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Please use the following name convention for the file name:

“[FP]-[Agency Short Name]-[Date]-[Serial Number]”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | A.1. Project/Programme MilestonES | | | | | Date of Board Approval | 14/12/2016 | | | | Date of Signature | 21/07/2017 | | | | Date of Effectiveness | 11/07/2017 | | | | Closing Date | 11/07/2022 | Revised Closing Date | 11/01/2024 | | Project Completion date | 11/07/2023 | Revised completion date | 11/01/2025 | | Number of Disbursements to date (by instrument - loans, grants, equity) | Three (3) disbursements | | | | Total disbursed Amounts (by instrument- loans, grants, equity) | Loans  Grants USD 23,793,643  Equity | | | | Undisbursed amounts (by instrument- loans, grants, equity) | Loans  Grants USD 33,923,305  Equity | | | | Cancelled amounts (broken down by instrument - loans, grants, equity) | Loans  Grants  Equity | Cancellation date | dd/mm/yyyy | | | | |  |
| A.2. Summary of proposed changes to the project/programme **(max 300 words)** | | |
| *Please provide a brief description of the proposed changes to the project/programme, including the rationale and justification for the restructuring changes including the objectives and primary measurable benefits (see* [*investment criteria in section E*](#SectionE)*). The detailed description can be elaborated in* [*section C*](#SectionC)*.*  *In this restructuring proposal for the Vaisigano Catchment Project (VCP), the project outlines several changes and on-going challenges that may potentially affect the achievement of the project objectives together with adaptive management efforts and proposed solutions to address the financial issues which have a major impact on the VCP’s ability to meet its intended results. The changes include the following:*   1. ***Change in Environmental and Social Risk Assessment (see G.1 and F.3 for more details)***   *As part of the implementation of Output 2 of the VCP, Social Environmental Safeguards (SES) Standard 5 on Displacement and Resettlement has been triggered due to potential impacts of voluntary physical displacement and land acquisition that were not identified in the original Environment and Social Management Plan and Framework and Management Plan (ESMF-MP) approved by the GCF Board. In addition, the status of the project concerning SES Standard 6 on Indigenous People was reviewed.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *UNDP Safeguards* | *At Funding Proposal* | *After the changes* | | *Overall risk* | *Category B (medium)* | *Category B (medium)* | | *SES Standard 5 – Displacement & Resettlement* | *Not applicable* | *Moderate* | | *SES Standard 6 – Indigenous People* | *Not applicable* | *Moderate* |   *The social risks associated with the project, with revised voluntary land acquisition and displacement and FPIC for Indigenous people assessments remain in the category Moderate (Category B) but triggered adaptive management measures by developing Land Acquisition and Resettlement Action Plan (LARAP) and Land Acquisition Action Plan (LAAP) for each of the project infrastructures activities. (See revised ESMP in Annex X)*   1. ***Change in project activities’ costing (see B.3 for more details)***   *Following investigation reports for the construction of the flood retaining riverwalls for Segments 2, 3 and 4, as well as the Lelata Bridge and subsequent final technical designs, cost estimates in the FAA were significantly underestimated and impact on the budget available for fully implementing the flood mitigation measures of the project.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Activities* | *At Funding Proposal*  *USD* | *After the changes*  *USD* | | *1.3 Conduct Hydrological modelling for flood scenarios and Flooding EWS* | *$500,000* | *$820,640* | | *2.1 Channelization of Segment 2, 3 and 4 of the Vaisigano River streambeds, including 2.4 Extension of floodwalls at bridges. Total.* | *$14,172,000* | *$44,792,300* | | *Design and Supervision contract* | *$1,145,000* | *$1,039,537* | | *Construction of Segment 2* | *$6,513,500* | *$19,809,856* | | *Construction of Segment 3* | *$6,513,500* | *$9,322,319* | | *Construction of Segment 4* | *$0* | *$14,420,588* | | *2.3 Design, supervision, and construction of Lelata Bridge. Total.* | *$5,646,000* | *$6,778,614* | | *Design and Supervision contract* | *$1,000,000* | *$729,002* | | *Construction* | *$4,646,000* | *$6,049,612* | | *3.1/3.2 Design and Supervision of drainage upgrades* | *$1,269,000* | *$1,998,219* | | ***Total Budget*** | *$21,587,000* | *$54,389,773* |   *Despite addressing the risk management issues on key safeguards, the project cannot initiate further tender process and construction without guarantee that funding is sufficient to complete the physical assets construction and supervision work. The current budget allocation is insufficient to cover these costs, thus impacting on the main objective of the project to strengthen the adaptive capacity and to reduce exposure to extreme weather events -climate risks on infrastructures and flooding of vulnerable communities in the Vaisigano river catchment area (VRCA*   1. ***Change in Technical Designs and Evaluation (see F.2 for more details)***   *The technical designs in the Funding Proposal (FP) for the channelization of Segment 2,3 and 4 of Vaisigano River Flood management measures were done under the GEF-EWACC project with the scope of 1:20 year event in mind. A review of interdependence of flood mitigation options as part of Activity 1.1.1, as well as engineering assessment of flood modeling as part of Activity 2.1.1 recommended a horizon of 1:50 year event for both the final designs of the riverwalls and Lelata bridge.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Flood modelling* | *At Funding Proposal* | *After the changes* | | *Extreme flooding event return period used for design of infrastructures for the VCP (Annual Exceedance Probability)* | *1:20 AEP* | *1:50 AEP* |  1. ***Change in Scope for Activity 3.2.2 – Additional Priority Hazard Drainages (See B.3 for details)***   *The FP narrative states 9 priority sites and additional priority hazards sites to be identified, designed and built, but no budget was allocated for upgrades to additional sites in critical flood prone areas of Apia Urban Area (AUA). The VCP contracted the design of the additional hazard sites in the flood-plain to be integrated in the flood assessments for the StormWater Master Plan although they will not be constructed under the GCF project.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Activity 3.2.2* | *Funding Proposal* | *After the changes* | | *Number of drainages of priority hazard areas to be designed* | *9* | *19* | | *Number of drainages of priority hazard areas to be upgraded.* | *9* | *9* |  1. ***Change in Legal Terms - Funded Activity Agreement (FAA-see B.4 for details)***   *The Financial Elements of the Project/Programme and the project Financing Information does not include Contingency funding which is subject to separate request and approval by the GCF. This is a requirement of the FAA, that was not in the FP approved by the GCF Board. None of the three first year’s contingencies requests were approved nor remitted. Considering the budget shortfall of more than USD$30 million (see 1 above), the VCP seeks to merge the contingency funds with the Core Allocated budget.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Disbursement Plan (FAA)* | *Before the change* | *After the changes* | | *GCF proceeds (USD)* | *$ 49,586,565* | *$57,716,948* | | *Contingency (USD)* | *$ 8,130,383* | *$ 0* |  1. ***Extension request – change in completion date (see A.1 and C.3 for more details)***   *Despite mitigation measures, the Covid-19 pandemic has had a major impact in delaying many activities, as Samoa declared a State of Emergency (SoE) that remains on-going (20 months) with closed borders and other restrictions still in effect. This is in addition to additional delay caused by fully implemented safeguards triggered by SES Standard 5 on Displacement and Resettlement and UNDP due diligence prior to initiate any construction activities. The project is requesting an extension of 18 months to ensure full completion of contracted arrangements, in particular the construction of physical assets that will fulfill the objective of flood mitigation to the vulnerable communities of the AUA. The Implementation Schedule and Plan has been amended accordingly.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Project completion* | *At Funding Proposal* | *After the changes* | | *Closing Date* | *11 July 2022* | *11 January 2024* | | *Completion Date* | *11 July 2023* | *11 January 2025* | | | |
| **A.3. Is there any deviation from the AMA required for this project?****Yes**  **No**  **If yes, please elaborate and justify why** | | |
|  | | |
| *Change in Implementing/Executing Agency* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [* ***X*** *]* |
| *Change in Implementing/Executing Agency* | *Yes [ ]* | *No* ***[ X ]*** |
| *Change in Project's Objectives* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [* ***X*** *]* |
| *Change in Results Framework)* | *Yes [* ***X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change in Expected Impact* | *Yes [ ]* | *No* ***[ X*** *]* |
| *Change in Legal Terms, Conditions and Covenants* | *Yes [****X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change in Closing Date(s)* | *Yes [* ***X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change in Completion Date* | *Yes [* ***X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change in Technical/Project Design* | *Yes* ***[ X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change in Scope* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [* ***X*** *]* |
| *Any Cancellations Proposed* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [* ***X*** *]* |
| *Change to Financing Plan* | *Yes [* ***X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Changes to GCF Financing Amount* | *Yes [ ]* | *No* ***[ X*** *]* |
| *Change in Disbursement Arrangements* | *Yes [* ***X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Reallocation between Disbursement Categories* | *Yes [ ]* | *No* ***[ X*** *]* |
| *Change in Disbursement Estimates* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [* ***X*** *]* |
| *Change to Components and Cost* | *Yes [* ***X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change in Institutional Arrangements* | *Yes []* | *No [ X ]* |
| *Change in Financial Management* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [* ***X*** *]* |
| *Change in Procurement* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [* ***X*** *]* |
| *Change in Implementation Schedule* | *Yes [* ***X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change of ESS category* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [* ***X*** *]* |
| *Other Changes to Safeguards* | *Yes [* ***X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change in Economic and Financial Analysis* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [ X ]* |
| *Change in Technical Analysis* | *Yes [* ***X*** *]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change in Environmental and Social Analysis* | *Yes [****X****]* | *No [ ]* |
| *Change in Risk Analysis* | *Yes [X ]* | *No [* *]* |
| *Other Change(s)* | *Yes [ ]* | *No [* ***X*** *]* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Please fill out applicable sub-sections and provide additional information as necessary, as these requirements may vary depending on the nature of the project / programme. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B.1.. Any Changes to Strategic Context, financial market and/or project baseline since approval that have influenced the change? Yes  No  If yes, please elaborate | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *The strategic context in the original FP remains valid and Section B.3 of the FP states that Financial Markets overview is not applicable to this project. But the breakdown of costs estimates for major budget sub-activities have changed significantly since approval and have influenced the change in budget costs estimates. Cost estimates used in the VCP budget since GCF Board approval and contained in the FAA were prepared based on earlier pricing of designs and supervision costs, as well as construction costs of floodwalls under the GEF EWACC for Segment 1 available in 2016 and 2017. Bridge design, supervision and construction estimates were based on costs of the Leone bridge completed in 2017. Since the VCP design to date, the following factors have contributed towards a higher cost of construction:*  *1. Changes of floodwall design requirements: Flood walls extensions earlier designs were based on seawall construction costs (rock gabion) from the same period but have been amended now to floodwall design at much higher costs. Current estimates are based on engineers cost estimates and tender responses from 2020 – the difference in costs during those four years is significant. The same applies for the construction costs of the Lelata bridge.*  *2. COVID-19 impacts: The force majeure circumstances of COVID-19 have highly impacted the costs of construction with impacts on availability of material, transportation costs and delays as reflected by the engineering estimates and the bid prices already received in 2020. These include changes to the shipping prices and charter rates by 50% and 25% increase for containers based on recent rates released in May 2021 by major shipping companies, increase in price of materials such as steel. (see Annex X for details)*  *3. Inflation impacts: Inflation has had an impact on prices in Samoa over the 4 years between design and the implementation of the project’s activities with indications pointing at a price increase of 6% for the rest of 2021 (see Annex X for details)*  *The changes in cost estimate breakdown are reflected in the breakdown costs estimates table for total project costs and GCF financing by sub-component presented in Section B.4 below. These will show a major budget shortfall expected in the implementation of project activities with an impact on delivery of objectives and and the need for restructuring over and beyond the Safeguard risk increase.* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **B.2.** Changes to Project / Programme Objective against Baseline? Yes  No  If yes, please elaborate | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Describe the baseline scenario (i.e. emissions baseline, climate vulnerability baseline, key barriers, challenges and/or policies) and the outcomes and the impact that the project/programme will aim to achieve in improving the baseline scenario.* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B.3. CHANGES TO Project/Programme Description Yes  No  If yes, please elaborate | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Describe the main activities and the planned measures of the project/programme according to each of its components.*  *As reported in the FP037 Samoa VCP 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR), there have been no major changes in the overall scope of the VCP, its Outputs and Main Activities descriptions. However, there have been some changes in the following Activities, cost overruns in key activities compared with budget allocations in the FAA. These changes are due to cost overrun and based on technical design review as part of the project Sub-activity 1.1.1 Interdependence assessment of flood mitigation options and 2.1.1 Review of technical designs for the channelization of Segment 2,3, and 4 of the Vaisigano River.*  *The project represents the GoS’s initial steps in operationalizing a comprehensive flood management solution to the likely consequences of extreme events in the AUA. Three interlinked project outputs have been pursued over the last three years to operationalize the GoS’s plan in the context of an overarching programme for managing flood risks. They include:*  *(a) Output 1 - Strengthening capacities and mechanisms for integrated approach to reduce flood related risks in place.*  *(b) Output 2 - Key infrastructure in the Vaisigano River Catchment are flood-proofed to increase resilience to negative effects of excessive water, and*  *(c) Output 3 - Drainage in downstream areas upgraded for increased regulation of waterflows.*  *The changes outlined below are based on:*  *a) The results of the procurement actions and process in regard to implementation scheduling.*  *b) Minor adjustments to scope taking into account government priorities and reality on the ground in integration and coordination of VCP funded activities with other donor funded activities within the VRCA; and*  *c) The final/actual costs per activity as compared to the FP/FAA/Project Document (ProDoc) budget allocations following completion of procurement actions and processes.*  *As a result of these, there are implications to the overall budget within Outputs which will impact on the remaining VCP activities.*  *Provide information on how the activities are linked to objectives, outputs and outcomes that the project/programme intends to achieve, in relationship to the project Theory of Change (ToC) and how it will substantiate results with evidence. The objectives, outputs and outcomes should be consistent with the information reported in the logic framework in section H.*  ***Change in Output 1, Activity 1.3: Expand Early Warning System (EWS) coverage to provide flooding alerts in the AUA***  *In the FP, this main activity has two sub-activities. These include:*  *a) Update data collection to undertake hydrological modelling to generate flood scenarios: work will be undertaken to upgrade of existing hydrological network to collect rainfall and river level data etc., to generate key data to facilitate improved flood forecasting and flood impact mapping of VRCA; and*  *b) Integration of flood warning into the EWS in VRCA: activities will be undertaken to integrate the five new sirens into the National Emergency Siren Network (ESN). This will include installation and regular testing of the sirens as well as signpost indicating the nearest storm shelters. Work will be undertaken with villages, with special attention to downstream populations, on identifying the appropriate sounds and evacuation preparations need for daytime and nighttime flooding scenarios. The capacity of the technical officers at the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) will be enhanced to integrate flood forecast into the EWS.*  *The FAA budget allocated USD$220,000 for the procurement of 5 sirens per a total of 5 sites (i.e., 25 units at an estimated USD$8,800 each), and USD$155,000 for the installation of the same, amounting to USD$375,000. However, following the receipt of tenders at the first Request for Tenders (RfT), the cost of one siren exceeded the estimated total budget costs. Hence, the MNRE reduced the quantity of the sirens from 25 to 5 and sought another quote via the direct procurement method. However, the quote received still exceeded the budget allocation at NZD$603,483 or approximately USD$430,000.*  *In order to achieve the targets for the flood EWS, changes were made on the contracts and the number of sirens and in both cases with cost overrun and the project proposes to reallocate funding from savings identified from other Output 1 Sub-activities.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Activities* | *At Funding Proposal* | *After the changes* | | *Number of sirens for EWS* | *25* | *5* | | *1.3 Conduct Hydrological modelling for flood scenarios and Flooding EWS* | *USD $500,000* | *USD $820,640* | | ***Budget shortfall*** | ***$320,640*** | |   ***Change to Output 2, Activity 2.1.1: Review designs and construction for channelization of Segments 2, 3 and 4***  *Following the preliminary investigations by Tinai Gordon and Associates (TGA), the contractor for the design of the river levees, the design has changed significantly from the original design by Kramer Ausenco based on most recent studies including hydraulic analysis, Geotech assessments and flood modelling. According to TGA and their findings, this revised design of the river levees is the most practical design to ensure the effective mitigation of potential severe flooding in the future.*  *It was agreed at the joint meeting of the UNDP and the GCF Chief Executive Officers (GCF-CEO) Forum (GCF-CEO-F) on 31st March 2020 (in place of the GCF-VCP Board (PB/PSC) due to the Covid-19 SoE to proceed with procurement for construction works for Segment 3 to test the market for costs of construction of the riverwalls. A change in design was agreed from the original 1:20 event in the FP for constructing a 1 in 50-year event river wall which has also been based on and projected by more recent flood modelling, investigations and studies which have been fundamental in validating and justifying the changes in dimensions (length, height and structure) to contain the increase in flow and volume of the Vaisigano River (see F.2 on changes of technical evaluation for details).*  *With the new design, the river levees have a much longer span, which will require a longer period for construction. Furthermore, the changes to the design from rock gabion to concrete T-walls as well as the integration of the culvert box drainage for the eastern branch stormwater run-off and the upgraded Lelata Bridge will require more technical engineering and expertise for the construction.*  *The MWTI issued their first construction tender for Segment 3 of the river wall on 24th August 2020 with bidding documents containing the Designs and Technical Specifications for a 1:50 event. Tenders’ bid assessment has indicated a significant cost overrun for the river walls of segment 3 and by extension all to-be-built segments’ river walls for Segment 2, 3 and 4. This cost overrun is extensive and requires the allocation of additional funding. from the Contingency Funds for Years 3 and beyond, as well as reallocation of funds between Outputs of more than 10%. Upon receipt of UNDP’s due diligence report on the Package 1, Lot 2: Box Culverts option for the stormwater drainage and hydraulic study review, further discussions were held to consider the findings from the consolidated review by all stakeholders to determine the best mitigation option in light of the safeguards issues that have been identified.*  *Finally, although Segment 4 is an important component of the flood mitigation strategy for the Vaisigano River, the costs for its construction were not included in the project budget as per the FAA. This is considered in the design as a critical component for the integrity of the entire infrastructure to protect from flooding.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Activities* | *At Funding Proposal*  *USD* | *After the changes*  *USD* | | *2.1 Channelization of Segment 2, 3 and 4 of the Vaisigano River streambeds, including 2.4 Extension of floodwalls at bridges. Total.* | *$12,481,000* | *$44,792,300* | | *Design and Supervision contract* | *$1,000,000* | *$1,039,537* | | *Construction of Segment 2* | *$5,740,500* | *$19,809,856* | | *Construction of Segment 3* | *$5,740,500* | *$9,322,319* | | *Construction of Segment 4* | *$0* | *$14,420,588* | | ***Budget shortfall*** | ***$32,111,300*** | |   *Despite addressing the risk management issues on key safeguards mainly SES Standard 5 on Displacement and Relocation (see details in Section F.3), the project cannot initiate further tender process and construction without guarantee that funding is sufficient to complete the physical assets construction and supervision work. The current budget allocation is insufficient to cover these costs, thus impacting on the main objective of the project to strengthen the adaptive capacity and to reduce exposure to extreme weather events -climate risks on infrastructures and flooding of vulnerable communities in the VRCA. ). It should also be noted that the budget allocation for the construction of Segments 2 and 3 under the Project Document, was directly derived from the actual construction costs of Segment 1 with no provisions or incremental cost pricing to take into account the likely differences in dimensions (length, height and width) and structure of Segments 2 and 3 from Segment 1. Consequently, this would lead to differences in the number/type of materials required and the duration for construction which would result in differences in costing.*  ***Change to Output 2, Activity 2.3: Construction Upgrade of Lelata bridge to accommodate increase flood waters***  *The Engineers Estimate for the Lelata Bridge Reconstruction as per Final Detailed Designs approved by the Land Transport Authority (LTA) in August 2020 indicated a higher cost than the FP/FAA budget allocation for Sub-Activity 2.3.2 (Budget Note 2D “Construction of Lelata bridge based on the price of Leone bridge). The tender for the Lelata Bridge Reconstruction was advertised in September 2020 for eight weeks. Three bids were received and evaluated by the TEC with support from the Lelata Bridge design consultant. The preferred bidder’s price for the Lelata Bridge Reconstruction in the Tender Evaluation Report (TER) for this procurement indicated a cost overrun against the FP/FAA/Project Document budget.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Activities* | *At Funding Proposal*  *USD* | *After the changes*  *USD* | | *2.3 Design, supervision, and construction of Lelata Bridge. Total.* | *$5,646,000* | *$6,778,614* | | *Design and Supervision contract* | *$1,000,000* | *$729,002* | | *Construction* | *$4,646,000* | *$6,049,612* | | ***Budget shortfall*** | ***$1,132,614*** | |   *Like for the riverwalls in Activity 2.1 and 2.4, despite addressing the risk management issues on key safeguards mainly SES Standard 5 on Displacement and Relocation (see details in Section F.3), the project cannot initiate further tender process and construction of the bridge without guarantee that funding is sufficient to complete the physical assets construction and supervision work.*  ***Change to Output 2, Activity 2.4 Extension of floodwalls at Lelata and Leone Bridges to prevent damage during extreme events***  *Here Sub-Activity 2.4.1 is integrated and implemented together with Sub-Activity 2.1.1 as the floodwall extensions are included in the scope for the Activity 2.1 implementation and reporting under Sub-Activity 2.1.1. Funding and payments of relevant infrastructure works will be shared based on agreed workplan using the 7:1 ratio on the Output and Activity allocated budgets. This sub-activity has started but implementation is delayed. The contract for the design and supervision of the Channelization work for Segments 2 and 3 referenced in Sub-activity 2.1.1 also includes the adjacent floodwalls to both the Leone and the Lelata bridges.*  *Likewise, Sub-Activity 2.4.2 is integrated and implemented together with Sub-Activity 2.1.2 as the floodwall extensions is included in the scope for the Activity 2.1 implementation and reporting under Sub-Activity 2.1.2. The APR 2018 reported progress for this activity which noted construction of priority construction works to protect vulnerable infrastructure (hydroelectric penstock at Loto Samasoni power station) in Segment 2 and flood wall extensions for one side of the Leone Bridge. The percentage reflects the incorporation of this progress which was not recorded in the APR 2019, noting that there was no further progress on construction during the 2020 reporting period. The costs overrun are integrated with budget shortfall provide for Activity 2.1 above.*  ***Change in Scope for Output 3. Activity 3.2.2 – Additional Priority Hazard Drainages***  *The FP narrative states 9 priority sites and additional priority hazards sites to be identified, designed and built, but no budget was allocated for upgrades to additional sites in critical flood prone areas of AUA.*  *There are two main activities under Output 3 as per FAA, and on 5 sub-activities that are explicitly mentioned in the FP under the Results-based logic framework (section H). The project noticed the position of the GCF in regard to additional hazard sites whereas no budget was allocated in the FAA for the construction of these priority hazard sites.*  *Therefore, in addition to the 9 sites, GoS/MoF/LTA have identified additional priority hazard areas in the floodplain (sites 11 to 20) and requested the design to be completed by the contractor, so these can be incorporated in the Master Plan (as per ProDoc). These additional sites are even more critical as it covers repeatedly flooded areas of the flood plain mainly in village communities adjacent of the CBD (where the 9 priority drainage where upgraded). These together with the additional sites designed will be included as part of the revised Stormwater Plan for AUA without which the StormWater Master Plan would be incomplete.* *The project conveyed funds from one contract for the design of these additional hazard sites and through this Restructuring Proposal is seeking retrospective authorization for this allocation of Drainage funds so that floodplains hazards sites can be part of the assessment for the StormWater Master Plan for the Apia Urban Area although they will not be constructed under this project. The VCP will not seek the inclusion of 11 new sites, as part of this Restructuring Proposal. Refer to map below that provides location of additional hazard sites assessed during community consultations as per Activity 3.1.3 and note that the 9 priority sites upgraded with GCF funding are outside the flood assessment map of the Vaisigano River.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Activities* | *At Funding Proposal*  *USD* | *After the changes*  *USD* | | *3.1/3.2 Design and Supervision of drainage upgrades* | *$1,269,000* | *$1,998,219* | | ***Budget shortfall*** | ***$729,219*** | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Activity 3.2.2* | *At Funding Proposal* | *After the changes* | | *Number of drainages of priority hazard areas to be designed* | *9* | *19* | | *Number of drainages of priority hazard areas to be upgraded.* | *9* | *9* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **B.4. CHANGES TO FINANCIAL ELEMENTS OF THE PROJECT/PROGRAMME** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Please Indicate any changes proposed relative to the Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) in:*   * *the integrated financial model in* [*Annexes*](#SectionI) *that includes a projection covering the period from financial closing through final maturity of the proposed GCF financing with detailed assumptions and rationale; and a sensitivity analysis of critical elements of the project/programme*   *The integrated Financial Model that provides sensitivity analysis of critical elements is not applicable for this project as indicated in the FP. The VCP therefore proposes to change the FAA terms in regards to the Disbursement plan as follows: aims:*  *a) to access all the contingency funds from Years 1 to 7, to cover these budget cost overruns as an initial step;*  *b) for the GoS through the PB/PSC re-prioritize remaining project activities within the overall VCP to identify cost savings to accommodate the cost overrun; and*  *c) finally, for the PB/PSC to also seek partnerships or co-financing with other donor funded projects and the GoS national budget as a way of addressing any remaining budget gaps.*  ***Change in Legal Terms - Funded Activity Agreement***  *The Financial Elements of the Project/Programme and the project Financing Information does not include Contingency funding upon request and approval by the GCF. This is a requirement of the FAA, this was not in the FP approved by the Project Board. None of the three first year’s contingencies requests were approved nor remitted. Considering the budget shortfall of more than USD30 million the project seeks to merge the contingency funds with the Core Allocated budget.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Disbursement Plan (FAA)* | *Before the change* | *After the changes* | | *GCF proceeds (USD)* | *$ 49,586,565* | *$57,716,948* | | *Contingency (USD)* | *$ 8,130,383* | *$ 0* |  * *the breakdown of cost estimates for total project costs and GCF financing by sub-component. Please indicate breakdown in local and foreign currency, highlighting any changes in allocation and comment on any (changes) in currency hedging mechanism, as applicable:* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Project Output/ component*** | ***Project subcomponent*** | ***Currency*** | ***Current Budget Allocation*** | ***Proposed Budget allocation*** | ***% Change*** | ***Remarks (as applicable 1)*** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | *Output 1 – Assessment and Mechanisms in place for an integrated approach to reduce vulnerability towards flood-related risks* | *1.1 Strengthen capacities and information requirements for flood management.* | *WST* | *7,529,382* | *6,787,402* | *10%* | *Subcomponent 1.1 completed -* ***Savings*** *to be reallocated to Output 2. Noting this activity cost overrun on the feasibility of the Flood Buffering of Alaoa Multipurpose Dam was partly funded by the approved Y2 contingency USD$32,657. Proposed change includes relevant TAs/staff costs to July 2023 (end project)* | |  |  | *USD* | *2,992,600* | *2,697,695* | *10%* |  | |  | *1.2 Establish Health surveillance systems to track and manage flood-related issues* | *WST* | *1,811,520* | *1,437,646* | *21%* | As stated, the completion of the development and operationalization of H-CLEWS is essential. The H-CLEWS is the health surveillance system that is to be established under the main activity of the health component. The four sub-activities all focus on enabling the use and application of this system by health practitioners and communities, therefore, these sub-activities must be completed to ensure the system is utilized and applied accordingly. | |  |  | *USD* | *720,000* | *571,402* | *21%* |  | |  | *1.3 Expand EWS coverage to provide flooding alerts in Apia* | *WST* | *1,976,779* | *2,734,581* | *-38%* | *Noting cost overrun on procurement of sirens and rainwater gauges which is partly funded with Y2 approved Contingency Fund USD$172,028 and still cost overrun of US$49,889* | |  |  | *USD* | *785,683* | *1,086,876* | *-38%* |  | |  | *1.4 Conduct awareness raising campaigns on building practices and designs for at risk communities.* | *WST* | *1,109,556* | *386,691* | *65%* | *Subcomponent delayed-Remaining funds for model flood-proof houses, reallocated to Output 2, Activity 2.1. – Provision of contract for Upland Conservation Regulation* | |  |  | *USD* | *441,000* | *153,693* | *65%* |  | | *Output 2 – Infrastructure in the Vaisigano \river are flood-proofed to increase resilience to negative effects of excessive water.* | *2.1 Channelization of Segment 2 and 3 of the Vaisigano River* | *WST* | *35,154,309* | *84,990,312* | *-142%* | *Subcomponent delayed due to safeguards issues. Budget includes construction of Segment 4 - not budgeted in FAA. IEE recommendations to merge with Activity 2.4 but cover run to be funded from identified overall savings, other funding options by GoS/GCF/UNDP. Proposed change includes relevant TAs/staff costs to July 2023 (end project).* | |  |  | *USD* | *13,972,300* | *33,779,932* | *-142%* |  | |  | *2.2 Implement eco-system responses upstream for decreased flows in extreme weather events.* | *WST* | *22,353,906* | *21,163,619* | *5%* | *Savings of USD275,000 identified as part of revision of MYWPB for Activity 2.2. Proposed reallocation of savings to Output 2.3 to cover shortfall on Lelata bridge* | |  |  | *USD* | *8,884,700* | *8,411,613* | *5%* |  | |  | *2.3 Construction upgrade of Lelata bridge for increase flood waters* | *WST* | *14,280,817* | *17,134,266* | *-20%* | *Subcomponent delayed due to safeguards issues. Bids exceed ProDoc Budget and cost overrun of US$1,487,668. This excess is proposed to be funded from within Output 2 (between activities per UNDP oversight rule) and from 10% of total Output 3.* | |  |  | *USD* | *5,676,000* | *6,810,121* | *-20%* |  | |  | *2.4 Extension of floodwalls at Lelata and Leone bridges to prevent damage during extreme events* | *WST* | *7,548,408* | *34,686,042* | *-360%* | *Subcomponent delayed due to safeguards issues. Budget includes construction of Segment 4 - not budgeted in FP. IEE recommendations to merge with Activity 2.4 but cover run to be funded from identified overall savings, other fuding options by GoS/GCF/UNDP* | |  |  | *USD* | *3,000,162* | *13,786,184* | *-360%* |  | | *Output 3 – Drainage in downstream areas upgraded for increased regulation of waterflows* | *3.1 Develop a climate resilient Stormwater Master Plan* | *WST* | *2,879,814* | *2,871,728* | *0%* | *Noting cost overrun on Drainage design work was partly funded with Y2 approved Contingency Fund USD$143,484. Proposed change includes relevant TAs/staff costs to July 2023 (end project).* | |  |  | *USD* | *1,144,600* | *1,141,386* | *0%* |  | |  | *3.2 Upgrade drainage systems and outfalls in hazard areas for flooding events* | *WST* | *24,462,674* | *21,518,329* | *12%* | *Noting Savings from construction of 9 priority sites U$1,170,248. Proposed reallocation of savings to Output 2.3 to cover shortfall on Lelata bridge* | |  |  | *USD* | *9,722,843* | *8,552,595* | *12%* |  | | *Output 4 - Project Management* |  | *WST* | *5,652,640* | *5,593,164* | *1%* | *Proposed change includes relevant TAs/staff costs to July 2023 (end project)* | |  |  | *USD* | *2,246,677* | *2,223,038* | *1%* |  | | *TOTAL VCP* |  | *WST* | *124,759,804* | *199,303,780* | *-60%* |  | |  |  | *USD* | *49,586,565* | *79,214,535* | *-60%* |  | | *Contingency* |  | *WST* | *20,456,045* | *0* | *100%* | *For purpose of this, reallocated full Contingency to Output 2 to cover budget shortfall. However, Note GCF approved a total of US$348,169 from Y2 Contingency Request which is yet to be paid out. Therefore, balance remaining of Contingency (including Y1&Y2 balances) to date is US$7,782,214.* | |  |  | *USD* | *8,130,383* | *0* | *100%* |  | | *TOTAL VCP + Contingency* |  | *WST* | *145,215,849* | *199,303,780* | *-37%* |  | |  |  | *USD* | *57,716,948* | *79,214,535* | *-37%* |  |  * *[[1]](#footnote-2)The revised breakdown of cost/budget by expenditure type (project staff and consultants, travel, goods, works, services, etc.) and disbursement schedule in project/programme confirmation (term sheet) as included in Annex X* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **B.5.** Changes in Project Financing Information? Yes  No  If Yes, Please elaborate below | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Financial Instrument[[2]](#footnote-3)** | | **Amount** | | **Currency** | | **Tenor** | | | **Pricing (% interest or IRR for equity)** | |
| **(a) Total project financing** | **(a) = (b) + (c)** | | ………………… | | Options | |  | | | | |
| (b) GCF financing to recipient |  | |  | | Options  Options | |  | | |  | |
| *\* Please provide any changes to original economic and financial justification for the concessionality that GCF is expected to provide, particularly in the case of grants. Please specify difference in tenor and price between GCF financing and that of accredited entities. Please note that the level of concessionality should correspond to the level of the project/programme’s expected performance against the investment criteria.* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total requested | | ………………… | | Options | |  | | | | |
| (c) Co-financing to recipient | **Financial Instrument** | **Amount** | | **Currency** | | **Name of Institution** | | **Tenor (years)** | **Pricing (% interest or IRR for equity)** | | **Seniority[[3]](#footnote-4)** |
|  |  | |  | |  | |  |  | |  |
| Lead financing institution: ……………………… | | | | | | | | | | |
| *\* Please provide a confirmation letter or a letter of commitment, for any additional co-financing resulting from changes, issued by the co-financing institution.* | | | | | | | | | | |
| (d) Financial terms between GCF and AE (if applicable) | *In cases where the accredited entity (AE) deploys the GCF financing directly to the recipient, (i.e. the GCF financing passes directly from the GCF to the recipient through the AE) or if the AE is the recipient itself, in the proposed financial instrument and terms as described in part (b), this subsection can be skipped.*  *If there is a financial arrangement between the GCF and the AE, which entails a financial instrument and/or financial terms separate from the ones described in part (b), please fill out the table below to specify the proposed instrument and terms between the GCF and the AE and justify any deviation from initial terms described in the original Funding Proposal/FAA agreement.*   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Financial instrument** | **Amount** | **Currency** | **Tenor** | **Pricing** | | Choose an item. | …………………. | Options | ( ) years | ( ) % | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C.1.Any updates To Background Information on Project / Programme Sponsor (Executing Entity)?  Yes  No  if yes, please elaborate | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Describe any changes in the project/programme sponsor and the implications for the quality of the management team, overall strategy and financial profile of the Sponsor (Executing Entity) and how it will support the restructured project/programme in terms of equity investment, management, operations, production and marketing.* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **C.2. Any Institutional / Implementation Arrangements? Yes  No  If yes, please elaborate** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Please describe in detail any changes to the governance structure of the project/programme, including but not limited to the organization structure, roles and responsibilities of the project/programme management unit, steering committee, executing entities and so on, as well as the flow of funds structure. Also describe which of these structures are already in place and which are still pending and which will be new. For the pending and new ones, please specify the requirements to establish them.*  *Describe construction and supervision methodology with key contractual agreements*.  *Describe any new operational arrangements with key contractual agreements. If applicable, provide the credit analysis of key counterparties of key contractual agreements and/or structural mitigants to cover the counterparty risks.* | | | | | | | | | | | |

C.3. Updated Timetable of Project/Programme Implementation

*Please provide a project/programme implementation timetable in* [*section I (Annexes)*](#SectionI) *with information on milestones, deliverables and results in the cells. The table below is for illustrative purposes. If the table format below is used, please refer to the activities as numbered in Section H. In the case of outputs, please mark when all the required activities will be completed see example.*

|  | **2017** | | | | | | | | **2018** | | | | | | | | **2019** | | | | | | | | **2020** | | | | | | | | **2021** | | | | | | | | **2022** | | | | | | | | **2023** | | | | | | | | **2024** | | | | | | | | | **2025** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Q1** | **Q2** | | | **Q3** | | **Q4** | | **Q1** | | **Q2** | | **Q3** | | **Q4** | | **Q1** | | **Q2** | | **Q3** | | **Q4** | | **Q1** | | **Q2** | | **Q3** | | **Q4** | | **Q1** | | **Q2** | | **Q3** | | **Q4** | | **Q1** | | **Q2** | | **Q3** | | **Q4** | | **Q1** | | **Q2** | | **Q3** | | **Q4** | | **Q1** | | **Q2** | | **Q3** | | **Q4** | | **Q1** | | | **Q2** | **Q3** | | |
| **1: Output 1** Assessments and mechanisms in place for an integrated approach to reduce vulnerability towards flood-related risks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Activity 1.1 Strengthen capacities and information requirements to pursue an integrated programme approach to flood management |  |  | | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Three feasibility Studies complete | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | Fourth feasibility Studies complete (AISS) | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| Activity 1.2 Establish health surveillance systems to track and manage flood-related health issues |  |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Train health practitioners dealing with emergencies how to respond to flood-related emergencies; | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Train village councils on how to prepare for and evacuate flood-related victims; | | Include flood related information in CLEWS messaging system | | Awareness raising among health practitioners and village councils about the flood-related EWS. | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| Activity 1.3 Expand EWS coverage to provide flooding alerts in Apia |  |  | | |  | |  | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Integration of flood warning into the EWS by training technical officers | | MNRE to conduct hydrological modelling to generate flood scenarios | | x | |  | |  | | Integration of flood warning into the EWS by training technical officers | | MNRE to conduct hydrological modelling to generate flood scenarios | | x | | Increase awareness of updated EWS with at risk populations (mock drills, etc.) | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| Activity 1.4 Conduct awareness raising campaigns on building practices and designs for at risk communities living along the Vaisigano River |  |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | x | | x | | x | | Translation of the new building code and Apia spatial plan into simple manuals for builders to follow | | x | | MoU with builders associations on flood-proof building. | | x | |  | |  | |  | |  | | x | | MOU with SUNGO and members to participate in campaign | | Production of exhibition on flood-proof building | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| **2: Output 2** Infrastructure in the Vaisigano River are flood-proofed to increase resilience to negative effects of excessive water | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Activity 2.1 Channelization of segment 2 and  3 of the Vaisigano River streambeds to  accommodate increased water flow and decrease flood risks |  |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Review proposed designs for channelization of Segments 2, 3 and 4 of the Vaisigano River including the impact on channel capacity of the new Lelata Bridge and the potential for optimizing scheme design and durability. | | x | | x | | x | | x | |  | |  | |  | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Capacity Building of Maintenance teams for flood protection measures | | x | | Contracting members of local communities for execution of activities with regards to building and landscape restoration along the segments x | | Start Construction of flood protection measures along Segment 2, 3 and 4 of Vaisigano River | | x | | x | | x | | Estimated completion of Construction of flood protection measures along Segments 2, 3 and 4 of Vaisigano River | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| Activity 2.2 Implement ecosystem responses upstream for decreased flows during extreme weather events |  |  | | |  | |  | | x | | x | | Develop a community-based adaptation strategy for ecosystem based alternative income generating activities | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x Procurement of inputs for business ventures that promote enhancement of ecosystem functions that can support flood risk reduction. | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Community based ecosystem solutions supported including cash-for-work flood-related catchment rehabilitation | | x | | x | | x | | Demarcation Process of one area within the VRC as a no development zone | | Follow the development consent process for demarcation. | | x | | Estimated completion date for PES Program | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| Activity 2.3 Construction upgrade of Lelata bridge to accommodate increase flood waters |  |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | x | | x | | x | | Review current design of Lelata Bridge | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Start Construction of Lelata bridge upgrade according to design | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Estimated completion of Construction of Lelata bridge upgrade according to design Construction complete | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| Activity 2.4. Extension of floodwalls at Lelata and Leone Bridges to prevent damage during extreme events |  |  | | |  | |  | |  | | Review current design of floodwalls adjacent to both bridges. | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | design of floodwalls adjacent to both x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Construction of floodwall extensions at both bridges | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| **3: Output 3** Drainage in downstream areas upgraded for increased regulation of water flows | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| Activity 3.1. Develop a climate resilient  Stormwater Master Plan |  |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | x | | x | | x | | Review the current drainage systems existent in the Vaisigano River floodplain | | Identification of specific design options for current hazard spots in order to flood proof these in line with expected flood risks | | Consultation process for selection of priority areas to be upgraded | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Elaborate a multi-year climate resilient stormwater masterplan for Vaisigano River Floodplain | | Capacity building of the relevant stakeholder agencies with regards to implementation of the Master Plan | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| Activity 3.2. Upgrade drainage systems and outfalls in hazard areas to accommodate flooding events |  |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Assessment and design of the priority drainage upgrades and critical hazard areas with reagrds to needed upgrades | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | x | | Implementation of upgrades | | Integration of upgrades in the Master plan | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  |  | | |
| **Reporting dates as per FAA** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | |
| Inception report (including baselines assessment | | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | | |  |
| First Annual Performance Report (APR) | | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | | |  |
| APRs | | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | | |  |
| Interim Evaluation Report (IER) | | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | | |  |
| Project Completion Report | | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | | |  |
| Final Evaluation Report | | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | | |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **D.1.** Any changes to Value Added for GCF Involvement?  **Yes**  **No  If yes, please elaborate** |
| *Please specify why the GCF involvement is still required for the project/programme, in consideration of the new design or revision to the project and climate change rationale.* |
| **D.2.** Any Changes to Exit Strategy?  **Yes**  **No  If yes, please elaborate** |
| *Please explain if and how the restructuring affects the initial project/programme sustainability considerations as well as strategies for longer term maintenance of physical assets (if applicable) while also taking into consideration the long-term financial viability of the project/program.* |

In this section, the accredited entity is expected to provide a brief description of changes in the expected performance of the proposed project/programme against each of the Fund’s six investment criteria resulting from the proposed changes. Activity-specific sub-criteria and indicative assessment factors, which can be found in the Fund’s [Investment Framework](http://www.gcfund.org/fileadmin/00_customer/documents/Operations/3.2_Investment_Framework.pdf), should be addressed where relevant and applicable. This section should tie into any request for concessionality.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **E.1**. **Any Changes To** **Impact Potential? Yes**  **No  If yes, please elaborate**  Potential of the project/programme to contribute to the achievement of the Fund’s objectives and result areas | | | | |
| E.1.1. Mitigation / adaptation impact potential | | | | |
| *Specify the mitigation and/or adaptation impact, taking into account the relevant and applicable sub-criteria and assessment factors in the Fund’s* [*investment framework*](http://www.gcfund.org/fileadmin/00_customer/documents/Operations/3.2_Investment_Framework.pdf)*.*  *When applicable, specify the degree to which the project/programme avoids lock-in of long-lived, high emission or climate-vulnerable infrastructure.* | | | | |
| E.1.2. Key impact potential indicator | | | | |
| *GCF core indicators* | * *Expected total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries, disaggregated by gender (reduced vulnerability or increased resilience);* * *Number of beneficiaries relative to total population, disaggregated by gender (adaptation only)* | *Total* | Direct: 26,000 (Apia Urban Area)  Direct +Indirect: 37,000 (Greater Apia Catchment Area) | |
| *Percentage (%)* | 14% of total population (direct); 20% of total population (direct + indirect) | |
| *Other relevant indicators* | *Examples include:*   * *Expected increase in the number of households with access to low-emission energy* * *Expected increase in the number of small, medium and large low-emission power suppliers, and installed effective capacity* * *Expected increase in generation and use of climate information in decision-making* * *Expected strengthening of adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks* * *Others* | | | |
| *Describe the detailed methodology used for calculating the indicators above.*  *Details of methodology used for calculating the GEF core indicators and others for the VCP project are described in the revised Monitoring and Evaluation Framework presented in Annex X.*  *Describe how the project/programme’s indicator values compare to the appropriate benchmarks (i.e. the indicator values for a similar project/programme in a comparable context).* | | | | |
| E.2. **Any changes to Other investment criteria[[4]](#footnote-5)? Yes  No  If yes, please provide against each investment criterion that is affected by the Change, as applicable** | | | | |
| *Describe how the project/programme changes affect the investment criteria* | | | | |
|  | | | | |  | |
| **E. 3.** **Engagement with NDAs, civil society organizations and other relevant stakeholders** | | | | |
| *Please provide a full description of the steps taken to ensure country ownership, including the engagement with NDAs on the proposed changes. Please also specify the multi-stakeholder engagement plan and the consultations that were conducted with respect to the proposed changes.*  *The proposed changes were first initiated by the NDA following review of project budget discrepancies, and review of the first technical investigation report on the channelization for Segment 2, 3 and 4 submitted in March 2020 that pointed to changes needed in both technical design and estimated costs of construction of the most critical flood-proofing infrastructures of the VCP. Thus, confirming full country ownership of the proposed changes. This engagement continued with GoS note-to-files and communications with UNDP in raising budget shortfall issues, necessary designs adjustment to reflect latest flood-modelling studies and scenarios. A first review of activities in this context was held in the GCF-VCP Annual Retreat held in November 2020 and again, in the GCF-Mid-term Annual Planning Retreat held last June 2021 and finally in the GCF-VCP Annual Planning Retreat held on 23-24 November 2021 to validate the draft Restructuring Paper and provide final inputs from the GoS, project partners and other stakeholders. The final Restructuring Paper was circulated for comments and reviewed by all project partners and stakeholders, including all GoS Implementing Agencies. This Restructuring Paper. has also been shared with the GCF-VCP CEO Forum and endorsed by the PB/PSC on 15th December 2021.*  *The multi-stakeholder engagement plan for the Restructuring and changes agreed was as follows:*     |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | ***Samoa NDA and partners participation*** |  | ***Scheduled Timeline*** |     *The potential Restructure of the project was deemed necessary by the Secretariat based on changes to the safeguards standards. The decision was made to include all issues and changes pertaining to the project, including the issues surrounding budget shortfall, as part of the restructure process in agreement with the NDA. Please see rounds of communications, consultations and events that took place with NDA, IAs and other stakeholders on the changes in the project as described in Section A.2 from the time the first issues that may trigger a Restructuring where identified. A no-objection letter from the NDA is submitted in Annex X.*   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***No*** | ***Event and Key participants*** | ***Date*** | ***Remarks*** *(See Annex X for minutes and participants documentation)* | | *1* | *Communication from UNDP RR to Ministry of Finance (EA)* | *8th Dec 2020* | *Official letter on emergence of new safeguard standard triggered with impact on the project.* | | *2* | *GCF-VCP CEO Forum (Local partners and IAs staff - CEOs of MNRE, Acting CEO -MoF, CEO-LTA, ACEO-MWTI* | *10th Aug 2021* | *Review of Note-to-file on Safeguard Standards and budget shortfall to be submitted to GCF (UNDP draft of 26th July 2021)* | | *3* | *GCF-VCP 15th Meeting of PB/PSC - UNDP RR, CEOs/Rep from IAs and partners ( MoF, MNRE, MoH, MWTI, MWCSD, LTA)* | *6th Oct 2021* | *Agenda Item 5.5 – Update on potential VCP restructuring presented by UNDP to PB/PSC* | | *4* | *GCF-VCP Tripartite Meeting (UNDP, MoF CEO, PMU team) – UNDP RR, DRR, RTA, STA – Acting CEO, ACEO AID, ACEO, CRICD, MoF* | *12th Nov 2021* | *Project progress update, presentation on Restructuring Proposal – identify issues and options and roles/responsibilities.* | | *5* | *GCF-VCP CEO Forum & Focal Points Workshop (Local Partners and IAs staff) – CEOs of MNRE, Acting CEO -MoF, CEO-LTA, ACEO-MWTI* | *17th Nov 2021* | *Agenda Item 5. Presentation on the Version 2 – Draft Restructuring Proposal (V2.RP)* | | *6* | *GCF-VCP Joint Workshop/Retreat on GCF-VCP Restructuring Proposal and Multi-Year Workplan and Budget (MYWPB) – UNDP DRR, ARR and staff; Acting CEO-MoF; PMU team; LTA, MWTI, MoH, CSSP, MNRE-WRD, MNRE-DEC, SUNGO, SBH.* | *23-24th Nov 2021* | *Session 1.2 GCF position and trigger for Restructuring Proposal (UNDP MCO representative)*  *Session 3 – GCF-VCP Monitoring and Reporting requirements & Expectations for Restructure Proposal (PMU-M&E/STA)*  *Session 5 – GCF V2 Restructure Proposal presentation (PMU-STA)*  *Session 8 – Update Multi-year Work Plan and Budget/Changes for the Restructure Proposal (PMU-PM)*  *Section 10 – Future direction and finalization process for the GCF-VCP Restructuring Proposal (PMU-PM)* | | *7* | *GCF-VCP 16th Project Board chaired by Acting CEO-MoF, CEOs of MNRE, LTA, MWTI, ACEO-MoH, UNDP RR, DRR,ARR, SUNGO and PMU* | *15th Dec 2021* | *Agenda Item 3. Paper on GCF Restructuring Proposal for review and discussion on V3 Draft Restructuring Proposal* | | | | | |

***\* The information can be drawn from the project/programme appraisal document.***

|  |
| --- |
| F.1.Any changes in Economic and Financial Analysis?  **Yes**  **No**  **If yes, please elaborate** |
| *Please provide any changes to the originally submitted narrative and rationale for the detailed economic and financial analysis (including the financial model).*  *Based on the above analysis, please provide economic and financial justification (both qualitative and quantitative) for the concessionally that GCF provides, with a reference to the financial structure proposed in section B.2.* |
| F.2. Any changes in Technical Evaluation**?** **Yes  No**  **If yes, please elaborate** |
| *Please provide an assessment from the technical perspective on any changes in the project design/activity. If a technological solution that is different from the original proposal has been chosen, describe why it is the most appropriate for this project/programme.*  ***Change in Technical Designs and Evaluation***  *The technical designs for the channelization of Segment 2,3 and 4 of Vaisigano River Flood management measures were done under the GEF-EWACC project with the scope of 1:20 year event in mind. A review of interdependence of flood mitigation options as part of Activity 1.1.1, as well as engineering assessment of flood modeling as part of Activity 2.1.1 recommended a horizon of 1:50 year event for both the final designs of the riverwalls.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Flood modelling* | *At Funding Proposal* | *After the changes* | | *Extreme flooding event return period used for design of riverwalls’ infrastructure for the VCP (Annual Exceedance Probability)* | *1:20 AEP* | *1:50 AEP* |   *The channelization of the Segments and their riverwalls are being designed for a 1 in 50-year flood event, and the Lelata Bridge is being designed for a 1 in 20-year flood event. However, it is important to note that these two design events are extracted from different hydraulic studies, in which the Lelata Bridge is being designed according to a 1 in 20-year flood event aligned with the flows from the BMT study, whereas the Riverwalls have been designed in accordance with the Water Technology study done prior to the BMT’s. If the design flow rates for the riverwall and bridge designs were to be compared however, they will be found to be very close, in which the riverwall is being designed for a 1 in 50 year flood event, and the Lelata bridge is being designed for a 1 in 20 year. It is important to note that the Lelata bridge design level is 1.2 metre above the 20-year ARI flood level giving the bridge soffit level of 22.2m (1 in 20 years flood at 21.0m MSL plus the 1.2m freeboard). The Investigation Report for Package 1 riverwall in its review of the Lelata bridge designs confirmed that the bridge passes the 100-year flood but without freeboard.*  *The results were based upon modelling the river at 50 meters intervals using the topographic survey from the contracted surveyor, and the Vaisigano River was re-modelled using the HEC-RAS programme at 50-meter cross section intervals. The output results were similar and enabled a much-improved understanding of flow characteristics in the vicinity of the 3 bridges within the Project area. The results of the hydraulic model showed that a 1 in 20-year flood wall design will not suffice containment of a flood at the same extent as Tropical Cyclone Evan (2012) which was recorded at a design flow of over 900 m3/s. In other words, a 1-in-20-year design for the Riverwalls will be almost considered as a ‘do nothing’ situation given the extent of the recent flooding within the VRCA.*  *BMT was engaged for additional flood modelling in 2020 aimed at testing the hydraulic performance for both the proposed Lelata Bridge and Segments 2, 3 and 4 walls. The results showed that in a 1 in 50 AEP scenario (with an equivalent flow of 690m3/s), peak flood water level is contained within wall channels and under the bridge soffit. As a result of this change construction costs estimates were revised and these are presented in Section B.3.* |
| F.3. Any changes in environmental, social assessment including gender considerations? **Yes  No**  **If yes, please elaborate** |
| *Describe the main changes in expected outcome of the environment and social impact assessment for the restructured project. Specify the Environmental and Social Management Plan, and how the project/programme will avoid or mitigate negative impacts at each stage (e.g. preparation, implementation and operation), in accordance with the Fund’s Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) standard. Also describe how the gender aspect is considered/addressed in the restructuring of the project, in accordance with the Fund’s Gender Policy and Action Plan.*  *As part of the implementation of Output 2 of GCF-VCP, SES Standard 5 on Displacement and Resettlement has been triggered due to potential impacts of voluntary physical displacement that were not identified in the original ESMF-MP approved by the GCF Board.*  *The project has revised and updated the ESMF-MP accordingly (refer to Annex X) and developed the required LARAPs. The project has now completed the LAAP for the Lelata bridge but the LARAP for the Segment 3 riverwall remains to be completed, and surveys have now confirmed that only a LAAP will be required for the the river walls of Segment 2. Cases triggering this SES Standard 5 on Displacement and Resettlement are as follows:*  *II. Details of the Cases*  *Case 1: Activity 2.1 on Channelization of segments 2, 3, and 4 of the Vaisigano River streambeds to accommodate water flow and to decrease flood risks*   * *Segment 3: The detailed designs for Segment 3 of the Vaisigano River are currently being completed, therefore more information is currently available on Segment 3 than on Segments 2 and 4. The Preliminary Environment Assessment Report (PEAR) identified that there is a risk of “displacement of people”. Further assessment (currently ongoing) identified that there may be both permanent displacement and temporary displacement of tentatively 55 people (made up of 2 families) with the expectation that the final number may be slightly higher once further details are gathered.* * *One potentially impacted family live on customary land that is located in a low-lying and highly vulnerable area on the western shore of the river. While the family is already susceptible to the flood risks of the Vaisigano River, the addition of a new floodwall on the opposite side of the river (eastern) would potentially increase this family’s risk to floodwaters. While the plans include rock revetments and gabion walls on the western side of the riverbank, there is still significant potential for overtopping from flash floods during extreme rainfall / weather events. As reducing the loss of lives remains one of the top priorities for both the GoS and the donor, the GoS will make necessary mitigation measures such as arrangements with the family to consider alternative housing away from their current area which is prone to flooding during extreme weather events. The GoS will facilitate arranging a vacant land for the family, thus improving their livelihoods as opposed to their existing conditions and most importantly, improving resilience to impacts of climate change.* * *The second potentially impacted family live at the immediate northwest corner of the Lelata bridge. This family’s living conditions would be severely impacted during the proposed construction works relating to the floodwall and the Lelata Bridge, specifically in terms of the high levels of noise and vibrations expected. Therefore, the temporary relocation of the family (until construction works near their home have completed) may be required. Proper consultations with the family members will be carried out to ensure full transparency and understanding of the potential risks, as well as understanding the proposed mitigation measures in place to minimize these impacts.*   ***Table a: Elements of SES Standard 5 potentially triggered by Case 1 (Activity 2.1; Segment 3 only)***   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | ***5.1*** | *Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?* | ***YES*** | | ***5.2*** | *Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g., loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?* | ***YES*** | | ***5.3*** | *Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?* | ***NO*** | | ***5.4*** | *Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?* | ***YES*** |  * ***Segment 2:*** *The preliminary designs for Segment 2 are currently being completed. Information on identifying potential impacts under SES Standard 5 have not been fully ruled out, nor have they been confirmed. While Segment 2 is in preliminary stages, implementation plans have been developed by GCF-PMU to assist with expeditious planning, effective monitoring and smooth implementation of Safeguards activities. This also includes close monitoring of survey works that are currently being undertaken, for early identification of potential land-taking and implementation of subsequent options to either a) avoiding land acquisition along the riverbanks, b) minimizing the impact of the floodwall footprint along the riverbank, including initiating the development of a LARAP/LAAP in accordance with the ESMF-MP and GoS regulations and policies. Following completion of land surveys of the riverwall footprint, these have confirmed that land acquisition for small land areas along the riverbanks will be required for 17 lots but that no relocation or resettlement will be required. The project is currently finalizing the LAAP and most of the land acquisition will concern small parcels of free-hold land (less than 500 sqm each) alongside the riverbank. Preliminary assessment indicates that 11 households will be affected with a total of 50 people/residents. The costs of compensation and acquisition will be borne by the Government of Samoa (to be confirmed with PEAR/LAAP).*   ***Table b: Elements of SES Standard 5 potentially triggered by Case 1 (Activity 2.1; Segment 2 only)***   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | ***5.1*** | *Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?* | ***NO*** | | ***5.2*** | *Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?* | ***YES*** | | ***5.3*** | *Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?* | ***NO*** | | ***5.4*** | *Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?* | ***YES*** |   ***Case 2: Activity 2.3 Construction of the Lelata Bridge to accommodate increased flood waters***  *The proposed design for the new replacement bridge would reconstruct the Lelata Bridge at the same location and layout, but with the height of the bridge raised by 2.8 meters. By raising the bridge, certain access ways or right of ways (RoWs) located near the bridge approaches would need to be reconfigured.*  *Only one RoW located immediately to the northeast of the current bridge would no longer be able to connect to the main street for safety reasons. In finding an alternative RoW to the properties located to the northeastern side of the bridge, the GoS and the design team have proposed for a new RoW to be located further east from the Lelata Bridge, which would require the acquisition of two lots / properties nearest to the northeast corner of the bridge. The two Lots are currently vacant as the houses that were previously located there were destroyed during the extreme flood event of 2012. The two lots (789 and 790) would be purchased directly by the GoS from the landowners, at an agreed compensation amount following the land-taking process as per the GoS Land Taking Act 1964 and Donor policies. The full range of potential impacts, including economic displacement and the number of people impacted, has now been fully assessed as part of the LAAP.*  ***Table c: Elements of SES Standard 5 potentially triggered by Case 2 (Activity 2.3)***   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | ***5.1*** | *Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?* | ***NO*** | | ***5.2*** | *Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?* | ***YES*** | | ***5.3*** | *Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?* | ***NO*** | | ***5.4*** | *Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?* | ***YES*** |   ***SES Standard 6 Indigenous People***  *The SES Standard 6 Indigenous People is in place to ensure indigenous peoples’ human rights are recognized, as well as their rights to their land and resources. The SES 6 has been triggered under the project due to the existing ties of Samoan people to Customary lands. While there is potential land-taking that involves changing land tenure of customary lands, part of the SES Standard 6 requirement is to satisfy/implement the Free, Prior and Informed Consent Process (FPIC) with indigenous people. The FPIC is mainly to reach a mutual agreement through effective, meaningful consultations and ensure their consents are given without coercion and manipulation.* *No activities that may adversely affect indigenous peoples/communities, their lands, resources, or cultural heritage will be permitted without explicit agreement of the potentially affected communities. Such agreement must adhere to the definition of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC), in order to be sufficient to permit the relevant activities to take place. Consent can be withheld by affected people at any stage of the project’s implementation. Any such withdrawal of consent will result in the immediate cessation of the activities in question. While UNDP’s SES Standard 6 would typically require the development of an Indigenous People’s Plan for the GCF-VCP project, considering that many Samoans self-identify as Pacific Islanders/Indigenous peoples, the project will not develop an indigenous people plan (IPP), as it would need to cover most of the population. Instead, a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan has been developed, with necessary IPP elements incorporated in the project’s SES-related documentation (i.e. ESMF/MP, SEP, LARAPs etc). (Revised Stakeholder Engagement Plan is presented in Annex X)*  *Changes in Environmental, Social Assessments for Standard 5 and 6 are provided below (see details in the revised ESMF-MP in Annex X) .*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *UNDP Safeguards* | *At Funding Proposal* | *After the changes* | | *SES Standard 5 – Displacement & Resettlement* | *Not applicable* | *Moderate* | | *SES Standard 6 – Indigenous People* | *Not applicable* | *Moderate* |   ***Gender aspect considerations in the Restructuring of the Project***  *The restructuring of the project will have no negative impact on the gender aspect in accordance with the Fund’s Gender Policy and Action Plan. However, participation of women in ongoing discussions with the potentially impacted families was encouraged and implemented to ensure equal opportunity in decision-making as per principle 2 of the GCF-Gender policy. The intervention by the GoS through the GCF-VCP will have a more positive impact on the safety and protection of the most vulnerable flooding prone communities including women, children, persons with disability and the elderly.* |
| F.4. Any changes in Financial Management and Procurement? **Yes**  **No  If yes, please elaborate** |
| *Describe any expected changes in the project/programmes financial management and procurement, including financial accounting, disbursement methods and auditing.* |

|  |
| --- |
| G.1.  **Any changes** to the Risk Assessment Summary? **Yes  No**  **If yes, please elaborate** |
| *Please provide a summary of main risk factors, including any newly identified risks from the restructuring of the project. Detailed description of risk factors and mitigation measures can be elaborated in G.2.*  *The main change from the Risk Assessment Summary from the FP approved by the GCF Board is that, against the statement that the construction work will have limited social risks associated with the project and that no people will be displaced or relocated, as well as no land acquisition will be required under the project activities. There is a change now that the PEAR for construction of the river walls in Segment 3 and the construction of the Lelata Bridge have identified land and families to be impacted, triggering SES Standard 5 on Displacement and Resettlement, and land acquisition thus changing the level of risk for the project. In addition, surveys of the footprint of the Segment 2 riverwalls conducted as part of the PEAR have shown that only land acquisition will be required for this segment. Details are provided in Section F.3.*  *As part of the implementation of Output 2 of the VCP, SES Standard 5 on Displacement and Resettlement has been triggered due to potential impacts of voluntary physical displacement and land acquisition that were not identified in the original ESMF-MP approved by the GCF Board. In addition, the status of the project concerning SES Standard 6 on Indigenous People was reviewed.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *UNDP Safeguards* | *At Funding Proposal* | *After the changes* | | *Overall risk* | *Category B (medium)* | *Category B (medium)* | | *SES Standard 5 – Displacement & Resettlement* | *Not applicable* | *Moderate* | | *SES Standard 6 – Indigenous People* | *Not applicable* | *Low* |   *The social risks associated with the project, with revised voluntary land acquisition and displacement and FPIC for Indigenous people assessments remain in the category Moderate (Category B) but triggered adaptive management measures by developing LARAP and LAAP for each of the project infrastructures activities. (See revised ESMP in Annex X)* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **G.2.** Any changes for Risk Factors and Mitigation Measures? **Yes  No**  **If yes, please elaborate** | | | |
| *Please describe* ***additional*** *(financial, technical and operational, social and environmental and other risks) that might prevent the project/programme objectives from being achieved. This section should also describe other potential issues which will be monitored as “emerging risks” during the life of the project (i.e., issues that have not yet raised to the level of “risk factor” but which will need monitoring). Also describe the proposed risk mitigation measures.* | | | |
| **Selected Risk Factor 1** | | | |
| Description | Risk category | Level of impact | Probability of risk occurring |
| Updated construction costs remain over and above the GCF funding allocation under the Restructuring. | Financial | High (>20% of project value) | High |
| Mitigation Measure(s) | | | |
| *Please describe how the identified risk will be mitigated or managed. Do the mitigation measures lower the probability of risk occurring? If so, to what level?*  Reconsideration of technical designs to reduce costs incurred by the project; reduce the scope of the project interventions to only segments budgeted in the FAA and excluding construction of Segment 4 or find co-financing from other donors or Government of Samoa to match the budget shortfall. It is difficult to mitigate over continued budget shortfall and this will be the most likely reason to prevent the VCP project objectives from being achieved. | | | |
| **Selected Risk Factor 2** | | | |
| Description | Risk category | Level of impact | Probability of risk occurring |
| Tender process impeded or closed due to lack of secured funding over the life of contractors’ contracts. | Financial | High (>20% of project value) | High |
| Mitigation Measure(s) | | | |
| *Please describe how the identified risk will be mitigated or managed. Do the mitigation measures lower the probability of risk occurring? If so, to what level?*  Reconsideration of technical designs to reduce costs incurred by the project; use of contingency funds approved for this purpose or find co-financing from other donors or GoS to match the budget shortfall. This would lower the probability of the risk occurring to a medium risk level and probability of occurring. | | | |
| **Selected Risk Factor 3** | | | |
| Description | Risk category | Level of impact | Probability of risk occurring |
| Covid-19 cases reaching Samoa with transmission into the community and new restrictions on project operations. | Other | Medium (5.1-20% of project value) | Medium |
| Mitigation Measure(s) | | | |
| *Please describe how the identified risk will be mitigated or managed. Do the mitigation measures lower the probability of risk occurring? If so, to what level?*  This emerging risk with the re-opening of borders is impossible to mitigate, but can be managed by following NEOC guidelines for project management and implementation during this crisis and reassess timetable and deliverables for the project activities. This will include a mitigation plan to be prepared in collaboration with the MoH for sub-activities remaining to be completed as part of Activity 1.2, in accordance with the Covid-19 Emergency Plan adopted by the Project and supported by UNDP. | | | |
| **Selected Risk Factor 4** | | | |
| Description | Risk category | Level of impact | Probability of risk occurring |
| Integrity of the flood mitigation scheme for controlling flooding in the floodplain of the Apia Urban Area is compromised by removing the construction of key flood-proof infrastructure from the project. | Technical and operational | High (>20% of project value) | Medium |
| Mitigation Measure(s) | | | |
| *Please describe how the identified risk will be mitigated or managed. Do the mitigation measures lower the probability of risk occurring? If so, to what level?*  Undertake a revised assessment of flood-mitigation options following completion of project funded infrastructure, and GoS to seek additional co-financing to complete minimum infrastructure requirements to reduce impact of flooding in the AUA, as originally intended through the support of the GCF. | | | |
| **Selected Risk Factor 5** | | | |
| Description | Risk category | Level of impact | Probability of risk occurring |
| Construction of Alaoa Multi-purpose Dam and Reservoir planned to be funded by ADB is not going ahead and co-financing to GCF project by ADB is canceled | Financial | High (>20% of project value) | Low |
| Mitigation Measure(s) | | | |
| *Please describe how the identified risk will be mitigated or managed. Do the mitigation measures lower the probability of risk occurring? If so, to what level?*  Undertake a revised assessment of flood-mitigation options following completion of project funded infrastructure, and GoS to seek additional co-financing to complete minimum infrastructure requirements to reduce impact of flooding in the AUA, as originally intended through the support of the GCF. | | | |

*Note: Some of these risks may be deleted depending on decisions made by GoS in regards to construction of Segment 4 and Alaoa Dam as part of this Restructuring Proposal.*

*\* Please expand this sub-section when needed to address all potential material and relevant risks.*

H.1. Revised Logic Framework.

Please update the logic framework in accordance with the GCF’s [Performance Measurement Framework](http://www.gcfund.org/fileadmin/00_customer/documents/Operations/5.3_Initial_PMF.pdf) under the [Results Management Framework](http://www.gcfund.org/fileadmin/00_customer/documents/Operations/5.2_RMF.pdf).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **H.1.1. Paradigm Shift Objectives and Impacts at the Fund level[[5]](#footnote-6)** | | | | | | |
| **Paradigm shift objectives** | | | | | | |
| *Increased climate-resilient sustainable development* | The objective of this project is to strengthen adaptive capacity, and reduced exposure to climate risks of vulnerable communities, infrastructure, and the built environment in the Vaisigano River Catchment. | | | | | |
| **Expected Result** | **Indicator** | **Means of Verification (MoV)** | **Baseline** | **Target** | | **Assumptions** |
| Mid-term  (if applicable) | Final |
| **Fund-level impacts** | | | | | | |
| *A3.0 Increased resilience of intrastructure and the built environment to climate change* | A3.1 Number of physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change considering human benefits | *Site visits and Certificates of completion of construction of physical assets (registered in Quarterly Reports)* | No single engineered river works solutions to minimize and withstand flooding exists in Segments 2,3,4 in the Vaisigano River | N/A | *A total of 19 physical assets made more resilient (Riverwall segments, bridges and drainage sites)* | Political stability fosters implementation as planned.  *The intensity of natural disasters does not delay the implementation of the project.*  *Coordination with EWACC and ADB project activities will continue to align during implementation of activities in the Vaisigano River catchment.*  *Environment and Social impact Assessments and Safeguards Plans are completed and implemented without further delays.* |
|  | A3.2 Value of physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change considering human benefits | *Financial reports on construction activities reported by PMU* | EWACC project ($12 million) climate proofing only segment 1 of Vaisigano River | N/A | USD19.8 million for Output 2 (Riverwalls) USD10.3 milion for Output 3 (Drainage) for Total climate proofing of USD30 milion |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **H.1.2. Outcomes, Outputs, Activities and Inputs at Project/Programme level** | | | | | | | | |
| **Expected Result** | **Indicator** | **Means of Verification (MoV)** | **Baseline** | | | **Target** | | **Assumptions** |
| Mid-term (if applicable) | Final |
| **Project/programme**  **outcomes** | **Outcomes that contribute to Fund-level impacts** | | | | | | | |
| A7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks | A7.1 Use by vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public sector services of Fund supported tools, instruments, strategies and activities to respond to climate change and variability | *Participants lists to project activities, consultations trainings collated and analysed. In final phase, complemented with end-of project sample survey questionnaire of AUA residents on use of project services, tools, instruments and strategies.*  *Monitoring Reports on project activities and stakeholder engagement collated by M&E Officer* | Currently residents and economic assets located in the AUA lack protection from extreme flooding of the Vaisigano River | | N/A | | At least 26,528 residents located in the AUA are protected by flood management interventions. | *Good coordination between government agencies enhances and sustains project progress that is aligned with sectoral adaptation priorities.*  *Coordination with EWACC and ADB project activities will continue to align during implementation of activities in the Vaisigano River catchment.* |
|  | A7.2 Number of males and females (and percentage of total population) reached by climate-related early warning systems established/strengthened | *Currently the EWS covers tsunami, earthquake, forest fire and droughts.* | | N/A | | At least 37,000 residents located in the Apia Urban Area receive EWS for flooding. | *Good coordination among National Siren Network at NEOC, DMO and MNRE-MET services foster expansion of the EWS.* |
| **Project Performance Measurements** |  | | | | | | | |
| 1. Assessments and mechanisms in place for an integrated approach to reduce vulnerability towards flood-related risks | Number of sectoral plans and studies developed and/or adopted aligned to the IWMP | Review of final reports and contract payments for each plan/feasibility studies approved by IAs. | Limited number of sectoral plans and projects to centrally plan drainage. No feasibility stuies prepared for better rain and wastewater storage. | | | N/A | 4 sectoral plans/studies developed/adopted for sectors in the Greater Apia Catchment (Roads, Drainage, Reservoir, Water supply, etc) aligned to the IWMP. | Coordination between government agencies enhances and sustains project progress that is aligned with sectoral adaptation priorities. MNRE Climate Change Unit and MoF-CRICD will ensure programmatic approach and coordination of adaptation work. |
| Number of technical and extension officers trained on flood related EWS data collection and interpretation | *Record sheets of trainees from flood related EWS Training Workshops – reviewed by M&E officer* | Limited capacity exists for technicians to interpret early warning data instruments and utilize for flood-related response. | | | N/A | At least 40 techniciens will be trained on EWS related to flooding data collection and interpretation  At least 200 extension officers and staff will be trained on EWS systems and application related to flooding | Human resources in GoS ministries and agencies will be sufficient to ensure successful development of sectoral plans aligned with IWMP and implementation of flood related EWS. |
| 1. Infrastructures in the Vaisigano River are flood-proofed to increase resilience to negative effects of excessive waters. | Number of people benefitting from improved flood management through implementation of soft and hard measures for protection of community assets (set by gender) | Participants lists to project activities, consultations trainings collated and analysed. In final phase, complemented with end-of project sample survey questionnaire of AUA and Greater Apia Catchment Area residents on benefiting from VCP activities. | *No people benefit from flood management measures or flood protection measures in the Vaisigano River catchment.* | | | N/A | At least 26,528 people benefit from improved flood management from climate-resilient flood protection measures in the VRCA for protection of community assets (separated by gender) | Coordination with EWACC project increases opportunities for collaboration and alignment with interventions on segment 2 and 3.  Coordination between government agencies enhances and sustain project progress that is aligned with sectoral adaptation priorities and EWS expansion. |
| Number of people reached by flood related early warning systems established (separate by gender) | *DMO map of flooding EWS sirens range against AUA village boundaries. Data on SMS messages from NEOC. (add narrative from ACEO-WRD)* | The current EWS does not cover floods | | | N/A | At least 37,000 residents located in the Apia Urban Area receive EWS for flooding. | Involvement of women committees and traditional authority structures will ensure gender and cultural sensitivity of project interventions. |
| 1. Drainage in downstream areas upgraded for increased regulation of waterflows. | Number of households served with flood-proofed drainage in Vaisigano River Catchment. | Review of drainage Master Plan.  *Site visits and review certificates of drainage work for each site.* *Satellite imagery analysis to* *assess number of buildings and households covered by the improved drainage.* | Currently hazard areas exist within the AUA have inadequate drainage systems to withstand high volume of water. | | | N/A | At least 5,000 households benefit from flood-proofed drainage in Apia. | Awareness raising of communities allows them to perceive adaptation benefits of project interventions.  Constant communication and management of expectations to ensure continuous community involvement throughout planning and implementation. |
| **Activities** | **Description** | | | **Sub activities** | | | **Deliverables** | |
| * 1. Strengthen capacities and information requirement to pursue an integrated approach to flood management | The GoS is pursuing a programmatic ridge-to-reef approach with regards to reducing flood risk for Samoan society. As such, the current project is part of a bigger vision of the GoS – of extending GCF collaboration towards other topics and (sub-) catchments. Within this approach, feasibility studies need to be carried out for flood- mitigation measures that are necessary for optimal flood management in Vaisigano River catchment area and adjacent critical catchments. Sectors included: Water/Reservoir, Road/Infrastructure, Drainage and Sanitation/Sewage. | | | * + 1. Review the interdependence of flood mitigation options | | | *Final Report of Assessment of overall performance of integrated flood mitigation options*  *Final report on additional flood mitigation scenarios* | |
| * + 1. Conduct feasibility studies for flood-buffering reservoir in Vaisigano River | | | *Final Report of Assessment of feasibility of multi-purpose reservoir including EIA and Biodiversity Offset Plan* | |
| * + 1. Conduct feasibility studies for flood-proofing central-cross island Road (CCIR) | | | *Final Report of Flood-proofing designs of road construction and accompanying drainage and landscaping for the CCIR.* | |
| 1.1.4 Conduct feasibility studies for Apia Integrated Sewage System | | | *Final Report of Feasibility assessment for an overall Apia Integrated sewage system for the Apia Urban Areas.* | |
| 1.2 Establish health surveillance systems to track and manage flood-related health issues | Although the EWS in Samoa is pretty advanced already, it doesn’t cater to the need for flood-related early warning, covering only tsunami and earthquake warnings. Particularly the Health Sector would be benefiting from a flood-related early warning system, helping them to prepare for an expected higher occurrence of water- and vector borne diseases, as well as flood-related injuries and traumas. Such early warning can also help village councils in the evacuation of their villagers to appropriate high ground or shelters. | | | 1.2.1 Include flood-related information in CLEWS messaging system | | | Report on collating and analysis of data required for the development of H-CLEWS | |
| 1.2.2 Train health practitioners dealing with emergencies how to respond to flood-related emergencies | | | Completion Report of Training including participants list | |
| 1.2.3 Train village councils on how to prepare for and evacuate flood-related victims. | | | Completion Report of training completed including participants lists | |
| 1.2.4 Awareness raising among health practitioners and village councils about the flood-related EWS. | | | Participants Lists in stakeholder Engagement events  For future workshops – simple report and evaluation of workshop | |
| 1.3 Expand EWS coverage to provide flooding alerts in Apia | Although the Early Warning System in Samoa is pretty advanced already, it doesn’t cater to the need for flood-related early warning, covering only tsunami and earthquake warnings.  Expansion and development of tailored warnings for flooding will be established. | | | 1.3.1 MNRE to conduct hydrological modelling to generate flood scenarios. | | | Provision of AWS equipment (river and rain gauges)  Training Report on Equipment, Instruments Installations and Data Management  Certification Reports on Installation of five AWS sites  Report on hydrological modelling results  Installation of flood-warning alert sirens at five sites | |
| 1.3.2 Integration of flood warning into the EWS by training technical officers | | | System Operations Procedures for Vaisigano Flood alert & decision-support System  Training Report on Flooding EWS System Operations procedures  Training Reports for extension officers, community leaders and officials on Flooding EWS . | |
| 1.3.3 Increase awareness of updated EWS with at risk populations (mock drills, etc.) | | | Report of awareness raising workshops and mock drills with local communities | |
| 1.4 Conduct awareness raising campaigns on building practices and designs for at risk communities living along the Vaisigano River | The new building code contains a clear section on hazard prone infrastructure elements (buildings, roads, etc.) and hazard-proofing these. The code needs to be explained to the citizens and builders of Samoa, particularly the AUA, in a comprehensive and simple way, offering alternative solutions for different budgets.  Visualization is key in this approach, as well as the involvement of civil society and private sector. | | | 1.4.1 Translation of the new building code and Apia Spatial Plan into simple manuals for builders to follow. | | | National Building Code translated in Samoan language  Five Manuals of building code published  Apia Spatial Plan manual published | |
| 1.4.2 Production of exhibition on flood-proofing building and land use practices to be used in water tower and 2 million trees campaign. | | | Form part of restructuring activity- Design of Model House cancelled.  Final Upland Watershed Conservation Regulations  Training reports on community and builders on flood-proof practices (SUNGO) | |
| *1.4.3 The articulation of appropriate land-use practices to be used in the Upland Watershed Conservation Policy and the 2 million tree campaign.* | | | Manual of land use practices for landscape restoration | |
| 2.1 Channelization of Segment 2 and 3 of the Vaisigano river streambed to accommodate increased water flow and decrease flood risks. | The lower part of the streambed of the Vaisigano River is often the source of flooding during extreme weather events, inundating a large part of urban Apia's floodplain. Channelization of Segment 1 is already being done under the EWACC project; follow up with construction of Segments 2, 3 and 4 is necessary to provide additional channel protection and to complete the proposed scheme | | | 2.1.1 Review proposed designs for channelization of Segments, 2, 3 and 4 of the Vaisigano River including the impact on channel capacity of the new Lelata bridge and the potential for optimizing scheme design and durability. | | | Concept/Preliminary design for Segment 2 and 4 completed  Concept/Preliminary Design for Segment 3 completed  PEAR completion for Segment 3PEAR completion for Segment 2  LAAP completion for Segment 2  LARAP completion for Segment 3  Final Design completion Report for Segment 2  Final design completion report for Segment 3  t | |
| 2.1.2 Establishment of flood protection measures along Segments 2,3 and 4 of Vaisigano Rover. | | | CEMP completion for Segment 2  CEMP completion for Segment 3  Practical Certificate Completion Report for Segment 2  Practical Certificate Completion Report for Segment 3  Final Certificate Completion Report for Segment 2  Final certificate completion Report for Segment 3 | |
| 2.1.3 Capacity building of maintenance teams for flood protection measures. | | | Training workshops completed | |
| 2.1.4 Contracting members of local communities for execution of activities with regards to building and landscape restoration along the segments. | | | Draft Local Involvement and Engagement Plan  Annual Reports on implementation of contracts | |
| 2.2 Implement ecosystem responses upstream for decreased flows during extreme weather events. | Next to hard infrastructural measures in the downstream areas of Vaisigano River Catchment areas, ecosystem- based adaptation activities in the side- and upstream catchment areas are necessary to make sure excessive rain during extreme weather events does not accumulate into flashfloods.  Zoning is part of this: ensuring that the most vulnerable areas remain under conservation, whereas the lesser vulnerable areas provide optimal ecosystem functions as well as the opportunity for land based livelihoods. The realization that sustainability of such activities is only ensured when community members (particularly members of vulnerable groups) see the value of them: in other words – they need to be provided with flood-proofing related alternative income generating activities that ensure perpetuation of the activities in the future. | | | 2.2.1 Determining the best protection options for flood management activities from Ridge to reef, depending on landscape, land tenure, existing land use and planned developments. | | | Final report on description of selection criteria for ecosystem Activities  Final report on viability of the Implementation Mechanism of Activity 2.2 Assessment Report  Final Report on Crop selection and Market Access  Final Report on Upland Watershed Management Policy regulations  Final Report on ground-truthing of VC forest land use and biodiversity | |
| 2.2.2 Demarcation process of one area within the Vaisigano River catchment as a “no development zone” in combination with a “restricted zone below it and assign this as a “Water Source protection Area”. | | | Final report and zoning maps of Upland Watershed Management Regulations  Final report on demarcation of protected water source areas in the VRC | |
| 2.2.3 Follow development consent process for demarcation. | | | Development Consent Form approved | |
| 2.2.4 Develop a community-based adaptation strategy for ecosystem based alternative income generating activities. | | | PES Inception Report integrating 5 stages (Stage 1)  PES Workshop and Approaches Recommendations Report (Stage 1)  Full Feasibility Report for PES at location of Malololelei (Stage 2)  PES Database developed and operational (Stage 2)  PES Design Concept note and workplan approved (Stage 3)  PES project certification and validation (Stage 3)  PES Progress Report on implementation, activities, risks and upscaling (Stage 4)  Full PES 3-year final report with lessons learned and recommendations (Stage 5) | |
| 2.2.5 Community-based ecosystem solutions supported including cash-for-work flood-related catchment rehabilitation (anti-erosive measures, landscaping options and procurement of inputs for business ventures that promote enhancement of ecosystem functions that can support flood risk reduction. | | | Quarterly progress reports on Cash-for-work rehabilitation, including maps.  1st Call for proposal Guidelines for EbAEDP  Final Evaluation report and community projects selected for 1st call of EbAEDP  2nd Call for proposal Guidelines for EbAEDP  Final Evaluation report and community projects selected for 2nd call of EbAEDP  Quarterly Progress reports on EbAEDP implementation, including business trainings. | |
| 2.3 Construction upgrade of Lelata bridge to accommodate increase flood waters | Lelata Bridge is a major artery for transport in the AUA. The design for implementation of Segments 2, 3 and 4 of the Vaisigano River flood scheme will necessitate upgrading this bridge to maintain the design capacity of the channelization works. | | | 2.3.1 Review current design of Lelata bridge | | | Concept/Preliminary Design completion for bridge  PEAR completion for bridge  Final Design Completion Report for bridge  LAAP completion for bridge | |
| 2.3.2 Construction of Lelata bridge according to upgrading design. | | | CEMP completion  Practical Certificate Completion Report  Final Certificate Completion Report | |
| 2.4 Extension of floodwalls at Lelata and leone bridges to prevent damage during extreme events | The currently existing floodwalls adjacent to the bridge have not been designed in line with the designs for Segment 1 and 2 of the Vaisigano River flood measures. The floodwalls need to be extended to accommodate the new plans. | | | 2.4.1 Review current design of floodwalls adjacent to both bridges. | | | Aligned with Activity 2.1.1 | |
| 2.4.2 Construction of floodwall extensions at both bridges. | | | Aligned with Activity 2.1.1 | |
| 3.1 Develop a climate resilient Stormwater Master Plan | The greater Apia area currently has no master plan for management of the urban stormwater network. Developing of such a plan will lead to linking the stormwater systems developed under 3.2 to a wider stormwater network that can be upgraded according to recognized priority areas. | | | 3.1.1 Review the current drainage systems existent in the Vaisigano River floodplain | | | Concept/preliminary Design Completion Report for Sites 2-3-9-4-8-10 Drainage Sites  Concept/preliminary design completion report for sites 5-6-7  Detailed designs report completion Sites 2-3-9-4-8-10  Detailed designs report completion Sites 5-6-7  PEAR completion for Sites 2-3-9-4-8-10  PEAR completion for Sites 5-6-7 | |
| 3.1.2 Identification of specific designs options for current hazard spots in order to flood proof these in line with expected flood risks. | | | Aligned with 3.1.1 | |
| 3.1.3 Consultation process for selection of priority areas to be upgraded. | | | EMP Report for 9 priority drainage sites | |
| 3.1.4 Elaborate a multi-year climate resilient stormwater master plan for the Vaisigano River floodplain. | | | Final MY Stormwater Master Plan completion | |
| 3.1.5 Capacity building of the relevant stakeholder agencies with regards to implementation of the Master Plan | | | Training Report completion | |
| 3.2 Upgrade drainage systems and outfalls in hazard areas to accommodate flooding events. | During the EWACC project, 9 specific priority upgrades or drainage reticulation were recognized to be of extreme importance for upgrading if flooding of the urban area was to be contained. Upgrade of drainage outfalls and adjacent piped reticulation in the critical hazard coastal area is also targeted first | | | 3.2.1 Assessment and design of the priority drainage upgrades and critical hazard areas with regards to needed upgrade. | | | Concept/Preliminary designs for additional drainage sites.  Final Design Completion Report for additional drainage sites. | |
| 3.2.2 Implementation of upgrades | | | Practical Certificate of Completion for Drainage sites 2-3-9  Practical Certificate of completion for Sites 4-8-10  Practical Certificate of completion for Sites 5-6-7  Final Certificate of Completion Report for drainages sites 2-3-9  Final Certificate of Completion Report for drainages sites 4-8-10  Final Certificate of Completion Report for drainages sites 5-6-7 | |
| 3.2.3 Integration of upgrades in the Master Plan (activity 3.1). | | | Align with 3.1.4 above. | |

|  |
| --- |
| H.2. Any changes to arrangements for Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation? **Yes**  **No  If yes, please elaborate** |
| *Besides the arrangements (e.g. semi-annual performance reports) laid out in AMA, please provide project/programme specific institutional setting and implementation arrangements for monitoring and reporting and evaluation*  *Please provide methodologies for monitoring and reporting of key outcomes of the restructured project/programme, and how data/evidence will be collected to substantiate the results reported and the proposed changes.* |

|  |
| --- |
| I. UPDATED Supporting Documents for Restructuring Paper |
| NDA No-objection Letter  Feasibility Study  Integrated Financial Model that provides sensitivity analysis of critical elements (xls format, if applicable)  Confirmation letter or letter of commitment for co-financing commitment (If applicable)  Project/Programme Confirmation/Term Sheet (including cost/budget breakdown, disbursement schedule, etc.) – *see the Accreditation Master Agreement, Annex I*  Environmental and Social Management Framework and Management Plan (ESMF-MP)  (If applicable)  Appraisal Report or Due Diligence Report with recommendations (If applicable)  Independent Interim Evaluation Report of the baseline project (If applicable)  Map indicating the location of the project/programme  Inflation and costs impacts of Covid-19 – Briefing Note |

*\* Please note that a funding proposal will be considered complete only upon receipt of all the applicable supporting documents.*

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Broken down by instrument i.e. (i) Senior Loans; (ii) Subordinated Loans; (iii) Equity; (iv) Guarantees; (v) Reimbursable grants & (vi) Grants [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Seniority categories include Pari-passu; senior; junior [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Besides impact potential, the other GCF investment criteria are paradigm shift potential; sustainable development potential; needs of the recipient; country ownership; and efficiency and effectiveness [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Information on the Fund’s expected results and indicators can be found in its Performance Measurement Frameworks available at the following link (Please note that some indicators are under refinement): <http://www.gcfund.org/fileadmin/00_customer/documents/Operations/5.3_Initial_PMF.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)