



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

GEF ID:	5164		
Country/Region:	Samoa		
Project Title:	Capacity for implementing Rio Conventions in Samoa		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4938 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CD-2; CD-2; Project Mana; CD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$25,000	Project Grant:	\$500,000
Co-financing:	\$500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,025,000
PIF Approval:	April 11, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	tom.twining-ward@undp.org

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Samoa ratified the CBD on Feb 2, 1994, the UNFCCC on Nov 29, 1994 and the UNCCD on Aug 21, 1998. Cleared 10/10/12.	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. with letter dated August 15, 2012. Cleared 10/10/12	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNDP has a comparative advantage in capacity development and it has a long history of collaborating with the government and other stakeholders. Cleared 10/10/12.	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	It seems so. However, details on team size and capacities should be provided. Additional information is requested. 10/10/12 Provided. Cleared 02/20/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	N/A
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. CCCD allocation. Cleared 10/10/12.	Yes. Resources available from CCCD allocation. Cleared 06/25/2014
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	N/A
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	N/A
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Not really. The focal area strategy framework as it's laid out is confusing. The FA outcomes and outputs are repeated in the two tables. The first table should be consistent with the Cross Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) Framework. There's a mix of CCCD objectives (CD) and outcomes and outputs. Some of the outputs are more part of CD2 and CD3. It's recommended that the FA Outcomes are close (if not exact) to the ones established in the CCCD strategy. In this sense, some of the project's FA outputs could be listed under CD2: Increased capacity of stakeholders to diagnose, understand and transform complex dynamic nature of global environmental problems and	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>develop local solutions. Please refer to the CCCD strategy and revise the whole framework. Please make sure also that project framework identifies all tangible outputs and outcomes. Additional information requested. 10/10/12.</p> <p>The FA strategy framework has been reworked and now is more attuned to the CCCD Strategy Framework. However there are a couple of outstanding issues: 1) Not clear how 1.1 is an output, it seems more like an outcome. Please provide more specificity on this "output" or reclassify as outcome and provided appropriate output. and 2) output 1.2 seems to belong better with CD3 and the respective outcome for development of policies and legislation. Please revise. Additional information is requested. 02/20/2013</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 04/10/2013</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>No. See point 7 above. Needs revision. Additional information requested. 10/10/12.</p> <p>To some extent. See new comment on point 7 above. Additional information is requested. 02/20/2013</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 04/10/2013</p>	<p>Yes. The project targets CCCD objectives CD 2: To generate, access and use information and Knowledge and CD 3: To strengthen capacities to develop policy and legislative frameworks.</p> <p>Cleared 06/25/2014</p>
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant</p>	<p>Yes. The project is consistent with Samoa's National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) completed in 2007 and with the subsequent National</p>	<p>Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Environmental Capacity Strategy and Action Plan (ECS) and other national plans and strategies. Cleared 10/10/12	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Not sufficiently clear. There's also no clear indication of how many staff will be positively influenced by the project and how the outcomes will be sustained in the future. Additional information is requested. 10/10/2012 Provided. Additional sustainability measures will be identified during the PPG phase. Cleared 02/20/2013	Yes. The project builds primarily upon existing institutional structure and mandates of the government agencies and as per existing policies. This is expected to be sustainable as long as participants find the analysis and trainings informative, practical and applicable to their respective roles in the implementation of the Rio Convention obligations. Hence the project will ensure that the main driving organization's capacities (institutional, systemic and individual) are strengthened to better service and raise awareness of all stakeholders, on Rio Conventions and other relevant MEAs. Cleared 06/25/2014
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	To some extent. However a revision of the project components is suggested. See point 14 below. Additional information is requested 10/10/12. Provided. Cleared. 02/20/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes. Cleared 10/10/12	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	To some extent. However, it is suggested that the first component be divided into for instance institutional strengthening and legal framework and a second component which refers to tools and mechanism (data management and information dissemination). Additional revision is requested. 10/10/12 Provided. Cleared. 02/20/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 10/10/12	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	No. This section needs to be developed further: what are the gender considerations (which are only briefly mentioned when the Minsitry of Women, Social and Communtiy Development will be part of the project) The description of socio-economic benefits is vague. Additional information is requested. 10/10/12 Provided. Gender dissagregated data will be further developed during PPG phase. Cleared. 02/20/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. Cleared 10/10/12	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes. Cleared 10/10/12	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Some initiatives are mentioned, but the mechanics of coordination with the proposed project are not described. Please elaborate further. Additional information is requested. 10/10/12</p> <p>Provided in the Agency's response to the review sheet. Please incorporate description into the PIF itself. Additional information is requested. 02/20/2013</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 04/10/2013</p>	<p>Yes, to a large extent. Please note that the UNDP-implemented CCCD project for the Pacific with SPREP as executing agency and which is due for CEO approval, contains elements that may be relevant in the implementation of this project. Please coordinate with SPREP accordingly.</p> <p>Cleared 06/25/2014</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>The proposed execution arrangements are not clear. Please provide more information. Additional information is requested. 10/10/12</p> <p>Provided. Cleared. 02/20/2013</p>	<p>Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014</p>
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		<p>N/A</p>
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>Too high. Please consider revising them to 9% level. Revisions are requested. 10/10/12</p> <p>Explanation provided. Cleared. 02/20/2013</p>	<p>Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014</p>
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>It seems so. Cleared 10/10/12</p>	<p>Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	<p>Co-financing is appropriate. There's a</p>	<p>Co-financing letters from UNDP and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	1:1 cash match. Cleared 10/10/12	the Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Meteorology are provided. Cleared 06/25/2014
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. UNDP is bringing 100,000 in cash. However, amount of in-kind contribution should be also properly identified. Revision is requested. 10/10/12 Explanation provided. Cleared. 02/20/2013	Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Additional information and clarifications are requested. 10/10/12. Not yet. Please address the questions and provide clarifications. In addition, as per the new policy, please review the Agency fee to no more than 9.5% of the GEF contribution. 02/20/2013 Yes. The PIF is technically cleared and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		recommended. 04/10/2013	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please address the following during PPG phase: 1) More details about how the capacities developed will contribute to the sustainability of the project's outcomes . 2) When available, gender disaggregated data.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		Yes. Cleared 06/25/2014
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Yes. CEO approval is recommended. 06/25/2014
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 10, 2012	June 25, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 20, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes appropriate. Cleared 10/10/12
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes. Cleared 10/10/12
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not until the PIF is cleared. However, if the responses are adequate, the PPG could be recommended. 10/10/12
		Not yet. Once PIF is cleared. 02/20/2013

		The PPG is technically cleared and recommended. 04/10/2013
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 10, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2013

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