

Country Portfolio Evaluation Samoa


GEF Council Meeting 31

Agenda Item 8

June 12, 2007

Samoa

- Focus of evaluation: all 18 GEF approved projects, including 6 EAs, 7 regional, and 3 global with a GEF investment of US\$7 million
- Evaluation took place between January and April 2007
- Conducted by EO staff and team of consultants



Conclusion 1

- GEF support has been relevant to the Samoa development strategy and national environmental priorities
 - There are direct linkages to the key outcomes of the SDS
 - GEF is the main source of external financial assistance to Samoa's environmental protection and conservation needs
 - GEF modalities of support have been appropriate to the state of Samoa's development

Conclusion 2

- GEF support has been relevant to the objectives and mandate of the GEF but slow follow-up support from government sources could jeopardize the sustainability of results.
 - All GEF-funded projects were developed and approved on the basis of their relevance to the GEF mandate and focal areas strategies
 - Sustainability of projects results could be jeopardized

Conclusion 3

- Enabling activities have supported Samoa in building the foundations for its environmental frameworks and strategies which are necessary conditions for generating global environmental benefits.
 - GEF support achieved its greatest results in the area of policy and strategy development: NBSAPs, NAPAs, land degradation NAP, POPs NIP, improved environment ministry capacity
 - Enabling Activities in climate change have supported strategies and frameworks: increased awareness on GHG, ODS, natural disasters and impacts

Conclusion 4

- Completed projects have achieved concrete on-the ground results but reporting on results has limitations because of poor quality of final evaluations and limited baselines
 - Biodiversity projects enabled the conservation and sustainable management of forest and marine ecosystems:
 - Community participation in critical and mangrove ecosystems conservation and management, improved local capacity
 - Bans on commercial scuba fishing and harvesting of sea turtles within Protected Areas and then expanded to 50 communities
 - Population of sea turtles have increased
 - Anecdotal information on improved fisheries
 - Evaluating the impacts of GEF funded initiatives is not straightforward
 - Other results on the ground achieved through the replication of approaches, processes and lessons

Conclusion 5

- Samoa has improved its efficiency to access GEF funding, but there are still some obstacles
 - Improvements:
 - Capacity of Ministry of Natural Resources
 - EAs have produced action plans and strategies ready for implementation
 - GEF SGP recognized as an efficient mechanism for delivery support to local communities and for local communities to access the GEF
 - All GEF types of project modalities have been used
 - Willingness to work with more than one GEF agency
 - Sharing of lessons across GEF projects within and outside Samoa

But there are still some obstacles...

- GEF project cycle has too many steps, it is too long, too costly and with limited transparency (“what happened to my project?”)
- Lengthy delays between project preparation and actual start up hinders implementation: “wait and see period” creates negative feedback, reduces readiness of project start up and reduces participation
- Unknown fate of “pipeline” projects
- Harmonization has not taken place among all players and places burden because of different requirements from different sources of funding (positive example of AusAid and NZAid)
- Most relevant government agencies have not participated in GEF reducing the country’s capacity to reach GEF

Conclusion 6: Most GEF Agencies have not been engaged in Samoa mainly because of the high transaction cost and limited understanding of GEF objectives and procedures

- Most GEF Agencies have not been engaged in Samoa mainly because of the high transaction cost and limited understanding of GEF objectives and procedures
 - The leading GEF Agency in Samoa is UNDP
 - World Bank and Asian Development Bank have extensive portfolios of loans and technical assistance (combined \$70 million), many relevant to GEF mandate
 - Most relevant GEF Agencies have now a presence in the Pacific region
 - High transaction cost for developing stand alone GEF activities, limited knowledge of the GEF, limited internal communication about GEF possibilities, complexity of accessing GEF and lengthy project cycle, limited GEF resources available

Conclusion 6

- Most GEF Agencies have not been engaged in Samoa mainly because of the high transaction cost and limited understanding of GEF objectives and procedures
 - The leading GEF Agency in Samoa is UNDP
 - World Bank and Asian Development Bank have extensive portfolios of loans and technical assistance (combined \$70 million), many relevant to GEF mandate
 - Most relevant GEF Agencies have now a presence in the Pacific region
 - High transaction cost for developing stand alone GEF activities, limited knowledge of the GEF, limited internal communication about GEF possibilities, complexity of accessing GEF and lengthy project cycle, limited GEF resources available

Recommendation to the GEF Council

- The proposed programmatic approach for the Pacific SIDS should take into account Samoa's experience:
 - The need for GEF to support the establishment of an environmental framework for national policies, laws and regulations, and where this has been achieved, the need for support for implementation of the framework so as to achieve global environmental benefits
 - Recognition of the importance of marine resources and resilience to climate change to sustain global environmental benefits
 - Recognition of the high transaction costs in the region; and
 - The need for involving more GEF Agencies in the region, as well as harmonization with recipient countries and other donors

Recommendations to Samoa

- Environmental concerns as cross-cutting issue needs to become visible in the Samoa Development Strategy
- Increased participation by other stakeholders (ministries, civil society, and private sector) in implementing GEF supported projects will increase national capacity