directly relevant indicators for this – such as At least 50% of the project sites report on increased water quality by the end of the project as a consequence of enhanced watershed management and water source protection; and at least 50% of livestock relocated to optimal grazing areas away from critical riparian areas. In doing so, the project is fully consistent with the LD3 Outcome 1.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency, sustainable fisheries with rights-based management, IWRM, water supply protection in SIDS, and aquifer and catchment protection.

⁸ 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.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

In addition to that presented in the PIF, these are considered additional comparative advantages of UNDP for this project. UNDP has been working globally to strengthen governance and markets for SLM—taking a multi sectoral approach at the landscape level in Samoa and in many other countries around the world. This project fits well under UNDP's Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012-2020 (The Future We Want: Biodiversity and Ecosystems - Driving Sustainability). The project fits the **Signature** Programme 1 is “Integrating biodiversity and ecosystem management into development planning and production sector activities to safeguard biodiversity and maintain ecosystem services that sustain human wellbeing” , as this project will support the integration of and operationalization of biodiversity and ecosystem conservation objectives into multiple sectors across land- including key productive sectors, such as fisheries, agriculture and forestry; promote more sustainable production practices that maintain land and water ecosystem services; and conserve remaining biodiversity. The project is also aligned with Signature Programme 3 is “Managing and rehabilitating ecosystems for adaptation to and mitigation of climate change”, as the project will support Samoa to conserve and rehabilitate natural ecosystems to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. UNDP has been particularly active in several small island nations to strengthen land and resource management. This project is in line with UNDP's comparative advantage, as noted in the GEF Council Paper C.31.5 “Comparative Advantages of GEF Agencies”, in the area of capacity building, and strengthening technical and policy development. UNDP has implemented several initiatives related to SLM – in policy development, capacity development and in field implementation. In Samoa, UNDP has supported the development and implementation of the UNDP-GEF MSP Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of SLM, which has supported the development of a National Action Plan (NAP) for SLM, as well as some activities on capacity building and demonstration work. Several community based projects related to SLM have been supported under the UNDP/GEF-Small Grants Programme (SGP) and the Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA)-funded CBA Programme. They include work in at least 10 communities on riverbanks and coastal protection, wetland management, upland management, Integrated Watershed Management and Marine Protected Areas, including coastal planting and watershed planting. UNDP was particularly instrumental in the formulation of the Tsunami Early Recovery Framework to assist Samoa to rebuild its communities after a devastating tsunami severely affected livelihoods in September 2009. This Project is designed to address key recovery needs identified under this Framework in the areas of improving livelihoods, reducing disaster risks, and improving development coordination, as well as restoring and expanding people's livelihoods in the mainstay fishing, tourism and agricultural sectors. Investing in green development and green jobs is an overarching theme of the UNDP early recovery effort. The Project also enables people to reduce their exposure to disasters by offering training, and by promoting activities that are environmentally sustainable and ultimately build peoples' resilience to climate change. At the same time, to support a coordinated implementation of early recovery efforts at the national and community levels, UNDP co-chairs the Early Recovery Cluster with the Ministry of Finance.

UNDP's comparative advantage in the implementation of this Sustainable Land Management project also lies in the potential benefits obtainable from the implementation of UNDP-supported adaptation projects under-way in the “Economy-wide integration of CC Adaptation and DRM/DRR to reduce climate vulnerability of communities in Samoa” (LDCF) project, forestry (ICCRAFS, LDCF) and agriculture (ICCRAHS, LDCF) sectors, which are relevant to the proposed project, given Sustainable Land Management's cross sectoral nature.

Another relevant initiative that represents a comparative advantage for the implementation of the SLM project is the Samoa Cyclone Evan Early Recovery, which will help resume the heavily damaged agricultural sector and strengthen national and community capacity for disaster risk reduction and recovery planning, while mainstreaming climate change adaptation measures. UNDP's comparative advantage in the implementation of this Sustainable Land Management project also lies in the potential benefits obtainable from the implementation of UNDP-supported adaptation projects under-way in the “Economy-wide integration of CC Adaptation and DRM/DRR to reduce climate vulnerability of communities in Samoa” (LDCF) project, forestry (ICCRAFS, LDCF) and agriculture (ICCRAHS, LDCF) sectors, which are relevant to the proposed project, given Sustainable Land Management's cross sectoral nature.

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

The baseline problems of land degradation and gaps in the baseline have not changed between PIF approval and this project document finalization. However, since the PIF approval, there has been a cyclone that has accelerated land degradation and ecosystem loss and that this loss in part is because of the already advanced land degradation. Thus this has accentuated the existing problems. Towards the end of 2012, watershed around the capital city Apia was devastated by the Tropical Cyclone Evan. Tropical Cyclone Evan has been considered the worst tropical cyclone to impact Samoa since Cyclone Val in 1991. The Cyclone made landfall in Samoa at 2 pm, on the 13th December 2012, and from 13 December 2012, it caused widespread damage across the country, bringing heavy rainfall, flash floods and maximum sustained winds up to 90 knots (166.7 kilometers per hour). The impact has been severe with the loss of 5 lives and about four thousand, eight hundred people temporarily displaced. TC Evan destroyed power plants cutting power, disrupted communication services, uprooted trees many of which contributed to log dams and adding to already swollen rivers, destroyed buildings and roads, and extensively damaged crops. Based on modelled ground-up losses per district of Samoa from Tropical Cyclone Evan, the highest impacts are calculated for Apia and the districts surrounding Apia. The damage of this Cyclone

The Cyclone has accelerated land degradation and ecosystem loss and that this loss in part is because of the already existing land and water management problems in this area, which was accentuated by the Cyclone. One key degradation problem that exacerbated the Cyclone impact was the large areas of faster growing *Albezzia* and other non-native tree species that had replaced local tree species. The Cyclone was not only able to more easily uproot these shallow rooted species more easily, thereby exposing topsoil to the high intensity rainfall, they are also thought to have caused temporary damming of rivers and streams and caused localized flooding and then upon bursting, caused further flooding, erosion and damages to infrastructure. Rapid urbanization and inappropriate locations of settlements (such as known floodplains) further aggravated the impacts of the Cyclone. The government's estimates of financial needs for rehabilitation and restoration of habitats, infrastructure and livelihoods as a consequence of the Cyclone is around 300 million USD. Currently, proposals have been presented to several donors to seek such funds and the current pledges for the Samoa Cyclone Evan Early Recovery Project, is equivalent of 217,100,000 Samoan Tala or 95,219,298 US dollars. Under this project, most amounts pledged will assist communities to clear debris and damaged infrastructure and help in the reconstruction of transport systems, electricity, and other services that are essential for local communities. Integrated natural resources management, including proper land use planning and implementation, has been recognized as a key need to address long term resilience of the watersheds to further such climatic events. However, without the support of this project, the investments in INRM are likely to be extremely limited and the degradation that has been caused may further worsen during even normal climatic events. By working in this geographic area, not only will GEF resources add incremental values in achieving SLM objectives, the project will also increase its overall area of impact from 60,000 ha (proposed in the PIF) to over 160,000 ha, thereby further aiding cost effectiveness of the project. We are taking the opportunity of the baseline restoration to introduce SLM and reduce conflicting land uses so that in the ecosystems will be restored but more importantly in the future they will be more resilient.

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 project's results framework has been refined from the version that was presented in the PIF, without fundamentally changing the overall project results. Several of the PIF Outputs have been subsumed under the project document's Outputs. The Alignments are noted in the table below.

Project Component	Expected Outputs presented in the PIF	Links to revised project framework
Effective national enabling environment to promote integrated landscape management = Component 2 in	1.1.1 Strengthened legal and policy frameworks to enhance global benefits through (i) updated Agriculture Sector Plan; (ii) legally binding sustainable land management plans (SMPs) approved for each village under PUM Act (2004) ,	1. Subsumed under Component 2 – Output 2.1. Please see indicator in Strategic Results Framework 10. Number of national policies and plans that support for inter-sectoral and

Project Component	Expected Outputs presented in the PIF	Links to revised project framework
Project Document	which also include indicators for improved ecosystem services, GHG emission reduction and GHG sequestration	partnership approach to promote community based SLM
	1.1.2 Strengthened institutional collaboration at national level, especially across sectors between MNRE, MAF, MWCSD, MCIL and SBS to manage multiuse landscapes through combined efforts, shared technical resources and to empower local government and communities. The focus here will be on aligning extension services between agriculture and environment sectors.	Subsumed under Component 2, Output 2.1. Please refer to the Strategic Results Framework indicator 12 Coordination mechanism in place to ensure multi-sector approach to SLM in line with National Environment management Strategy
	1.1.3. Interactive web-based decision support/ information system available in English and Samoan languages for national and local authorities and local communities to integrate multiple datasets from environment, population, agriculture, climate information, hazard maps to aid landscape modeling and planning. This will aid spatial landscape planning, setting benchmarks and monitoring of impacts on SLM, biodiversity conservation and GHG emission reduction and sequestration of GHG through community and government actions.	Subsumed under Component 2, Output 2.2 . Please refer to Strategic Results Framework indicator 14 on “National SLM information system in line with information system for national Environment Management Strategy”
	1.1.4 Long term systematic capacity building on SLM through the institutionalization of curriculum for civil servants and communities on landscape level planning for SLM, enhanced global biodiversity conservation and GHG emission reduction/ sequestration as well as financing. This will be done in partnership with the Samoa National University (through their Professional Development Centre) and the University of South Pacific’s agriculture faculty based in Samoa (School of Agriculture and Food Technology)	Subsumed under Component 2, Output 2.2. Please refer to indicator 15 in the Strategic Results Framework on Number of government staff who have completed new training of trainers short term courses provided by USP on SLM, tailored for Samoa and including carbon accounting from LULUCF”
Long term capacities and incentives in place for local communities and local authorities to undertake integrated landscape	2.1.1 Landscape management plans developed for two critical landscapes and implemented through community participation	Included under Component 1, Output 1.2, see indicator “Number of integrated participatory village level SLM plans”. It was felt that rather than landscape plans, community plans that are owned by local communities over the lands they use would be better suited for local implementation
	2.1.2 Improved SLM and SFM compatible land-use by farming households such as: a) soil and water conservation methods – such as organic fertilizer use, low tillage agriculture, (including biological nitrogen fixation), b) agro-forestry and alley cropping, c) tree plantations on sloping and contour mountain areas, and to promote mixed cropping, as well as terracing-improvement measures on sloping/hilly or marginal lands	Included as Component 1, Output 1.1. under various indicators on SFM, farmland management etc.

Project Component	Expected Outputs presented in the PIF	Links to revised project framework
	2.1.3 At least 40% of farming households in target sites adopt best-practice, integrated organic and traditional /local innovations for agriculture	Included as an indicator for Component 1, Output 1.1 – such as on organic farming, number of farmer households adopting at least one soil/ water management and conservation practice etc.
	2.1.4 Improved SLM at landscape level by community based management beyond household farms that can plan, facilitate and raise funds to implement landscape level plans	Included as an indicator for Component 1, Output 1.2

Key direct global benefits of this project have been further clarified in the project document and include the following:

1. **Sustainable land and water management:** adoption by at least 50 villages, and by over 5000 households, that leads to integrated land, ecosystems and water management in critical landscapes of at least 160000 hectares including :
 - a. soil and water conservation techniques on household managed farms totalling at least 18,000 ha
 - b. Increased vegetative cover of at least 24000 ha (outside proposed protected areas) through moving from mono-cropping to more mixed/ agroforestry systems on farm, restoration and rehabilitation of degraded lands (including forest lands) using native species. This is expected to reduce exposure of soil to direct rainfall, reducing soil loss and maintaining soil structure, biomass content and water retention.
 - c. Reduced pollution of water through better waste management through household pollution and judicious use agrochemical or through conversion to organic farming (such as through measurement of nutrient loading and coliform counts)
2. **Maintenance of globally important ecosystems and their services:** The project will directly support the maintenance of 43,800 ha of community owned forests through sustainable management practices that includes promotion of sustainable harvesting of timber, firewood and non-timber forest products. Additionally, the project will further support the creation of new protected areas within such community owned landscapes. Such globally important ecosystems have already been identified (called Key Biodiversity Areas). The project’s pilot sites include at least 4 KBAs totalling 88000 ha. As most of the land ownership in Samoa (including these KBAs) is vested into local communities, a new legal regime needs to be in place that recognizes local ownership and rights over land but still ensures long term maintenance and conservation of such areas. Thus, the project will help develop the regulatory mechanism for these new PA creations, and their effective management thereby avoiding their loss or degradation. One of the KBAs that will be supported – the Central Savaii Rainforest KBA is considered the highest priority for terrestrial conservation investment, as it is the largest contiguous area of rainforest in tropical Polynesia and internationally. It is recognised as one of the last refuge for some critically endangered or endangered species including the following endemic species: Samoan Bush Palm (*Niu vao*), *Drymophleous samoensis* (Maniuniu), Tooth Billed Pigeon (Manumea), Mao (Maomao), Samoan Broadbill (Tolaifatu), Samoan Flying Fox (Pea vao) and the Samoan Moorhen (Puna’e). The last species is regarded as critically endangered and possibly extinct. In addition to the biodiversity conservation services, the conservation of such important habitats will also ensure that they continue to act as water ‘reservoirs’ by regulating water infiltration into underground water stores, regulate water flows into the streams and rivers; and ensure that soil and organic matters in soil are maintained in-situ.
3. **Avoidance of GHG emissions and GHG sequestration:** The project is expected to remove pressure on forest resources – particularly the threats to conversion into other land uses. By conservative estimates, the deforestation that will be avoided is estimated at around 500 ha per year (using assumption of 0.5% loss per

year). The loss of 500 ha of tropical dry forests is equivalent, at minimum to release of 137867tons of CO₂-eq/year⁹ and 689333 CO₂-eq for 4 years. The project’s afforestation of 500 ha of tropical forests is expected to store additionally 10,755 tCO₂¹⁰.

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:

During the project preparation a series of consultation and studies were undertaken that has led to adjustments in the risk assessment. The risk table has been updated as below:

Risk	Level	Mitigation
Lack of past experiences on a strong inter-sectoral approach for SLM in the past, especially with the MWCS	Medium	Though the envisaged inter-sectoral approach for SLM is a fairly new concept for Samoa, there have been other projects that have been implemented in an inter-sectoral approach – particularly on adaptation to climate change. This project was designed with close cooperation and collaboration with different government Ministries, and with participation of NGOs as well. Thus, there is considerable understanding and support for this inter-sectoral approach. The implementation of this concept in actual field situation will be the main challenge for the project. For this, the project will invest adequate time and resources to identify key issues where truly inter-sectoral approach is necessary, and where coordination alone is adequate, and where different agencies may lead some parts of the activities. This will be done during the project inception phase.
Low levels of participation by local people as most local communities do not see national projects as primarily benefiting them	Medium to low	The project has clearly articulated an Output (1.1) that will assist the households to undertake improved soil and water conservation measures, including conversion to organic farming. This is expected to lead to an increase of household incomes on average by 10%. Thus, the project has been designed to ensure that communities and households benefit directly from the project and that such likely benefits have been communicated widely during project design phase. Please refer to socioeconomic benefits section for more details.
Local SLM commitments will not be able to strong enough to deter land use practices that are contrary to SLM objectives, especially if sudden global rise in prices of exported agricultural commodities (such as Taro) become attractive proposition for communities to convert land use	Medium to high	Local decision making on land allocation and wider land use in Samoa are primarily under the domain of traditional chiefs in a community. In order to ensure that village Chiefs understand the importance of SLM for the sustainability of their own land and water resources, they will also be focal targets for awareness raising as well as for “entering” village level activities, so that there is support for them for project activities. The project will also ensure that village chiefs of villages that are able to plan and implement successful SLM actions are also used as champions to have peer-to-peer influence on other Chiefs. During community consultations, many have noted on how the price increases in Taro led to forest clearance on steep forest lands, only to lead to landslides and their abandonment after the price decreases (leading to the abandoned land being infested with invasive species) and thus most communities are keen to avoid this from repeating. The project will ensure that the soil and water conservation practices introduced are able to increase yields on-farm, without the need to expand to natural ecosystems.
Impacts of climate change on Samoa are severe and causes low viability of	High	The project will have strong partnership with other UNDP, GEF, JICA and AusAID projects that are examining the links between climate change and agriculture, and promoting adaptation measures for the agriculture and forestry sectors. This project

⁹ This has been calculated following the Tier-1 method, based on the IPCC 2006 National GHG Inventory Guidance, Vol.2 AFOLU, Chapter 4. Table 4.7, Above-ground biomass in forests, suggests that tropical dry forests in insular Asia contain 160 tons of dry matter per ha above ground (below ground biomass loss, as well as loss in organic soil carbon and litter omitted from the current calculation for conservatism); The carbon fraction default value of 0.47 (Table 4.3) was used. The default conversion of carbon to CO₂ is *44/12:

¹⁰ The IPCC Good Practice Guidance for National Inventories (2006, AFOLU Volume, Table 4.12, column Above-ground net biomass growth in forest plantations in d.m. per ha per year) estimates for such forests the annual increment of above-ground biomass in plantations to be 8.0 tons aboveground dry biomass per year or 3.76 tons of carbon per year (IPCC conversion factor of 0.47 for d.m. to C conversion). The relevant root to shoot ratio is 0.56 (IPCC table 4.4, for under 20 t per ha), the total carbon increment per ha is therefore 3.76+3.76*0.56=5.87 tC/ha/y, or, when converted to CO₂, is 21.51 tCO₂-eq per ha per year (litter and soil carbon pool fluxes are ignored for conservatism at this stage). For 500 ha of forests created under the project, the annual sequestration benefit is thus estimated to be 21.51*500

Risk	Level	Mitigation
farming and loss of livelihoods		will also strengthen local community understanding on CC issues, and strengthen climate resilience amongst highly vulnerable communities and ensure that any SLM activities are also clearly linked to possible adaptation measures linked to predicted impacts on climate change. One of the ways the project will increase resilience of local ecosystems and thus ensure community resilience is through the promotion of local species at the expense of alien tree species. The introduced species have been easily uprooted and broken during storm and cyclone events due to their weaker structure and shallower roots. Thus, they have often been easily removed by storm events, exposing soil and damaging infrastructure when they get washed into streams and rivers.
Land disputes amongst village members may adversely affect community land use visioning, planning and implementation	Low	The project will support dispute resolution mechanisms so that appropriate solutions can be developed through consultation with the Village Council, with the involvement of local chiefs (Matai) and Pulenuu to secure commitment and minimize disputes
The techniques and technologies developed are not gender sensitive – i.e. they increase inequity between men and women or change the social roles of men and women in a way that reduces self reliance.	Low	The project will conduct training on gender analysis for project team, incorporate gender training and use guidelines during selection of technologies. Women’s committees at local level will be strongly involved in all aspects of local planning and implementation.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The Government of Samoa will ensure that this project benefits from strong donor coordination in Samoa, led by the Aid Coordination and Loan Management Division (ACLMD) of the Ministry of Finance. In order to promote joint work planning, proper activity sequencing between different related initiatives, and adaptive management of interventions, a working group will be established under the joint aegis of MNRE and MAF comprising the project teams of different projects. Since the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment is involved in most of these initiatives, a special effort will be made to ensure strong coordination and cooperation between all these projects through the development of an institutional support and M&E mechanism within the Ministry. Further, periodic meetings will be organized to share best practices and knowledge between these related initiatives, as being proposed in the World Bank-ADB regional Pilot Programme for building Climate Resilience (PPCR) in the Pacific (a special emphasis has been placed on sharing the lessons learnt using the Adaptation Learning Mechanism [ALM]).

The key initiatives that this project will coordinate activities with include a number of GEF and LDCF funded initiatives. Key initiatives include:

- The GEF-UNDP Small Grants projects building capacity of local communities in Samoa,
- GEF-UNDP regional “Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change” (PACC) Project where Samoa is implementing coastal adaptation measures. The PACC project aims to strengthen technical capacities to support appropriate adaptation-centric policies, demonstrate cost-effective adaptation techniques in key sectors, and promote regional cooperation. It is designed to lay the framework for effective and efficient future investment on climate change adaptation in the Pacific.
- The UNDP-LDCF Integrating Climate Change Risks into the Forestry Sector in Samoa is supporting the Government of Samoa (GoS) to strengthen institutional capacities to systematically identify and address the climate change-driven risks for the management of native forests and agroforestry areas, in order to increase the resilience of rural communities and protect their livelihoods from dynamic climate-related damage.
- The activities of this project also have strong links with the UNEP-GEF regional project on invasive species management and the GEF-FAO multi-country project on Forestry and Protected Area Management in the Pacific.

- This project’s implementation will also be closely coordinated with the GEF5’s Regional Ridge to Reef Programmatic Approach for the Pacific, which will be led by UNDP. This programme, entitled “Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods” brings together a number of Pacific nations under one programmatic approach. The Programme will help to cross fertilize lessons and good practices between countries and Samoa will also be able to contribute its lessons from this project and learn from other projects in the regional through this. Under this regional framework, a new UNDP-LDCF project entitled “Economy-wide integration of CC Adaptation and DRM/DRR to reduce climate vulnerability of communities in Samoa” is being proposed. This project will establish an economy-wide approach to climate change adaptation in Samoa, aimed for efficient integration and management of adaptation and DRR/DRM into national development planning and programming and enhancing the resilience of communities’ physical assets and livelihoods across Samoa, to CC and natural disasters.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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 is expected to benefit at least 24,459 men and 22,942 women, who reside in the project’s target areas, constituting around 5000 households. These include 2152 men and 2018 women who are nationally defined as poor.

Key socioeconomic benefits of the project will include the following:

- **Improved water quality and availability:** The project supported SLM activities are expected to have strong benefits to local communities through maintenance/ conservation of water sources (bore holes, water springs and rivers/ streams), and through better management of vegetation cover and soil management (to retain water). Furthermore, the support by the project to convert a number of farmers to organic farming and for others to better use eco-friendly agriculture (such as integrated pest management), to move away domestic animals grazing from riparian areas, and to ensure that waterways are not polluted from domestic animal and household wastes are expected to lead to improved water quality. The project will support national capacities to monitor water quality regularly and to analyse and disseminate such information to local communities to aid SLM practises locally. Indicators for surface water quality will include - turbidity (sedimentation from soil erosion), and chemical analysis; and river flow (volume) taken at rivers in project sites. For underground water – changes in water volume and salinity (any increase in groundwater table or lowering of salinity due to the impact of SLM practices upon over-exploitation or reduced recharge of groundwater - measured through boreholes if available) will be monitored, amongst others.
- **Increased ecosystem services and products from sustainable forest management** – The project’s support to effectively manage at least 43000 ha of forests and an additional 6,600 ha of integrated landscape is expected to maintain and enhance forest products that local communities depend on – including non-timber forest products (such as traditional medicinal plants) and even fuel wood. Sustainable harvesting will ensure that communities will continue to benefit from such services from the forests for the long term. The socioeconomic benefits of this project at local level will be improved productivity of agricultural lands through better land and water management practices that are expected to halt or reduce soil degradation. In addition, the project’s work to support value chain development is expected to increase local employment and increase household level revenues. The project’s support is expected to lead to an increased productivity of crops, increased annual incomes per household and improved household food and energy security. These will be tracked during project implementation. The project’s main beneficiaries will also include women and the project will ensure thorough gender analysis to better promote equitable participation and benefit sharing in the project related actions, including strong gender dimensions as outlined in the national Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Sector Plan (2011). The project is expecting to involve at least 5000 households in the adoption of SLM activities.
- **Increased national capacities:** The project’s capacity building actions at the national level is expected to increase the capacities of over 100 national government staff on cutting-edge SLM knowledge and technologies. Additionally, over 15000 people from local communities will benefit from awareness raising and “learning-by-doing” the issues and methodologies on SLM. Such enhanced capacities will not only have positive socioeconomic benefits to the target communities, but also to the wider population of Samoa.

- Improving the state of the bio-physical environment through the activities of the project will also improve the productivity and potential of land resources. As a result of the project activities, targeted households are expected to increase their incomes by at least 10% from the baseline as a result of engaging in a new income generating activity or in a traditional activity improved by the application of SLM practices.

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

The project's approach of mainstreaming sustainable land management through community-led landscape management is considered to be more cost effective than unisectoral and largely government driven approaches.

By being centred around community participation the proposal is expected to be more cost effective than being built solely on government investment and actions. This is because such public-private partnership reduces costs for each group of stakeholder as costs are shared or substituted by investment by another group. For example, community led protection of forests reduces government investment for fencing or policing to achieve the same objective. For communities, their investment of time and effort brings them direct access to forest goods and services and, through the support of this project, will also ensure financial benefits for the ecosystem services they maintain and enhance. Therefore, this should be more economically attractive proposition for them than their non-participation in project supported activities.

Secondly, the project's approach of taking a multi-stakeholder approach, whereby different relevant government institutions work together to achieve SLM may initially require some additional efforts and investments, but in the longer terms it is expected to yield more cost effectiveness as duplication of efforts and investments are avoided, and any contradictory actions by different sectors in the same landscape is also avoided. This will also allow more cross-learning from each other to avoid repeating any mistakes and to accelerate the dissemination of approaches that work for people and the environment, leading to more cost-effectiveness. The project's approach of providing technical support and extension through existing NGOs and other sectors to local households and communities is also expected to be more cost effective than developing or expanding its own extension services.

The project has also expanded its spatial scope from around 6000 ha in PIF to over 160000 ha, which further enhances the project's impacts and "value for money".

Additionally, the project's focus on sustainability is also considered important factors for its cost-effectiveness. These include:

- **Institutional sustainability:** The project builds primarily upon existing institutional structure and mandates of the government agencies and as per expressed policies of the government. This is expected to be sustainable as long as participants find it useful. Thus no extra investments are envisaged to maintain the institutional structures by the government post project completion. The capacity building of government staff and others are expected to be institutionalized within the USP and continued with the University's funds. Securing the institutional sustainability of the project's impacts will be promoted by developing the technical capacities at relevant levels, in all the participating institutions. Capacity building is a major thrust of the project, so both short-term and long-term plans to strengthen technical expertise and capability for all involved, have been recommended.
- **Financial sustainability:** The project will be supporting community level actions to test, demonstrate and disseminate appropriate SLM techniques. Whilst doing this, the project will ensure that such approaches are not very investment heavy so that such actions can be continued by local communities and partners with their own resources. For this, the project will develop a very clear strategy and action plan during project implementation as well as a long term plan. Every step will be taken to avoid free handing out of resources so that there are no dependencies built on external inputs amongst the local stakeholders. The financial sustainability of the project's impacts will be further assured by the project's focus on a business-based approach to SLM and SFM. The ideal situation is to develop the business aspect of the project into activities so that in the long-term, these same activities will become self-supporting and independent of external funding.

- **Social sustainability:** The capacity building activities, networking and continuous field-level presence by the management agencies (state, private and civil society) will help achieve social sustainability of the project. The build-up of trust through dialogues and stakeholder consultations, and stakeholder mobilization through capacity building by the project will assist in achieving this long-term objective. The strong focus on building on local knowledge, capacities and incentives and ensuring gender equity are expected to lead to social sustainability.
- **Environmental Sustainability:** The primary purpose of this project is to achieve environmental sustainability in Samoa. The project implementation will strive to achieve environmental sustainability at the target sites but will, in addition, also ensure that there are no off-site displacement of threats (such as protecting forests at target sites displaces harvesting in non-target sites). The environmental sustainability of the project's impacts will be assured by supporting the incorporation of environmental considerations into the location and design of SLM at all levels. This includes landscape-level ecological processes, the location of vulnerable globally-significant biodiversity and the ecological characteristics and regenerative capacity of the resources.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

Project M&E procedures will be designed and conducted by the project team and the UNDP-CO, in accordance with established GoS and UNDP-GEF procedures. The Project Results Framework contains objectives and outcomes level indicators for evaluating project implementation, along with their corresponding means of verification. These provide the basis on which the project's M&E system will be built.

Audit on project will follow UNDP audit policies and UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules.

Project start:

Project's first 6 months be considered inception and to include the development of a detailed implementation plan with all the details, including a multiple year plan with the key sub products. 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 and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- 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.
- Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool (Annex 1) if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board 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 meeting. A fundamental objective of this Inception Report will be to finalize preparation of the project's first operational AWP on the basis of the project's SRF. This will include reviewing the SRF (indicators, means of verification, and assumptions) and imparting additional details as

needed. On the basis of this exercise, the AWP will be finalized with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

Monitoring Responsibilities and Events

A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project management, in consultation with project implementation partners and other stakeholders, and incorporated into the AWP. Such a schedule will include: (i) timeframes for TRs, NSC Meetings, and other relevant advisory and/or coordination mechanisms; and (ii) project-related M&E activities.

Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the PC, based on the annual and quarterly work plans and associated indicators, with overall guidance from the PD. Project Team members will inform the Assistant Project Director and UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion.

Tripartite Review (TR) provides the tool for annual monitoring of the project and for international overseeing of the project and consists of the three signatories to the project document - UNDP, MNRE and the GEF Operational Focal Point. The project will be subject to TR at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve months of the start of full implementation. With support of the Assistant Project Director and PC, the PD will prepare an APR and submit it to UNDP-CO and the UNDP-GEF regional office at least two weeks prior to the TR for review and comments. The TR has the authority to suspend disbursement of funds if project performance benchmarks are not met, based on delivery rates and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.

Annually:

Annual work plan will be the main management instruments governing the implementation of the project. The project will prepare an AWP with well-defined result indicators, using the standard format for UNDP-supported projects. AWP will be appraised and endorsed by the PD/MNRE and UNDP. Quarterly work plans will also be prepared, consistent with the AWP. Upon approval, the annual and quarterly work plans will be an instrument of authorization to the PC for implementation of the project. Human resources mobilization and procurement plans will be added to the AWP as annexes and be subject to review and endorsement by the PD and UNDP.

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report 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.

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).
- Lesson 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.

The Annual Project Report (APR) will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the TR meeting. With support of the Assistant Project Director, the PD will present the APR to the TR, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the TR participants. The project proponent will also inform the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted, if necessary.

The UNDP-CO and the UNDP-GEF RCU, as appropriate, will conduct visits to the project field sites (based on an

agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's IR and AWP) to assess firsthand the project progress. Any member of the NCCCT may also accompany the visit, as decided by the NCCCT. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the UNDP-CO and circulated no less than one month after the visit to the Project Team, all NSC members and UNDP-GEF.

Project Monitoring Reporting

The PC, in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF extended team, will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process. The following Items (a)-(f) are mandatory and strictly related to monitoring, while (g) and (h) have a broader function. Their frequency and nature is project specific, to be defined throughout implementation.

Inception Report (IR)

The IR should address the following issues, and others deemed necessary: (i) review and finalize project institutional arrangements, including the role and responsibility of various participants for achieving the project outcomes; (ii) review and finalize project management arrangements of the project, including reporting lines; (iii) review, agree on and finalize the M&E framework for the implementation of the project; (iv) re-confirm and coordinate all co-financing sources with the project work plan; (v) review, and where necessary identify additional project risks and prepare a detailed risk management strategy for project implementation; (vi) prepare a detailed work plan for the first year of implementation and prepare a budget revision if necessary; (vii) update on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities; and (viii) update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation.

The preliminary first draft IR will be shared with the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF as soon as available and before a final draft IR is to be prepared. The final draft version is to be circulated to all stakeholders at least two weeks before the IW, for discussion and endorsement at the IW. The agreed final project IR will be sent to stakeholders no later than two weeks after the national Inception Meeting. It will include a detailed First-Year AWP, divided in quarterly timeframes, detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. This AWP includes the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the UNDP-CO or RCU or consultants, as well as timeframes for meetings of the project's decision-making structures. The IR will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation and any M&E requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months.

Annual Project Report (APR)

The APR is a UNDP requirement and part of UNDP-CO's central overseeing, monitoring, and project management. It is a self-assessment report by project management to the CO and provides input to the CO reporting process, as well as forming a key input to the TR. An APR will be prepared on an annual basis prior to the TR, to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project's AWP and assess performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work.

The format of the APR is flexible, but should include the following:

- An analysis of project performance over the reporting period, including outputs produced and, where possible, information on the status of the outcome;
- The constraints experienced in the progress towards results and the reasons for these;
- The three (at most) major constraints to achievement of results;
- AWP, Country Assistance Evaluation, and other expenditure reports generated;
- Assessment of whether the lessons learnt were being widely published on MNRE project websites and ALM websites and/or being reported at CCA meetings nationally and regionally;
- Clear recommendations for future orientation in addressing key problems.

Project Implementation Review (PIR)

The PIR is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. It has become an essential management and monitoring tool for project managers and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from on-going projects.

Once the project has been under implementation for a year, a PIR Report must be completed by the UNDP-CO, together with the NSC. The PIR Report can be prepared anytime after the review period and ideally prior to the TR. The PIR Report should then be discussed in the TR so that the result would be a PIR that has been agreed upon by the project, the executing agency, UNDP-CO and the concerned RCU.

The individual PIR Reports are collected, reviewed, and analyzed by the RCUs prior to sending them to the focal area clusters at UNDP-GEF headquarters. The focal area clusters supported by the UNDP-GEF M&E Unit analyze the PIR Reports by focal area, theme and region, for common issues/results and lessons.

The focal area PIR Reports are then discussed in the GEF Interagency Focal Area Task Forces in or around November each year, and consolidated reports by focal area are collated by the GEF Independent M&E Unit, based on the Task Force findings.

The GEF M&E Unit provides the scope and content of the PIR. In light of the similarities of both APR and PIR, UNDP-GEF has prepared a harmonized format for reference.

Quarterly Progress Reports

Quarterly monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken jointly by the PC and UNDP-CO through quarterly progress and financial reports, and the meetings of the NSC. This will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities. The project's performance indicators will be fine-tuned in consultation with stakeholders at the IW, with support from the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU. Specific targets for the first year of implementation will form part of the AWP and will be used to assess whether quarterly implementation is proceeding at the intended pace. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes. Short reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP-CO and the UNDP RCU in Bangkok by the NSC. **Quarterly:**

Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.

Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).

Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.

Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Periodic Thematic Reports

As and when called for by UNDP, UNDP RCU or project financing partners, the NSC will prepare specific thematic reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. The request for a thematic report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNDP and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. The resulting reports can be used as a form of lessons learnt exercise, specific overseeing in key areas, or as troubleshooting studies to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered. UNDP is requested to minimize its requests for thematic reports and, when such are necessary, will allow reasonable timeframes for their preparation by the Project Team.

Project Terminal Report (PTR)

During the last three months of the project the Project Team will prepare the PTR. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements and outputs of the Project, lessons learnt, objectives met, or not achieved, structures and systems implemented, etc. and will be the definitive statement of the Project's activities during its lifetime. It will also lie out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the Project's activities.

Terminal Tripartite Review (TTR) is held in the last month of project operations. With support of the PC, the PD is

responsible for preparing the TTTR Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU. It shall be prepared in draft at least one month in advance of the TTR, in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the TTR. The TTR also considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learnt can be captured, to feed into other projects under implementation or formulation.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits:

UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU 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 Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit 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 Board members.

Independent Evaluations

The project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows:

Mid-term of project cycle:

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (insert date). 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 Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle (see Annex 1).

End of Project:

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board 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 Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also 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).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

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.

Learning and knowledge sharing:

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and visibility requirements:

Full compliance is required with UNDP’s Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF%20logo). The UNDP logo can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is also required with the GEF’s Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the “GEF Guidelines”). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at:

[http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08 Branding the GEF%20final 0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08%20Branding%20the%20GEF%20final%200.pdf). Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

M& E workplan and budget

The following sections outline the principal components of the M&E Plan. Indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Indicative Monitoring and Evaluation Work Plan and Corresponding Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ excluding project team staff time	Timeframe
Inception Workshop (IW)	Assistant Project Director (APD) UNDP Country Office (CO) UNDP-GEF Regional Service Centre (RSC)	3,000 USD	Within first two months of the appointment of PD and APD
Inception Report	Assistant Project Director (APD) and Project Administrative Team staff UNDP CO	None	Immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	PC under close supervision of PD will oversee the hiring of specific institutions and delegate tasks and responsibilities to relevant Project Administrative Team members	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop	Start, mid and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual	National Steering Committee (NSC) chaired by CEO of MNRE NSC with overseeing by UNDP-CO and PD;	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to Annual Project Report and Project Implementation Review and upon completion of the implementation of the annual work

basis)	Measurement of progress conducted by MNRE, MWCSO and MAF		plans
Annual Project Report (APR) and Project Implementation Review (PIR)	PC and NSC staff UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF	None	Annually
Tripartite Review (TR) and Terminal Tripartite Review (TTR) Reports	GEF Operational Focal Point UNDP-CO PC	None	Every year, upon receipt of APR
PB Meetings	PC PB Members UNDP-CO	None	Following Project IW and subsequently at least once a year
Annual status reports /seminar /workshop	PC and NSC staff	2,000	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP
Technical reports/ knowledge and advocacy material	MNRE, MWCSO, MAF, APD and Project Administrative Team staff, UNDP External consultants as needed	None	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP
Mid-term External Review	PC and Project Administrative Team staff UNDP-CO, UNDP-GEF RCU, External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	20,000 SD	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final External Evaluation	PC and Project Administrative Team members UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	25,000 USD	At the end of project implementation
Lessons learnt and shared at international level	Project Team and UNDP		Yearly
Financial Audits	MoF and UNDP	40000	Yearly
Visits to field sites (UNDP staff travel costs to be charged to IA fees)	UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF RCU (as appropriate) NSC Members	10000	Yearly
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		100,000 USD	For 5 years

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 OPF endorsement letter).

FOR	NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
GEF5 STAR	Taulealeausumai Laavasa Malua	Chief Executive officer	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	08/22/2011
GEF5 IW	Taulealeausumai Laavasa Malua	Chief Executive officer	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	04/02/2013

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 UNDP			Sameer Karki (ENR)	66-2- 304 9100 ext. 2729	Sameer.karki @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).

LONG-TERM PROJECT GOAL:				
Samoa's productive landscapes are protected and sustainably managed to mitigate land degradation, to promote biodiversity conservation and to increase soil carbon sequestration so as to contribute to poverty alleviation as well as mitigation and adaptation to climate change impacts.				
Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Targets	Source of verification
To strengthen local capacities, incentives and actions for integrated landscape management to reduce land degradation and greenhouse gas emissions and to promote conservation whilst enhancing sustainable local livelihoods	Area under increased vegetative cover (with average tree density of 111 trees/ ha)	135000 ha	Increased by 24,430 ha	Aerial photography and satellite imagery with sampled ground truthing
	Area under forest cover (no net loss due to land use conversion) under effective management	128000 ha	128000 ha	Aerial photography and satellite imagery
	Increase of agriculture income and consumption per household as a consequence of increased productivity of land	US\$2692 on average (national ¹¹)	5000 households' incomes increase by 10% on average by project end through increased land productivity	Project surveys at beginning and end of project
	Total amount of CO2 equivalent greenhouse gas emission avoided, and sequestered at the target sites due to effective application of SLM good practices	Total national emissions from AFOLU 135.37, Gg CO2-e (2007).12	Avoided emission of 689333 CO2-eq for 4 years and sequestration of store additionally 10,755 tCO2eq.	Project report using REALU/ Carbon Benefits tool or relevant methodology
OUTCOME 1. Communities and farmers are able to undertake and benefit from integrated land and water management on their traditionally owned lands.	1. Number of certified organic farmers/farms	606 ¹³ certified currently exist; 345 in Savaii & 261 in Upolu	A 30% increase in number of households engaged in organic farming or more ecological farming	National Organic Farmers Database/ Project database
	2. Increased density and diversity of native tree species in cyclone damaged landscapes around Apia covering 3314 ha	With recent damage by TC Evans, baseline will be determined when project start.	At least 50% increase forest cover in a landscape	Site assessment reports at mid-term and terminal

¹¹ The average household income of target areas will be determined at project start

¹² GoS 2010, Samoa's 2nd National Communication to UNFCCC.

¹³ Women in Business (WIB)

	3. Area of natural forests, riverine areas and wetlands under protection and management in the production landscape under community land use plans (forest and tree cover maintenance; maintenance of wetlands; no net increase of agricultural land under mono cropping)	0	By the end of the project, at least 55000 ha will be under integrated landscape management outside KBAs	Site assessment reports at mid-term and terminal
	4. Number of farmer households adopting at least one or more soil / water management and conservation practices on agricultural lands	There are 10790 households in the target area of the project, but with limited soil and water conservation activities	At least 5000 households will be adopting soil management and conservation practices in their land by the end of the project covering at least 18000 ha	Site assessment reports at mid-term and terminal
	5. Increased water quality as a consequence of enhanced watershed management and water source protection	Water quality at sampled sites (3 major sites) shows confirmed incidences of <i>E.coli</i> presence exceeding national standards	At least 50% of the project sites report on increased water quality by the end of the project – including <i>E. coli</i> levels within national standards; and additional parameters of nutrient loads (such as nitrogen) are also within acceptable international standards	Water quality monitoring reports
	6. Per cent of Livestock relocated to optimal grazing areas away from critical riparian areas	Estimated 30000 livestock in target areas, covering around 5000 ha ¹⁴	At least 50% relocated (at least 2500 ha)	Project sites monitoring report
	7. Number of integrated participatory village level SLM plans	No village plans incorporating SLM	At least 50 villages have developed plans integrating SLM with the participation of 15000 community member including men, women and young	Village meeting records

¹⁴ To be confirmed at project start

	8. Number of community members that report on increased knowledge and capacity on SLM	No reports on knowledge on SLM	At least 40% of the communities are able to report on increased knowledge on SLM through access to national SLM system, audio-video materials and trainings	Surveys defined for the trainings, workshops and consultations that identify awareness level and actual implementation of SLM practices
OUTCOME 2. Strengthened national enabling environment to promote integrated landscape management through local households and communities.	9. Soil management and conservation manual targeting local communities in local language	No soil management and conservation manual	By the end of year 1 a Soil management and conservation manual developed including SLM practices for agriculture, forestry and water resources management	MNRE publications
	10. Number of national policies and plans that support for inter-sectoral and partnership approach to promote community based SLM	A number of policies and plans to support SLM (see section 1.5 of the project document) but inter-sectoral approach is weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Resource management legislation developed and national land use policy updated • Agriculture Sector Plan 2011-2016 strengthened to mainstream SLM approaches and management practices • policies on mining (including sand mining) strengthened or developed • formal guidelines for sustainable land management under village development plans under PUMA Act developed 	Legislation and planning instruments

	11. increased capacities for INRM as measured by an increase in the score of the GEF LD Tracking Tool Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management	3	5	GEF LD PMAT Tracking Tool
	12. Coordination mechanism in place to ensure multi-sector approach to SLM in line with National Environment management Strategy	No coordination mechanisms for SLM	By the end of the project a formal institutional coordination mechanism has been established including all relevant ministries to ensure integration of SLM in all sectors to manage multiuse landscapes through combined efforts, shared technical resources	Government records/ reports/ coordination meeting minutes
	13. Increased involvement of private sector, civil society and others in promoting SLM in partnership with the government.	SFA and WIBDI – NGOs assisting communities with projects that are SLM compatible.	By Year 4, the number of NGOs and private partners in SLM is increased by 200%.	Government records/ national NGOs surveys
	14. National SLM information system in line with information system for national Environment Management Strategy	No SLM information system	By Year 4 an SLM information System will be established and managed by MNRE	Government records
	15. Number of government staff who have completed new training of trainers short term courses provided by USP on SLM, tailored for Samoa and including carbon accounting from LULUCF	No SLM training currently available at USP for government staff	By the end of the project, at least 100 staff from MNRE, MAF, MWCS have completed the SLM training at USP	Government reports/ training reports
	16. Number of long term courses institutionalized in USP to degree students on SLM	No SLM courses available at University for undergraduate students	By the end of the project, at least 1 SLM long term course has been institutionalized at USP	University curriculum

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

Review Criteria	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion 1	Response
Recommendation at PIF Stage	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>The Strategic Results Framework has established most of the baselines and targets. The means of verification have also been noted under the Project Document's Table 5: Plan for Measurement of Project Indicators.</p> <p>Some of the baseline information will be finalized during the project inception period – such as baseline household incomes, the level of awareness and understanding on SLM issues at the community level. This is because these will require comprehensive surveys and community participation and thus will require additional time and resources.</p> <p>The PIF had identified REALU as a potential methodology for assessing carbon benefits from the project's activities. As local expertise was unavailable to assess this, and the procurement of such expertise from outside Samoa was not feasible under the PPG budget, the project was unable to undertake such a full assessment. Additionally, the land use change information for Samoa for the period after 2000 has not been analysed and thus was not easily available to provide information to assess land use changes and the likely impacts on GHG emission or reduction.</p> <p>Based on targets identified in the Strategic Results Framework for forest conservation, restoration and rehabilitation, and using the IPCC default values, the carbon benefits have been estimated and presented in the document. This will be refined during project implementation.</p> <p>One of the key capacity building actions of the project will be to build national capacities on carbon benefits measurements based on global best practices such as the REALU and or the GEF funded Global Carbon Benefits project that STAP has also noted in their comments.</p>

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking

GEF FOCAL AREA: Land Degradation

STAP Comments	Responses
1. Make the outputs more explicit. For example, it would be good to specify further how many farm households will achieve "Improved SLM and SFM..." in 2.1.2.	These have been made clear in the Results Framework. The project expects to work with at least 5000 households to improve SLM. The extent of current practices and their area coverage has also been presented in Table 3 in the project document
2. The introduction of a 'learning' output at 2.1.5 is desirable in an innovative project such as this, where the conditions and ingredients for achieving integrated landscape management of land and forests are analyzed.	We agree that internal knowledge management should be a key feature of any project management. This has been fully internalized in the project management and M&E sections.

<p>Not only is it necessary to demonstrate successful implementation (2.1.4) but also it is essential to know why and how success was achieved (a new 2.1.5, preferably ‘ or added into the Expected Outcome for 2.1.4). A stronger emphasis on internal knowledge management is a good strategy for making organizations more efficient, more open, flexible and connected. UNDP should itself be involved in this to inform similar proposals for other SIDS.</p>	
<p>3. UNDP should be aware of the GEF "Carbon Benefits Project (CBP), implemented by UNEP, which will be completed shortly and which will inform the GEF on the tracking of total system carbon. In particular, UNDP may wish to investigate further when the carbon measuring tools will be available, so they can potentially be used to strengthen Samoa's capacity building to measure carbon and greenhouse gas emissions ‘ Component 1. Additionally, 2 further details are needed on how the expected global environmental benefits, including increased carbon sequestration, will be measured and tracked ‘ see incremental reasoning section. Further knowledge and reference to the CBP, or other tools, could fill this gap.</p>	<p>The project has included specific reference to building national capacity on carbon measurements using the tools developed by this project under Output 2.2. Here the project will build national capacities to use carbon measurement tools based on the GEF-UNEP project and also identify and use other relevant tools. Measurements of global environmental benefits have been incorporated into the Results Framework and are also presented under Table 5 in the project document.</p>
<p>4. The table on page 8 is useful to illustrate the different efforts the project seeks to address on land management and conservation. There are two comments/questions that arise from this table: a.) The statement on "Strong market links to products from sustainably managed lands to provide incentives to farmers to adopt and promote SLM" implies that market links are the main driver of farmers' incentives to adopt and promote SLM. Perhaps this statement also could link to the outcomes of Component 1, given that enabling policy environments are critical to farmers' motivation for SLM adoption/investments. b.) It is unclear how the selection of crops with bioenergy potential was made ‘ that is, whether the crops are being proposed by the project, or by the Samoa entities. It also would be good to clarify whether the crops will be native species or not. Further details on this would be useful in order to better determine what potential impacts the crops could have on the ecosystems.</p>	<p>The following has been noted under Output 2.1’s description in the project document “As enabling policy environments are critical to farmers' motivation for SLM adoption/investments, strong emphasis will be made in relevant policies on introducing market incentives and other incentives for farmers and communities to adopt and promote SLM. These may link to export markets for sustainably produced products as well as links with local hotels/ restaurants etc.”</p> <p>The project will not focus on the promotion of any new bio-energy crops But will focus on the use of native species - particularly in relation to restoration and rehabilitation of degraded forests and other lands. The project’s support for sustainable forest management will also include support for sustainable harvesting of fuel wood to meet local demands. The reason the project will focus on native species are both because they are better for local biodiversity and also with the recent Cyclone damages, the faster growing non-native species have been shown to be less resilient and more damage-causing.</p>
<p>5. STAP recommends including the potential risks of biochar. For example, it would be good to specify the mitigation strategy that would address the potential risk that crops used to making biochar could become more profitable than food crops; thereby, posing a threat to food security.</p>	<p>There has not been any experience of using biochar in Samoa in soils. There are potentials to use biochar as briquettes for domestic energy use, with the biochar potentially being produced from alien species such as Albizzia trees. However, since this can be a labour intensive process and more expensive than sustainable harvesting of fuel wood, the project will not promote this without additional cost-benefit analysis. On the use of biochar in soils for soil quality improvement and for GHG sequestration, given that there have been some recent studies suggesting that bio-char may not bring about significant productivity improvements in soil in already rich volcanic soil¹⁵. There are also further studies that suggest that biochar may not actually be locked in soil as originally</p>

¹⁵ Biochar Effect on Maize Yield and Soil Characteristics in Five Conservation Farming Sites in Zambia
Gerard Cornelissen, Vegard Martinsen, Victor Shitumbanuma, Vanja Alling, Gijs D. Breedveld, David W. Rutherford, Magnus Sparrevik, Sarah E. Hale, Alfred Obia and Jan Mulder; *Agronomy* 2013, 3, 256-274; doi:10.3390/agronomy3020256

	<p>thought, and may actually be dissolved in water and transported to sea, the project will not focus on promoting this technique.¹⁶</p>
<p>6. STAP also suggests revising the mitigation strategy for the "sudden global rise in prices of exported agricultural commodities" because it does not propose a specific mitigation strategy.</p>	<p>The risk has been presented as Local decision making on land allocation and wider land use in Samoa are primarily under the domain of traditional chiefs in a community. In order to ensure that village Chiefs understand the importance of SLM for the sustainability of their own land and water resources, they will also be focal targets for awareness raising as well as for “entering” village level activities, so that there is support for them for project activities. The project will also ensure that village chiefs of villages that are able to plan and implement successful SLM actions are also used as champions to have peer-to-peer influence on other Chiefs. During community consultations, many have noted on how the price increases in Taro led to forest clearance on steep forest lands, only to lead to landslides and their abandonment after the price decreases (leading to the abandoned land being infested with invasive species) and thus most communities are keen to avoid this from repeating. The project will ensure that the soil and water conservation practices introduced are able to increase yields on-farm, without the need to expand to natural ecosystems.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁷

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

Please refer to Section A5 for the changes in project PIF based on some changes in local context (such as the impact of Cyclone and the opportunity the baseline funding for the Cyclone Recovery Programme has presented to ensure stronger sustainable land management in the affected areas etc.).

In terms of project implementation, using the UNDP social and environmental screening tool, the following two issues have been noted for project implementation stage:

- On environmental management - to ensure that there are no displacement of threats to ecosystems due to the conservation and sustainable management activities. That is, that by conserving certain areas, people do not undertake ecosystem destruction outside the project focus areas to replace harvesting of products etc. The project document has included Component 1 the need to assess wider landscape changes during project period to monitor and avoid any “leakage” of land degrading actions to non-target sites.
- On social side: the project needs to continue to monitor equity impacts of project activities and ensure that project activities are implemented fully respecting people's rights on full informed prior consent. Whilst the project has been designed with strong local participation, a paragraph under the project document ‘s Component 1 has further stressed this point.

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$136,364			
<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>
Activity 1-- Inception & Implementation of process	35,000	80,876	0
Activity 2 -- Development of the Project	80,000	19,713	0
Activity 3 -- Monitoring and Evaluation	3,364	0	0
Activity 4 -- Final project preparation and submission	18,000	27,577	8,198
Total	136,364	128,166	8,198

*Note: Project Preparation covers the following activities as per the PPG request:

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)

N/A

¹⁷ 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.