

Building the resilience of forest biodiversity to the threats of climate change in Tanzania's Nature Forest Reserves

Basic Information

GEF ID

10690

Countries

Tanzania

Project Title

Building the resilience of forest biodiversity to the threats of climate change in Tanzania's Nature Forest Reserves

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6544

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. The proposed PIF proposes an innovative way to consider PA development and management, not only to protect global important biodiversity, but to reduce climate risks.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Output 1.2.1: Please explain the additionality of this output. It seems that all activities are financed by the GEF.

Output 1.2.2: at least at PPG, if not possible at PIF level, we would like to see further explanation on the multiple stakeholder dialogue that should take place around each NFR, notably the legal, regulatory, and institutional anchorage.

Output 2.1.1: Please explain the additionality of this output. The GEF seems the only financing partner. Moreover, these activities under this output are only possible if they basically contribute to reduce the pressures on the Nature Forest Reserves. Please, reinforce the

demonstration, if possible with scientific references or similar experiences in the country.

Output 2.1.2: same observation. It seems that the GEF is the only partner, financing all activities from scratch (basic infrastructure, road systems, footpath network, energy, waste management, basic visitor infrastructure). What about the sustainability of these infrastructures once the project will have closed).

Output 2.1.3: same observation. The GEF seems the only financing partner.

October 16, 2020

Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response on 10 October 2020

Additional text has been inserted into the PIF to respond to each comment above, as follows:

Output 1.2.1 (p. 17 in PIF): The TFS will continue to finance the development and maintenance of a basic staff complement (4 to 16 staff, depending on the reserve), an office (1), ranger-outpost infrastructure (1- 4 outposts), a vehicle pool (1 to 4 vehicles) and equipment (various) in each of the project-targeted NFRs. GEF funding will supplement this baseline investment to ensure that that staff in each NFR have enhanced operational capacities [as further described on page 17].

Output 1.2.2. (p 17 of PIF): Effective communication with local-level stakeholders around each NFR will be channeled through existing community forums and structures that have legitimacy (mandate) and credibility (such as District and Ward Development Councils, Village Councils, and Village Natural Resource Committees). Participatory development of Reserve Management Plans will enable regular dialogue with forest-adjacent communities through Reserve Management Committees (on which women, youth and other vulnerable groups will be equitably represented), and formal mechanisms for collaboration and coordination will be captured in co-management agreements (MoUs) set up under.

(Please note that an explanation of the GEF additionality under this Output has also been added to the PIF: The GEF investment will be additional to support for operational activities in NFRs provided through annual OPEX allocations by the TFS, investment mobilized through the TaFF, and loan funding from the World Bank-IDA REGROW project for southern circuit reserves).

Output 2.1.1. (p. 18). TFS is currently establishing the staff capacity and budget required to develop tourism infrastructure and solicit greater private sector interest and investment in NFRs, and increase the marketing of ecotourism opportunities, as a means of improving financial revenue streams to supplement the costs of the long-term protection and management of the NFR network and to increase benefit-sharing opportunities with local communities (to incentivize reduction of existing threats to NFRs). Under Output 2.1.1, the TFS has, to date, already invested in the development of Investment Plans for 10 other NFRs, with incremental roll-out of the implementation of these plans programmed over the next 5-10 years. The GEF support for development of Investment Plans for the nine targeted NFRs in this project, will, therefore be incremental to the baseline contributions by TFS, and will contribute to ensuring that all NFRs in Tanzania will have an Investment Plan in place to guide their business planning.

Output 2.1.2, (p. 18): While the targeted NFRs already maintain a basic system of infrastructure (e.g. road and footpath network) and bulk services (e.g. water supply, waste disposal, electricity supply) in each reserve, funded through CAPEX and OPEX allocations, this is currently

not geared to tourism or recreational use and the existing infrastructure will become severely overloaded in the case of an increase in visitor numbers. The additionality of the GEF investment in infrastructure and bulk services in the targeted NFRs will, therefore, lie in upgrading the existing infrastructure and services to enable the NFRs to unleash their full economic potential. GEF investments will be supplemented by cofinance committed by the TaFF and loan finance secured through the REGROW project for southern circuit forest reserves.

Output 2.1.3 (p.19): GEF support will build on the annual training program for TFS staff already being delivered through the Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation (Sokoine University of Agriculture), the College of African Wildlife Management, Olmotonyi Forestry Training Institute, the Forestry Industry Training Institute and the Tanzania National College of Tourism.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The cofinancing is described.

- However, the loan and grant amounts from the WB and the German government (\$200,000) seem surprising. Please, confirm.

- We take note of the cofinancing from TFS, VPO, TFF. Please, confirm this cofinancing (in-kind, in grant, in public investment) is significantly involved in the component 1 and 2. Several outputs appear very basic and may not preferably be financed by the GEF. Please, confirm.

October 16, 2020

Again, it is surprising from a \$150 million IDA support to only retain \$200,000 as cofinancing of this project. The comment is also valid for the \$200,000 from the German cooperation. To be confirmed at PPG.

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response 10 October, 2020

- (i) The loan and grant amounts from World Bank-IDA and the German Government are confirmed at these conservative values. The World Bank investment mobilized (\$200,000) represents only a portion of the total investment of \$150 M in strengthening operational capacity in Tanzania's Southern Circuit Reserves - which may include a few of the targeted forest reserves. The investment mobilized from the German Government also represents a portion of the grant to the GoT to support its NAD, taking onto account those activities can will be realistically

identified as contributing to realization of the project outcomes and objective. Since the latter grant agreement is still being finalize, the decision was taken to peg the cofinance from this source conservatively, though it is expected that at CEO ER high amounts will be committed.

- (ii) Cofinance from the TFS, VPO and TaFF will be significantly involved in delivery of outcomes under Components 1 and 2, as described above - see ITEM 2 - , and now also in the PIF, (pages 17 to 19)

In addition, Delivery of Output 3.1.1. will build on and align with parallel initiatives supported through the VPO (e.g. the *Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Tanzania's Planning Processes* project, among others), EAMCEF (various applied research projects related to the impacts of climate change on forest biodiversity in the Eastern Arc Mountains and strengthening the resilience of forest-based livelihoods), WWF ROA (e.g. the Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative in Africa), and technical support provided through agencies such as TFCG.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes, the \$150,000 PPG is under the cap for a project under \$6 million.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The indicators are justified and explained.

However, please clarify the carbon calculations: on which basis can you estimate a deforestation pressure under 5% (even 2%)? It seems very ambitious. Please, justify.

October 14, 2020

Thanks for the adjustments on carbon calculation.

Thanks for the adjustments from 1.1. to 1.2 following additional exchanges by email.

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: 10 October 2020

Carbon calculations: explanation

Considering the comment from the reviewer, the EXACT calculations have been revised to achieve a more modest target of a *7% reduction* in the loss of forest cover in the targeted reserves, based largely on loss driven largely by uncontrolled fires, and exacerbated by various resource/land-use practices. A more detailed explanation has been provided in the body of the PIF (pages 7 & 8), and the assumptions underpinning the carbon calculations have been detailed in Annex F to the PIF. Table F and the Core Indicator Worksheet have also been amended accordingly.

The revised target under Core Indicator 6, using the FAO Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool now stands at 1,142,870 t/ceq. The total area of the forest reserves is 219,209 ha, of which about 12% is impacted annually by uncontrolled fires - although the data for losses caused by fire are limited, at least some data and trends are available (See FAO, 2013; globalforestwatch.org and several other publications - now cited in the PIF). Five of the nine targeted NFRs occur in the regions that are among the most heavily-impacted by fire in Tanzania (Pwani, Lindi, Mtwara and Ruvuma) and also contain dry, lowland forest types (in a mosaic with woodlands and montane forest patches) that are fire-prone. With the project's focus on integrated fire management, removal of IAS and other activities to enhance forest health and connectivity (thereby reducing vulnerability through edge-effects), the aim is to reduce the extent of forest cover impacted in the targeted reserves from the current average of 12% (26,305ha) to 5% (10,960 ha), and the fire interval from an average of 4 to 10 years. The EXACT default values for dry forest types (Forest Type 2) were used, and calculations were based on a 20 year accounting period (6 years implementation, 14 years capitalization), and an anticipated start year for GHG-benefit accounting of 2022.

Given that there is currently a paucity of accurate baseline data for the targeted NFRs (relating to extent and coverage of different forest types, biomass values, number, size and frequency of fires, and other relevant parameters), the target for Indicator 6 will be recalculated using the FAO Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool during the PPG phase.

Core Indicator1:

Please also note that there was an entry-error in the GEF portal for the ha of protected areas under improved management - these should have been entered under Core Indicator 1.2 - this has been corrected in the GEF portal with the re-submission and has been clarified in the narrative under Table F in the PIF.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Please, confirm and justify the following keywords: fisheries?

October 14, 2020

Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: 10 October 2020

This is an entry error and has been corrected in the GEF Portal and Table G

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not fully.

The climate screening guidance from STAP is mentioned and will be further developed at PPG.

However, some basic elements of description are lacking:

- Climate data, climate projections are needed to define the notion of climate risk, define the notion of vulnerability, and justify institutional arrangements, capacity building activities and field interventions. Examples of potential consequences would be welcome. Please, complete. It should not be difficult as UNDP supported the NDC in Tanzania.

October 14, 2020

Additional information is provided: Data and projections are available. The reasoning is better documented to figure the logics: climate risks > hazards > exposure (vulnerability) > impacts on natural habitats and species > measures to improve habitat management and ecological connectivity in view to reduce vulnerability and risks.

Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response; 10 October 2020

Please note the inclusion of an expanded climate risk assessment under Item 5.1 (following the framework outlined in the STAP climate-screening guidance document) which includes climate data and climate projections, which define the identified climate risks and vulnerabilities and provide the justification for the institutional arrangements, capacity building activities and field interventions proposed in the project. Examples of potential consequences are provided, with reference to published data - see pages 29 & 30 of the PIF and Table 2 - Risks.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

There is a logical reasoning, based on assumptions. We can see the pathways for change. The diagram and explanations are much welcome.

Thanks.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the project is aligned with BD2.7.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

On one hand, the reasoning is logical and makes sense. On the other hand, some parts of the result framework seem only supported by the GEF, and do not appear additional. See item I.2.

October 14, 2020

Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: 10 October 2020

A more detailed explanation of GEF additionality has been provided under the descriptions of Outputs (see pages 17 - 19 of the PIF and under Part I, Items 2 and 3 above) to demonstrate how cofinance will contribute to all aspects of the results framework

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. to be confirmed for carbon.

October 16, 2020

You focused the demonstration of GEBs on the indicators 1 (protected areas) and 6 (carbon). At PPG and then at CEO endorsement, please think to include the 9,000 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (core indicator 4.1). To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: 10 October 2020

Please see the adjustment to the target for carbon (as detailed under Part 1, Item 6, above and amended in the PIF under the description of Core Indicator 6, pages 7 and 8). The revised target for carbon is now set at 1,142,870t/c

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

There is indeed a potential for innovation and scaling up. Please, clarify the sustainability aspects.

October 16, 2020

Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: 10 October

Sustainability aspects have been clarified further in the PIF on the following pages:

Component 2, page 17/18:

The excellent financial management capabilities of TFS and the opportunities for investment and revenue-generation from NFRs, lay a strong foundation for financial sustainability of the NFR network. The Project Terminal Evaluation Report for the GEF-financed, UNDP-supported project '*Enhancing the Forest Nature Reserves Network for Biodiversity Conservation in Tanzania*' (2020) recommended that TFS should identify and test a range of alternative opportunities (beyond the current focus on tourism concessioning under a PPP modality) for potential revenue generation by NFRs. Diversifying income streams for NFRs will also contribute to reducing risk from external shocks, such as the decline in tourism as a result of COVID-19, on visitor revenues.

Component 2 has been designed to respond to this recommendation, and the post-COVID-19 opportunity for contributing to recovery of the sector and strengthening long-term resilience through diversification of revenue streams.

TFS is currently establishing the staff capacity and budget required to develop tourism infrastructure and solicit greater private sector interest and investment in NFRs, and increase the marketing of ecotourism opportunities, as a means of improving financial revenue streams to supplement the costs of the long-term protection and management of the NFR network and to increase benefit-sharing opportunities with local communities (to incentivize the reduction of existing threats to NFRs).

Sustainability, p.23:

The sustainability of project investments in infrastructure development and bulk services will be secured by ring-fencing a proportion of the income from the commercial use of NFRs for re-investment back into the ongoing maintenance of these facilities and services.

Sustainability aspects will also be further elaborated at PPG.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

During the PPG, please, explore potential synergies with the GEF project developed by FAO under the GEF7 Impact Program on Sustainable Drylands Landscapes: "Integrated Landscape Management in Dry Miombo Woodlands of Tanzania".

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Partially.

The section on gender is fine, but we regret that the PIF does not systematically mainstream principles and activities against inequalities between male and females in the rest of the project document. To be improved.

At PPG level, we suggest looking at the tools developed under the Resilient Food Systems Program (IAP on Food Security) and connect with the Tanzania project.

October 16, 2020

Addressed. Please, when we raised this point on gender, it was not our intent to focus much on the need for disaggregated data between male and female: the strategic question is how this project will contribute to fight inequalities between male and female on different aspects addressed in this project (representativeness in decision bodies, agriculture, landscape restoration, access to project resources, access to land, etc.).

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: 10 October 2020

Activities to address gender inequalities have been described more specifically throughout the PIF (as described below), and the relationship of general principles and measures described under the section in the PIF on Gender Equality and Empowerment (see Part II, Item 3, page 25) and delivery of specific project outputs has been made explicit.

Please note the following amendments in the pIF:
Table B: additions marked in yellow)

Outcome 1.1, Indicator (i):(with gender disaggregated targets to be developed at PPG)

Outcome 1.1, Indicator (iii):.....(with gender considerations built into targets during PPG)

Output 1.2.1:- gender disaggregated targets for staff training to be developed at PPG

Output 2.1.3:.....- gender-disaggregated targets for staff training to be developed at PPG

Outcome 2.2, Indicator (ii):(with targets for involvement of women, youth and other vulnerable groups in income-generating activities developed during PPG)

Output 3.2.1:with women's participation in M&E secured as per the project's Gender Action Plan

In the project narrative, Part I, Item 3, starting page16), the following statements have been added:

Under Output 1.1.1, p. 16: The project's Gender Action Plan will include measures for ensuring that the interests of women, youth and other vulnerable groups in reserve-adjacent villages are adequately represented on reserve management committees and are actively involved in the implementation of joint forest management activities.

Under Output 1.2.1, p.17: Guided by the project's Gender Action Plan, specific attention will be given to optimizing opportunities for women, especially youth (of working age) to be employed, trained and equipped as forest rangers and forest guards

Under Output 1.2.2, p. 17: Much of the success under this output will lie in the stakeholder dialogue that will take place around each NFR, including legal, regulatory and institutional anchorage. Effective communication with local-level stakeholders around each NFR will be channelled through existing community forums and structures that have legitimacy (mandate) and credibility (such as District and Ward Development Councils, Village Councils, and Village Natural Resource Committees). Participatory development of Reserve Management

Plans will enable regular dialogue with forest-adjacent communities through Reserve Management Committees (on which women, youth and other vulnerable groups will be equitably represented), and formal mechanisms for collaboration and coordination will be captured in co-management agreements (MoUs).

Under Output 2.1.2, p.19: The project will actively promote engagement of women and youth (of working age) as supervisors, technicians, artisans and labourers in project-supported construction, maintenance, and conservation works undertaken in the NFRs, and will ensure that women-owned or managed businesses participate equitably in supply of equipment and materials for infrastructure upgrades.

Under Outcome 2.2, P.19: Under both Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2, the project's Gender Action Plan (to be developed during PPG) will set targets to ensure that women within TFS and from forest-adjacent communities benefit equitably from project-funded training and capacity development programmes, and that they are able to participate fully in NFR-based revenue-generation activities.

Under Output 3.1.2, p.20: Measures will be taken to engage women in the collection of baseline and end-of-project socio-economic, bio-physical and land use data (as per the project's Gender Action Plan, which will be developed during the PPG phase, based on a rapid social assessment - see Item 3: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment).

On page 25, the specific outputs under which targets for delivering gender-benefits will be set have been added (see below, highlighted):

- Ensuring that the Reserve Management Plans and Reserve Investment Plans (project Outputs 1.1.1 and 2.1.1) include strategies and activities that will enable and finance the equitable involvement of men and women in the implementation of the plans.
- Actively encouraging the equitable use of women labour and supervisors from reserve-adjacent villages in project-supported construction, maintenance and conservation works undertaken in NFRs (Outputs 1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 2.1.2).
- Optimising opportunities for the employment, training and equipping of women as forest guards and forest rangers (Output 1.2.1).
- Ensuring that women-owned and/or managed businesses participate equitably in the development of income-generating opportunities in NFRs (Output 2.2.3).
- Ensuring that the reach of project-funded training and capacity development programs will include women and women-headed households from reserve-adjacent villages (Outputs 1.2.1 and 2.1.3).
- Advocating for an increase in the number of women involved in the collection of baseline and end-of-project socio-economic, bio-physical and land use data (Component 3, Output 3.1.2).
- Collaborating with the project-contracted businesses to continually develop and implement mechanisms which may further strengthen the capacities of women and women-headed households in reserve-adjacent villages (Component 2).
- Ensuring that the interests of women and women-headed households in reserve-adjacent villages are adequately represented on reserve management committees and are actively involved in the development and implementation of PFM agreements (Outcome 1, Output 1.1.1 and 1.1.2).
- Wherever possible, procuring professional, technical and management services from suitably qualified and experienced female national consultants and women-owned businesses (all outputs).
- Ensuring that women-owned and/or managed businesses participate equitably in the procurement of project-funded equipment, technical services and infrastructure (all outputs).

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Risks related to the COVID-19 situation are partially included. However, we would like a more systemic way of addressing these risks. Please, check the GEF guidelines (<https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>.) and provide elements related to the following points: 1) Describe how the pandemic is affecting the country and the selected landscapes and how they will be dealt in the context of generating GEBs; 2) Describe how risks from COVID-19 have been analyzed and mitigation strategies incorporated in the design, and 3) Describe how the project has identified potential opportunities to mitigate impacts, if any, to deliver GEBs, resilience benefits, and contribute to green recovery and building back better.
- See above the comment on climate risks and the need for data, description, analysis, projections, examples, and mitigation measures.

October 16, 2020

Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: 10 October 2020

Section 5 of the PIF (Risks) has been expanded substantially to include a more detailed analysis of the risks related to COVID-19 and climate (see pages 26 to 36).

With regard to COVID-19 (Sect. 5.2 of the PIF, starting page 30) a description is provided of how the pandemic is affecting the country, the generalized socio-economic impacts and specific risks this poses in the project landscapes (with reference to the best-available published data), risks to project implementation (with mitigation measures described in Table 3, under Part 11, Section 5.2), and a description of opportunities for the project to mitigate negative COVID-19 impacts and still deliver GEBs, with a focus on: (i) Protection and restoration of forest ecosystems, including through promoting sustainable use of forest resources and limiting forest fragmentation and degradation through inappropriate land uses; (ii) Promoting NRM practices that generate GEBs and resilience to climate change, with ancillary benefits for forest adjacent communities; (iii) Innovating climate change mitigation and enhancing carbon sinks to strengthen green recovery and promote long-term resilience to shocks and disturbances. Specific activities for capitalizing on these opportunities are described in Table 4 in the PIF, under Part II, Section 5.

A more comprehensive analysis of risks and opportunities related to the Covid-19 pandemic will be necessary during the project preparation phase as the situation is still fluid and it will be important to have an up-to-date assessment to inform project design. An updated COVID-19 Action Framework will be incorporated in the project's Environmental and Social Management Framework to be developed during PPG.

With regard to climate risks, a more detailed assessment was carried out (following the STAP Guidance) based on data, projections and examples (with published data sources cited in the PIF, Part II, Section 5.1, starting page 29). Mitigation measures are described in narrative and are included in the project's Risks Table (PIF Table 2, page 26), with specific reference to the project outputs through which these measures will be implemented.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. Point taken. We are seeing only advantages to develop a good coordination with the projects developed by IFAD, UNEP, and the WB, in addition to other UNDP managed projects. Please, describe the mechanisms at CEO endorsement.

October 16, 2020

Addressed.

During the PPG, please, also explore potential synergies with the GEF project currently developed by FAO under the GEF7 Impact Program on Sustainable Drylands Landscapes: "Integrated Landscape Management in Dry Miombo Woodlands of Tanzania".

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response: 10 October 2020

An addition has been made to the PIF on page 36, as follows:

Coordination with other projects and partners will be achieved at least initially through the Technical Working Group that will oversee the PPG phase and a Partner's Forum (or similar) that will be set up under the project during implementation – the composition and Terms of Reference for which will be elaborated during PPG. The UNDP-supported Development Partners Group on Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change (DPG-E) will also facilitate higher-level coordination between line ministries, donor programmes and civil society partners within the sector.

As recommended by the reviewer, these coordination mechanisms will be further elaborated at CEO endorsement

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not yet. The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.

October 16, 2020

The project is recommended for technical clearance, as well as the PPG.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Provide a comprehensive risk analysis;
- Confirm the targets for the core indicators, especially those on carbon, including explanations on the parameters and assumptions selected in EXACT;
- Include the areas under better management for biodiversity in the reasoning and the GEBs.
- Confirm cofinancing;
- Detail the mechanisms of dialogue between stakeholders around each NFR;
- Detail the coordination mechanisms with other projects and partners. See opportunities with the Drylands IP.
- Detail the response to fight inequality between male and female.
- Detail the elements for sustainability.

Review Dates

| | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| First Review | 10/2/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 10/16/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Cover memo, GEFID 10690, Tanzania, UNDP, Building the resilience of forest biodiversity to the threats of climate change in Tanzania's Nature Forest Reserves (GEF: \$4,837,010; Cofinancing: \$28,886,000)

Context

Most of Tanzania's native forests are of the dry woodland type, with Miombo woodlands and Acacia savannah woodlands. These forests have experienced high rates of forest cover change in recent years, with rates of deforestation estimated at 469,000 ha/annum. The major causes of deforestation are attributed to an increased area for shifting cultivation and permanent agriculture, development of human settlements, firewood and charcoal production, timber extraction, overgrazing, uncontrolled fires, and most recently the introduction of large-scale agriculture for biofuel production. Underpinning these direct causes of deforestation and forest degradation are market and policy failures, rapid population growth, rural poverty and climate-change. Recent evidences show that protected areas in Tanzania have lower deforestation rates than unprotected landscapes.

Nature Forests Reserves with high risks and low capacities were selected for this project based on the following criteria: presence of a key-biodiversity area, reported climate-induced risks (fire, drought, flooding, increase pressure of illegal activities, forest fragmentation, invasive species, reduced or no capacity to effectively manage these threats; and opportunities to test innovative income generating activities to finance management measures, as well as functional working relationships with neighbors and local villages

Project

The project GEFID 10690 "Building the resilience of forest biodiversity to the threats of climate change in Tanzania's Nature Forest Reserves" (GEF: \$4,837,010; cofinancing: 28,886,000) has been designed, using the STAP guidance on Climate Risk Screening, to reduce the exposure of Nature Forest Reserves to the risks and hazards associated. The project objective is to enhance the resilience of forest biodiversity to the threats of climate change by improving governance, operations, and financial management of Nature Forest Reserves

resilience to the threats of climate change by improving governance, operations, and financial management of Nature Forest Reserves. The project is designed through three components to 1) Manage climate-induced threats to forest biodiversity, 2) Develop income-generating opportunities to finance threat-reduction measures, and 3) Monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management and gender mainstreaming.

The proposed project targets six existing NFRs with Mt. Hanang (5,836 ha) in the Manyara Region; Pindirol (12,249 ha) and Rondo (11,742 ha) in the Lindi Region; Pugu–Kazimzumbwi (8,965 ha) in the Pwani Region; Uzigua (27,654 ha) in the Pwani and Tanga region; and Mwambesi (112,901 ha) in the Ruvuma Region; and three national forest reserves in the process to be upgraded to NFRs - Hassama Hills (4,856 ha) and Essimangor (6,070 ha) in the Arusha Region, and Nou (28,936 ha) in the Manyara Region.

Global Environment Benefits

The project targets 219,209 ha of terrestrial protected areas (Nature Forest Reserves) under improved management effectiveness (1.2); 9,000 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (4.1), and 1.1 million tCO₂e of emissions avoided outside AFOLU sector. The project also targets 9,000 beneficiaries, including 4,200 women.

Country Priorities

The project is endorsed by the GEF OFP. It is aligned with several documents related to CBD, including the NBSAP and the National Action Plan for Implementing the CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas. The project is also coherent with the National Climate Change Strategy and the commitment to AFR100 under the Bonn Challenge.

GEF7 Strategies

The project is developed under the BD2.7 objective on protected areas.

Innovation, Sustainability & Scaling up

The project is innovative in the way to use protected areas into national and local efforts to address climate change and reduce natural habitat and species loss. The project approach aims to be sustainable by reinforcing institutional and operational capacities for conservation management of NFRs and increasing and diversifying the revenue flows to NFRs. There is a strong potential for replication and scaling-up in other NFRs.