



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.34/18  
11 October 2019

---

Adaptation Fund Board  
Thirty-fourth Meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 11 October 2019

Agenda item 11 c)

## **REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO MONITORING MISSION IN SAMOA**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
Background and scope of the mission .....	3
<b>PROJECT/PROGRAMME CONTEXT AND PROGRESS TO DATE</b> .....	3
Context .....	3
Progress to Date for the project .....	4
<b>MEETINGS, SITE VISITS AND FINDINGS OF THE MISSION</b> .....	5
Integrated management plans help in the overall coordination towards a sustainable development pathway .....	5
Community early engagement foster empowerment and strengthens the sustainability of the project adaptation measures .....	7
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....	9
<b>ANNEXES</b> .....	11

## **INTRODUCTION**

### Background and scope of the mission

1. As part of the Knowledge Management (KM) Strategy, the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat (the secretariat) conducts missions to projects/programmes under implementation to collect and analyze lessons learned through its portfolio. The secretariat's work plan for the fiscal year 2020 (FY20) which was approved by the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) at its thirty-third meeting (Decision B.33/50) includes a portfolio monitoring mission in Samoa. This report covers the FY20 mission from 22 to 27 July 2019 to the finalized programme "Enhancing Resilience of Samoa's Coastal Communities to Climate Change" which was implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE).
2. The mission targeted these programmes for a number of reasons including: It will help learning from the implementation of the project's concrete adaptation practices, such as coastal adaptation measures addressing climate change impact of key infrastructure and coastal ecosystems in an integrated way; and to learn from experiences concerning the institutional capacity building towards an enabling environment for replication and scaling up of concrete interventions.

### Methodology

3. The secretariat was represented by a senior climate change specialist, and a programme analyst. The mission was carried out from July 22<sup>nd</sup> to July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019 and included field visits to project sites in the islands of Upolu and Savai'i. The methodology used for the monitoring mission comprised qualitative semi-structured interviews and meetings with key stakeholders from communities, local government, non-government entities, MNRE, UNDP and the World Bank. A set of guiding questions, covering the afore-mentioned objectives, had been prepared for the mission and shared in advance with UNDP (see Annex 1).

## **PROJECT/PROGRAMME CONTEXT AND PROGRESS TO DATE**

### Context

4. Samoa is a small island country in the southwest Pacific, comprised of four inhabited islands and six smaller, uninhabited islands of volcanic origin, with a total population of around 200,000. Samoa has a total land area of around 2,900 km<sup>2</sup>. Samoa's two main islands are Upolu and Savai'i.



Figure 1: Samoa's main islands Upolu and Savai'i

5. The project “Enhancing resilience of coastal communities of Samoa to climate change” is immersed in a regional context, wherein all Pacific Island countries, are extremely susceptible to the effects of natural disasters, most of which are weather- and climate-related, while the social, institutional and economic characteristics, are limiting the quality of livelihoods. Samoa, in particular, will face systematic changes in climate according to UNFCCC; for instance, by 2050 the sea level is likely to have increased by 36 cm in addition to maximum temperatures by 0.7 C. A country in which 70% of the population is reported to live within 1 km of the coast, besides having central infrastructure and institutions in that range (e.g., hospitals, schools, port facilities, power plants, airports, tourist infrastructure)m can only foresee multi-sectorial challenges.

6. Therefore, the Government of Samoa is looking to fortify the capacity of the communities in conjunction with the public service, to make knowledgeable decisions, and manage climate change driven pressures in a pro-active, cohesive, and strategic mode. The project aim to reduce vulnerability, including variability at local and national levels, in addition to increasing the adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, through three program components: i) Community engagement in coastal vulnerability assessment, adaptation planning, and awareness, ii) Integrated Community – Based Coastal Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management measures, and finally iii) Institutional strengthening to support climate-resilient coastal management policy frameworks.

#### Progress to Date for the project

7. The programme implemented by UNDP was approved by the Board at its nineteenth meeting, and the agreement was signed with the implementing entity in February 2012. The inception workshop was held on January 28, 2013 and marked the commencement of the project implementation. The expected duration of the project was four years. To date the trustee has transferred US\$ 8,732,351 or 100% of the approved amount for the project. In line with the performance-based grant financing used by the Fund, UNDP, had submitted five annual project performance reports (PPR) to the Board at the time of the mission. The project has gone through

a mid-term evaluation and the secretariat is waiting to receive the final evaluation report and the audited statement which will confirm the operational closure of the programme.

## **MEETINGS, SITE VISITS AND FINDINGS OF THE MISSION**

8. The representatives of the secretariat met with a number of stakeholders including project beneficiaries during the five days of the mission, discussing various aspects of the project implementation and execution. A number of field visits were undertaken in the islands of Upolu and Savai'i. The agenda of the mission is provided in Annex 2 of this report.

9. The mission team held several meetings with government representatives in Apia. Specifically, they met with the Deputy Resident Representative and other project staff of the Implementing Agency UNDP multi-country office, with the acting Designated Authority of the AF and chair of the SDG task force, with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, who was the Executing Entity of the project. The team met with the Ministry of Finance and then with the Ministry of Works, Transport and Infrastructure, with the Land Transport Authority and finally they had a meeting with the UN Resident Coordinator.

10. The mission team also met with representatives from the Civil Society Support Programme (CSSP), officials from the Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (MWCSD) and staff from the World Bank Office, as they implemented the Pilot Project for Climate Resilience (PPCR), a closely-related and complementary project. The team conducted site visits to infrastructure funded by the project, including coastal protection, water supply, access roads and small grants projects in Vaiala, Lelepa and Fagaloa (all in Upolu island).

11. The mission team also visited Savai'i and observed a number of project sites with adaptation measures such as access roads, coastal water pool enhancement; revetment wall and bridge; and beach replenishment and coastal protection.

12. The following section summarizes the findings of such visits and meetings during the mission.

### **Integrated management plans help in the overall coordination**

13. The country has a chair of the SDG task force, which is in charge of the monitoring and reporting processes. It is under this context that Samoa promotes the implementation of approaches to address climate change impacts, in a comprehensive manner, and there is interest in embracing an inter-sectorial approach mainstreaming climate change. The country, in addition, is mainstreaming climate change into budgetary processes, within each sectoral plan.

14. It is key to mention that despite that the majority of projects can be implemented following the national implementation modality (NIM), it was mentioned in the course of the discussions

with the government officials that institutional capacities need to be strengthened. Staff turnover is generally high, especially in the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment (MNRE) and this constitutes an impediment in the retention of knowledge after a project is finalized. A suggested solution would be to create operational manuals for projects, but these should not substitute the creation of networks and people, which can be equally important. In addition, the country graduated in 2014 from the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) group, which still allows the access to vertical funds, but has had an impact on trade since they lost a preferential market access.

15. The AF funded project together with the WB project have been critical in achieving nationwide benefits in all 41 districts by having updated the Coastal Infrastructure Management Plans (CIMP). The Adaptation Fund project was already approved, and the World Bank project started late and is still ongoing, these two initiatives created a solid partnership which aligned with government priorities. The MNRE is the lead agency for both projects, which resulted being a good option for coordination and cost effectiveness purposes.

16. The priorities defined in the community integrated management plans are now implemented by other climate funds, for example the Green Climate Fund (GCF) project “Integrated Flood Management to Enhance Climate Resilience of the Vaisigano River Catchment in Samoa”, implemented by UNDP, will align ecosystem-based adaptation (EBA) interventions based on the results of CIM Plan review relevant to districts in the Vaisigano river catchment area. In addition, the MNRE, through GEF 7 fund will also implement biodiversity and agriculture adaptation priorities defined in the plans.

17. The updated plans are known as Community Integrated Management, or “CIM-2” Plans and incorporate the multitude of existing plans – e.g. Village Sustainable Development Plans, Village Disaster Risk Management Plans and Watershed Management Plans – into comprehensive local-level planning frameworks for each district. Based on the CIM-2 Plans, the project implemented prioritized interventions that are informed by communities’ development needs. The AF project and the PPCR reviewed CIM Plans in 25 districts (139 villages) and 16 districts respectively. The complementarity of the two initiatives can also be reflected by the fact that some priorities identified in the CIMP in the AF districts allowed communities to apply for small grants under the World Bank PPCR project.

18. With a broader geographic scope well beyond the coastal environment, the revised CIM Plans present an integrated approach, covering all areas from the ridge-to-reef, and include the thematic areas of not only infrastructure, but also the environment and biological resources, as well as livelihood sources and governance.

19. The CIM Plans are considered as a roadmap for climate change interventions across all development sectors – reflecting the programmatic approach to climate resilience adaptation taken by Samoa, and they can be used by communities to ask for funds. The proposed interventions outlined in the CIM Plans are also linked to the Strategy for the Development of Samoa 2016/17 – 2019/20 and the relevant ministry sector plans. The reviews of these plans is

done every ten years, and the latest one under the project, was coordinated by the Planning and Urban Management Agency (PUMA), and implied extensive consultations at village level (which had to follow every village protocol), with the support from other government agencies such as, the Ministry of Women, the Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of Water). The government is now finalizing the translation of the CIMS to be accessible to local people, so they can directly manage their resource mobilization. The CIMS model could be replicated by Tonga, through South-South cooperation.

20. In addition, the project developed the National Relocation Roadmap and Handbook, to facilitate the relocation of the identified vulnerable communities. 15 identified communities have Relocation Plans developed.

21. For what it concerns the inter-sectorial articulation approach, the Ministry of Finance (MoF) is exploring opportunities to seek complementarities among different donors and linking projects through its Aid Division. In Samoa there is a single treasury account within the MoF, and they have a climate resilience coordination and finance. The challenge is to harmonize reporting criteria from different donors.

**Community early engagement fosters empowerment and strengthens the sustainability of the project adaptation measures**

22. The implementation of the Small Grants (SG) components to support village level subprojects was coordinated by the Civil Society Support Programme (CSSP), which was established in 2010 by the government as a facility to bring together funding from donors for the civil society. The process started with a call for proposals in each island, which included technical trainings to targeted villages on the grant application process. Upon reception of the SG proposals, a Technical Assessment Plan (TAP) comprised of representatives from the MNRE, MoF, Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development, UNDP, and CSSP, selected 31 out of the 64 received projects (12 in Savai'i and 21 in Upolu). Due to remaining budget the TAP could reconsider proposals that were not originally approved and selected 12 additional projects. Every village was entitled to US\$ 50,000.

23. Due to the two-fold governance system in Samoa, where the national government is based on a modern state system and village local government is based on traditional structures, the participation of the Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development was fundamental, as they are the gateway to communities. All the funded proposals needed to be signed by the village chiefs, who are responsible to ensure funds are used and their report back to the CSSP.

24. The type of projects supported were rain water harvesting and storage systems protection, mangrove rehabilitation, cliff walkway, coastal replanting and nurse, deepening of river channel and bed, construction of river revetment wall, among others, and 52% of women are direct beneficiaries of these subprojects.

25. Since the 2009 tsunami there has been road reconstructions and upgrading undertaken, but these works they did not systematically include climate change risks in the process. Within the project, the Ministry of Land and Transport Authority had to select which road and infrastructure to prioritize in each district since the funds were not enough to cover all the needed interventions. PUMA was the main implementing agency with which they worked. The main works done were roads, seawalls (Vaiala Seawall of 0.66km; Saleia Rock wall of 1.053 km; and the Salimu road comprising 1 km of rock wall), 6 access roads (for a total of 12.4 km) and plantation roads. The project improved the regulatory procedures for the implementation of physical works with the incorporation of climate change and disaster risks considerations, through the review of the PUMA Act 2014. The amendments imply an improvement in the consent process to ensure that the infrastructure is resilient to disasters and poses no risks to communities.

26. The government is paying for maintenance visits, to follow up the road works which are covered under the contractual agreement with the contractors. Citizen early engagement was proved to be key in the implementation of the subprojects, the technical teams need to be engaged through side visits and beneficiaries' consultations. Women were key in providing information on the location of water springs or where floods happened.



Picture 1: Asaga project  
revetment wall close to mangrove  
habitat



27. Some of the challenges encountered under this component, were: i) the uncertainty for most village proponents on the potential interventions that they could undertake, since the revision of the CIM plans was still undergoing and the priorities identified in the plans would have had to inform the relevant and suitable interventions to be funded under the SG; ii) the low availability of technical assistance for village proponents, since 49% of the funded sub-projects were structural developments (e.g. revetment walls; water piping systems, etc.). In this regard CSSP had to find technical assistance from subcontractors selected for each project, which resulted being more expensive.



Picture 2: Wave breaker to avoid coastal erosion in Savai'i

## LESSONS LEARNED

28. In addition to the issues raised in previous sections, a few other insights have emerged that merit highlighting.

29. **Institutional capacity and coordination are foundational.** These messages came across both directly and implicitly. Initially, coordination mechanisms were not pre-arranged, as there was no precedent for an adaptation project, but these fell into place, through trial and error, during early implementation. That respective roles and overall process are now clear was something that was confirmed and highlighted as an enabling condition for subsequent adaptation initiatives.

**30. Community-level plans ensure sustained support and serve as a good facilitating tool but may not represent technically optimal adaptation solutions.** Plans at the community level that were developed through a largely bottom-up approach seem to have a lot of buy-in from the community. However, there are risks with this in that the community and its leadership may not have the awareness that comes with technical expertise to come up with the optimal solutions. It is possible that the communities, in their planning, would benefit from strong technical support that could support the decision-making process by supplying information, validate the community choices, or recommend enhancements to the ultimately-chosen interventions. Furthermore, community-level plans, when developed independently, may lack coherence and may unintentionally result in increasing vulnerability of communities, by, for example, using infrastructure to lower risk in one area but which results in increasing risk in another (i.e. “exporting risk”).

**31. Lack of spatial planning in Samoa is part of the problem.** Related to the previous point, there appears to be no national-level spatial planning effort that adaptation projects could harmonize activities toward. Spatial planning at the national scale would allow for comprehensive risk modeling and strategic prioritization of action and would also provide a framework within which community-level plans could be developed more coherently. In addition to climate change, other risks are evolving that stand to magnify the adverse impacts, for example urbanization. Spatial planning in Samoa would, besides helping reduce vulnerabilities, have many co-benefits which would be significant for a country dependent on tourism and with significant dependence on natural resources and nature-based services.

**32. Scaling up or replication requires commensurate attention to environmental and social risks.** Another related point is that it was observed that, while the coastal infrastructure interventions, which were generally at a small scale, were appreciated and considered successful by the communities, it is not clear how much the weight was given to environmental and social issues. It did not seem that any of these interventions were especially risky, at the current scale, but it does bear keeping in mind that these, if successful, will become a blueprint for their replication, by which point issues of environmental and social risks would need to be thoroughly re-examined. Some potential obvious issues to consider are risks to the cultural heritage, and solutions that may protect an asset but diminish its economic potential (i.e. tourism) because the intervention is of poor aesthetic quality. Another includes integrity ecosystems and any risks to public health, but all future interventions would benefit from being thoroughly screened without prejudice.

**33. Enable autonomous adaptation.** One of the most promising and impactful interventions appear to be the access roads that were cleared, leading to higher ground. While road construction has been proven frequently to lead to settlement (initially along the road and eventually along the arterial roads that follow), and this may have detrimental effects on the environment that should be carefully considered, where the government wishes to encourage voluntary resettlement of risk-prone coastal communities, an access road can be an effective measure for doing so. The team observed a number of new homes constructed along the road

built by the project, which, by virtue of being on higher ground, are not going to be susceptible to increasingly destructive coastal flooding events.

## **ANNEXES**

- Key questions
- Agenda of the mission and participants

**ANNEX I: Key questions**

A set of questions was prepared for the objectives of the mission, which were applied for the mission.

<b>Key guiding questions in the targeted learning plan</b>	
<b>Mission objectives</b>	<b>Key questions for the mission</b>
<p><u>Objective 1</u>: to collect lessons learned from concrete adaptation practices in the context of coastal management addressing climate change impacts of key infrastructure and coastal ecosystems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons drawn from the adaptation measures implemented on coastal roads and related infrastructure;</li> <li>• Learn from the project’s approach in enhancing water supply in targeted villages, and how this is benefitting targeted beneficiaries, including women and youth;</li> <li>• Draw lessons from the project’s strategy for the integration of climate-change induced disaster risk management principles in the districts’ coastal infrastructure management (CIM) plans;</li> <li>• Learn from the project’s approach in the formulation and implementation of hazard zone relocation plans taking climate risks into account;</li> <li>• Enhancing climate change resilience through training delivered to village leaders and CSO representatives for the review of the CIM plans and for the relocation planning process (i.e. 3D participatory modeling techniques)</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Based on what previous experiences/studies were the project adaptation options selected?</li> <li>2) What, if any, were the main challenges faced by the project in implementing its identified adaptation options?</li> <li>3) How have the coastal management adaptation activities helped in adapting to climate change impacts?</li> <li>4) What were the most innovative options proposed through the project and how have they been accepted by the communities?</li> <li>5) Which were the most successful activities? Which ones were less so? What are the main reasons behind this?</li> <li>6) What are the considerations for the sustainability of the proposed innovative options?</li> <li>7) What would you consider to be the most successful aspects of the project interventions for the target communities?</li> <li>8) To what extent was local/traditional knowledge considered?</li> <li>9) What steps have been taken to measure the success of climate proofing measures implemented and of the CIMPs?</li> <li>10) Have there been any developments of note on the environmental and social risks of the project since the design? If yes, how have those been managed?</li> </ol>

	<p>11) What has been the role of gender and youth in the project? Are there any observations of note? Would this experience have an effect on how gender and youth considerations would be reflected in a similar or a subsequent project (i.e. a replicated or scaled-up version of this project)?</p>
<p><u>Objective 2:</u> to learn from the project’s systemic approach in capturing and disseminating knowledge and lessons learned to aid and inform further implementation of climate resilient development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons from how the revision and development of guiding tools (organization and institutional structures for CIM plans implementation; village hazard zone relocation handbook) and regulatory procedures (hard measures integrating climate change risks) have been institutionalized and have been strengthening institutional capacities;</li> <li>• Lessons drawn from the capacity building in climate risk assessment and planning processes for coastal adaptation;</li> <li>• Learn from the project’s general approach of involving women and youth in the CIM plan formulation to strengthen their role and participation in the decision-making realm;</li> <li>• Lessons from key aspects of the project, such as knowledge sharing and community empowerment to foster the sustainability and scalability of a project;</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How have the trainings conducted in the CIM plan formulation helped improve the decisions supporting coastal management?</li> <li>2) Where there any challenges encountered by the local staff in disseminating technical information about risk assessments and sectorial reports to the communities?</li> <li>3) What are the positive impacts of the development of the Relocation Road Map, the Relocation Handbook and the Hazard Zone Relocation Plans?</li> <li>4) What role did the sharing of knowledge play in informing the small grants-based mechanism for funding shoreline protection measures?</li> <li>5) How are the lessons that had been derived from the adaptive management process being documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners and incorporated into project implementation?</li> <li>6) The project interventions address gender dimensions (road access, improved water reticulation system, etc.). What has been the effect on women?</li> </ol>
<p><u>Objective 3: to draw lessons from the project’s replication and scaling up of concrete interventions</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To what extent has scalability of the project been considered at the project design phase?</li> <li>2) Have there been any concrete plans to scale up the project activities?</li> </ol>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learn from how the project is ensuring the sustainability of its results;</li><li>• Learn from the project's solutions at scale and its approach for a replicable intervention strategy that can be applied to the whole country.</li></ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3) Was the potential for replication and scalability outside the project areas taken into consideration when choosing the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project?</li><li>4) What is the potential for the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?</li></ol>
---	--

**ANNEX II: Agenda of the Mission**

<b>Time/ Venue</b>	<b>Agenda</b>	<b>Expected Participants</b>
<b>Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 – Arrived in Samoa</b>		
<b>Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2019</b>		
Time: 9am-10am Venue: One UN-House Conference Room	Courtesy meeting with UNDP Multi-Country Office Samoa on Adaptation Fund Portfolio	<b>UNDP:</b> Sharad Neupane, Anne Trevor and Ioane Iosefo.  <b>AF:</b> Martina Dorigo & Saliha Dobardzic
Time: TBC Venue: TBC	Courtesy meetings with Government of Samoa counterparts on Adaptation Fund Portfolio: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade</li> <li>Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment</li> <li>Ministry of Finance</li> <li>Ministry of Works, Transport and Infrastructure</li> <li>Land Transport Authority</li> </ul>	<b>MFAT:</b> Peseta Noumea Simi <b>MNRE:</b> Ulu Bismarck Crawley <b>MOF:</b> Leasiosiofaasisina Oscar Malielegaoi <b>MWTI:</b> Fetola'i Yandall-Alama <b>LTA:</b> Galumalemana Ta'atialeoititi A. Tutuvanu-Schwalger <b>AF:</b> Martina Dorigo & Saliha Dobardzic
<b>Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> July 2019</b>		
Time: TBC Venue: TBC	Courtesy meetings with Government of Samoa counterparts and partners on Adaptation Fund Portfolio: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil Society Support Program (CSSP)</li> <li>World Bank Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience Project (PPCR)</li> </ul>	<b>AF:</b> Martina Dorigo & Saliha Dobardzic  <b>World Bank:</b> Maeva Betham  <b>CSSP:</b> Christina Taua
Time: TBC Venue: TBC	Project Site visit in Upolu islands <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vaiala Seawall</li> <li>Access roads and coastal protection project at Fagaloa,</li> <li>Small Grants Project at Lalomanu.</li> </ul>	
<b>Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> July 2019 - Depart Upolu to Savaii at 8am.</b>		
Time: TBC Venue: TBC	Project Site visit in Savaii islands	<b>AF:</b> Martina Dorigo & Saliha Dobardzic <b>UNDP:</b> Ioane Iosefo <b>MWTI:</b> Kirsimasi
<b>Friday 26<sup>th</sup> July 2019 - Depart Savaii to Upolu at 6am.</b>		
Time: TBC Venue: TBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Debriefing with National Designated Authority (NDA) – Peseta Noumea Simi</li> <li>Debriefing with UNDP MCO Samoa</li> </ul>	<b>AF:</b> Martina Dorigo & Saliha Dobardzic <b>MFAT:</b> Peseta Noumea Simi <b>UNDP:</b> Sharad Neupane & Yvette Kerslake.
<b>Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> July 2019 – Depart Apia to Auckland.</b>		

**Mission Team**

Ms. Saliha Dobardzic – Senior Climate Change Specialist, Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat

Ms. Martina Dorigo – Programme Analyst, Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat

Mr. Sharad Neupane – Deputy Resident Representative at United Nations Development Programme

Ms. Anne Trevor – Programme Officer at United Nations Development Programme

Ms. Ioane Iosefalo – Programme Associate at United Nations Development Programme

Ms. Laufaleaina Lesa – Communications officer at United Nations Development Programme

Mr. Kirsimasi – Ministry of Works Transport and Infrastructure

Ms. Christina Taua – Officer at the Civil Society Support Programme