



Integrated Adaptation Program to enhance resilience of communities and ecosystems in the dry Miombo Woodlands of Tanzania Mainland and Dryland of Zanzibar

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

10364

Countries

Tanzania

Project Name

Integrated Adaptation Program to enhance resilience of communities and ecosystems in the dry Miombo Woodlands of Tanzania Mainland and Dryland of Zanzibar

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

2/10/2022

Review completed by PM

5/5/2022

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

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

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Yes

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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
GEFSEC 5May2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 21April2022:

A) Please correct the name of the agency from ?GEF Agency? to ?FAO?.

B) In addition, as per the co-financing letter, this seems to be in-kind contribution (for \$600,000) and not ?grant? as stipulated in the Portal. Please correct. If \$262,141 will be provided in the form of grant please have two separate lines for both types of co-financing.

C) Please briefly describe, individually, how each Investment Mobilized, for this project was identified.

GEFSEC 31March2022:

The increased sources and scale of co-finance is appreciated. Please upload all relevant co-finance letters in the newly created feature directly in the co-finance section of the CER template.

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Please provide an explanation for each source of co-finance that was eliminated or reduced, and what was done to avoid and/or compensate for this. Please also explain any implications on scope or impact of the project due to these reductions.

Please provide a description of how all new investment mobilized since the PIF, building on the previous explanation in the PIF.

Please ensure the NMB Co-financing letter is uploaded.

Agency Response

5 May 2022: Corrections to co-financing have been made to include Tanganyika District Council.

Investment mobilized updated in prodoc on pages 15 and 16 and included below:

Co-financing mobilized was identified through a thorough engagement process with other closely related ongoing and planned initiatives, governments (national, regional, district), and private sector actors. Where complementarities were particularly significant, parties expressed their interest in supporting the project through targeted investments.

Investment mobilized has been identified with the NMB Foundation and AG Energies.

For NMB Foundation, the USD 500,000 investment mobilized will: i) support small and medium farmers to access agricultural finance; ii) facilitate job creation and economic growth through mentorship, coaching, business training, digital and financial literacy training; iii) support the development of sustainable businesses plans for selected SMEs/cooperative businesses; iv) support the development of market strategies for selected SMEs/cooperative businesses; v) facilitate access to/creation of innovative finance mechanisms for value chain resilience, including bonds (such as green bonds) for resilient production of niche commodities, micro-insurance, as well as creation of credit lines for SMEs and start-up agribusinesses.

For AG Energies investment mobilized will contribute to i) promote innovative water harvesting and irrigation systems (e.g. water use efficient technologies) for priority sectors introduced, tested and promoted in FFS, FFF and producers' plots; ii) equip SMEs/cooperative businesses with solar-powered cold storage systems, solar cold

rooms/fridges/freezers (capacity depending of the products stored and amount); iii) promote partnership with solar companies to equip SMEs/cooperative businesses with solar and electric drying systems for highly perishable horticulture products or NTFPs such as berries and mushrooms; iv) promote partnership with Solar Companies to equip SMEs/cooperative businesses with solar moisture controlled storage technologies for cattle fodder in the Miombo region; and v) promote partnership with Solar Companies to provide training on operation and maintenance of climate resilient storage facilities for beneficiary SMEs/cooperative businesses.

08 April 2022: Letters have been re-uploaded. Thanks.

March 2022

Additional co-financing letters obtained from Ministry of Agriculture and TFS. Overall, co-financing mobilized (USD 48,192,029) now exceeds co-financing at PIF stage.

NMB co-financing letter has been uploaded.

Investments mobilized were identified through a thorough engagement process with other closely related ongoing and planned initiatives, governments (national, regional, district), and private sector actors. Where complementarities were particularly significant, parties expressed their interest in supporting the project through recurrent expenditures and investments. Further elaboration in table 3, pages 36-38, as well as section 8 (Summary of changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF).

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

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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
GEFSEC 5May2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 20April2022:

Please insert the monitoring and evaluation plan from the project document into the
?monitoring and evaluation? section.

GEFSEC 31March2022:

Well noted. However, the number of direct beneficiaries (core indicator 1) is still showing as 38,000 in the core indicators section of the CER in the portal. Please make this change directly in the indicators section in the CER submission, which is a relatively new feature in the portal.

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

We note with concern the significant reduction in impact level for the total number of direct beneficiaries from 82,000 in the approved PIF, down to 38,000. Please identify all opportunities to maintain the impact level at the time of PIF approval. Any reduction in impact level, if approved, would require substantial explanation.

Regarding number of people trained, we note with appreciation the increased total number. However, please identify all opportunities for gender balance between male and female.

Agency Response

5 May 2022: Monitoring and evaluation plan in the portal is the same as the Monitoring and Evaluation plan in the prodoc. and is inserted in the monitoring and evaluation section.

08 April 2022: Calculation error corrected. The number of direct beneficiaries (core indicator 1) is 58,143 and number of people trained (core indicator 4) is 25,000. These targets were carefully reviewed during PPG based on actually size of communities in the project intervention areas.

March 2022

In fact there was an error in the calculation - supposed to be 83,143 (female 44,479 and male 38,664).

The number of direct beneficiaries includes 25,000 people trained, as well as 58,143 direct beneficiaries of more resilient physical and natural assets; diversified livelihoods and income; improved climate information; and supported entrepreneurs. The beneficiaries of more resilient physical and natural assets was estimated to correspond to 4% of the rural population of the areas of intervention of Zanzibar, plus a fraction of the target villages population in Tanzania Mainland.

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

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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

GEFSEC 31March2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

The Theory of Change in the alternative scenario section is appreciated, but it is barely legible due to the small font. Please attempt to make it more legible in the CER document, as well as include a clear version in the documents upload function.

Agency Response The ToC has been enlarged.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 31March2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Please note the comments above on co-financing.

With regards to additional cost reasoning and expected baseline contributions, please expand on the ways in which this project financing will build on specific current and ongoing domestic and international sources of public financing.

Agency Response The additional cost reasoning has been expanded (pages 67-69).

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

GEFSEC 31March2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Please elaborate further on the climate adaptation benefits that will be gained from this project, including as related to Tanzania's priorities defined in their NDC and through their adaptation planning process.

Agency Response Further elaboration of the climate adaptation benefits (pages 69-70).

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

GEFSEC 31March2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

As referred to in the PIF review sheet as needing to be addressed prior to CEO Endorsement, please expand in this section, and make any corresponding project design changes needed, on the financial sustainability of the project activities, including with regards to removing the barrier of smallholder farmers and MSME's access to capital to be able to make the types of choices and changes in their economic activities that are encouraged through this project, though access to microfinance, MSME incubation, or other approaches.

Agency Response Private sector engagement section revised, p. 81-83, to include narrative on NMB foundation co-financing, as well as VICOBA and AG Energies. As mentioned, the project will work with a number of financial institutions to facilitate access to finance and create innovative finance mechanisms for increased value chain resilience.

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
GEFSEC 25Oct2019 (Jason Spensley):

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

N/A

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Yes.

Agency Response
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
GEFSEC 31March2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

We note the reference to micro-credit institutions in this section. Please expand on how they will be engaged and strengthened to provide accessible capital for transition to climate adaptation and resilience practices, beyond just linking them market actors.

Agency Response

Please see response on private sector engagement above.

As mentioned, the project will work with a number of financial institutions to facilitate access to finance and create innovative finance mechanisms for increased value chain resilience.

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

GEFSEC 31March2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

We note the indication that the project will engage with a number of FIs to increase the availability of capital and other forms of finance needed to ensure the update of climate technologies. Please clarify in this section (and elsewhere in the CER as needed) more specifically what this will entail and ensure there is adequate activity budget to do so.

Agency Response

Clarification below has been added to the document - under the private sector engagement section.

The LDCF project will work with a number of financial institutions to facilitate access to finance and create innovative finance mechanisms for increased value chain resilience. Amongst those, the National Microfinance Bank Foundation for Agricultural Development, as a co-financier for this project, will contribute to the following: 1. Support small and medium farmers to access agricultural finance. This is achieved through increased capacity-building of farmer organizations and their respective members while also offering training to improve financial literacy skills; 2. Facilitate job creation and economic growth through mentorship, coaching, business training, digital and financial literacy training. The emphasis is on innovation to spur positive change for our communities; 3. Support the development of sustainable businesses plans for selected SMEs/cooperative businesses; 4. Support the development of market strategies for selected SMEs/cooperative businesses; and 5. Facilitate access to/creation of innovative finance mechanisms for value chain resilience, including bonds (such as green bonds) for resilient production of niche commodities, micro-insurance, as well as creation of credit lines for SMEs and start-up agribusinesses. Additionally, the project will work with Village Community Banks (VICOBA and SACCOS) on such issues. VICOBA is a tailored micro-finance program designed to provide credit to low-income people who need capital to start their own businesses and can be particularly helpful to increase access to finance to the most vulnerable groups, including women. The effectiveness of VICOBA can be associated with : i) self-help initiatives among the group members; ii) community capacity building and local resources mobilization; iii) community ownership and shared leadership; iv) high level of transparency and

effective information sharing; v) promotes voluntary accountability among the group members; vi) and enhances good governance.

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Yes.

Agency Response
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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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
GEFSEC 31March2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Please expand on the types and scale of socio-economic benefits that will be accrued, providing anticipated quantitative figures as possible.

Agency Response Further elaboration has been provided under the additional cost reasoning section, and the results framework.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 13May2022:

A) We note the extensive response and appreciate the budget being adjusted to include 1 vehicle instead of 2. However, there is still no explanation about why the cost of the 1 vehicle cannot be borne by the co-financed portion of PMC, a significant portion of which is grant. Please concisely respond to this aspect of the comment with a brief response to this point.

B) We note indication in the Agency's response that "the Technical coordinator of the GEF project which will have to dedicate 120% of his time to the project itself". We are not sure if the reference to 120% is a typo or is not intended in a literal sense, but to please revise so as not to suggest that a person will be required to work more than full time on a GEF supported project.

GEFSEC 6May2022:

A) We note the explanation in the Review Sheet that the project's staff cannot be covered by the co-financing portion allocated to PMC (*The costs of the Project technical officer and Project technical assistant are charged either totally or partially to projects components. Only the admin/accountant is charged fully to PMC. Please note that most of the PMC co-finance are in-kind targeting office space and salaries for project officer who will be involved during project implementation period?*). However, this does not reflect the composition of the co-financing, as per table C in with nearly 1.2 million is represented in grants. Please either engage with these co-financiers and/or to seek alternatives to increase the cost-share for the Project Technical Coordinator, Driver (if accepted, per the comment below on vehicle) and Technical Assistant.

B) We note the explanation of the reasoning why the vehicles are needed (*Justification for Vehicle: Given the size of the project area, road condition and terrain of most project areas, it will be difficult for project staff (PMU staff & project consultants to participate in the fieldwork activities, as there will be no dedicated car for the fieldwork activities. Therefore, two vehicles are required to be funded by the project?*). This explanation is reasonable. However, there is no explanation about why the cost of the vehicle cannot be borne by the co-financed portion of PMC, a significant portion of

which is grants. Please either build the vehicle cost into the co-financing portion of the PMC, or provide an explanation of why this is not possible.

GEFSEC 20April2022:

A) Project Technical Coordinator, Accountant and Technical Assistant are being charged across components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. As the co-financing portion to PMC is 4.0, and considering that the grants portion of co-financing is 262 k (see point 2 (a) above), there is room to partially cover the costs of the Project Technical Coordinator, Accountant and Technical Assistant from co-financing.

B) The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program. Please consider alternatives.

C) Unspecified miscellaneous expenses cannot be bared by GEF resources. Please charge these costs to co-financing or suggest an alternative.

GEFSEC 31March2022:

For the PMU, please indicate cost of each staff/team member on an annual basis.

Please provide more information with a breakdown of the following expendable procurement items: Equipment and inputs for FFS; Modern beehives; beekeeping equipment; Tree and crop seeds production; tree nurseries; and agroforestry and restoration initiatives.

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

With regards to Annex E - Project Budget Table -

The budget table is barely legible due to its very small and blurry font. Please try to provide a clearer version in the CER and at least upload a clear version in the documents upload section. Further comments may be provided when a more legible version is available for review.

Agency Response

Response 16 May 2022

A) The Agency consulted all main co-financers on the opportunity to obtain a vehicle for the project from non-GEF sources. The co-financing in grant is already allocated to other purposes as shown from the below table in the response of 13 May 2022. As regards the in-kind portion of the PMC co-financing, the fleets of the 2 core Ministries owning the project are under equipped and the team could not ensure that a vehicle is made available to the project on a full time basis. Full time availability is essential for the effectiveness of project's intervention in the landscape. The demand of vehicles available to the 2 ministries from the projects currently exceeds the availability so it was no possible to provide a vehicle from co-financing. The Agency and the formulation team wants to avoid the risk of having PMUs sitting in Ministries because the vehicles from co-financing sources are available only some days a week and in competition with other Program Management Units (the main recurrent risk materializing in on-going GEF projects with vehicles coming from co-financing).

B) Thank you for this appropriate note. The Agency meant that the project coordinator will have to work full time on the GEF project. To avoid misunderstandings, the reference to "120% of his time" has been removed from the below answer from 13th of May.

Response 13 May 2022:

As described in Section 6.a Institutional arrangement for project implementation, the Project staff, including the Technical Coordinator and the Driver, will be recruited on competitive basis or seconded from the government entities for the lifespan of the project, to ensure their full time dedication to the project implementation. These proposed organizational structures and staff recruitment processes are based on lessons learned from the implementation of on-going GEF funded project implemented by the proposed implementing agency GEF ID.: 5695 <https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/5695> --- where project staff were initially public servant appointed to the project implementation, which caused important delays in implementation and insufficient delivery of project results. After more than two years of delays, it was decided to seek secondment of the project staff under this project from the Vice President Office to ensure their full dedication to project implementation, with their full salary covered by the GEF LDCF grant during the secondment. This decision helped the project to start implementing activities on the ground and start achieving results.

Please note that the project team and executing partners has made all efforts to increase the PMC ration on co-financing to the maximum. A number of management functions will be covered by PMC co-financing. These include for instance office space from VPO, as well as office space and facilities, motor vehicles, other office equipment, electricity, travels, staff time from Sikonge, Nsimbo, Nkasi and Tanganyika District

Councils, as well as Ministry of Agriculture, irrigation, natural resources and livestock of Zanzibar, among others.

Albeit significant, these amounts are already allocated to the management of the co-financing portion of the project and cannot cost-share the Technical coordinator of the GEF project which **will have to be full time dedicated to the project itself.**

Please note the TORs attached in roadmaps showing the technical vis a vis the managerial functions performed by the technical coordinator.

Regarding the grants mentioned in the comment please note that these are allocated as follows:

B.

Response 13 May 2022:

The Agency and the formulation team has agreed to reduce to one vehicle despite the risks of reducing the presence of the PMU in the target landscapes. Alternative solutions will be sought.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Grant allocated	Focus
GEF Agency	FAO	USD 262,141	Grant allocated to the Hand in Hand Initiative by the FAO and the United Republic of Tanzania, in direct support to scaling-up adaptation technologies and practices in NTFP and horticulture value chains
Recipient Country Government	Tanganyika DC	USD 966,000	Grant allocated to complementary activities under components 2 and 3, including the establishment of new forest reserve and boundary verification of existing Tongwe West Forest Reserve, the development of a touristic strategy, beekeeping materials, and land use planning process in the District

5 May 2022:

A. The costs of the Project technical officer and Project technical assistant are charged either totally or partially to projects components. Only the admin/accountant is charged fully to PMC. Please note that most of the PMC co-finance are in-kind targeting office space and salaries for project officer who will be involved during project implementation period

B. Justification for vehicles in included in the prodoc on page 111 as well as below:

Justification for Vehicle: Given the size of the project area, road condition and terrain of most project areas, it will be difficult for project staff (PMU staff & project consultants) to participate in the fieldwork activities, as there will be no dedicated car for the fieldwork activities. Therefore, two vehicles are required to be funded by the project

C. Addressed

08 April 2022: Full detailed budget (excel file) has been uploaded.

Breakdown of procurement items:

- Equipment for FFS: Irrigation equipment/Irrigation system, Rain harvesters, Rippers, Planters, Push weepers, Rental of Practice Field, Stationary Supplies, Tablets for data collection.
- Tree and crop production, tree Nurseries: Germination cabinets, tree climbing gears, seed extraction machine, rehabilitation and vanishing of seed vetting, seed storage facilities, polythene tubes, water cans, water pumps.
- Agroforestry and restoration: Services, inputs, tools, and equipment for restoration of highly degraded areas in the targeted forests, through in-situ natural regeneration. These include: seeds/seedling, fertilizers, weed control, Seeding collector, seed storage package, polythene tubes, (Nursery Equipment), and casual labour.
- Modern beehives and beekeeping equipment: beehives, hive tool, bee smoker, gloves, hats and veil.

March 2022

Corrected, thanks.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Please respond to the comments provided.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 5May2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 31March2022:

It appears that a comment from Canada was not explicitly responded to. Please provide response to this comment and ensure it is fully addressed.

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Please provide full and complete responses to all comments provided by the Council (in this case USA, Germany and Canada), and ensure the responses are also fully reflected within the CER document. Within the responses to each comment, please reference the specific relevant text locations within the CER document.

Agency Response

5 May 2022: Addressed, thanks. and comments from Canada included on Page 116 of prodoc and below.

Comments from Canada

? The choice of rehabilitation techniques should be influenced by its costs and benefits to participating communities. In addition, such interventions should ensure availability of enabling forest policies in order to address issues of concern, including (1) the full and meaningful participation of communities, (2) clear land and tree tenure, and (3) equitable benefit sharing. We also recommend that the project embraces and promotes landscape and multidisciplinary approaches and avoids sector approaches that have led to present situations of degradation.

All proposed restoration techniques and initiatives proposed under component 2, were identified during the PPG process through consultations with local communities. There were selected for their cost-effectiveness and the benefits they will provide to participating communities. Furthermore, it should be noted that this LDCF project will be implemented hand in hand with the DSL IP child project in Tanzania which will specifically implement forest and landscape restoration actions and techniques in the targeted landscapes in Tanzania Mainland. Several consultations with local communities, including SHARP assessment, were conducted during the design of the DSL IP child project in Tanzania, making sure proposed restoration and forest regeneration techniques are feasible, cost-effective, context specific and adapted to local communities.

The two projects together (DSL IP Child Project and LDCF) will support the improvement of the forest and landscape management policy frameworks and enabling environment, by building capacities in terms land degradation assessment tools and approaches, generating and disseminating knowledge on Miombo ecosystem value, conducting specific participatory CC vulnerability assessments (LDCF), and finalizing revising and strengthening the forest and land management strategic framework conditions by: i) supporting the implementation of National tree seed strategy (DSLIP Child project), ii) supporting the implementation of the national NTFPs strategy (DSLIP Child project); iii) assessing and reviewing the livestock development strategy and livestock master plan on improved farming taking into account sustainable rangeland management (DSLIP Child project); iv) supporting the implementation of the Participatory Forest Management (DSLIP Child Project); and v) supporting the development of a Miombo woodland fodder development strategy (LDCF). Furthermore, the two projects will support participatory land use planning processes at local level with the development of Joint Village Land Use Plans and the integration of CCA into these Plans to promote a landscape approach (cross-boundary) in miombo woodlands (including DSL-IP target areas), as well as drylands of Zanzibar. Combined together, all these multidisciplinary interventions at landscape level will ensure 1) the full participation of local communities; 2) clear land and forest tenure at local and landscape level; and 3) equitable benefit sharing.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

No provided

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None provided

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

None provided

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request None provided

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Cleared.

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

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

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

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 13May2022:

The 2 remaining comments and the responses to them regarding budget aspects still need to be clarified.

GEFSEC 5May2022:

2 specific comments related to the budget still need to be addressed.

GEFSEC 13April2022:

Recommended for technical clearance, pending any further comments on policy related matters.

GEFSEC 31March2022:

A reduced set of comments still need to be addressed.

GEFSEC 28Feb2022:

Several comments are required to be addressed.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/28/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/31/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/21/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/5/2022	