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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Samoa Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management Project **(hereafter refered to as the SLM project)** is a joint undertaking of the Government of Samoa, UNDP and GEF. It aims at strengthening the enabling environment for sustainable land management (SLM) while assuring a broad based political and participatory support for the process.

The major achievement of the SLM project is the pilot work at Vaipouli watershed, in Savaii which was a participatory watershed management initiative involving the community at the core of implementing it to build their capacity. While this pilot is still very much a work in progress, the concept that it represented has already been mainstreamed into the national program for integrated water resources management. Four watersheds that service Apia are using the successful aspects in terms of lessons learnt from this pilot watershed at Vaipouli to be replicated in catchment areas of Upolu, as well as a good model for improved capacity of staff in watershed management areas.

The pilot work for coastal resources protection focused on the construction of a seawall. The complementary role of mangrove protection and enhancement was not given due attention. This, plus the fact that the project did not go through an EIA process has eroded its potential to become a model for other communities faced with coastal protection problems.

The pilot work for Asau which primarily intended to focus on sustainable agriculture on drought-prone areas through adoption of SLM practices to adapt to the recurrent drought conditions, diverted its focus instead on the construction of a Resource training centre for farmers and other land resource users in the district. A strategic training program that was supposed to guide the Center’s activities was not developed and launched.

The project conducted at least six formal training courses benefitting a substantial number of staff and community representatives. In addition, the Project organized three Technical Implementation groups (TIGs) composed of technical experts from various disciplines and sectors. The TIGs were asked to identify and plan for interventions for three pilot areas. In doing so, members of the TIGs benefitted from an unstructured learning experience. However, there has been very limited monitoring and documentation and only the effect of capacity building on watershed management skills could be discerned at this point.

The National Action Programme (NAP) 2006 to combat land degradation is a conceptual policy and legal framework which has been adopted and since became operational as the core instrument to implement UNCCD at the national level. And currently pending is the NAP revision to realign it to UNCCD’s 10-year Strategic Plan 2008-2018 to enhance the implementation of the Convention. The NAP realignment is intended for late 2013 and will be GEF-funded through the direct access mechanism which Samoa is eligible to about USD150,000.00 for this assignment.

A recent feasibility study on a potential integrated financial strategy for SLM resource mobilization was conducted in late 2012 for Samoa. Fiji and Samoa are the first Pacific Island countries piloted for such experience to assess its practicability in the national context.

SLM concerns are reflected as cross-cutting issues in the State of the Environment (SOE) report and the NEMs as well as several other national development sector plans. A new project on climate change adaptation for GEF 5 is also being designed.

The Midterm review recommended specific measures to address the gaps particularly in the three pilot sites. However, actual implementation of the recommendations was negligible. A major constraint was that there was only a year for implementing the MTR recommendations before the exit of the Project Coordinator and the Project Assistant Assistant

**Conclusion.** Section 7 provides a performance rating to the various aspects of the Project following GE guidelines. Some key findings are shared here. Most of the outputs (under NAP, Capacity building, mainstreaming and investment program) are considered relevant to attaining outcomes, notwithstanding the unclear status of the pilot work on Lano coastal resources and the training center for drought situations. The relevance of the Asau Training |Centre remains a potential only until a training program is set in place. The impact of the biggest component which is capacity building is significant. This is because of the work on the pilot watershed and its positive effect on national watershed initiatives including the work on four watersheds servicing Apia.

In terms of meeting the indicators to effectiveness, the individual rating for Outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 4 range between moderately unsatisfactory (Outcomes on Capacity Building, and to moderately satisfactory (NAP, Mainstreaming, Medium Term Investment Plan). The ratings for sustainability are “moderately likely” in spite of challenges on the ground because of the strong interest of GOS particularly in supporting the watershed program.

**Recommendations.** Several recommendations are shared on Section 7. There is a need to consolidate the role of the pilot watershed as a mature model for nationwide participatory watershed and landscape/ management. To do this, the implementation approaches at the pilot community level need to be assessed, fine tuned and documented. Good practices in participatory watershed management need not solely come from the pilot watershed in Vaipouli. There are other sources of good practices in the Asia Pacific that can provide additional insights and approaches and can be combined with the learning from Vaipouli.

The GOS and UNDP are now developing a proposal to address critical landscapes which in event contribute to conservation of biodiversity and resilience to climate change through mitigation and adaptation interventions under GEF 5. Program formulation efforts may wish to consider a two- pronged approach to be more effective.

The first is to think and plan at the landscape level (a big basin or main watershed) and act at the local levels. Knowledge management, sectoral coordination and policy formulation are done at this level. The second level is at the micro watershed level where communities and user groups can contribute their own efforts to the watershed immediately important to the community and thus ensure ownership and sustainability. Vaipolui is an example of a 2nd level (small or micro watershed) effort. The experience in the Asia Pacific including that of the Australian Land care movement demonstrates the need for a two pronged approach.

The training centre in Asau can attain strategic value if combined with a training program that builds on the good practices of pioneering farmers in the vicinity of the Centre. The Asau training centre would inevitably belong to a micro watershed which in turn would be part of a bigger watershed. Taking this view enhances the relationship between overall watershed integrity and on farm interventions.

As SLM in its various forms will be increasingly adopted by programs and policies, there is a need to ensure that it is founded on strong, evidence-based knowledge. It is recommended that succeeding interventions start with an assessment of the nature, scope and cost of land degradation. Concurrently, identify documentation of emerging good practices that directly or indirectly address aspects of land degradation. Both types of information (land degradation and good practices) will enable planners and decision makers to prioritize limited development assistance resources.

**Lessons learned**. Section 10 shares the possible lessons that can be learned. Some are shared here. First, a substantive inception report is very critical for a new project .However revisions during the inception workshop are no guarantee that targets can be more achievable.On hindsight, a regular “in-house review” of outcomes, after the inception workshop, could also be very useful.

Second**,** stay focused on planned outcomes/results (particularly outcomes). There was a long dialogue on the viability of the Lano Seawall and Asau Training Centre. This could have been concluded earlier if stakeholders always referred to the planned project outcomes and on that basis, identified the mix of practical, | win –win “ mitigative activities to implement.

Third, it is possible to mainstream a concept even if the pilot is still a work in progress. There is still much to do to make Vaipouli a mature and convincing pilot. Yet, the GOS leadership has placed trust in the pilot project and has used the concept to guide its work on other watersheds in the country including four watersheds that serve the Apia City. This means that one does not have to wait for pilot projects to be “perfect” before they can be “replicated” to other areas.

# 1.0 BACKGROUND

The Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Samoa or the Samoa SLM Project is a joint project of the Government of Samoa, UNDP and GEF. It addresses the issues of land degradation and opportunities of sustainable land management in Samoa in line with the National Development Plan. While signed in 2007, the Project started in January 2008. It was supposed to end in January 2011 but it was extended to June 2012.

This Project was evaluated in February 2011.This evaluation aimed to assess the levels of project accomplishments and outcomes and synthesize lessons that may inform future plans for SLM in Samoa. It can also help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF projects. This is the report of the external evaluation.

# 2.0 THE PROJECT

## 2.1. OBJECTIVES

As finalized during the inception workshop, the goal of the SLM Project is to contribute to the mitigation of land degradation through capacity development and mainstreaming sustainable land management.

The overall objective is to strengthen the enabling environment for sustainable land management while ensuring a broad based political and participatory support for the process.

## 2.2. EXPECTED OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS

There are four expected outcomes:

1. Completion of the National Action Plan
2. Capacities developed for sustainable land management
3. Mainstreaming of sustainable land management
4. Medium-term investment plan

Each outcome above is supported by several outputs and activities. These are described in the Project log frame. The table below provides a comprehensive view of outcomes, outputs and activities.

The MTR designated the actual start of the Project on January 2008 although it may be noted that the PM was already on board in Aug 2007. The Project was supposed to end in December 2009 but it was extended until June 2012 .The Project Total cost is USD 1,003,000.00 of which GEF provided USD 475,000.00. The balance would be provided by Government through in kind contributions (USD 300,000), and other co-financing (USD 228,000).

## 

## 2.3. OUTPUTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

| OUTCOME | OUTPUTS | MNREM | MAF | MFAT | NG0 | NUS | USP |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Completion of the National Action Plan | 1.1.Preparation of the NAP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2. Adoption of the NAP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Capacities developed for sustainable | 2.1. Enhanced capacities for the effective administration and sustainable management of lands and land-based resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2. Strengthened capacity for sustainable agriculture, particularly in drought prone areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3. Enhanced Capacities for the rehabilitation of degraded coastal areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4. Enhanced governance to promote proper land use of degraded watershed areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.5. Assessments of the appropriate use of land |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.6. Enhance SLM through improvements of individual, systemic and institutional capacities including relevant national plans and policies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.7. Development of monitoring and evaluation systems on the effectiveness of the implementation phase of the SLM Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Mainstreaming of SLM | 3.1. Mainstreaming of SLM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * 1. Sharing of Knowledge on SLM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Medium term investment plan for SLM and its resources mobilization | 4.1. Development of a Medium Term Investment Plan with associated resource mobilization plan that incorporates SLM. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# 3.0 THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION

## 3.1. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation is part of the life cycle of the Sustainable Land management (SLM) Project. Following the global guidance provided by GEF, the purposes of the external evaluation are:

* assess extent of achievements of projects outputs and results including extent of implementation of Mid-Term Evaluation recommendations;
* examine current level of impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to  institutional strengthening, biodiversity conservation and conservation friendly livelihood promotion, and the achievement of global and national environmental goals;
* identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that will maximize  the impact of the project and also to provide evidences to improve design and implementation of similar projects in near future; and
* identify an exit strategy for the project by linking its products to other ongoing initiatives.

## 3.2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

An external evaluator was engaged to conduct the evaluation of both Samoa and Niue SLM Projects for the period November 30 to December 30, 2012. The external evaluator visited Samoa from December 1 to December 7 and interacted with Project holders and stakeholders. The Evaluator also visited Niue from December 8 to December 14, 2012 (*Separate report*). Specifically, the following evaluation methods were utilized for Samoa.

* Review of project documents and other relevant literature
* Interviews and follow-up interviews (average of 30 to 45 minutes each)
* Visit to an agricultural landscape and interact with community leaders and designated MNRE staff (Vaipouli Watershed)

Findings were presented on December 6 to Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Meteorology (MNREM) based Project leadership and feedback addressed in the draft report. Additional data was collected after the visit through electronic mail. A questionnaire was proposed to United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and MNREM to obtain insights from other stakeholders that could not be interviewed due to the limited period of the mission. (The final report was prepared in Manila with guidance from intermittent communication between the Evaluator, Project Management Unit (PMU) and UNDP CO.

## 3.3. STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

The following is a summary of stakeholders who were consulted. The number of interviews and the number of persons involved are indicated below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder** | **Number of Interviews** | **Number of Persons** |
| MNREM | 5 | 6 |
| Village Leaders in Project Pilot sites | 4 | 3 |
| UNDP | 3 | 5 |
| FORMER ASSISTANT PROJECT MANAGER | 1 | 1 |
| NGO | 1 | 1 |
| (Note: Also attended a GEF 5 community consultation) | NA | listened to views |

**Limitations:**

The time allotted for interaction with stakeholders was only for four and a half days. Competing year-end commitments of Government offices prevented interaction with some key stakeholders (e.g. NGO members of the Steering Committee). Limited time (one day) for project site visits and the quick turn-around time for the inter-island vessel allowed the visit to only two of three project sites. The former project coordinator was sick and unavailable but the Assistant Project Coordinator provided key information and reference materials that she could muster.

The planned post mission questionnaire did not materialize (a questionnaire was prepared) as this coincided with the post cyclone period in Samoa in mid-December 2012. The Evaluator’s findings are therefore, largely based on the limited interactions in Samoa, intensive review of available documentation as well as the results of the Mid Term Review (MTR). Additional information was also gleaned from the Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs), GEF Annual Project Review and the partial information provided to the United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification (UNCCD) Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System (PRAIS).

# 4.0 FINDINGS ON PROJECT FORMULATION

## 4.1. OVERALL PROJECT CONCEPT

Overall, the project design reflects both the needs of the country and the recommended minimum components under the UNDP/GEF Targeted Portfolio approach for SLM capacity building among Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Similar to the design of SLM Projects in other SIDS countries, the completion of the NAP is a key intervention. It provides the platform for the public to become more deeply aware of land degradation issues and their root causes; and to chart out strategic directions to address these.

In addition to the NAP, the project provides for capacity building and mainstreaming actions as well as preparation of the medium term investment plan and project concepts. The concept of implementing project activities in three sites is sound. It would enable stakeholders to better visualize what SLM is all about. The allocation of majority of resources to capacity building is appropriate as an investment to the necessary long-term work on SLM.

## 4.2. ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS

The Project Document (PRODOC) highlights assumptions related to institutional commitments to the SLM concept, commitment of resources and the adoption of a working M&E system. Based on the issues raised at the end of the project, it may be noted that a few other assumptions should also have been anticipated so that the Project Management would constantly plan for risk management. These items may not necessarily be cited in the log frame, they could have been elaborated during the inception workshop.

One of possible additional assumptions that could have been included in the project log frame was the adoption of management systems that will capacitate project staff to comply effectively with mandatory administrative requirements of both UNDP and GOS. Another assumption that could have been added would be “the presence of an effective system would allow timely procurement of goods and services for timely implementation.

One existing assumption in the PRODOC could have also been elaborated during the inception review or in subsequent NSC decisions. This is about the “the willingness of institutions to collaborate on integrated approaches to SLM”. The case of the Lano Seawall may tend to show that projects could be vulnerable to situations where investment decisions, in response to urgent needs, could be slanted to specific types of interventions (infrastructure)and sidelining the role of other types of interventions (“soft interventions such as mangrove protection/restoration) that lead to integrated solutions.

## 4.3. LESSONS FROM OTHER PROJECTS

The PRODOC cites GEF assisted initiatives that support UNFCCC, CBD as well as NCSA as major sources of information that can support the SLM implementation in Samoa. In addition, selected pilot projects dealing with mangroves management (SPREP Mangrove Project) and sustainable agriculture (e.g. EU-DSP) are cited as sources of learning for capacity building. The experience of educational institutions such as the USP/SOA and NUS are also cited as important benchmarks for efforts in mainstreaming.

One notable absence in the PRODOC is the identification of both global and local sources of learning on participatory watershed management particularly at small watershed levels. This would have been very helpful in the design of activities for the Vaipouli Watershed Project.

## 4.4. STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

The PRODOCs Stakeholder plan cites a good mix of government agencies and non-government organizations that would be involved in the SLM project either as implementing agencies; partners, or as resource persons. Each organization was identified in terms of the strategic value they could provide not only for the SLM Project, but for the whole concept of SLM, in general.

The discussion, however, focuses on stakeholders at the national level. It is not very clear on the nature and scope of stakeholder (community) involvement at the project site level. The local stakeholders would vary from site to site and would include both formal and non-formal sectors. The Project subsequently incorporated stakeholder involvement in their site level activities.

## 4.5. REPLICATION APPROACH

The PRODOC did not have a specific discussion on replication approach. It implies, however, that the project would generate innovative approaches and practices in the three pilot sites, which would then be replicated in other areas after the project. Enabling policies and education campaigns to be developed during the program would then help in the replication process

During implementation, the project organized Technical Implementation Groups or TIGs comprising of experts from different disciplines and agencies. The interaction with the TIGS served as a method to promote the dissemination of good practices and eventual replication in the respective geographic areas where TIG participants are located.

## 4.6. UNDP COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE

Because of its close programmatic relationship with GEF and the UNCCD, UNDP has the comparative advantage to implement the project. Its work in other areas and other topics serve as inputs to the project while the same network involves the UNDP to also utilize the outputs of the Project.

The UNDP System implements the GEFs program for SLM and implements similar projects in other parts of Asia. The organization benefits learning from the global experience. One of the mechanisms for global exchange is the UNDP web platform on good practices in climate change adaptation practices (ALM). UNDP is also the main GOS partner for the conduct of the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA), which can provide an independent update on the status of capacity related to SLM.

At the same time, UNDP is also a key partner for the implementation of actions for adaptation to climate change. Most SLM interventions have strong relevance to adaptation and mitigation especially in land and water management.

## 4.7. LINKS WITH OTHER INTERVENTIONS

The Project Document identified selected projects that would provide inputs (technical support and or co- financing) to the project as well as utilize the outputs of the Project. The PRODOC sections on Linkages to IA Activities and Programs (Section X) as well as Stakeholder Involvement Plan (Section X1) describe the links that the Project could tap. Under the Financial Plan of the PRODOC (Section X11) selected on-going initiatives were identified that could be treated as sources of co-financing. These initiatives include current work on land use information systems.

The Midterm Review (MTR) cited a decision in 2009 for a parallel project entitled “Climate Change Risks in the Agriculture and Health Sectors in Samoa Project” to take up a specific output of the SLM Project dealing with the assessment of appropriate uses of land.

The project worked closely with the Water and Sanitation Sector Policy Support (WASSP) in the co-implementation of training modules for watershed management. The experience of both the SLM project in Vaipouli and WASSP is providing the basis for the GOS to launch expanded work on watersheds including those in Apia City.

## 4.8. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The PRODOC envisioned a multi-tiered system for providing strategic direction and operational management of the project. A National Execution (NEX) project, the GOS through the MNRE, would provide project leadership. UNDP would participate in the decision making processes, providing advice and quality assurance. Strategic decision making would be collaborative and rely on the Project Executive Group and National Steering Committee (NSC) acting on information and recommendations prepared by the PMU. The existing UNCCD Technical Advisory Group would provide technical advice to project operations.

As gleaned from the performance of the NSC and PMU during implementation, the role of the Project Executive Group (or the absence of it) appear to have a critical role in project direction setting.

# 5.0 FINDINGS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

## 5.1. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The inception workshop resulted in the modification of certain outputs under Outcome 2. However, as indicated in the discussion on results (Section 6), the alternative planned outputs were also not fully implemented.

During the Project inception, it was agreed to add another outcome (Outcome 5) entitled “Adaptive Management and Lessons Learned”. This new component however was not elaborated and no indicators were set in order to determine if it was effectively accomplished or not. Nonetheless, this was still a good move on the part of the Project.

Adaptive management was put to real test in at least two instances: The Lano Seawall Project and the Asau Training Centre. The minutes of the NSC meetings indicate that the Lano Seawall project was based on recommendations from the TIG, which called for both hard and soft approaches to coastal protection as well as strong preferences articulated by the affected community. Questions were raised (by UNDP among others) on how this was logically linked to the SLM concept and the need to conduct an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The NSC nonetheless proceeded with the construction of the seawall. Field findings of a composite MNRE –UNDP team in early 2011 indicated that there was limited follow up on the planned supplemental bio–remediation activities. Also the fact that this did not go through an EIA or an equivalent screening process may tend to erode its credibility as a good process model for other communities on coastal resources protection. There are no available records after mid 2011, which indicate that the Project ensured that a follow up integrated approach (hard and soft) was proactively done after the construction, as recommended by the MTR.

The second case of lack of adaptive management was the case of the Training Center in Asau. This was not part of both the PRODOC and the Inception Report. Nonetheless, the new project was conducted because it was perceived to have a strategic value for capacity building. The training center was actually part of an evolving vision to tap the existing farmer-based demonstrations in the district. The Project was not able to develop a follow on plan after the center construction that would then link the “hard investment” with the soft investments i.e. training programs as also implied by the Midterm Review results. Thus, the training center could not yet lead to the attainment of project outcomes.

It is unfortunate that in both the Lano and Asau cases, the Project actually had the authority; the staff (up to Dec 2011) and the time after the MTR, to ensure that follow on work was conducted to fill in some of the loose ends of earlier “hard” interventions. The follow up actions did not require huge budgetary outlays and were more of investments in time.

Finally, the termination of services of both the National Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator in mid-June 2011 (due to lack of financial resources) was not matched with appropriate adaptive measures (e.g. early planning for absorption of contractual staff; or failing that, the designation of organic staff that could have the time to fulfil the role of the Project Coordinator, etc.). Such a move would have enhanced the chances that the remaining project targets would be addressed on the final year.

## 5.2. PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS

The PRODOC included a Stakeholder Involvement Matrix which identified at least 14 key stakeholders, eleven of which were from government and three from civil society (including two who were educational institutions). The Project worked closely with the Water Sector Project for the development of the Watershed pilot in Vaipouli and subsequent communication of learning into the planning process for other watersheds. Beyond this, no other information on major partnerships with other Projects was provided.

The main form of collaboration between government and civil society sectors was through their close interaction during the workshops of the Technical Implementation Groups or TIGs. University representatives attended these sessions and exchanged notes with their government counterparts. The discussions identified issues that could be researchable. Unfortunately there was no further formulation of research proposals where at least two universities could have helped.

## 5.3. PROJECT FINANCE

The Project Total cost is USD 1,003,000.00 of which GEF provided USD 475,000.00. The balance would be provided by Government (USD 300,000, in kind), other co financing (USD 228,000). Co financing would be provided by the Ministry of Agriculture (USD 50,000), MNRE (USD 110,000) and UNDP (USD 48,000).

Of the four outcomes, more than 70% of combined project funds would go to Outcome 2 – Capacity Building while 20% would go to Adaptive Management and Lessons learned.

The combined CDRs from 2007 to 2012 indicate that the actual expenditures of USD 499, 188.47 of grant funds exceeded the grant of USD 499,188.47 of grant funds exceeded the grant of USD 475,000 by 18,980.00 . The important conclusion is that Grant funds were 100% disbursed to say the least. Ninety percent of the expenditures were made between 2008 to 2011. There is no available report of actual government counterpart resources that was made available nor of co financing provided by other projects that was made available to the external evaluator.

Elements within the MNRE indicate that there were recurrent problems in the implementation of financial management /accounting rules within the GOS/ Ministry. These involved delayed release of funds (from UNDP to GOS and within the Ministry) due to a system that for some reason, penalizes special projects like the SLM for financial management lapses committed by other projects (e.g. delayed liquidation of cash advances by another project).

The other challenge was the time needed to reconcile the accounting records of between GOS and UNDP (and accordingly within UNDP) . These challenges resulted to delay in financial transactions and subsequently in project efficiency. The problems were captured by the more recent audits and both GOS and UNDP have committed to study the problem more carefully and come up with solutions

## 5.4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

**The following are the required M&E instruments as well as planning instruments as envisioned by the PRODOC. Information on actual status is also provided.**

* **Inception Report** – This was done. However, the MTR reports that the inception report was only made available almost a year after the inception workshop was conducted. The long delay may have diminished the value of the inception report as a guide for operational planning.
* **Annual and Quarterly Plans -** This were proposed by the PMU for approval by the NSC and subsequently by the UNDP.
* **National MSP Annual Project Review Form** – This is a joint UNDP-GEF requirement to be filled up by the PMU. This was done for all the years covered up to June 2012.
* **Quarterly Progress Reports** - This was accomplished. But there are no QPR are available for the 2011 period.
* **Annual Tripartite Review** -This was not done.
* **Terminal Tripartite Review** - This was not done.
* **Technical reports** -These were shared with the NSC. Not all are in active files.
* **Midterm Review** - This was done in February 2011.

**Quality of M&E design.** No customized M&E plan was made for the Project. All monitoring protocols and instruments used are based on the recommendations of UNDP and GEF. No additional GOS-based instrument was used on top of the standard instruments agreed upon between GOS and UNDP.

**Quality of M&E implementation.** UNDP and the Project office exercised proactive roles in monitoring and documentation of the project situation using standard instruments of the lead agency as well as the UNDP. What is not clear is that issues were not sufficiently reflected in the APR early enough so that high level action may be considered.

* In mid-2010, a satisfactory rating was provided by both GOS and UNDP. At this time the issues on the seawall (which incurred major costs) were already worrying some members of the NSC and that there were some doubts if they were tightly linked to project outcomes.

In the mid-2011 APR, the issues dealing with Project Outcomes such as “lack of TOR for ASAU” and “follow up in Lano” were raised (The Capacity building component consumed the largest portion of the budget allocation and consisted of many planned outputs). It is not very clear why a SATISFACTORY rating was still provided. This rating may have given stakeholders a perception that overall, there was no urgency for corrective actions as implied by the MTR.

* In mid-2012, the APR finally cites the problem in clearer terms and UNDP indicates a MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY rate. However, by this time funds have practically run-out to effectively implement corrective measures. On a positive note however, work on mainstreaming of watershed learnings has progressed at this time.

There is no available record that indicates the convening of the Project Executive Group to discuss issues orally, if they could not be put in writing.

In another vein, the APR format requests for information on good practices (item 6 of the format). It appears that the project accomplishments tended to be equated to good practices. A case in point is the APR of mid-2011 which states actually listed project physical accomplishments as “good practices”.

## 5.5. IMPLEMENTING PARTNER AND UNDP COORDINATION AND OPERATION

**Project Management**. The NSC made the strategic decisions during the implementation on the basis of agenda prepared by the PMU. The NSC was composed of representatives from participating agencies and NGOS. The record of minutes of nine NSC meetings were made available and were reviewed. The minutes indicate the following pattern of the discussions:

* fairly good attendance of government and non-government stakeholders;
* the chair and Project manager provided the institutional memory as they were almost consistently present in all meetings;
* intermittent reference made on the link of proposed plans to the log frame and inception report ;
* use of technical recommendations by the TIG;
* high interest in the project site activities and a frequent concern on the need for a thorough consultation process;
* reference to other ongoing projects for synergy

**Project Coordination**. The Project engaged a Project Coordinator who worked closely with the DLM head. Coordination work was generally perceived to be satisfactory. There was generally good coordination among different agencies through the NSC meetings and TIG processes, at least in the years before the Project Coordinators services ended.

The MTR, reported that the Project Coordinator could not devote full time to the work as she was also asked to contribute to other technical tasks within the MNRE. This move had its benefits in terms of better networking and synergy with other projects within the sector. However, it is possible that better balancing act may have been needed in order to ensure that project targets and project efficiency were not affected.

An assistant coordinator was engaged in mid-2010 to help the Coordinator with the sheer volume of work as well as with the financial management requirements of both the GOS and UNDP.

The terms of both the Project Coordinator and Assistant Project Coordinator ended in mid-2011 due to lack of financial resources. Apparently, there was no one from among the regular staff of MNRE who could actively (and physically) take over even some of the roles of coordination after December 2011. This had an adverse effect on the ability of the Project to implement the recommendations of the MTR for the remaining months of the project.

**Technical Inputs from GOS.** The Project was able to mobilize resident technical experts of GOS agencies through the formation of TIGs. The TIGs were inter-disciplinary in nature. There was knowledge exchange among members. At least two groups produced technically sound reports (one for the Vaipouli Watershed and one for the Lano Coastal initiative, no report were available for the Asau Project site).

**UNDP.** UNDP participated actively in the NSC deliberations and based on the records of the NSC meetings, provided insights and suggestions to ensure that project plans and activities were linked to planned results and outcomes. Staff participated in field visits. UNDP also assisted in ensuring that the project would be able to tap knowledge resources emanating from other UNDP–GEF assisted initiatives such as the NCSA.

UNDP ensured that a timely Inception Workshop was conducted and that all key M&E instruments were utilized and complied with. The quality of **the quarterly and annual reports** indicates that some form of guidance was provided to the implementing agency on the application of these instruments. There are however UNDP actions related to the Annual Project Review that need to be clarified (please see relevant discussion under the Section on M&E).

UNDP was particularly active in helping clarify the objectives and plans for the Lano Seawall and Asau Training Centre. It consistently advised the conduct of EIA and encouraged follow-up action to address the trade-offs in such decisions. Unfortunately, this has not fully resulted to substantive mitigate action on the ground.

The Executing Agency indicated difficulty in adjusting to the financial management requirements of both GOS and UNDP. The difficulty of implementing the requirements was illustrated in an example provided by the MTR. In addition, there was an instance when new financial information especially dealing with fund shortages was made available only on short notice.

There is no record of UNDP and MNRE trying to convene the Project Executive Group to conduct high level discussion particularly at the outcome level. This would have been a helpful process to help resolve some complex operational issues that the NSC may have difficulty addressing and ensure that project activities were consistent with the planned outcomes.

No exchange of information with the GEF Operational Unit is recorded during the entire project life. This also coincided with the disbandment of that unit and transfer of responsibilities to UNDP Bangkok.

**Tapping a strategic opportunity** – The GOS with support of UNDP and partners has made a bold move to begin to mainstream the learnings on community watershed management on a national scale (e.g. work on 4 watersheds in Apia).

# 6.0 DOCUMENTING ACCOMPLISHMENTS AT OUTPUT AND ACTIVITY LEVEL - SAMOA SLM PROJECT

**Outcome 1:** Completion of NAPS (through Co-financing)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planned Outputs** | **Activities** | **Accomplishment** |
| Output 1.1 Preparation of NAP | * + 1. Develop a draft NAP including problem and root cause analysis and prioritization of actions | The NAP of 2006 has a concise description of key issues and overarching strategic actions needed. Some level of prioritization is made. The 6 year old NAP is accordingly, a product of the consultative process although records are not available on the issues and concerns raised on the consultative process. The NAP also needs updating.    Plans are underway to revise the NAP to extend, update and align it to the 10-year UNCCD Strategy. GOS staff was oriented on the Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS). There is no clear timetable being followed to guide the revision process. |
| * + 1. Complete the modification and validation of the NAP through stakeholder workshop |
| * + 1. SLM National Steering Committee endorsement/validation of the NAP |
| Output 1.2 Adoption of NAP | * + 1. Final Compilation of the NAP and submission to CDC | The NAP has been endorsed by the Cabinet. Some strategies advocated by the NAP are evident in current programs e.g. watershed framework for water management.  The NAP, after adoption by Cabinet was officially launched in 2006 during a National Land Awareness Day which primarily focused on nation-wide publicity and promotion of a variety of land services provided by MNRE. |
| * + 1. Official Submission of the NAP |
| * + 1. Official Launch of the NAP Document |
| * + 1. Formal publication and dissemination of NAP through awareness campaign and media programs |

**Outcome 2:** Capacities Developed for Sustainable Land Management

| Planned Outputs | Activities | Accomplishment based on LFW, Inception Report & MTR |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Output 2.1 Enhanced capacities for the effective administration and sustainable management of lands and land-based resources | 2.1.1 Conduct trainings on the assessments and appropriate uses of land and land-based resources | Six formal training programs were accordingly conducted covering the topics of a) soil characterization; sustainable agriculture; reporting on SLM actions; integrated environmental management and watershed planning. Some of the modules were co implemented with another relevant project (WASSP). However there are no records on the design of the training modules and results of training assessment conducted. Effects on capacity are unclear except in the case of watershed management.    Land tenure information has not been updated. |
| 2.1.2 Conduct trainings to enhance capacity on minimizing and management of land degradation |
| 2.1.3 Update through technical and information survey of Land Tenure distribution of Samoa lands |
| Output 2.2 Strengthened capacity for sustainable agriculture, particularly in drought prone areas | * + 1. Conduct trainings through demonstration plots and workshops on sustainable agriculture and organic farming practices | A center was constructed with the aim of providing long term training services to support farmer capacity building in drought prone areas. The main intervention did not however go beyond the construction of the training center. Plans remain unclear about the programmatic directions (or “software aspects “) of the Center. There is recognition of the potential to develop a training network of farmer based Agroforestry demonstration sites with the training center as “hub”. The center can also be used for Foestry Trainings and by other agencies.for their training needs.Training on sustainable agriculture was conducted for 50 staff according to a report. |
| * + 1. Establish a pilot site for sustainable farming in a drought prone area |
| 2.2.3 Develop and apply training modules on sustainable farming for Samoa |
| Output 2.3 Enhanced capacities for the rehabilitation of degraded coastal areas | 2.3.1 Conduct demonstration of soil protection measures through terracing and application of structural mitigation measures on eroded steep lands/slopes in Upolu and Savaii | A multi-disciplinary TIG composed mostly of GOS experts conducted on site studies and recommendations. Interaction within the TIG provided an unstructured learning experience however effects on staff capacity are unclear due to lack or records and limited availability of staff  A seawall was constructed. However, the interventions did not go beyond the infrastructure aspects of the integrated approach recommended by the TIG. Post construction attempts to introduce bio – remediation measures and other land use practices were accordingly started. But these have not been sustained. This leaves to doubt, the overall demonstration value of the infrastructure as an effective measure to address coastal degradation. |
| 2.3.2 Conduct extensive workshops for coastal communities for Upolu and Savaii |
| Output 2.4 Enhanced governance to promote proper land use of degraded watershed areas | 2.4.1 Implement single village watershed management pilot with differing land ownership and governance issues through reforestation and replanting | A multi-disciplinary TIG composed mostly of GOS experts conducted on site studies and recommendations ( as similarly done for the coastal intervention) . Interaction within the TIG provided a positive but unstructured learning experience.  In addition a formal training on watershed planning. Selected GOS staff indicates appreciable learning from both the internal interactions within the TIG as well as the formal training on watershed management planning. Communities have higher awareness and the watershed remains largely protected. But there is no clear indication of consistent inputs to rehabilitation work among community members. A watershed management plan with community inputs has been prepared.    Learning’s from experience (positive and negative) have not been systematically documented. Instead, informal individual efforts are applying the experience into major new watershed management projects covering four watersheds for Apia. |
| 2.4.2 Consultation with all landowners with differing types of land tenure ship at the pilot site. |
| 2.4.3 Prepare a governance report on piloted areas *(changed to: “capacity building of staff for better management of watershed areas”)* |
| Output 2.5 Assessments of the appropriate use of land | 2.5.1 Develop a framework for the technical assessment of soil classifications in Samoa *(changed to: Conduct national tech. survey and assessment on land use and soil classification”)* | Except for the training on soil physical characterization (see description under Output 2.1), there are no significant actions leading to this output (2.5). |
| 2.5.2 Conduct a technical survey assessment in relation to soil type, fertility and other bio-physical characteristics and on all degraded land areas in Samoa *(changed to: Produce/update soil and land use map based on 2.5.1.)* |
| 2.5.3 Prepare a technical report on the status with the biophysical environment and a report on land degradation in Samoa *(Note: dropped at inception)* |
| 2.5.4 Produce soil maps based on technical survey of soil classification *(Note: dropped at Inception)* |
| Output 2.6 Enhance SLM through improvements of individual, systemic and institutional capacities including relevant national plans and policies. | 2.6.1 Extensive community consultation of existing land policies for the review and development of effective policies | No Action. According to the MTR, this output was to be absorbed by the GEF funded Climate Change Risks in the Agriculture and Heath Sector in Samoa Project.  Discussions with communities in the three sites were on setting up pilot projects. No new land administration policy was developed based on the dialogue with communities. |
| * + 1. Develop a land administration policy which functions to regulate the development and use of land (settlement, survey, valuation, and assessment, land control and management, infrastructure utilities), collection of revenue from land (sale, leasing, taxation, etc.) and resolving conflicts concerning ownership and use of land |
| Output 2.7 Development of monitoring and evaluation systems on the effectiveness of the implementation phase of the SLM Project | 2.7.1 Develop a system for monitoring the effectiveness of the uses of land-based resources and the sustainable use of land for forest/woodland and agricultural purposes | According to the MTR, this output was to be replaced by GOS compliance to the Performance Review and Assessment of Implementation System or PRAIS which is managed by the UNCCD and is filled online.  GOS has submitted initial information to PRAIS online; but much more information needs to be provided. The PRAIS is considered important to the proposed new project (SMSMCL.).Meantime, the monitoring of the SLM project has thus relied largely on standard GEF and UNDP monitoring tools. |
| 2.7.2 Produce a report on the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation systems in place and potential for sustainability after the life of the project, |

**Outcome 3:** Mainstreaming of SLM

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Planned Outputs | Activities | Accomplishment |
| Output 3.1 Mainstreaming of SLM | 3.1.1 Review and integrate SLM into SDS and other appropriate national plans and policies | The need for SLM as well as SLM-oriented practies are reflected in the State of Environment Report (SOE) and in the NAPA. It is slightly covered by the Strategy for the Development of Samoa for 2008 to 2012 ( i.e. promotion of organic agriculture and waterhed protection). It is covered by the Agricultural Sector Plan for 2011-2015 which covers SLM concerns under Objective # 4 (To Ensure Sustainable Adaptation and Management of Agricultural Resources).  There are also slight reference to SLM issues and practices in the strategy papers of the NGO umbrella network (SUNGO).  The Sand mining policy which the Project earlier contemplated for attention, remains unadressed. Accordingly, the PACC project is now addressing this,. According to the UNCCD Focal Person, MNRE plans to include revision of the Policy in its 2013 agenda as well as revisions of regulations on mining different land-based natural resources such as scoria, rocks and other earth materials etc. |
| 3.1.2Increase and strengthen SLM in Government Planning and Development processes |
| 3.1.3 Review MNRE Bill 2003 to include SLM issues and strengthened provisions under which to enforce implementation of illegal activities*. (Note : dropped during Inception)* |
| Output 3.2 Sharing of Knowledge on SLM | 3.2.1 Formal publication and dissemination of NAP through awareness campaign and media programs | Knowledge exchange happened during the interactions among the discipline experts in each of the three TIGs are recorded in the minutes. However knowledge on lessons learned and succesful practices are not documented.  Public awareness campaigns were focused in three communities with the most extensive process done for Vaipouli Watershed. There are a few publications about the SLM project but there were no publications developed about good SLM practices either from the SLM project or from other relevant projects. |
| 3.2.2 Implement public awareness campaigns through the media |
| 3.2.3 Prepare SLM materials and documents for distribution to general public *(Note: dropped during Inception)* |
| 3.2.4 Prepare video and radio shorts for general public *(Note: dropped during inception)* |

**Outcome 4:** Medium Term Investment Plan and its Resource Mobilization

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Planned Outputs | Activities | Accomplishment |
| Output 4.1. Development of a Medium Term Investment Plan with associated resource mobilization plan that incorporates SLM | * + 1. Identify priority SLM investment needs and opportunities | There is no medium term investment plan developed specific for SLM but equivalent plans accordingly exist. GOS and UNCCD are now discussing plans for UNCCD support for the formulation of an Integrated Financing Strategy (IFS).  Under the Agricultural Sector Plan for 2011-2015 covers SLM concerns are addressed by Objective # 4 (To Ensure Sustainable Adaptation and Management of Agricultural Resources) Specific ouputs over a five year period include: a) enhanced capacity for sustainable practices in the Sector and b) enhanced adoption of environmentally friendly production practices. Available documentation do not indicate specific interventions and budgetary plans.  The GOS is presenlty preparing a project proposal for landscape level management under GEF 5 inclusive of biodiversity and climate change mitigation and adaptation considerations as well as contributing to community livelihoods. A major feature is the development of landscape based (including watershed) approaches to SLM which is based partly on the lessons learned from the SLM project |
| * + 1. Develop a costed Mid-Term Investment Plan including brief concept papers for priority investments |

# 7.0 CONCLUSION - OVERALL RATINGS

The following conclusions on the project can be made based a) the findings above; b) on the presence or absence of agreed upon outcome indicators and c) the rating framework specified for GEF supported medium sized projects as amplified by the TOR for this Evaluation exercise.

## 7.1. RATINGS FOR OUTCOMES

Each outcome is assessed by certain parameters, namely: Effectiveness (Efv); and Efficiency (Efy), M&E and Implementing AgencyI (IA) & Executing Agency ( EA) The ratings are done for each Outcome.

6. Highly Satisfactory (HS) - No shortcomings

5. Satisfactory (S) – Minor shortcomings

4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) – Significant shortcomings

2. Unsatisfactory (U) - Major problems

1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) – Severe problems

Unable to Assess (UA)

**RATINGS FOR OUTCOMES**

| **Project Outcomes** | **Description of Target Outcomes Indicator** | **Status as at November 2012** | **Efc** | **Efy** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1:** Completion of NAPS (through Co-financing) | 1. NAP approved by Cabinet 2. Best practices and guidelines for SLM are broadly disseminated and used for development planning, zoning and agricultural extension. 3. National stakeholders consultation finalized | 1. NAP is approved by the Cabinet but needs to be updated. The NAP is referred to in ongoing dialogue on SLM. 2. Best practices exist in some sites (not project sites) but no documentation so far. 3. Multi – stakeholder Consultations conducted but no records are available. | MS | MS |
| **Outcome 2:** Capacities Developed for Sustainable Land Management. | 1. The staffs of MNRE and MOA both have the capacity to implement SLM practices and train others in SLM. 2. Community based capacities are enhanced through SLM pilots that are established in key sites throughout Samoa (both Upolu and Savai’i). 3. Best forestry management and reforestation guidelines are established by MNRE 4. SLM networks established at regional, national and local levels. 5. Sustainable agricultural practices and guidelines prepared by MOA | 1. Members of the interdisciplinary Technical Implementation Groups learned new insights. Capacity is evident among the MNRE based watershed staff. 2. Community awareness is evident in the protection of Watershed site but consistent adoption of good practices remains a challenge. No community capacity attributed to the project in the two other sites is noted. 3. No intervention made here 4. Environmentally oriented NGO network exists and have begun to incorporate SLM s. 5. GOS staff are familiar with what should be part of the sustainable agricultural guidelines but guidelines have not yet been formulated.   \* Note: the capacity building work on the pilot watershed has helped improve GOS staff capacity but this milestone is unable to compensate for the gaps of many other outputs (coastal, drought agriculture). However the positive effect of pilot watershed work is reflected under the Outcome 3 on Mainstreaming (item 4) | MU\* | MU |
| **Outcome 3:** Mainstreaming of SLM | 1. SLM integrated into national education curricula 2. Appropriate legislation reviewed to strengthened the inclusion of SLM issues 3. SLM public awareness campaign completed 4. SLM strategies are integrated into SDS, National Plans and Policies 5. A clearly defined, transparent mechanism will be in place for other government and civil society institutions to gain access to information from the SLM-related land information systems. 6. SLM M&E systems are operational for agricultural, forest lands and watershed areas and operational costs are covered by non-project sources | 1. SLM education tackled in one project site but SLM has not been integrated in education curricula 2. The initial plans on land management bill were not sustained. 3. Limited work on SLM public awareness campaign. 4. SLM strategies are integrated in SOE, SDS, Agriculture Sector Plan and Water Sector Plans. Experience in pilot watershed is used in national watershed program with new pilots in Apia .( a notable major gain) 5. No major gains in developing information system for SLM related information. 6. SLM oriented SLM system does not exist. Start-up work on completing the PRAIS. Completion of information is pending. | MS | MU |
| **Outcome 4:** Medium Term Investment Plan and its Resource Mobilization | 1. Midterm Investment Plan is developed 2. Necessary resources are mobilized | 1. SLM is reflected in the multi-year Agricultural Sector Plan (2011-2016) at the objective level. Records available do not indicate projectized actions. 2. GOS is working with UNDP to develop an adaptation cum with SLM proposal for GEF 5 support | MS | MU |

Overall Rating on OUTCOME:

Relevance: Relevant ( See Sect 7.3 for explanations )

Effectiveness: MS

Efficiency : MU

Overall: MS

Rating for M& E ( See Section 5.1 and 5.4 for explanations)

Quality of design: no rating per GEF protocol

Implementation : MU

Overall: MU

Rating for IA & EA ( See Sections 5.1 to 5.5)

Quality of IA implementation: MS

Quality of EA Implementation: MS

Overall quality of implementation and Execution: MS

## 7.2. RATINGS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

A discussion is provided below on four aspects of sustainability as specified by GEF protocols. A rating is then provided based on the following scale:

4. Likely (L) – negligible risks to sustainability

3. Moderately likely (ML) – moderate risks

2. Moderately unlikely (MU) - significant risks

1. Unlikely (U) - severe risks

**Socio-political.** It is not very clear if the interest level of communities in Vaiapouli watershed project will continue to improve after the project. But the political interest of the GOS will continue to be there because of the water management issue that affects the whole nation and also because the GOS has designated Vaiapouli as a model site. As a result, interventions will likely continue in Vaiapouli, Perhaps it will still be driven for some time by GOS interventions. An example would be the engagement of three GOS based field staff in the watershed site. It is thus important for GOS to carefully assess the situation and consider alternative approaches to be more effective in the site.

At the national level, the central issue of water – too little or too much of it, will drive the prospects of sustained interest in SLM interventions by both government and non-government sectors. Residents of Apia are very much affected by water issues. Residents include decision makers will directly and indirectly benefit from major watershed interventions being started by the GOS through the efforts of the MNRE Watershed Department. If multi-sectoral dialogue is encouraged, there will be heightened interest in land management practices.

The training centre for sustainable agriculture in drought-prone areas exists. It has been physically well maintained so far, one year after the project ended. With the advent of new programs/projects on climate change adaptation, MNRE will likely accelerate the dialogues with partner agencies (especially Ministry of Agriculture) and local communities to develop a training program that will utilize both the centre as well as farmer-based demonstration that already exist. The MNRE plans to establish internet connectivity. The work in Lanu coastal management will need to be thoroughly reviewed and clear follow-on plans launched, to make it first effective before worrying about sustainability.

Interventions for capacity building and mainstreaming is expected to continue because of the undeniable concern for climate change adaptation and the need to put in place adaptation capacity at the individual, institutional and systems level. Rating: ML

**Financial.** Financial support will be driven by socio-political support as well as interest of the donor community to support national initiatives. The increased availability of Global Adaptation Funds will continue to provide the enabling environment for GOS to actively develop project proposals, based on available strategic plans such as the NAP and the Agriculture and Water Sector Plans. GEF and UNDP will continue to play a catalytic role in project identification and development. Rating: ML

**Institutional Framework and Governance.** The recent re-organization of GOS has provided clearer responsibilities for watershed management. With clearer responsibilities, strategic work on watershed management will likely be sustainable. At the same time, there are no major institutional bottlenecks in managing interventions in drought prone agricultural areas and fragile coastal areas. It will be helpful though if MNRE will accelerate its dialogue with the Ministry of Agriculture on the development of a training program for sustainable agriculture that is linked to ecosystems management. Rating: ML

**Environmental.** The interventions started under the SLM project are environmentally friendly. The SLM project has also provided the platform for continuing dialogue on environmentally friendly land based, low cost technologies that help adapt to climate change and improve overall land management.

A possible issue would be the seawall in Lano. The latest technical report prepared by a composite GOS and UNDP team in early 2011 indicated some potential problems posed by a large bridge base which appear to obstruct clear flow of inland water. If the structural problems are not attended and if other supplemental bio-remediation measures are not installed, the seawalls sustainability may be at question. Rating: ML

Overall, land-based interventions will be likely sustainable but the sustainability of interventions on and benefits from the Lanu Seawall remain a mystery for reasons cited above.

*Overall the sustainability of the concepts and practices for SLM generated under the Project will be moderately likely (ML).*

## 7.3. RATINGS FOR RELEVANCE AND IMPACTS

The ratings for relevance are: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR). The ratings for impacts are: Significant (S); Minimal (M) or Negligible (N). The ratings below are made for those aspects of the Project accomplishments that have been fairly successful. It does not apply to those aspects that did not work out well.

| **Planned Project Outcomes** | **Ratings of actual outcomes and explanation** |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1:** Completion of NAPS (through Co-financing) | **R, M**  Notwithstanding its limited dissemination and the need for updating, the NAP is used by GOS staff as reference for SLM planning in the absence of more updated plans. However it needs to be update. |
| **Outcome 2:** Capacities Developed for Sustainable Land Management. | **R, M ( special mention of watershed capacity as uniquely “S”)**  The Watershed pilot has many “loose ends” but it is a recognized source of learning for both high and middle level echelon of MNRM. Awareness and capacity is perceived to be significantly improving at least in the Watershed sector. The work in Asau will be potentially significant given the right attention. The pilot work on coastal protection in Lanu has doubtful value as a model. |
| **Outcome 3:** Mainstreaming of SLM | **R, S**  Elements of SLM are in key documents and plans such as the SOE, SDS and Agriculture Sector Plan.  Even if it is still a work in progress, the Vaiapouli experience is used as a model for a national program on watershed management. |
| **Outcome 4:** Medium Term Investment Plan and its Resource Mobilization | **R, M**  Elements of the SLM are in the Agriculture Sector Plan. The agreed upon preparation of an Integrated Financing Strategy ( IFS) has not yet taken off. SLM, particularly at the landscape level is also directly addressed by a climate change adaptation project proposal being developed for GEF 5. For now their impact is minimal yet. |

# 8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, there is a need to enhance and consolidate the gains made so far on selected project outputs. At the same time, there is a need to adopt measure to mitigate the possible gaps associated with some outputs. These recommendations are also meant to help both GOS and UNDP develop the next round of projects that climate change adaptation through SLM strategies particularly in the agriculture and NRM sectors.

## 8.1. RECOMMENDATIONS TO GOS AND UNDP

**(a) Prepare a synthesis report about SLM (land degradation and good practices)**

This may be considered instead of a traditional project terminal report. This report will be addressed to the development community interested in SLM issues and what can be done about it. It will contain information about the SLM project but will include also include related information from other initiatives. The purpose is to continue to build awareness of the issues and opportunities and programs of work that is needed.

**(b) Consolidate the pilot role of Vaipouli for the nationwide watershed program**

The GOS leadership looks up to the Vaipouli Watershed initiative as a model for the current national program that seeks to manage four watersheds that serve the City of Apia as well as other watersheds in the near future. This (Vaipouli) Watershed however is still very much a work in progress. There are many loose ends, foremost of which is the mixed attitude of the community to the project. It is not yet a strongly convincing model but this is not insurmountable.

**Measures for Community Ownership.** There is a need to ensure that Vaipouli can be “up to par” with the expectations as a model. To do this, there is a need to assess the current situation and analyze the underlying causes of the mixed attitude of the community. On that basis, current site level plans may be revised reflecting actions that encourage ownership.

There are two examples of variables that affect the degree of community ownership. These need to be addressed. One has to do with the need to address the opportunity costs of participation in watershed management. Community members express concern, among others on the privatization of costs (e.g. cost of transport to conduct their voluntary duties). Another variable is related to the misperception that the watershed management initiative will replace the community preference for maintaining its independent water system.

Moreover, it would be useful to check if the current government watershed plan needs to be matched by a “community version” of the plan. This community version should not just be a direct translation of the technically oriented watershed plan to the local language. It should also be a translation of the concepts as well (i.e. translate from the technicians explanation to the communities own way of rationalizing the investment in watershed management). To do this, local social scientists (perhaps from the NGO and Academic Sectors) may need to be involved in the government and community dialogue process.

**Expanding the information base for Good Watershed Practices**. GOS is now actively expanding its work on watershed management following the principles of IWRM in the 22 watersheds of the country. There is a need to provide adequate knowledge support for this effort. The Vaipouli Watershed may be an inadequate source of learning to guide the direction of the Watershed program. The GOS may therefore consider identifying documenting and communicating learning from additional similar initiatives in Samoa or in the region (South Pacific or nearby Southeast Asia). These learning (Vaipouli plus others) need to be communicated to the implementers of the IWRM program and watershed programs in the country. Assistance from partner agencies such as SPREP may be obtained for this purpose.

The MNRE may utilize its current knowledge of issues and opportunities of Samoa’s watersheds to guide the search for cases in Samoa and the Asia Pacific region that GOS may learn from. This will ensure that the cases identified for learning are those that match the needs of the country. GOS may utilize national resources of from the proposed GEF 5 project for this purpose.

**(c) Address both landscape (Basin) and micro level (micro-watershed and farm) needs**

The GOS and UNDP are now gearing up for preparing a proposal for landscape level interventions under GEF 5. Program formulation efforts need to consider the reality that a two-pronged approach will be needed. The first is to think and plan at the landscape level which may involve the bigger basin or watershed. However, actions will be needed at both big landscape level (policies, knowledge management) and the smaller units such as the micro-watershed where communities and user groups can contribute their own local efforts and thus ensure ownership and sustainability.

Vaipouli is an example of a small micro-watershed where community actions are encouraged. The bigger watershed where Vaipouli micro-watershed belongs will also need interventions. The land care movement in Australia provides lessons on the need to keep a balance between the two levels of interventions.

**(d) Training Network for drought prone agriculture with option for ecosystems approach**

The MNRE and Ministry of Agriculture should accelerate the dialogue to establish a training and action research network for addressing drought situation at the farm level in affected districts. Local agricultural institutions should also be involved. This should build on current programs and plans of both GOS and donor community for climate change adaptation in agriculture.

This program should take advantage of existing farmer based demonstration plots on Agroforestry started by GOS projects earlier. The idea is have a network of these demonstration areas with the Training Centre acting as hub or one of the hubs.

To develop a holistic model for addressing drought in agriculture sector there is a need to go beyond the farm level and consider the landscape level. The MNRM may wish to identify and study the micro-watershed where the Asau Training Centre belongs. Get to know how the current situation of this watershed is affecting the agricultural situation and institute targeted measures to improve the hydrology that directly influences natural water availability in the affected areas (surface water, groundwater and water in the soil or soil moisture).

**(e) Using UNCCD support resources, update the NAP and attune it to climate change adaptation**

MNRE to accelerate negotiation with UNCCD to provide support for the updating of the NAP. Updating would involve not only identifying resource mobilization plan but also to expand the knowledge base for current status of land degradation and documentation of good practices in SLM. Develop the new NAP objectives and the scope of actions to include biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation/adaptation in the agriculture sector as well as sustained community livelihood considerations.

## 8.2. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNDP AND GEF

**(a) Revisiting the Scope of SLM Projects**

Should GEF and UNDP consider a second wave of support for SLM in SIDS, these should now review the viability of aiming multiple outcomes over a short duration (3 years). While it is true that the project designs are flexible and can be amended during the inception workshop, the reality is that amendments do not have the luxury of being supported by thorough activity preparation with “due diligence”. Thus, the alternative outputs identified during the inception or in subsequent NSC meetings may not necessarily ensure that Project Outcomes are achieved.

**(b) Stronger, evidence-based foundation for SLM**

Subsequent studies should be to support studies to understand and communicate the nature, scope and even the costs of land degradation and to identify promising good practices developed locally that can be potentially replicated to address the degradation.

The good practices need not solely rely on the pilot project sites under an SLM Project. Efforts can be made to identify existing good practices. The whole idea is to help decision makers understand the nature of the problem and visualize and be inspired by the possible solutions.

If projects are able to do a good job on just these two items at the start (study of nature of land degradation and study on good practices), then they will have helped stakeholders attain a correct perspective and enthusiastic attitude to do other activities as well.

# 9.0 LESSONS LEARNED

**Revisions during inception workshop are no guarantee that targets can be more achievable.** The new outputs substituted for those in the original plan were also not implemented. On hindsight, a regular “in-house review” of outcomes, even after the inception workshop could have been useful to continue to redefine the outputs to match the realities of the project situation and still continue to ensure that planned outcomes are achieved.

**It is important to stay focused on planned results.** There was a long dialogue on the viability of the Lano Seawall and Asau Training Center. It is possible that this would have been concluded earlier with more tangible outputs if stakeholders always seriously referred to the planned project outcomes. By doing so, the NSC would have developed practical, “win – win “ ways to mitigate the situation and made sure that they were done immediately so that project outcomes would not be jeopardized.

**The MTR recommendations can not be taken lightly.** The MTR identified pressing issues that should be addressed during the final year of the project. These recommendations however did not appear to be resolutely implemented even though there was still a full time PMU until the middle of 2011. As a result, attainment of project outcomes particularly for outcome 2 has been jeopardized.

**It is possible to mainstream a concept even if the pilot is still a work in progress**. The Vaiapouli watershed pilot is a “young” good practice. There is still much to do to make it a convincing pilot. Yet, the GOS leadership has placed great trust in the pilot project and has used the concept to guide its work on other watersheds in the country including four watersheds that serve the Apia City. This means that one does not have to wait for pilot projects to be “perfect” before they can be “replicated” to other areas. What is important is to understand the principles behind the pilot and to look out for the positive trends that confirm the validity of assumptions behind the concept.
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# ATTACHMENTS

## ATTACHMENT 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

## 

In accordance with United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures, all full and medium- sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Sustainable Land Management Project in Samoa and Niue

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FINANCING PLAN (US$)** | | |
| **GEF PROJECT/COMPONENT** | | |
| Project | | $475,000.00 |
| *Total GEF* | | 475,000.00 |
| **Co-Financing** | | |
| Government of Samoa (GoS) | 300,000.00 | |
| MNREM (GoS) | 110,000.00 | |
| MAF (GoS) | 70,000.00 | |
| Others (UNDP) | 48,000.00 | |
| *Sub-Total Co-financing:* | **528,000.00** | |
| *Total Project Financing:* | **1,003,000.00** | |
| **FINANCING FOR ASSOCIATED ACTIVITY IF ANY:** | | |

**PROJECT SUMMARY T ABLE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AGENCY’S PROJECT ID: 00043651  GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3403  COUNTRY: SAMOA  PROJECT TITLE: Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in **SAMOA** GEF AGENCY: UNDP  OTHER EXECUTING AGENCY(IES): DURATION: Three years  GEF FOCAL AREA: Land Degradation  ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: August 31st 2006  AGENCY’S PROJECT ID: 00044093  GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3400  COUNTRY: Niue  PROJECT TITLE: Capacity Building for Sustainable  Land Management in **NIUE**  GEF AGENCY: UNDP  OTHER EXECUTING AGENCIES: Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries; Department of Environment; Department of Justice, Lands and Survey; Economic Planning Development & Statistics Unit  DURATION: Three years  GEF FOCAL AREA: Land Degradation  ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: 31st August 2006 |  | | | |
|  | **FINANCING PLAN (US$)** | |  |
| **GEF PROJECT/COMPONENT** | |
| Project | 474,545 |
| *Sub-Total GEF* | 474,545 |
| Co-financing | |
| Government | 254,063 |
| Bilateral |  |
| NGOs |  |
| Others | 751,276 |
| *Sub-Total Co-financing:* | **1,005,339** |
| *Total Project Financing:* | **1,479,884** |
| **FINANCING FOR ASSOCIATED ACTIVITY IF ANY:** | |

**OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

**Samoa.** Addressing land degradation is a priority issue for Samoa. The country’s First National Report to the UNCCD and the GEF Capacity Development Initiative Report both identified unsustainable agricultural practices and deforestation as the two main contributing factors to land degradation. Land degradation in Samoa has not been studied in detail to ascertain the extent of the problem. In recognition of national and global environmental benefits the overall expected goal of this project is the promotion of effective sustainable land management in Samoa so as to promote ecosystem heath, integrity, stability, functions and services. This project is submitted under the LDC-Small Islands Developing States (LDC-SIDS) Portfolio Project and will help achieve the objectives of Operational Programme 15 and Strategic Priority 1 relating to Targeted Capacity Building for sustainable land management. Its objective is to strengthen local and national capacity for Sustainable Land Management (SLM), including mainstreaming into national development strategies and policies, improving the quality of project design and implementation, and ensuring that all relevant stakeholder views are reflected and integrated into the process. Key activities will include completion of a National Action Plan (NAP) under the UNCCD, capacity building, strengthening legislative and policy frameworks and the development of a Medium Term Investment Plan and its Resource Mobilization. The management of the project will involve the existing National Steering Committee established initially under UNCCD, Technical Advisory Group, Project Manager and possibly a Project Assistant. The operational phase of the project is

3 years after which SLM issues and focus will be mainstreamed into the national development planning and policy framework.

**Niue.** This MSP project will enable Niue to address sustainable land management in Niue which will complement the NAP process and implementation. And contributes towards the achievement of the following long term goal which is the sustainable land management of Niue’s unique terrestrial resources while at the same time promoting sustainable productive systems contributing to the social well being of its present and future generations.

The MSP aims to address sustainable land management issues via a targeted practical

participatory “bottom up” approach inclusive of all stakeholders of Niue society. The ultimate objective being that capacities for sustainable land management are built in appropriate governmental departments, civil society groups, resource users and mainstreamed into government planning and strategy development.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. Specific objectives include:

 Assess extent of achievements of projects outputs and results including extent of implementation of Mid-Term Evaluation recommendations

 Examine current level of impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to institutional strengthening, biodiversity conservation and conservation friendly livelihood promotion, and the achievement of global and national environmental goals

 Identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that will maximize the impact of the project and also to provide evidences to improve design and implementation of similar projects in near future

 Identify an exit strategy for the project by linking its products to other ongoing initiatives

**EVALUAT IO N APPRO ACH AND METHOD**

An overall approach and method1 for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.

A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Samoa and Niue visiting the relevant project sites. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (UNDP, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment: land management division in Samoa, DAFF in Niue).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

**EVALUAT IO N CRITERIA & RAT INGS**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ***Annex 1***), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in ***Annex 3***.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

1 For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development

Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

**PROJECT FINANCE / CO FINANCE**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co- financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co-financing**  **(type/source)** | **UNDP own**  **financing**  **(million US$)** | | **Government**  **(million US$)** | | **Partner Agency**  **(million US$)** | | **Total**  **(million US$)** | |
| **Planned** | **Actual** | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Planned** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**MAINST REAMING**

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

**IMP ACT**

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.2

**CONCLUS IO NS, RECOMME ND ATIO NS & LESSONS**

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations**

and **lessons**.

**IMPLE ME NT ATIO N ARRANGE ME NTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Samoa.* The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

2A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: ROTI Handbook 2009

**EVALUAT IO N TIMEFRAME ( SAMOA AND NIUE )**

The total duration of the evaluation will be *30* working days according to the following plan:

**Annex 4** presents schedule of detailed time frame of evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days |  |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *17* days |  |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *7* days |  |
| **Final Report** | *3* days |  |

**EVALUAT IO N DELIVERABLES**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception**  **Report** | Evaluator provides  clarifications on timing and method | Before the evaluation  mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP  CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management,  UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final**  **Report** | Full report, (per  annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the  evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA,  PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving  UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to  UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. ***Annex 5*** presents tentative outline of evaluation report.

**TEAM CO MPOSITIO N**

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator. The international evaluator will lead the team and will be responsible for ensuring overall quality and finalizing the report. The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant is required to combine international calibre evaluation expertise, the latest thinking in landscape conservation and sustainable-use, and knowledge of the regional context. The consultant will be hired by UNDP directly, following UNDP rules and procedures.

International Consultant should have following qualification:

 At-least Master degree in natural resource management or relevant subjects

 Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience with strong technical background and proven competency in landscape level biodiversity conservation, protected areas

management, or related areas of natural resource management, including demonstrable expertise in project formulation, implementation and evaluation

 Knowledge of UNDP and GEF

 Demonstrated ability to work with developing country government agencies and NGOs.

Previous work experience in the Pacific, working experience in Samoa and Niue would be an asset

 Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;

 Familiarity with GEF programming and procedures, as well as its evaluation policies and guidelines, will be a useful asset

 Previous work experience with United Nations or other multilateral/bilateral development assistance agencies is a useful asset.

 Experience leading multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams in high stress. Ability to meet short deadlines

The evaluator should conduct a debriefing at the end of evaluation mission. The international consultant shall lead the presentation on a draft review of the findings and recommendations with the national level stakeholders, planned at the end of the evaluation mission. Likewise, s/he should lead drafting and finalization of the terminal evaluation.

## ATTACHMENT 2. ITINERARY

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Day** | **Hour** | **Meeting** | **Key Discussant /Responsible** |
| Dec 3  Monday | 10.00 – 12.00 | UNDP (debriefing meeting) | Ms. Marta Moneo |
|  | 2pm – 5pm | Desk Study |  |
| Dec 4  Tuesday | 10,00 – 12.00 | MRE - :Land Management | Ms. Faainoino Laulala |
|  | 2pm – 5pm | **MNRE – ACEO Legal** | **Ms. Josephine Stowers- Fiu** |
| Dec 5  Wednesday |  | Visit Savaii project sitescoastal site ( with seawall )   * watershed mgt site * drought interventions site | Mr. Tito Alatimu |
|  |  | **Former PMU Asst Coordinator** | **Ms. Annie Mauga** |
| Dec 6  Thursday | 7am-12nn | **Consultations with SMSMCL** | **Ms. Sara Ferrrandi** |
|  | 4pm – 530pm | Preliminary Findings – presentation | Ms. Georgnia Bonin  Ms. Faainoino Laulala |
| Dec 7  Friday | Morning | Desk Study |  |
|  | 230-330 pm | Watershed Program of MNRE | Mr. Fata Eti Maldo |

## ATTACHMENT 3. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position and Organization** |
| **GOS** | |
| Ms. Faainoino.Laulala | Principal Lands Officer, MNRE. UNCCD Focal Person |
| Ms. Josephine Stowers Fiu | ACEO – Legal |
| Ms. Naomi Auvae | DLM Staff, MNREM |
| Ms. Annie Mauga | Assistant Coordinator SLM Project (Former) |
| Tito Alatimu | Head of Forestry in Savaii Island |
| Mr. Moafanua Tolusina Pouli | Forestry – ACEO |
| Ms. Faanimo Reti-Warren | Principal Land Development Officer |
| Mr. Fata Eti Maldo | Principal Watershed Offices |
| Mr. Malaki Takopo | Principal Watershed Policy and  Planning |
| Mr. Sala Sagato Tuiafiso | Asst. CEO, Renewable Energy  Development, MNRE |
| **COMMUNITIES** | |
| Mr. Taito Muese | Village Chief, Vaiapoli |
| Mr. Tauasa Vaea Taito | Vllage Member (Local business) |
| Mr. Pili Fanaia | Matai , Salaeia Village |
| Mr. Anansa Laau Ole Ola | Farmer Leader, Asau |
| **UNDP** | |
| Ms. Nileema Noble | RR |
| Ms. Georgina Bonin | ARR |
| Ms. Marta Moneo | Evironment and Energy |
| Frances Brown | Finance Assistant |
| Rosaina Siitic | Program Associate |
| Sara Ferrandi | Intern – E.E. Unit (UNDP Milan, Italia) |