

Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration in Tanzania's Forest Landscapes

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10262

Countries

Tanzania

Project Name

Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration in Tanzania's Forest Landscapes

Agencies

WWF-US

Date received by PM

12/12/2020

Review completed by PM

8/2/2021

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

1/24/2021

- Overall comment - As there was no PIF for the child project, only a PFD for the entire program including child project concepts, please complete all the relevant sections of the portal submission for the CEO Endorsement.

-Please include the IP Objective for Table A and not the Focal Area objectives.

-Please change the RIO Marker for climate change mitigation to ??, given the focus of the project includes restoration/forests.

Agency Response

4/27/21

- All sections in the portal have been completed.

- Thank you for your comment, the IP Objective is now included in Table A instead of the Focal Area Objectives .

- Thank you for your comment, the RIO Marker for climate change mitigation has been changed to ??.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/14/2021:

Adjustments have been made. All cleared.

5/6/2021:

Thank you for the additional information provided. Please see follow up comment under the Core Indicators.

4/29/2021:

-Please link the GEF Core Indicator targets to their respective Outcomes, so that we can have a clear sense of which Outcomes are contributing to the expected targets. Please do so in Table B in the Portal and/or the Results Framework in the portal.

1/24/2021

Not fully.

-Please include Outcome level targets and indicators for each component. Where these maybe different for Tanzania and Zanzibar, please indicate.

-We expect that some activities outlined here would have been suitable for the PPG stage, such as Output 1.1.1 & 2.3.1. Any particular reason why these were not completed prior to submission?

-Component 1 as presented does not seem to bring out an any of the actions related to cross-sectoral or integrated action at the policy level- platform, coordinating group, etc. whether it is in Tanzania or Zanzibar. Please ensure it is captured at least in the Targets and indicators.

Output 1.1.5- This is written as an activity, what is the expected output of the training?

Agency Response

5/13/2021

Thank you, please see response under the core indicators.

5/5/2021

The Table B in the CEO Endorsement Document now references which outcomes will be contributing to which core indicators. Many of the Outcomes are working together to contribute to the core indicator targets, so it is difficult to provide a target per Outcome.

4/27/2021

- Outcome-level targets and indicators are presented in Annex 8 of the ProDoc, with separate indicators for each of the defined outcomes.

- With regard to the assessment described under output 1.1.1, the project team did undertake field assessment, remote sensing and stakeholder consultations as part of the PPG activity plan. The outcomes of these efforts are reflected in particular in annex 1 and annex 6. However, the scale of this preliminary analysis is too coarse for the level of more site-specific efforts and deeper assessment is required to inform the development of land-use plans and site-specific interventions in the rice production and value chain development. Similarly, for output 2.3.1, while the PPG stage did provide valuable insight in potential engagement with financial sector actors and private sector at large, there is more work required to develop these ideas into clear business cases.

- The issue of cross-sectoral and integrated coordination is indeed a very pertinent one, and is captured as follows:

1. In the barrier analysis (ProDoc, section 1.4) under ?Inadequate institutional coordination and integrated planning systems for land and water use management?

2. In the description of component 1 (ProDoc, section 2.3), in particular under Output 1.1.2: Implementation framework for Integrated Landscape Management in the Kilombero Valley and new Integrated Landscape Management Plan for Kiashange-Mokotoni and Kinyasini-Kisongoni catchment areas

3. Reflected in objective indicator 3 (ProDoc, Annex 8): Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity as characterized by the existence of ILM plans and effective institutional arrangements, with clear institutional responsibilities defined for cross-sectoral coordination and implementation, monitoring and evaluation of plans.

- Output 1.1.5 has been revised to ?Training and awareness raising program? to better read as an Output.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

1/24/2021

- The cash cofinancing in the ZAWA letter is not reflected in the portal

- The co-financing letter for MNRT has an error- \$150,000 indicated as in-kind rather than grant as indicated in the portal.

- The cofinancing from Korea Exim Bank/SMZ aims to build four irrigations schemes including dams. Please provide further information on the environmental and social context of this 64.5 million project, especially in the context of a Ramsar site and vulnerable wetlands.

Agency Response

4/27/2021

- The cash co-financing proposed by ZAWA relates to a water supply infrastructure project that is primarily urban focused. At this stage, the project cannot confirm how much of this project aligns with the FOLUR objectives.

- The co-financing for MNRT is now reflected as in-kind rather than grant to match the co-financing letter.

- Clarifying text on the potential environmental threats posed by this investment project are presented in the project document. Details of the actual planned infrastructure are presented in the baseline assessment (section 1.5 ? see in particular also Table 2), as well as in the threats analysis (section 1.2).

In summary: This project, implemented through a loan by KOREA Exim Bank/SMZ, supports the construction of four irrigation schemes that will use reservoirs and

groundwater as water sources. Four reservoirs are planned to be constructed to supply 427 hectares, of which the largest, Kinyasini dam (217 ha) will supply water to Kibokwa and Kinyasini areas in the North-Unguja landscape. In addition, the project will support investments in Zanzibar's Kilombero valley, through boreholes for irrigating rice fields (i.e. Kilombero, Pangeni and Upenja JKU areas). Among the main threats associated with this project potential (see section 1.2) are:

1. The conversion of considerable areas of land for irrigated rice farming will lead to increased stress on land. Encroachment and conversion of the remaining small patches of forests, as well as potential over-abstraction of groundwater resources, are particular risk factors in this regard. More specifically, the Kinyasini dam project, if not well planned and managed, may lead to further encroachment and degradation of the remaining stretch of coral rag forest along the Eastern coast, including the Kiwengwa-Pongwe Forest Reserve.
2. The effects of the planned reservoirs and boreholes, as well as related irrigation schemes, in terms of their overall impact on the hydrological balance of both ground- and surface water systems. This is particularly relevant in the context of Zanzibar, where seasonal streams and groundwater resources have already been reported to be drying up, as well as salinization of groundwater (due to saltwater intrusion) reported in coastal areas. Unfortunately, as data on groundwater availability and abstraction rates in Zanzibar is largely missing (see also section 1.3), the exact effects of the increasing abstraction rates are poorly understood.

The project will link closely to these planned irrigation schemes, complementing these investments in infrastructure with appropriate planning and technical support in order to make sure that this new rice development scheme is happening in the most sustainable way.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/25/2021:

All changes have been made and the budget is now clearly presented.

8/9/2021:

Thank you for the changes. Please see follow up comments below.

- Please adjust the budget table as it currently outside of the margin. Note when circulated to Council the portal submission will be a PDF and so we will need to ensure all of the information is visible.

- The way the budget is presented is misleading even if it is explained in a footnote: while for the M&E Specialist the costs of \$212,565 in columns 'Outcome 4.1' and 'Sub-total' do include the M&E costs of \$106,183, by comparison the project driver costs of \$15,250 in the different 'Outcome' columns and 'Sub-total' do not include the PMC costs. As a result, once one adds the 'Sub-total' column to either 'M&E' or 'PMC', the results are inconsistent. In the case of the M&E Specialist, the amount in the 'Total Project' column is equal to the amount in 'Sub-total', while in the case of the project Driver, the amount in the 'Total Project' column is equal to the amount in 'Sub-total' + the amount in 'PMC'. This can create confusion for the reader and in particular when the Portal submission is Circulated to the Council. Please amend the budget.

8/2/2021:

The technical functions of the Project Coordinator / Sustainable Food Systems Specialist have been clarified and are accepted by the PM. The functions 'Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning & Knowledge Management Program Officer' have been clarified in the TOR to include both M&E and KM tasks and these have been itemized in the budget accordingly.

6/16/2021:

Please see follow up comments below on the Project Coordinator functions and the overall budget.

- We note the changes to the Project Coordinator functions, however throughout the ProDoc , still the Project Management Unit and from page 70 onwards only makes reference to a 'Project Coordinator' rather than the new title of 'Project Coordinator / Sustainable Food Systems Specialist'. The TOR lists significantly more tasks related to project coordination/management, however only charges 21% of the Project Coordinator's time to PMC. In this case, the expectation is that as much as possible the PMC under the GEF financing and the co-financing should cover the Project Coordinator's costs. In order to justify the costs associated with technical functions, please provide further details in the TOR to ensure they are commensurate with the costs assigned and ensure these functions are reflected throughout the project document.

- Please utilize the same title for the M&E Manager -**Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning & Knowledge Management Program Officer** throughout out the project document for consistency.

-There appears to be errors throughout in the budget with double counting. This has been seen with a few line items including for the **Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning &**

Knowledge Management Program Officer. The amount for the M&E costs (\$106,183) appears to have been counted twice- in the M&E column and reflected in the Total Cost column. In addition we note the sum (Row 215) of the Sub-Total, M&E and PMC amounts to \$7,765,267 which is more than the project cost of \$7.3M. Please double check budget line items.

6/10/2021:

Thank you for the changes and additional information provided. The changes to the project staff functions are accepted and cleared.

5/21/2021:

Thank you for submitting the revised budget template. Following review of the budget, please see follow up comments below.

i. Project coordinator and Project Assistant are partially charged to the project's components and partially charged to PMC (only 21% of the Project Coordinator is charged to PMC) ? they are essential part of the execution, reason why should be charged to PMC (as it is the case of Finance Manager). Please readjust and reallocate all of the PC and PA financing to the PMC or reallocate the costs between GEF PMC financing and PMC covered by the co-financing or indicate specifically the technical functions that the PC and PA will be carrying out related to the components. If the latter the TORs will need to be revised to indicate same.

ii. M&E Manager is partially charged to the project's components and partially charged to M&E ? being an essential part of the M&E, it should be charged to M&E. Additionally, we note that the calculations show that M&E Manager would receive \$212,365 from the project's components + \$106,183 from M&E. However our calculations indicate the total costs should instead be \$318,548, while the result in the current budget is \$212,365. Please amend and review all the calculations.

5/19/2021:

Budget has been uploaded. Cleared.

5/18/2021:

Please see follow up comments below. Once revised a full review of the budget will be conducted.

In keeping with the (Updated) Guidelines of the Project and Program Cycle Policy (paragraph 2 ? page 42) - ?The Budget Template in Appendix A should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal. ?The same Budget Template in excel format should be uploaded in the Portal - section ?Documents?.

- Currently the version incorporated in the Portal is off margin and difficult to read.
- Using the template from the Guidelines, please upload an excel version of the budget as an Annex in the Portal and insert the same budget in the portal submission.

5/14/2021:

Costs associated with the project vehicle including the maintenance and driver are cleared.

5/5/2021:

Thank you. Please confirm whether or not co-financing will be covering any of the vehicle costs. GEF in keeping with our policy, usually requires these costs be covered by co-financing, otherwise justification should be provided.

4/29/2021:

Thank you for the information provided. Please see additional comments below:

- On the PMC Proportionality: there is currently a low level of proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. With the GEF contribution at 4.7%, for a co-financing of **\$72,686,863.00** the expected contribution to PMC which is currently at \$1,389,000.00 (which is 1.9%) should be increased as much as possible, given the grant co-financing that has been indicated in Table C. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, please increase the co-financing portion where possible.

1/24/2021

Not fully.

-Please provide a breakdown of the M&E budget. The current M&E budget of 9% of the total project cost is quite significant. Please double check the costs that have been assigned to M&E.

-It may be useful to separate the Component 4 costs from the M&E charges.

-Please include the TORs for the key project staff.

Agency Response

8/19/2021

- Thank you for your comment, the budget table is now included in the portal at the Component level (rather than Outcome level) to fit into the margins and still be legible.

- Thank you for your comment, the M&E budget (which equates to Output 4.1.1) is now solely shown under the M&E column. It has been removed from the

outcome/component budgets, and therefore the subtotal, M&E column, and PMC now equal the total GEF grant.

7/8/2021

Thank you for your comments.

- The title position for the 'Project Coordinator / Sustainable Food Systems Specialist' is now used consistently throughout the ProDoc and CEO Endorsement Request. The description of the technical tasks associated with this position have been expanded upon in the TOR ? please see Appendix 14 in the ProDoc. The technical tasks are significant enough that they're expected to take 80% time. 20% time will be dedicated to project management tasks.

- The title for the ?Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning & Knowledge Management Program Officer? role is now used consistently throughout the ProDoc and CEO Endorsement Request.

- The M&E column reflects specific M&E costs under Outcome 4.1 (specifically, Output 4.1.1). The costs in this column are not additional (e.g. are not added to the 'subtotal' towards the 'total project'), but are presented here merely to show the M&E costs associated with the project. A footnote has been added to the excel and portal entry to provide clarity.

6/7/2021

Thank you for your comments. A new budget has been uploaded and included in the Portal submission.

- i. The project assistant is now charged 100% to PMC. The project coordinator will cover both project management responsibilities and technical functions, and is therefore budgeted under components and PMC. This is now reflected in the TOR, and the role has been relabeled ?Project Coordinator / Food Systems Specialist? to account for this.

- ii. The M&E Manager will support M&E, knowledge management, and FOLUR inputs. The M&E Manager?s time is budgeted across Component 4 to reflect these roles and responsibilities, and this has been reflected in the TOR for this position.

The M&E Manager's salary is budgeted at \$212,365 total. \$106,183 is budgeted under M&E (4.1.1, and shown in the 'total M&E column'), the rest is budgeted under Output 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 for functions related to knowledge management and FOLUR coordination.

The ?Total M&E? column reflects costs under ?Output 4.1.1.'

5/19/2021

Thank you, the Budget Template in excel format has been uploaded in the Portal.

The version in the portal has been adjusted to fit in the margins.

5/13/2021

Thank you for your comment. Co-financing will not be used to cover the vehicle cost, as the use of the vehicle will be solely for the purpose of carrying out the project. Visits to the project landscapes require regular ground transport, and there are no flights between Dodoma (where the PMU is based) and Kilombero. In addition, the PMU will require the vehicle to undertake regular engagements with partner institutions in Dodoma. A justification for the vehicle has been provided in the ProDoc under Section 2.9 Budget Notes.

5/5/2021

Thank you for your comment. The PMC co-financing proportionality has been fixed.

4/27/2021

- A breakdown of the M&E budget is now included. The total budget allocated for M&E amounts to 4.95%.

-Thank you for your comment, the Component 4 costs and M&E costs are now shown separately.

-TORs for key project staff have been added, and can now be found in Annex 14 of the Project Document.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/24/2021

Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/14/2021:

Revisions, further clarification and justification have been provided for the targets. All cleared.

5/6/2021:

Thank you for the information provided. We have reviewed again the target for Core Indicator 4 which overall is quite high on the basis of what is expected to be achieved in the life of the project, the financing and the actual activities that will contribute to this target. In particular sub-indicator 4.3 which, based on the information provided is linked to Component 2 (in the Results Framework) and Components 1 & 2 (in Table B) . With this we note that the activities linked to sub-indicator 4.3 are focused on planning which is usually expected for sub-indicator 4.1, while for 4.3 we expect field based activities that support SLM. In fact the target under sub-indicator 3.1 is likely more appropriate for sub-indicator 4.3

Please reassess sub-indicator 4.3 to only include field based SLM practices and consider revising Core Indicator 4 overall to a more realistic target focusing mainly on the priority areas within the targeted landscapes. If additional hectares can be tangibly justified during project implementation these can be reflected at mid-term evaluation.

4/29/2021:

-The note under the core indicator table doesn't appear to match the core indicators figures or the note is not clear. Please clarify.

All other comments cleared.

1/24/2021

-Please include a note below the table indicating how the targets are being accounted (in particular the targets for Core Indicators 3 & 4).

-Please attach a GHG accounting tool (e.g FAO Ex-ACT tool) so that we may assess the expected results under indicator 6.

-Please provide a breakdown the category of the beneficiaries.

-Additional information/explanation should be provided on how these targets match with focal area specifics: Aichi targets, LDN targets, NDC

Agency Response

5/13/2021

Thank you for your comment. The core indicators have been revised as suggested, with stronger justification provided for the figures.

5/5/2021

Thank you for your comment. This note has been clarified.

4/27/21

- Footnotes are now included for indicators 3 and 4 in Annex 8 of the Project Document. A description has also been provided in the CEO Endorsement Request on the Portal.

-The Ex-ACT tool has now been attached to the project submission.

-An approximate distribution is now provided in Annex 8 of the Project Document (Results Framework), and a description has been included in the Portal.

-A table showing alignment with Aichi and LDN targets, and NDCs has been added to the CEO Endorsement Request alongside the Core Indicator table.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/5/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

What is the current context as it relates to COVID and impacts on the targeted sites?

All other comments are cleared.

1/24/2021

-The current context as it relates to the private sector and finance in general is limited and is not fully detailed for instance as it relates to value chains and restoration.

-Current context as it relates to COVID and impacts on the project sites in general is missing.

-The discussion on the context and background beyond the landscape is limited. Additional information about the other aspects and actors of the value chain, the challenges they face and the role they play in the rice value chain would be useful. This in particular as Outcome 2 will be addressing this aspect.

-Please provide any information on Tanzania's regional relationship with other rice growing countries as well as whether or not the country is involved in any existing commodity or rice related platforms. This provides a basis for the interventions under Component 4.

-In reference to the selection of sub-indicator 4.1. What portion of the targeted landscapes are HCV forests? Have they been designated as such at the national level?

Agency Response

5/5/2021

Tanzania has not instituted lockdowns or other measures for COVID 19. Therefore, life at the targeted sites largely continues as usual. The COVID impact on target sites is currently unknown given lack of data

4/27/2021

- Section 1.4 provides some detail on the private sector value chain actors in the rice sector. The rice value chain in Tanzania includes multiple horizontal and vertical links from the producer to the consumer. Those involved in the chain include primary producers (mainly small-scale farmers), input suppliers, credit and insurance providers, a large number of traders/agents who operate between producers and processors, processors (millers), wholesalers, retailers, transporters and consumers. The chain is fragmented, poorly organized, and largely uncontrolled (despite existing regulations), which makes engagement with private sector actors along the supply chain a complex undertaking. Tanzania does have in place structures for engagement with private sector, through for example the Tanzania Investment Center, the Rice Council of Tanzania and the SAGCOT Secretariat. However, there is a need to create a more targeted platform for engagement between these actors. This is planned under output 2.3.2.

- Text clarifying the key challenges faced by value chain actors has been added to section 1.4 of the project document (under 'Inadequate farmer support systems and enabling conditions for private sector investment in sustainable rice value chains?').

- Addition detail has been added to section 1.3 of the project document. In summary:

Tanzania is a member of both the East Africa Community (EAC) and the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), which both allow for duty-free trading of export within the region. The EAC imposes a Common External Tariff of 75% on rice exported from outside of the region. As current regional production only meets approximately 55% of demand, and as Tanzania's growing rice production already surpasses local demand, there is a growing regional export market for Tanzania surplus rice production.

Tanzania is a member/partner of several international forums, including the Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), the African Rice Initiative (ARI), the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA) and the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA).

- The total area of the target landscapes under PA status is 11.5%: The Kilombero landscape hosts 156,640 ha of forest and wetland landscape under official Protected Area status (which includes National Parks, Forest Reserves Game Reserves, etc). In Zanzibar, Kiwengwa forest occupies 3,324 ha of land under official Protected Area status.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared

1/24/2021

Yes however, please add details to the portal submission.

Agency Response

4/27/21

Thank you for your comment. The baseline section has been elaborated in the Portal.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/5/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

Thank you for the updates and revisions. Please include the ToC diagram in the portal submission if possible.

1/24/2021

Not fully.

-Please incorporate information on the project description including the Theory of Change in the portal submission.

- Please include some information on how the project may assist with green recovery efforts related to COIVD.

-In keeping with the focus of the FOLUR IP to drive transformational change, we would like to see more of a discussion on how the interventions (together with co-financing and parallel activities) can be anchored and upscaled to ensure board scale impact after the project has ended.

-There is very little discussion in the ToC on the KM aspects and coordination with the GCP. Please include. This is also missing from the Annex on the ToC.

-Output 1.1.2 -Please specify or indicate the role of local/village level stakeholders and private sector in the platform? Where will the platform be anchored to ensure continuity?

-Please clarify whether or not the Zanzibar representatives will be involved in this platform or if a separate platform will be created. If separate, what would be the linkage?

-The details provided reference a multi-stakeholder platform, however, how will the platform demonstrate a multi-sector focus. Which agencies will be involved?

-In keeping with the focus of the FOLUR IP to drive transformational change, we would like to see more of a discussion on how the interventions (together with co-financing and parallel activities) can be anchored and upscaled to ensure board scale impact after the project has ended.

-Output-1.1.4 mentions looking at land tenure issues. However there doesn't appear to be a discussion on this in the context. What are the challenges surrounding land tenure?

-In Zanzibar, there seems to be relatively less foundation in place for many of the interventions. How will the project ensure the change is transformational in this regard?

-Output 2.3.1- What are the tangible deliverables of this output? The activities centre on analytical documents such as an opportunity analysis, financial feasibility analysis and business cases. Will any actual financial mechanisms/schemes be tested or put in place?

-Output 3.1.3- the same question as above (for Output 3.1.3) applies.

Agency Response

5/5/2021

Thank you, the TOC diagram is now included in the Portal submission.

4/27/21

- The project description (Component and Outcome level) and Theory of Change have been expanded upon in the portal.

- Thank you for your comment. Information on how the project may assist with green recovery efforts is now captured in section 3.4 of the ProDoc, in particular Table 26 (COVID-19 Opportunity Analysis). This table is also in the portal submission.

- Thank you for your comment. To drive transformational change, the project will set an example at the landscape level, while institutionalizing recommended best practice approaches and solutions, and by creating the necessary enabling conditions for upscaling. This has been expanded in the theory of change description in section 2.1 of the ProDoc.

- The link to KM aspects and coordination with the GCP has been expanded in the ToC (section 2.1 of the ProDoc).

- For Kilombero, the MSP is managed by NLUPC, with the support of various other institutions. This is a standing platform that has been existing for several years and serves multiple purposes, including within the context of SAGCOT (which in itself has a long-term vision).

For Zanzibar, there is no existing MSP. The project will support its establishment. At this stage, it has not been decided who would be the official host, but likely this would be the Commission for Lands (equivalent of the NLUPC in Kilombero). Also, arrangements for maintaining this platform beyond the project will have to be confirmed through the process and the development of the ILM Plan.

For both Kilombero and Zanzibar, one of the key activities under output 1.1.3 is to undertake a review of inter-institutional systems for the implementation of the ILM Plans, which will involve the development of mechanisms for ensuring the sustainability of the agreed structures.

- There will be two different platforms ? one per landscape. Please see section 2.4 of the ProDoc (institutional arrangements) for a description of the two platforms.

- The constitution of the platforms is described in section 2.4 (institutional arrangements), as follows:

The existing Kilombero Multi-stakeholder Platform will function as a Landscape Advisory Committee (LAC), which will support the Kilombero LCU in terms of project strategies, workplan and implementation from the perspectives of the project partners, as well as to ensure wider outreach to the respective constituencies of the project partners. The platform consist of the District Executive Directors of the respective project districts, as well as of the representatives of the following ministries and agencies: MNRT, MoA, MoWI, MLHHS, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development, Ministry of Industry and Trade, VPO ? Division of Environment (DoE), PO-RALG, Regional Commissioner Morogoro, NLUPC, Tanzania Forest Services (TFS) Agency, TAWA (Ifakara), National Carbon Monitoring Centre, Sokoine University of Agriculture (NCCM/SUA), Rufiji River Basin Water Board, SAGCOT Secretariat, TARI, TAFORI. The platform furthermore involves relevant stakeholders from private sector (e.g. Kilombero Valley Teak Company, Kilombero Plantations Limited and RCT), as well as from relevant civil society organizations (e.g. Africa Wildlife Foundation, Tanzania Forest Conservation Group, WWF, Care).

For the Unguja landscape, in the absence of an existing forum, a dedicated Multi-stakeholder LAC will be established. The LAC will involve representation from North A and North B Town Councils, MAINRL, VPO-2 ? Department of Environment (DoE), ZAWA, MLHWE - Department of Urban and Rural Planning, President?s Office - Regional Administration, Local Governments and Special Departments, Ministry of Finance, ZURA, Zanzibar Commission for Tourism (ZCT), Regional Commissioner NorthA&B, ZARI, as well as representatives from private sector (e.g. Zanzibar Association for Tourism Investors), local communities (Shehas) and civil society organizations (e.g. ANGOZA and Zanzibar Climate Change Alliance).

Note: for clarity, a reference to section 2.4 is now included in the description of output 1.1.2 in the ProDoc.

- As described in section 1.4 of the ProDoc (barriers to be addressed by the project) the issue to be addressed is the fact that the existing land tenure and water governance (allocation and tariff) systems are not adequately aligned with land and water use plans. As a consequence, land tenure decisions are often not based on defined land and water use plans, and current pricing mechanisms for domestic and irrigation water use do not reflect the true environmental costs to manage, conserve and restore water catchments.

- Previous efforts towards integrated landscape planning in Zanzibar have, at least in part, failed to effectively deliver change because of lack of a very tangible driver from Government side as well as some weaknesses in stakeholder engagement. On the first, by linking this project to the planned large-scale irrigation infrastructure project, there is a higher chance of this project making a difference; in other words, there is a clear need. On the second point, the project will ensure stakeholder engagement (Government, private sector and communities) through a dedicated platform. Previous efforts, in this regard, have been more ad hoc, the project will attempt to mitigate this by institutionalizing such engagement.

- Output 2.3.1 and 3.1.3 aims to lay the basis for the establishment and implementation of concrete measures, e.g. public sector driven (financial) support instruments and packages such as credit and insurance schemes, as well as private sector investments. The project is not directly investing into such finance/investment schemes, but rather function as a catalyst, by providing design and feasibility services and by bringing actors (potential investors, finance institutions and insurance providers, etc.) together.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/29/2021:

Cleared

1/24/2021

No. Please include information on how the project is aligned with the IP.

Agency Response Thank you for your comment. Alignment to the IP has been expanded upon in section 3.2 of the ProDoc.

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

1/24/2021

Not fully.

-The added value of the GEF investment in relation to Component 4 is missing, in particular for the activities around GCP coordination and KM. Please include.

Agency Response

4/27/21

- An analysis of incremental cost benefits in relation to Component 4 are now included in section 3.1 of the ProDoc.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/24/2021

Yes

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

1/24/2021

Not fully.

Please see relevant questions above under Question 3.

-The project intends to support rice farmer associations/cooperatives. What is the plan for their continuity?

-Under financing sustainability, the submission indicates that each of the 3 components has built in the establishment of mechanisms for ensuring that the landscape plans and investments proposed under the project will become self-sustainable. What are these mechanisms?

-What are the plans for sustaining the Compact (between public and private sector stakeholders)- Output 2.3.2

Agency Response

4/27/21

- Please see response under question 3.

- Farmer groups (associations/cooperatives) are a common feature in Tanzania. These groups lend their sustainability generally through their services to participating farmers (e.g. in facilitating inputs supplies, processing and collection facilities, collective use of equipment, and in cases even negotiating deals for credit facilities, buyers, etc.). These structures are self-reliant, although Government extension services sometimes provide support; e.g. in the case of Zanzibar, Government is actively using such structures for the distribution of state-subsidized fertilizer, seeds and other inputs.

- An overview table of financial sustainability elements is now included in section 3.6 of the project document.

- The Compact will be anchored in SAGCOT, and its sustainability will be ensured by the SAGCOT secretariat. Public-private sector partnership engagement is its core mandate.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/24/2021

Yes

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/29/2021:

Cleared

1/24/2020

The portal submission has not described how the child project is contributing to the overall program (in particular for Components 1,2,3). The narrative mainly describes the FOLUR IP as a whole.

Agency Response
4/27/21

- Section 1.1 of the ProDoc provides a description of how the Tanzania FOLUR fits and relates to the broader IP.

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/24/2021

Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

1/24/2021

Not fully

-Please incorporate information from the gender analysis and action plan in the portal submission.

-We note and appreciate the Gender Analysis and Action Plan. Please integrate the Gender aspects into the project context, Table B and the project description in particular in components that require stakeholder engagement.

-The experience from the RFS (Food Security IAP) shows that the integration of gender issues in a project is difficult to tackle without specific attention, in addition to consultants during the project life. Gender should be treated as an integration process to be carried out throughout the duration of the project, rather than a one-off event. We note the Gender consultant will be hired for up to 5 months. How will they work with the PMU and LCUs to ensure gender is adequately integrated throughout the project.

Agency Response

4/27/21

- Information from the gender analysis and action plan have been added to the portal submission.

- The gender context is presented in section 2.6. Gender aspects and considerations, based on the gender analysis, are integrated throughout the description of the project components, as appropriate. Further details are presented in the gender assessment, as well as e.g. in the rice sector review analysis (Annex 9). A separate budget on gender and safeguards aspects is presented in section 2.9.

- \$125,000 has been allocated for a gender and safeguards consultant to be engaged through the lifetime of the project. The gender consultant will work actively with both PMU and LCU staff to integrate gender related approaches in project strategies. Provisions have been made for gender training for project staff. Also, focal group discussions have been planned and budgeted for. Reference is made to Table 20 in section 2.9 of the ProDoc (Budget), which provides an overview of all gender and safeguards related budget allocations.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

1/24/2021

Yes. However please see specific questions on the private sector focused activities under Question 3.

Agency Response

4/27/21

- Please see response to question 3.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

1/24/2021

Not fully.

We note the project considers potential climate change impacts and incorporates risk reduction and mitigation considerations. However, please confirm if specific climate risks monitoring activities are included.

Agency Response

4/27/21

- An annual risk rating exercise will be undertaken, which includes an analysis of potential climate change related risks and impacts.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared

1/24/2021

-Please confirm whether or not a decision has been made on the selection of the sub-grantee organizations to manage the LCUs.

-We note and understand the value in having Landscape Coordination Units and we urge a decision to be made quickly on the appropriate body(ies) to manage and coordinate these units. We recommend striking the right balance between ensuring that there is sufficient ownership of the project at the national/landscape level as well as selecting a body(ies) that can ensure efficient and effective project implementation.

-Following the submission of this information the Secretariat will conduct a further assessment on their tasks and the corresponding budget.

Agency Response

4/27/21

- The LCUs will be managed by the local (District) authorities. The narrative has been adjusted to reflect this.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/24/2021

Yes

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/24/2021

Yes

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/5/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

- M&E- equipment and operational costs are not eligible M&E expenses and these would have to be covered under the PMC.

-M&E- for clarity we recommend providing a breakdown/note explaining the line items under the M&E budget in the portal submission. Please see Table 3, Page 18 of the GUIDELINES ON THE PROJECT AND PROGRAM CYCLE POLICY for reference on how the M&E budget is normally presented.

1/24/2021

Please include a budgeted M&E Plan.

Agency Response

5/5/2021

Noted, equipment and operational costs have been removed from the M&E budget. A strengthened description of the M&E budget has been provided in the ProDoc and in the Portal submission.

4/27/21

-The M&E budget has been included in section 2.9 of the ProDoc and in the portal.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared

1/24/2021

Please describe the actual socio-economic benefits to be delivered- increased income, jobs, more inclusion/access by women to productive activities etc.

Agency Response

4/27/21

- Thank you for your comment. Socio-economic benefits have been expanded upon in section 3.3 of the ProDoc.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/21/2021:

Please see follow up comment above on the budget.

5/19/2021:

Budget has been uploaded. Cleared.

5/18/2021:

See comment above on the budget in the portal.

1/24/2021:

No

Agency Response

6/7/2021

A new budget has been uploaded and comments addressed.

5/19/21

Thank you, the comment on the budget has been addressed.

4/27/21

Annexes 11 (Gender Assessment) and 12 (ESMF) are now included in the ProDoc, with links to the relevant documents.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/14/2021:

Adjustments have been made. All cleared.

5/6/2021:

Thank you for the additional information provided. Please see follow up comment under the Core Indicators.

4/29/2021:

Please see comment above re Table B.

1/24/2021

-The targets for sub-indicator 4.1 do not match what is in the Results Framework. Please correct or clarify.

Agency Response

5/13/2021

Thank you for your comment, please see response under the Core Indicators.

5/5/2021

Thank you, this has been clarified.

4/27/21

- Thank you for your comment. This has been corrected.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/14/2021:

Adjustments have been made. All cleared.

5/6/2021:

Thank you for the additional information provided. Please see follow up comment under the Core Indicators.

4/29/2021:

These refer to GEF Secretariat comments at PFD stage and how the project submission has responded to them. Please include.

1/24/2021

No please include.

Agency Response

5/13/2021

Thank you for your comment, please see response under the Core Indicators.

5/5/2021

Responses to GEF Secretariat comments at PFD stage are now included in the Portal submission.

4/27/21

- Comments have been responded to above. Please inform if there are other comments that must be addressed.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/5/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

These refer to Council comments on the PFD at Council Approval stage and how the project submission has responded to them. Please include.

1/24/2021

No please include.

Agency Response

5/5/2021

Responses to Council comments are now included in the Portal submission.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/5/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

These refer to STAP comments on the PFD at Council Approval stage and how the project submission has responded to them. Please include.

1/24/2021

No please include.

Agency Response

5/5/2021

Responses to STAP comments are now included in the Portal submission.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/24/2021

Yes

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/24/2021

Yes

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/25/2021:

All comments on the budget have been addressed.

8/9/2021:

Please see follow up comments on the budget.

8/2/2021:

Follow up comments have been addressed. The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

6/16/2021:

Please see additional follow up comments on the budget.

6/10/2021:

Follow up comments have been addressed. The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

5/21/2021:

Please see follow up comments above on the new uploaded budget.

5/19/2021:

The correct budget has been uploaded. The project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

5/18/2021:

There are follow up comments to be addressed.

5/14/2021:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

5/6/2021:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

4/29/2021:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

1/24/2021

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/25/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/6/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/9/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations