Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

# 1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **GEF project ID** | | 4216 | |
| **GEF Agency project ID** | | 4318 | |
| **GEF Replenishment Phase** | | GEF - 4 | |
| **Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)** | | UNDP | |
| **Project name** | | Integration of Climate Change Risk and Resilience into Forestry Management (ICCRIFS) | |
| **Country/Countries** | | Samoa | |
| **Region** | | Asia | |
| **Focal area** | | Climate Change | |
| **Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives** | | Strategic Priority on Adaptation | |
| **Executing agencies involved** | | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) Samoa | |
| **NGOs/CBOs involvement** | | CI, co-financier involved in project execution | |
| **Private sector involvement** | | | |
| **CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)** | | March 15th, 2011 | |
| **Effectiveness date / project start** | | April 19th, 2011 | |
| **Expected date of project completion (at start)** | | April 19th, 2015 | |
| **Actual date of project completion** | | July 19th, 2016 | |
| **Project Financing** | | | |
| | | **At Endorsement (US $M)** | **At Completion (US $M)** |
| **Project Preparation Grant** | GEF funding | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| | Co-financing | | |
| **GEF Project Grant** | | 2.40 | 2.40 |
| **Co-financing** | IA own | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| | Government | 0.47 | 0.47 |
| | Other multi- /bi-laterals | 2.02 | 2.02 |
| | Private sector | | |
| | NGOs/CSOs | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| **Total GEF funding** | | 2.45 | 2.45 |
| **Total Co-financing** | | 2.53 | 2.53* |
| **Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)** | | 5.43 | 5.43 |
| **Terminal evaluation/review information** | | | |
| **TE completion date** | | May 6, 2016 | |
| **Author of TE** | | Salah Hakim | |
| **TER completion date** | | | |
| **TER prepared by** | | Molly Watts | |
| **TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)** | | | |

*2.06 million of co-financing is listed as "other"

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

| Criteria | Final PIR | IA Terminal Evaluation | IA Evaluation Office Review | GEF IEO Review |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Outcomes** | HS | NR | NR | S |
| **Sustainability of Outcomes** | | L | NR | ML |
| **M&E Design** | | MS | NR | S |
| **M&E Implementation** | | S | NR | S |
| **Quality of Implementation** | | HS | NR | S |
| **Quality of Execution** | | S | NR | S |
| **Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report** | | - | NR | S |

## 3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's goal as stated in the project document is to "integrate climate change risk and resilience enhancement into forestry management in Samoa." (ProDoc p.29) Samoa is experiencing damage from climate change to human and economic development, and is at risk from further climate-change related damage. This project will aid the Government of Samoa in strengthening institutional capacities to systematically identify and address climate change driven risks for management of native forests and agroforestry areas, to increase the resilience of rural communities and protect them climate-related damage. (ProDoc p.1)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective was to "increase the resilience and adaptive capacity of Samoa's forest areas and communities reliant on Samoa's forestry resources." (Request for CEO endorsement p.1)

The project planned to achieve this objective through three components with corresponding outcomes:

Component 1: Policy mainstreaming and institutional strengthening. The expected outcome was that climate risk and resilience is integrated into lowland agroforestry and upland native forestry policies, strategies and management techniques.

Component 2: Community-based adaptation implementation. The expected outcome was that climate resilient agro-forestry and forestry techniques are demonstrated in lowland and upland areas

Component 3: Knowledge management. The expected outcome was that project knowledge and lessons learned are captured, analyzed and disseminated.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

No changes in the Global environmental objectives, development objectives, or activities were noted in the TE.

## 4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| 4.1 **Relevance** | Rating: Satisfactory |
|---|---|

The TE rates project relevance as 'relevant' and this TER, which uses a different scale, rates it as satisfactory. The project was relevant to Samoa and the region due to its vulnerability to climate change, including drought, cyclones, heavy rainfall and erosion. For these reasons adaptation to climate change is a priority in the Strategy for the Development of Samoa (SDS). The project was based on the Samoa National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) and is in line with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The project activities also target upland and lowland forests, which is consistent with the priorities placed by the Samoan Government regarding climate change adaptation in its National Environment and Development Sector Plan.

The project is part of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) as it seeks to enhance resilience to climate change, and the climate change focal area, as it seeks to reduce emission of greenhouse gases.

| 4.2 **Effectiveness** | Rating: Satisfactory |
|---|---|

The TE rates project effectiveness as highly satisfactory. The project's development objective was to "increase the resilience and adaptive capacity of Samoa's forest areas and communities reliant on Samoa's forestry resources." (Request for CEO endorsement p.1) The TE provides an average for achievement of project targets at 89.2%, noting that there were variations. For instance, in Lake Lanoto'o forests, 70.8% of the target area was rehabilitated, while in Mauga o Salafai upland montane and cloud forests, three times the target was rehabilitated, 29.1 ha. When taken together, the project recorded an increase of 70.6 ha in forest coverage in upland and lowland forestry areas, against a project target of 88 ha. The number of farmers implementing agro-forestry adaptive measures by the end of the project was 500, out of a target of 1,000, while the project provided 2,3000 farmers with information in good adaptive practices out of a target of 3,000. Considering that all project outcomes

appear to be met for the most part, and the significant achievements under component 1, this TER rates effectiveness as satisfactory.

A summary of achievements under the project's three components is provided below:

Component 1: Policy mainstreaming and institutional strengthening. The expected outcome was that climate risk and resilience would be integrated into lowland agroforestry and upland native forestry policies, strategies and management techniques. This outcome was achieved. By project end, climate change risks were integrated into Samoa National Plan, which governs all sectors of government, and other legislations, including the National Policy on Sustainable Forest Management (NPSFM) were revised and completed, improving sustainable management forests across Samoa. A Forest Fire prevention strategy was developed as well. New Forestry and Climate Information tools were developed, including a rainfall map and database model developed by the Meteorology Division of the executing agency, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) Executing Agency. The Samoa Forest Resource Information System was updated, and a Climate Early Warning System was tailored to provide early warning to the forestry sector, which it had not been capable of doing before project start. Fifty government officers received climate early warning and forestry information as a result of this, meeting the project target, and one thousand farmers received this information, out of a target of 2000. Apart from this target, all other targets under this outcome were met or nearly met.

Component 2: Community-based adaptation implementation. The expected outcome was that climate resilient agro-forestry and forestry techniques are demonstrated in lowland and upland areas. The three activities under this component were the creation of climate sensitive management plans in the National Parks and community-based conservation areas, the number of district level committees established and functioning, and the number of farmers participating in climate-resilient land use and forestry planning processes, and the number of farmers implementing adaptive forestry and agro-forestry practices. Targets for the first two activities were met or nearly met, while targets were not achieved for the third activity. The project produced effective climate sensitive management plans for Lake Lanoto'o Mauga Slafai national parks and Laulii Three district level committees were established in the three demonstration sites with the task of activities related to establishment and management of community nurseries, demonstration plots and P3D model demonstrations. In the third area of climate resilient forestry planning the project launched a wide scale training program for farmers in the communities targeted. Farmers were trained in establishment of community nurseries and management as well as adaptive techniques in agro-forestry and native tree species. Although the target for number of farmers participating in climate resilient land use and forestry planning processes was met, with more than 1,5000 villagers and farmers participating, targets for the number of farmers who had participated in adaptive agro-forestry and forestry practices in pilot villages were half the expected target (500 farmers out of 1000).

Component 3: Knowledge management. The expected outcome was that project knowledge and lessons learned are captured, analyzed and disseminated. This outcome appears to have been achieved as the project published 14 technical reports on good practices and lessons learned (out of a target of 15),

tailored knowledge management products on good adaptive practices were provided to 1732 farmers, exceeding the target of 1000, and 6 national workshops were held, twice the project's target.

| 4.3 **Efficiency** | Rating: Satisfactory |
|---|---|

The TE rates efficiency as satisfactory, noting that as of April 21st, 2016, with 3 months of implementation left, the project had spent 98.5% of LDCF funds and 96% of co-financing funds, and that all outputs were produced as planned. The project was extended by one year and three months at no extra cost based on a recommendation from the mid-term review, which is within the normal range for GEF projects. The TE notes that the PMU used a small core team consisting of a Project Coordinator, a Project Assistance, a Native Forest Technical Officer, an Agro-forestry Technical Officer, and a Communication and Knowledge Management Officer, and hired consultants when necessary, which was an efficient way of using technical assistance, compared to hiring permanent consultants.

| 4.4 **Sustainability** | Rating: Moderately Likely |
|---|---|

The TE rates overall sustainability as likely, and this TER rates it overall as moderately likely, noting that sustainability of some project benefits, such as continued use of the agro-forestry model, do rely on additional funds, which appear likely to materialize, but have not yet been committed. The TE notes in its assessment of overall sustainability that another similar project "is critical for sustainability, but judging from all the information available, it is feasible." (TE p.32) Policies and legislations in place as a result of the project will continue to have benefits, and as noted by the TE, the funding atmosphere is favorable.

The TE rates sustainability of financial resources as likely. The TE notes that in lowland farming areas, interviewees were of the view that farmers could continue using the agro-forestry model in existing plots without external help, and that the water sector has pledged that they will continue providing support to plots in watershed areas. The upland forest conservation activities need funds to continue, but the TE is of the view that the Ministry of National Resources and Environment is likely to secure funds from small grants while it seeks funding for a full project, which would be vital to continue the momentum of the project.

The TE rates sociopolitical sustainability as moderately likely. The TE notes both that the project made significant strides in capacity building, with 500 farmers implementing adaptive ago-forestry and 1500 farmers participating in climate resilient agro-forestry and forestry planning processes, and that this knowledge is an important factor in sustainability. Additionally, the TE notes that the project developed a strong link with farmers in villagers in the targeted areas, with the Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development playing an important role in this, as the entry focal point for the team to the local communities. The project also worked with local communities through village chiefs and mayors, and through NGO partners.

The TE rates institutional sustainability as likely. As part of the project's first component, The MNRE was able to achieve National Policy on Sustainable Forest Management (NSFM), a National Forestry Sector Plan with climate change risks integrated, and a Forest Fire Prevention Strategy. Additionally, climate

change is integrated into Samoa Development Strategy. The TE also notes that the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment was effective in rallying other government agencies to cooperate as well.

The TE rates Environmental sustainability as moderately likely, noting the risk that severe weather can occur at any time, though measures can be taken to reduce the impact of such events.

# 5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE reports that all co-financing materialized as planned, for a total of 2.53 million USD of co-financing. Co-financing is reported as coming from the implementing agency UNDP, the government, from the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment, the MAF, and FESA, from the CSO Conversation International, and from other multilateral and bilateral aid agencies. No further information on utilization of co-financing is given, thus conclusions on the effect on outcomes and sustainability aren't possible.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was extended at no cost for an additional year, and then for an additional three months, for a total of 15 extra months of implementation. The TE notes some delays in the project's first outcome, specifically a delay in the National Policy on Sustainable Forest Management (NPSFM) review to integrate climate change risks, and a delay in the revisions of Forestry Management Bill and new National Forestry Sector Plan. The TE notes that the mid-term recommended both an extension and that certain targets be increased, though the increase in targets did not occur. (TE p.19) It appears that the extension allowed time for the project to complete activities.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The project was executed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment (MNRE), and the TE notes that MNRE was successful in "rallying other government agencies to cooperate in climate change goals including MOF [Ministry of Finance], MAF [Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries], MWCSD [Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development]." (TE p.32) The TE notes that government agencies appear likely to maintain their commitment towards combating climate change, especially as it is integrated into the Samoan National Plan. The project also had a number of NGO partners, and had the NGO umbrella organization SUNGO in its steering committee. Based on the available evidence country ownership appears high.

## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| 6.1 **M&E Design at entry** | Rating: Satisfactory |
|---|---|

The TE rates M&E Design at entry as Moderately Satisfactory. As all elements of the M&E plan appear to be in place, this TER rates M&E Design as Satisfactory. The TE notes that project indicators are smart, and that baselines became more defined and improve the M&E system significantly after the project updated the Samoa Forest Resource Information System (SamFRIS) with forestry tailored climate information. The project results framework includes smart indicators at all levels, and at the objective level, notes that the baseline for the indicators related to Ha of increase in forest coverage will be collected through the update of SamFris during the 1st year of the project. (Prodoc p.58) This appears to have been an appropriate plan. The M&E plan in the Project Document includes all relevant M&E activities, including an inception workshop and report, annual project reports(APRs) and project implementation reviews (PIRs) and an external mid-term and final evaluation, and includes a dedicated budget for M&E.

| 6.2 **M&E Implementation** | Rating: Satisfactory |
|---|---|

The TE rates M&E Plan implementation as Satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. The project collected data against indicators and reported them in its annual PIRs. Indicator data is also used as evidence in the terminal evaluation. The midterm was carried out as planned, and some of the recommendations were implemented.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| 7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation** | Rating: Satisfactory |
|---|---|

The implementing agency for the project was UNDP. The TE rates quality of implementation as highly satisfactory, but does not provide information on UNDP's performance, other than describing their role in the project, and noting that the relationship between UNDP and the executing agency, the Ministry of Natural Resources is strong and positive, and that they worked in good coordination and with mutual understanding. As the project appears to have had sufficient oversight and a strong design, this TER rates quality of project implementation as satisfactory.

| 7.2 **Quality of Project Execution** | Rating: Satisfactory |
|---|---|

The executing agency for the project was the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE). The TE rates quality of project execution as satisfactory. This TER agrees, as the evidence presented indicates that they fulfilled their responsibilities, and partnered effectively with other government agencies and project stakeholders. The budget was managed efficiently, and the PMU displayed adaptive management especially in the inception phase when adjustments to activities and rehabilitation targets were set. (TE p.19)

# 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

***Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.***

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

70 ha of forest have been rehabilitated by the project. The TE notes that though this number is low, and the area rehabilitated is limited, the model, namely agro-forestry development, is there to use. (TE p.34)
500 farmers are implementing agro-forestry and forestry practices resilient to climate change risks. (TE p.33)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Local farmers benefited from the project in 26 villages, as the project provided training, seeds, seedlings and saplings, enabling farmers to develop their vegetable farms. The TE notes that the agro-forestry

model proved successful and that farmers were excited about it. The TE notes “it contributed to poverty alleviation by providing extra income to the farmers. It improved the livelihood of those who participated in the program. Through the production of more vegetables and fruits, it enhanced the food security of these communities.” (TE p.34)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

1500 villagers participated in climate-resilient land use and forestry planning processes, and 500 farmers are implementing agro-forestry and forestry practices resilient to climate change risks. Fifty government officials and one thousand farmers regularly receive climate early warning and forestry information services.

b) Governance

Climate change risks and resilience are now integrated into the Samoa National Plan, which impacts all sectors of the Government. Legislation pushed for by the project was achieved, and there is now a National Policy on sustainable Forest Management (NPSFM) a new National Forestry Sector Plan with climate change risk integrated into it, and the Forest Fire Prevention Strategy (FFPS).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are mentioned in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

There is no mention of adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.

# 9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

Lessons and recommendations from the TE are recorded below (TE p. 36-39)

The slow start in outcome one up to the MTR time was obviously due to legislation and policy elements. These usually take longer than the activities executed by the project team. However, those elements were in place at the TE time. Also initial delays in procurement were eventually resolved. Another factor contributing to the delay was the high turnover of the project team members.

The project and partner's contribution was successful in the production of SamFRIS with climate information tailored to forestry. Another important technical tool was CLEWS tailored to forestry. These two technical tools are a big contribution to forestry management in Samoa and the region as related to climate change impact.

Another tool credited to ICCRIFS is the production and use of the P3D model that was used in community--based management plans with active participation of farmers and villagers. This tool has also been used in Tonga. The agro--forestry plots, developed by the project have been very successful. They provided benefits to the farmers while contributed to the rehabilitation of affected forest areas. The farmers value these plots and are determined to keep them. This model can be easily replicated as the technical and social information are all made available by the project.

The project used a PMU made up of five team members and hired consultants from time to time as needed. This strategy reduced cost and did not affect project performance as the outcomes compliance with targets rates indicated. As mentioned earlier the project produced a large number of technical report and training and awareness raising materials. These materials are available for use by future projects and other initiatives.
MWCSD provided the project with the link to the targeted villages' communities. It linked the project with village leaderships represented by chiefs and mayors. The project worked with three groups: the chiefs group, the women group and the youth group. Each group was exposed to training and awareness raising activities. About half of those trained were women. The project team itself has a significant number of women. There is a female representative for each village in the district committee for the three project sites. Females have been participating in the P3D models exercises and training in nursery construction and management. Therefore, it is clear that the project was serious in addressing the gender issues and has made a significant contribution in that area.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

4.2.1 Corrective actions

1. Important corrective actions were initiated and carried out during the inception phase of the project. The project revised the result framework to improve the M&E system to produce reliable indicators and robust baselines. The inception phase also initiated in cooperation with its partners the updating of SamFRIS with climate information to be used in determination of baselines for forest areas further improving the monitoring and evaluation system of the project. Also another development during the inception phase was the development of the successful P3D model which enhanced the participation of

farmers and villagers in community--based management of their resources. It is recommended that these important corrective actions and the use of SamFRIS and P3D continue in any new project or any future activities in forestry management and conservation of natural resources in the face of risks imposed by climate change.

4.2.2 Actions to follow up

2. As a result of the project training and knowledge sharing, now over 1700 farmers are trained in adaptive practice to climate change impact. The project also passed these tools and knowledge to Samoa Farmers Association. As the project is coming to an end, it is recommended that the association develop a program that passes this knowledge to farmers who were not exposed to such training.

3. The project produced a large amount of technical reports and training and awareness raising materials. It is recommended that the local NGOs tap into this resource and continue the project work in these areas. This will require modest funds that can be raised from small grants programs and other sources. International organizations including international NGOs may be a good source of such funding.

4.2.3. Proposal for future directions

4. Based on the experience ICRIFS accumulated and the favorable international funding atmosphere; it is highly recommended that MNRE move quickly to seek funding for a new project as a follow up to ICCRIFS. Because technical tools the project updated including SamFRIS and CLEWS are ready for use. The project successful P3D is also available. The project produced a successful tested model in agro--forestry that can easily be replicated avoiding all possible loopholes. On the other hand the funding atmosphere could not be better. In 12 December 2015, Paris agreement was adopted by 195 countries under the United Nations Framework of Climate Change Convention (UNFCCC). This agreement was under discussion for decades because of disagreement between industrialized and developing countries. Under this agreement the industrialized countries pledge to provide US$100 billion a year in aid to developing countries to help them implement procedures that minimize GHG emissions and reduce climate change impact. This is the time for MNRE to quickly move forward to tap this resource. MNRE can look at the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) tools such as the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), or Reduction of Emissions of Deforestation and Forest Degradation Plus (REDD+). With REDD+ the developed countries would fund projects that reduce emissions in developing countries and use the carbon credit generated by these projects to meet their obligation towards Kyoto Protocol.

5. If funding was secured from IPCC in the form of a new follow up project it is recommended that the new project continue the agro--forestry program. The agro--forestry plots achieved significant success in rehabilitations and producing benefits to the local communities in terms of awareness and improving farming skills and enhancing food security.

6. The upland forest rehabilitation is also vital to the success of reducing risks and enhancing resilience to climate change. Therefore it is recommended that these activities continue especially if funding was secured. It is vital in the face of the risks of climate change, and what the country has experienced in the past.

7. In any follow up project it is recommended that the gender issues addressed by ICCRIFS continue to be addressed. Training for women is vital in building the awareness of climate change risks and promoting resilience to climate change through adopting behavior and activities to that goal. Also it is

important for women to continue active participation in the future project teams as well as in district and village committees.

8. In a follow up future project it is highly recommended that the new project seeks to involve the local and regional NGOs in the activities of the project. The project can assign specific activities to NGOs according to their capacity and line of their expertise under the close supervision of the project.

9. It is recommended that any follow up project is to adopt the strategy of small core project team and use of consultant as needed. It will save funds and has proved effective in ICCRIFS project experience. This project management arrangement can also be passed on to other countries in the region.

10. The project in its early stages experienced delays in procurement that had a negative impact on the project progress. It is recommended that government selected staff receive training in procurement procedures. This will make procurement processes more smooth in the future and avoid any such delays in future projects.

11. It is recommended that the rehabilitated sites in upland forests be monitored annually to assess rehabilitation success and progress. Such data produced can be used in improvements in future rehabilitation strategies.

12. MWCSD provided the project with the important link to the local communities in the project sites. It made it possible for the project to access the community leaderships, and farmers and villagers as well as women and youth groups. It is recommended that MNRE continue to engage these groups and keep channels of communication open with them.

13. It is recommended that the community nurseries be maintained and enabled to produce seedlings and saplings that can be used in continuous rehabilitation activities as well as future agro--forestry plots. Coupled with that is the need to train local community members to maintain and manage these nurseries.

14. The consultant recommends that MNRE starts using extension officers who are selected from members of the local communities and can be embedded in their own communities. They can initially be brought to the MNRE for training in awareness as related to risks and resilience to climate change, as well as climate change resilience practices. A suitable curriculum should be developed for training these extension officers. This approach has been used with great success in several UN projects of similar circumstances. These extension officers could receive a modest pay and would be a valuable asset for MNRE that could continuously carry its message to these communities.

15. Because of the gravity of the impact of climate change in Samoa, it is recommended that government develops a central unit focused on rehabilitation and building resilience to climate change. Donor funded project can operate under the guidance of this unit, but the unit should have its own ongoing program.

16. To enhance funding of new projects, it would be helpful if MNRE would develop an easy access database of all regulations and activities conducted in Samoa in the area of climate change risks and resilience. The donors would be encouraged to fund projects when they detect seriousness and determination of the government as reflected in the effort already made in that area.

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

| Criteria | GEF IEO comments | Rating |
|---|---|---|
| To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? | The report contains a thorough assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts and achievement of objectives, supported by data against project targets. | **S** |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated? | The report is for the most part internally consistent. One discrepancy is in the number of farmers practicing agro-forestry activities (once noted to be 104, then 500 in other places.) For some elements, such as M&E and quality of implementation, execution, ratings are provided, but the discussion is brief and does not explain ratings. | **MS** |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | The report assesses project sustainability on the four dimensions and exit strategy thoroughly. | **S** |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | Lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by the evidence. | **S** |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | The report provides actual project costs by outcome, and actual materialized co-financing, though it does not describe what activities co-financing contributed towards. | **S** |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | Discussion of the M&E system, particularly M&E Design, is very brief. | **MU** |
| **Overall TE Rating** | | **S** |

## 11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).