

Building resilience through sustainable land management and climate change adaptation in Dodoma

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10418

Countries

Tanzania

Project Name

Building resilience through sustainable land management and climate change adaptation in Dodoma

Agencies

AfDB

Date received by PM

6/18/2021

Review completed by PM

12/8/2022

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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 The design overall is fine and comprehensive to deliver tangible adaptation benefits and avoiding land degradation.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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 Yes.

Agency Response
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 Yes.

Agency Response
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 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
Core Indicators are not entered in the portal for both LDCF and LD indicators.

The sectoral distribution is not aligned with project design. It doesn't indicate 40% of support for NBS. The focus is more on building standards and infrastructure standards and making them resilient. The Agency is recommended to consider 60% for infrastructure and remaining for water and NRM.

The hazards do not look comprehensive. It only ticks land degradation whereas the project will target flood, drought, water table reduction and climate variability risks.

If the land targeted to avoid LD and to make them climate resilient is the same, please include both numbers in the respective indicators.

Similarly for beneficiaries, please add it in both core indicator 1 of LDCF and core indicator 11 of GEFTF.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB

Core indicators have been entered in the portal for both LDCF and LD indicators.

The sectoral distribution is now more aligned with the project design. In addition, the hazards targeted directly and indirectly by the project have been indicated.

The beneficiaries of the project have also been added.

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

Please some comments:

- Overall the problem is defined well.
- We don't see the Figure 1, and other figures in the portal. Please add. It must be a local file which is linked in the document and so not accessible to us.
- In the adaptation problem section, can you please add more information about projected climate risks which this project will tackle.
- We see drivers of land degradation defined comprehensively in the project. However, drivers for climate vulnerability isn't elaborated. Please add a short description.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB 22 November 2022

-Thank you.

-Missing figures have been reattached.

-More information has been added in the adaptation problem section; it has been highlighted in yellow.

-The drivers of land degradation have been integrated in the adaptation problem section and a table has been added.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Please see below a few comments:

- The language of this entire section is misleading to us. It is written in a form of recommendation instead of what the project will do. e.g. "The determination of which strategies to adopt should be clear and justified. A clear plan for adoption should be produced" This is a misleading sentence which doesn't clearly state that project will do this in

a definite manner. Instead, it should say something like " The project will develop a plan and strategies which is adopted by the city and national governments." There are several such sentences which is confusing and misleading for the GEF Secretariat.

- The project aims to support 2018 Master Plan of Dodoma. Given that it was developed four years back, the project should consider developments which happened during the last four years and not take a straight forward approach to implement whatever the plan is. SO, a more flexible approach to support the Master Plan should be adopted which not only supports implementation of the plan but also strengthens the master plan by integrating climate change adaptation and risks perspectives in the project. In this context, we also suggest to remove the year "2018" in the Table B and output 1.2.

- Output 1.3.3.3 is not clear "conduct integration of in processes". There seems to be a typo in this sentence. It looks incomplete.

- With reference to output "2.2.2 Establish and expand Beekeeping Enterprises" - it is not clear how this activity is linked with the project objective and how it will address climate risks and land degradation challenges which the project focuses on. Please justify or suggest alternatives which are more relevant to this project.

- Output 2.3.1 is not clear in terms of what the project will actually support. Will it supporting mining of any sort? If yes, the LDCF-GEF resources can't be utilized

- Output 2.3.2- The EIA is welcome. Please confirm if social aspects will also be factored in.

- Output 2.3.3- We found this statement too extreme and not aligning with the transformation agenda of the project. **"full rehabilitation of degraded lands will take many years, possibly centuries."** The project could create an enabling environment and pathway for this to happen sooner than in "CENTURIES". Please revise or delete. Also, this entire section is not clear in terms of what the project will support. It rather describes the problems only. If the project can't support these problems, then delete this entire section and the Output 2.3.3.

-Output 3.3.1- we welcome the water balance analysis. We recommend that this analysis could cover broader natural capital accounting also in the Dodoma city, if feasible.

- Output 3.3.4- this is very confusing. Please mention what the project will do. It reads like recommendation of a consultant without stating what the project will actually do. Many sections are like this which has made the overall document quite difficult to review.

- Output 3.3.5- the document shouldn't recommend what the project should do. It should state what it will do with the LDCF and LD resources. I have made this comment earlier also. This applies almost every output in this document e.g. output 3.4 and its sub-outputs, 3.5 and others. In all these, it is not clear what the project will actually do and deliver.

- Same for 3.6.- A sentence says e.g. Wetland maps and other natural resources maps can be prepared from satellite image" From this it is not clear if the project will actually produce this map or does it expect someone else to do this. All sub outputs have similar language.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Please clarify how supporting "Beekeeping enterprises" fits in this project. It is not obvious from the project context and vulnerabilities defined. Output 1.3.3.3 is still not very clear. Please simplify and be a bit more specific.

Please respond to the below questions in the review sheet and how it has been addressed in the project:

- Output 2.3.1 is not clear in terms of what the project will actually support. Will it supporting mining of any sort? If yes, the LDCF-GEF resources can't be utilized

- Output 2.3.2- The EIA is welcome. Please confirm if social aspects will also be factored in.

- Output 2.3.3- We found this statement too extreme and not aligning with the transformation agenda of the project. "full rehabilitation of degraded lands will take many years, possibly centuries." The project could create an enabling environment and pathway for this to happen sooner than in "CENTURIES". Please revise or delete. Also, this entire section is not clear in terms of what the project will support. It rather describes the problems only. If the project can't support these problems, then delete this entire section and the Output 2.3.3.

-Output 3.3.1- we welcome the water balance analysis. We recommend that this analysis could cover broader natural capital accounting also in the Dodoma city, if feasible.

- Output 3.3.4- this is very confusing. Please mention what the project will do. It reads like recommendation of a consultant without stating what the project will actually do. Many sections are like this which has made the overall document quite difficult to review.

- Output 3.3.5- the document shouldn't recommend what the project should do. It should state what it will do with the LDCF and LD resources. I have made this comment earlier also. This applies almost every output in this document e.g. output 3.4 and its sub-outputs, 3.5 and others. In all these, it is not clear what the project will actually do and deliver.

- Same for 3.6.- A sentence says e.g. Wetland maps and other natural resources maps can be prepared from satellite image" From this it is not clear if the project will actually produce this map or does it expect someone else to do this. All sub outputs have similar language.

GEFSEC 29th Nov 2022

Thanks. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB

The alternative scenario section has been substantially revised to address all the comments made on the outputs, including a clarification of the the language in the text.

28 November 2022

Beekeeping

The communities are exerting pressures on land through unsustainable agricultural practices, among other, which are a contributing factor to the degradation of the land. Rehabilitation of land will be difficult is there are no foreseeable advantages to the local community.

Developing benefits within a reasonable time is therefore important. Beekeeping for honey production was expressed by communities during the consultations with communities that took place during the project development phase. Beekeeping is considered an alternative livelihood without heavy start-up capital required and it considered a practice desirable and acceptable to the culture and community and therefore has a higher sustainability and scale-up potential. Beekeeping for honey production does take place in Dodoma, but only on a very small-scale. As one of the numerous alternatively livelihoods proposed in this project, it is expected that providing training, capacity building and some equipment support to small-scale actors will help commercialize the sector and provide jobs to members of the communities (approximately 500 through the project). An initiative will be put in place to help train others, particularly youths, at a later stage (post project completion).

The proposed community-based alternative livelihoods proposed in the project have benefits for minimizing the drivers of land degradation, but also to help the communities build resilience to climate change. These include managing green spaces, establishing nurseries and planting trees, beekeeping

Output 1.3.3.3.

Thank you for this comment. We have revisited this activity and it is not defining a concrete intervention. We have therefore deleted the output 1.3.3.3.

Output 2.3.1

The intention was to introduce more sustainable construction practices, which inevitably would have started with the excavation of building materials, one of the main drivers for land degradation in Dodoma (caused by the rapidly expanding city). However, as it does not align with the LDCF investment framework, we have deleted this output entirely.

Output 2.3.2

We have corrected references to EIA with ESIA. In all cases, it will be an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment that will be carried out.

Output 2.3.3

Thank you for your comment. We agree with this comment. The text has been revised accordingly. The activities under this output include: i) confirmation of lands to be restored; ii) development of detailed plans for restoration produced and implemented.

Output 3.3.1

This is now output 3.2.2.1. Thank you for this comment. The recommendation has been taken on board this activity has been expanded to include natural capital accounting.

Output 3.3.4

This is now output 3.2.2.4. The section has been revised for clarity. The project will determine the cost of actions to improve water balances and increase water supply/ capture. These will be compared with the costs of not taking action and the consequences of water shortage on people, industry and agriculture. The costs of taking action are measurable. The costs of not taking action will be estimated. The cost of actions to reduce demand, increase supply and reduce pollutions will be realistically determined in currency equivalent. This activity will be completed by end of year three.

Output 3.3.5

This is now output 3.2.2.5. The section has been revised as has the whole alternative scenario to articulate clearly what the project will do. This activity will set specific water use reduction targets (in percentages). These targets will be checked against the targets from existing national water efficiency policy to ensure conformity. A written policy statement that ties water efficiency to the long-term operating objective of DMA, will also be prepared

3.6

This is now output 3.2.3.2. The text here and in all other areas have been revised for clarity on what the outputs and activities will actually do. The project will produce the maps.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

No. The adaptation benefits are not elaborated. There is a detailed analysis of CO₂ sequestered even though it is not identified as a core indicator in the indicator table CI 6. If CO₂ reduction is a core objective, either include it in the core indicator table with CCM RM as 1, or just reference to CO₂ reduction more as a co-benefit instead of elaborating it in such details. This section should elaborate the adaptation and LD benefits in more details.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB 22 November 2022

Adaptation benefits have been elaborated further and highlighted in yellow.

CO₂ reduction is only considered as a co-benefit ; therefore, this section has been reduced.

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

The section on sustainability reads very conceptual and theoretical. It doesn't specifically say what activities of the project will deliver long term, durable and sustainable benefits for the vulnerable communities and ecosystem. Please revise.

Same applies for the potential for scaling up. There is nothing concrete which says how the project will support scaling up of the benefits.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB

The section on sustainability has been revised in yellow highlights in order to make it more concrete and relevant to the project. The potential for scale-up is also further developed and detailed.

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

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

NA

Agency Response

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

Please add a summary of the stakeholder consultation in the portal also and make a reference to name of the file which is attached with the CEO ER submission.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB

A summary of the stakeholder consultations has been added with a reference to the relevant stakeholder report.

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

Please provide a summary in the portal and make a reference to the specific document which is attached with the portal submission.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB

A summary of the gender analysis has been added with a reference to the relevant gender report.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes, however, the document has missed to include a detailed COVID context, risk and green/resilient recovery analysis as recommended by GEF Secretariat. Please include an analysis which covers the following:

- The COVID context in the project's region
- Risks associated with the pandemic and mitigation strategies
- How the project will deliver adaptation and environmental benefits that can support green and resilient recovery.

In addition to COVID analysis as above, please also add a short climate risk analysis. This can include climate risk on project activities, how the project will mitigate these risks and how the project will contribute to building climate resilience.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Thanks. Please add the climate risk analysis.

GEFSEC 29 November, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB

A COVID context, risk and green/resilient recovery analysis has been added in the "risks" section of the CEO Endorsement package. Links were made with how the project will bring further benefits in that regard, including delivering adaptation and environmental benefits supporting green and resilient recovery.

AfDB 29/11/2022

A climate risk analysis has been added.

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

The Table under section 6 is not readable. Please paste it again.

More importantly, it doesn't answer the question in the template. We would like to see how the project will be implemented and its institutional arrangement.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB

The "coordination" section has been substantially revised, with a more detailed description of the implementation arrangements in combination with the AfDB co-financed ring-road project.

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

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

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 13, 2022

The CEO Endorsement submission has a number of sections not filled or elaborated. In particular, please elaborate in details all the sections of 1a. These sections need to be elaborated further building on the PIF submission. Without this detail, it will not be feasible to do a detailed review of the project.

Please also fill up the core indicators of the LDCF and GEF TF, since it's a multi-trust fund project.

Annex E is also missing. Please paste the budget table in Annex E.

In the response to comments from GEFSEC, STAP and Council (Annex B), please classify them clearly. It is not clear which are STAP's comments and which are from GEFSEC and Council's.

In the map, please provide the country map and location of the intervention region along with coordinates.

Annex C PPG utilization is also not filled up.

Please review the entire submission again and resubmit the full package for detailed review.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

GEFSEC 6 December, 2022

Please address the following additional comments from PPO

1. Environmental and Social Safeguards: We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and AfDB attached the Environment and Social Report. The Environment and Social Report indicates potential economic displacement (resettlement) due to the project (page 7, Table 6; page 10, Table 7; page 12, para 2.4 and 2.5). However, there is not clear about mitigation measures and risk management plan with budget to address these risks. Please ask Agencies to elaborate further 1) when an Environmental and Social Impact Reports including an environmental and social management plan and monitoring plan will be produced, 2) what is the process of consultations with local affected communities, and 3) what is the budget for the Environmental and Social Impact Reports, its implementation, and required training and capacity building mentioned in the Environment and Social Report (page 24, para 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10).

Note: The project PIF has been approved on December 19, 2019 after the Policy on ESS had been effective.

2. Gender: In addition to the gender analysis presented in Section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, Agency is requested to reflect gender perspectives in the project description itself, including in the description of project components and outputs. The annexed gender report has all the elements but these have to be incorporated in the project document itself as a recommended gender mainstreaming practice in project design.

3. Core Indicators:

a. The target under core Indicator 4 (Area of landscapes under improved practices) is missing in the annex A. Core Indicators targets need to be aligned with Project's Results Framework (Annex A). GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A.

b. The target under core indicator 11 is missing in the core indicator table and also in the results framework (annex A). It is mandatory to provide this target at the CEO endorsement stage.

4. Stakeholder Engagement: The project provides a detailed stakeholder analysis in DMA. However, the stakeholder report does not clearly outline a plan for stakeholder engagement in project implementation, including means of engagement, dissemination of information, roles and responsibilities. Please ask Agency to elaborate further the plan to engage the different project stakeholders.

5. Expected Implementation Start Date has long past ? as it is, the elapsed between implementation start and completion date is not 48 months ? please ask the Agency to amend both ?the implementation start / completion date and the elapsed time between these two dates?.

6. Compared with the amounts approved at PIF stage, LDCF funding at CEO endorsement

increased by 6% from \$3,759,000 to \$3,992,658 (similar changes of additional 6% is observed at the Agency Fee Level with an increase of \$22,198). As GEF-7 was already closed, this increase is allowed. Please ask the Agency to amend by including the figures approved at PIF stage.

7. On the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 3.6%, for a co-financing of \$134,940,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$3,748,333 instead of \$3,060,000 (which is 2.0%). 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, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion:

8. Table 3, 4 and some maps under Project Description is off margin. Annex A Project Results Framework is off margin. Please ask the Agency to amend ? otherwise these tables will not be readable when the document is web posted.

9. Budget table: Project Manager and other project staff is charged to the project components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project?s execution should be charged to the GEF and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC but not to project components ? this includes the project?s staff. Please note that there is room to increase the PMC up to 5.0% to cover these positions (in which case, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC has to be increased proportionally ? see comment 7 above) ? with this + the co-financing resources allocated to PMC, there will be enough fund to cover the project?s staff

GEFSEC 8th December, 2022

Thanks. Comments cleared.

GEFSEC 11 December, 2022- Please address the following two comments and resubmit the project

- Stakeholder Engagement: the comment on stakeholder engagement is not reflected in the review sheet, neither there is any evidence that the comment has been addressed.

- Core Indicators: The targets for core indicators are still missing in the results framework (annex A).

GEFSEC 12 December, 2022- Thanks. Comments are cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB - 21 November 2022

- The CEO Endorsement package is completed with all sections filled in.
- The Core indicators sheet for both LDCF and GEFTF have been filled in.
- Annex E was added, along with the budget table.
- Clarification has been added in addressing GEFSEC, STAP and Council comments in Annex B.
- A country map was also added.
- Annex C with PPG utilization has been filled up.

AfDB, 7 December 2022

1. This comment has been taken into consideration. There was a misunderstanding as the resettlement concerns the Ring-Road baseline project and not the GEF project. The Ring-Road project contains a Resettlement Action plan of tentative 7.4 million USD. Therefore, any reference to resettlement has been removed from the GEF project.
2. The project outputs and activities have been revised and updated to include the activities described in the gender action plan in the project's gender report. Kindly see the highlighted text in green in the updated alternative scenario section of the CEO Endorsement document
3. The indicators have been added. Thank you.
4. The stakeholder section has been updated to provide clear information and outline about the stakeholder engagement activities to take place during the project implementation, including the roles and responsibilities, means of engagement, areas of engagement. Kindly see the revised sections highlighted in green in the portal.
5. Thank you. The implementation and completion dates have been modified.
6. Thank you. Figures were amended to reflect those approved at PIF stage for the LD focal area and LDCF.
7. Thank you. The co-financing portion has been increased so that it is proportional to the GEF PMC contributions.
8. Thank you, the designated tables and maps have been amended and reviewed to ensure these are not off margin.
9. Thank you, the Project Manager and other project staff costs have been charged to the PMC column and the PMC has been increased to 5%.

AfDB, 12 December

The indicators have been added in Annex A and highlighted in yellow.

On Stakeholders, the following response was added on 7 December "The stakeholder section has been updated to provide clear information and outline about the stakeholder engagement activities to take place during the project implementation, including the roles and responsibilities, means of engagement, areas of engagement. Kindly see the revised sections highlighted in green in the portal". A few further revisions were made to the stakeholder engagement plan table, which are highlighted in a darker **green**.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not clear if responses are provided. The table in Annex B is not clear.

16 Nov 2022

We see a table which describes how comments are addressed. However, it is not clear whose comments are these. Please classify the comments in terms of GEFSEC, Council and STAP.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Please address this comment.

Agency Response

AfDB 29/11/2022

Council comments have been added and were addressed in Annex B.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not clear if responses are provided to STAP's comments.

GEFSEC 16th Nov- See comment above.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022

Please address this comment.

Agency Response
AfDB 29/11/2022

Council comments have been added and were addressed in Annex B.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Not provided

GEFSEC 16th Nov- Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response
AfDB

The status of PPG utilization as been provided.
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please provide more details of the project description (Part II) by elaborating further from the information provided in PIF. Please paste the budget table in the portal Annex E. Also attach the core indicators and detailed responses to comments from the STAP.

January 13, 2022 (please also see these comments above under GEF Secretariat Comments box and provide a response there)

Not yet. The CEO Endorsement submission has a number of sections not filled or elaborated. In particular, please fill all the sections of 1a. These sections need to be elaborated further building on the PIF submission. Without this detail, it will not be feasible to do a detailed review of the project.

Please also fill up the core indicators of the LDCF and GEF TF, since it's a multi-trust fund project.

Annex E is also missing. Please paste the budget table in Annex E.

In the response to comments from GEFSEC, STAP and Council (Annex B), please classify them clearly. It is not clear which are STAP's comments and which are from GEFSEC and Council's.

In the map, please provide the country map and location of the intervention region along with coordinates.

Annex C PPG utilization is also not filled up.

Please review the entire submission again and resubmit the full package for detailed review.

16th November- Not yet. Please address the comments and resubmit the project ASAP to avoid cancellation.

GEFSEC 23 November, 2022- Please address additional comments.

GEFSEC 29 November, 2022- Yes, the project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

GEFSEC 6 December, 2022- Please address additional comments inserted under "GEF Secretariat Comments" question above in the review sheet. Please respond to the questions also in the Agency response box.

GEFSEC 6 December, 2022- All comments have been addressed and the project is recommended.

GEFSEC 11 December, 2022- Please address the following two comments and resubmit the project

- Stakeholder Engagement: the comment on stakeholder engagement is not reflected in the review sheet, neither there is any evidence that the comment has been addressed.
- Core Indicators: The targets for core indicators are still missing in the results framework (annex A).

GEFSEC 12 December, 2022- Yes, the project is recommended for CEO endorsement. The comments have been addressed.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/10/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/13/2022	

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/16/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/23/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/29/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The multi-trust fund (LDCF + LD) project "Building resilience through sustainable land management and climate change adaptation in Dodoma", Tanzania aims to advance integrated approach for reducing pressures on the city's critical infrastructure, environmental and urban assets and increasing the city's climate resilience through integrated urban development planning for climate change adaptation and sustainable land management. The project will support mainstreaming climate change adaptation and interventions for reduction of land degradation in the urban growth of Dodoma city leading to sound and resilient urban development planning at the local and national levels. The city is highly vulnerable to extreme flooding and droughts and through the interventions such as urban land use planning, flood risk mapping and standards development, the project will enable national and city level institutions to tackle these vulnerabilities. The project will also support coordination and communication between sectoral ministries and agencies for adequate knowledge generation and management, and overall advance an integrated approach for reducing pressures on the city's critical infrastructure, environmental and urban assets. The project will also strengthen early warning systems, support implementation of land and water conservation measures, promote alternate livelihoods that reduce pressure on land and improve adaptive capacity, support groundwater recharge and promote nature based solutions in the Dodoma city of Tanzania. These activities will be complemented by a dedicated knowledge management component which will be delivered in partnership with local academic, research and other knowledge management institutions. The project will be co-financed by a 138 million USD loan from AfDB which aims to improve urban infrastructure of the city. The 5.8 million grant from LDCF and LD FA, will lead to improved land management of 75,000 hectares and strengthen resilience of nearly 1.2 million residents with 50% being women. The project has also factored in COVID related risks and opportunities to contribute to green and resilient recovery through interventions which can lead to improved basic urban services such as water supply and mobility, and create new economic opportunities. The Agency has addressed all the comments raised by Council Members and STAP satisfactorily and therefore the project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

