



Sustainable Restoration and Conservation of Malagarasi ? Moyowosi Wetland Ecosystem through an Integrated Approach

Review PPG Request and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11769

Countries

Tanzania

Project Name

Sustainable Restoration and Conservation of Malagarasi ? Moyowosi Wetland Ecosystem through an Integrated Approach

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

11/1/2024

Review completed by PM

12/10/2024

Program Manager

Razan Nimir

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

GBFF

GEF-8 Project Preparation Grant request Review Sheet

I. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GBFF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

RN 12/11/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

II. Indicative Project Overview

a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective?

Secretariat's Comments

RN 12/11/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

c) Are the components adequately funded?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional (only for Multi-trust Funds PPGs with BD from the GEF Trust Fund)?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for projects of more than \$2 million or 10% for projects of less than \$2 million? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

RN 12/11/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

III. Project Rationale

a. Does the project adequately describe the: (i) current situation/baseline conditions within the project geographic area or project thematic area; (ii) problem(s) that the project will address; (iii) goal and objectives of the project; and (iv) justification for the project intervention; and (v) expected results including the Global Environmental Benefits and an estimate of the project's contributions to the relevant biodiversity core indicators.

Secretariat's Comments

RN 12/11/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

IV. Project Description

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the project components and activities identified in the theory of change adequately described.

c) Is a list of stakeholders that will be involved in the project and their roles in the design and implementation of the project provided?

d) Are the Specific Action Area(s) that the project is aligned with identified and an explanation provided on and how the project will support the achievement of the specific Action Area objective(s).

Secretariat's Comments

RN 12/11/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

V. Does the proposal adequately describe how the project meets the following criteria:

- a) Potential to generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) (include a description of the GEBs the project will generate per the GEF-8 Core Indicators for biodiversity);**
- b) Alignment with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and/or National Biodiversity Finance Plans or similar instruments to identify national and/or regional priorities;**
- c) The level of policy coherence and coordination across multiple ministries, agencies, the private sector, and civil society that the project aims to support;**
- d) Whether the project will mobilize the resources of the private sector and philanthropies'; and**
- e) Whether and how the project will engage with and provide support to IPLCs.**

Secretariat's Comments

RN 12/11/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

VI. Project results indicators

Is the table correctly populated and consistent with the Project Description?

Secretariat's Comments

RN 12/11/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

VII. Project Financing Tables

- a) Are all the tables correctly populated?**

b) Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines (only for projects with GEF TF components)?

Secretariat's Comments

RN 12/11/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

VIII. Project Endorsement

a) Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) OFP and has the OFP at the time of PPG request submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

RN 11/25/2024

In order for this submission to be further considered in the 3rd GBFF selection round, please address the following comment: Executing Partner in Portal doesn't match that in LoE ? please amend the information in Portal to match that in LoE (executing partner can be modified during project preparation).

RN 12/11/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: 26 November 2024

We would like to apologies for the mismatch in the LoE and portal information relating to the executing partners. We have updated the portal with all the executing partner (s) names (Vice Presidents Office, Ministry of Natural Resources; and Ministry of Environment) as reflected in the LoE and updated the PPG request form as well.

IX. GEFSEC Decision

a. Is the PPG recommended for technical clearance?

b. Additional comments to be considered by the Agency during project preparation

Secretariat's Comments

RN 11/25/2024

Thank you for this submission. In order for this submission to be further considered in the selection round, please address the comments included in this review sheet and resubmit as soon as possible.

RN 12/10/2024

The financing tables include cents, which cannot be committed by the Trustee. Please remove the cents and keep rounded numbers.

RN 12/11/2024

This PPG request is recommended for clearance.

During project preparation, please consider the following:

- **IPLC**: ensure that the entire amount reported as ?amount to support action by IPLCs [for] biodiversity? in the CEO endorsement requests corresponds to project activities supporting action by IPLCs, and that the project documentation describes the IPLCs who will benefit from the project and details their role in the project. Activities where IPLCs are mere beneficiaries should not be counted in this amount. Support to stakeholders that are not IPLCs (i.e. indigenous peoples or local communities that embody traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity) should not be counted either. Whether the project as a whole or certain project activities support action by IPLCs could entail a number of circumstances including but not limited to: IPLCs directly receive resources through the GEF agency for execution of project components/activities; IPLCs lead the design and management of some project activities but do not manage financial resources; the project provides in-kind support to actions led by IPLCs for biodiversity, etc.

- **Alternative Livelihood interventions**: Component 2 is planning to work on alternative livelihoods, when the literature suggests that permanent shifts are often difficult to achieve and evidence supporting the effectiveness of this approach is limited. Please refer to dedicated STAP guidance (<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/background-note/alternative-livelihoods>) and carefully assess whether alternative livelihoods are the most appropriate intervention to deliver global environmental benefits in the specific context of this project, noting the limitations and challenges of this approach. If they are maintained in the design, develop a

theory of change with explicit pathways for achieving project outcomes through alternative livelihood activities, including clearly identifying and testing assumptions to ensure that the proposed activities are likely to support benefits for globally significant biodiversity. Please also design so as to identify and quantify durable environmental benefits arising from alternative livelihood interventions

- **Protected area management:** The project is to contribute to improved management effectiveness of more than 3 million hectare of protected areas. However, the current design seems limited to development of management plans, capacity building and provision of equipment with a budget for component 1 limited to \$1.7 million. During PPG, please carry out a detailed baseline analysis of the barriers to adequate protected area management and develop interventions that will address them in a systemic and durable manner. Please notably consider increasing the budget for interventions related to protected areas, consider adding interventions related to sustainable financing of protected areas, and pay attention to the institutionalization of all capacity building interventions

- **Component 2:** please provide detailed information on the specific types of restoration activities planned and explain how these activities will be designed to generate benefits for biodiversity of globally significance. Also, please make sure these activities are aligned with the allocated budget for this component.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response: 26 November 2024

We would like to appreciate your review comments which have been addressed in the portal and updated in the PPG request as guided. The change in the PPG request on executing partners is highlighted in GREEN.

Review Dates

	PPG Request Review	Agency Response
First Review	11/25/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		