Upscaling ecosystem-based adaptation to enhance ecosystem services and community adaptive capacity in Tanzania's Greater Serengeti Ecosystem.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11531
Countries
Tanzania
Project Name
Upscaling ecosystem-based adaptation to enhance ecosystem services and community adaptive capacity in Tanzania's Greater Serengeti Ecosystem.
Agencies
UNEP
Date received by PM
12/19/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Ladu David Morris Lemi
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, March 18, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes, However, the description under "Institutional Arrangement" states PO-RLAG as having some execution roles. If so, please list it also as an executing entity

Agency Response

Response12/03/2026

VPO is the only executing entity of this project. PO-RLAG will not have an execution role but, as the decentralized government institution, it will support the oversight of project implementation by the 8 districts that act as implementing partners of the executing entity, VPO.

Kindly refer to paragraph 93: *The Vice President?s Office (VPO) will serve as ,the national Executing Agency. It will coordinate project implementation in collaboration with sectoral ministries, the President?s Office ? Regional Administration and Local Government (PO-RALG), district-level authorities and other partners operating within the GSE*

And paragraph 94: *PO-RALG will oversee the coordination of District Authorities to support project implementation. While it may not be necessary to sign an MoU with PO-RALG, agreements will be established directly with the District Authorities, following the approach used for EBARR. To ensure active participation, consistent coordination and effective monitoring, both the Regional Secretariat and PO-RALG will be represented on the Steering Committee.*

New text has been included has been included under paragraph 94 to specify that PO-RALG does not have an execution or implementing role.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, March 18, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes, however, there is inconsistency between the choice of the Rio-Markers and the project alignment where BD targets were listed, yet the BD marker is not chosen. Please revise

Agency Response

Response12/03/2026

The BD marker has been revised, and the ?Significant Objective? option has been selected.

2. Project Summary.
a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency ResponseN/A
3. Project Description Overview
a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, March 18, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

b) Yes. Please also consider reflecting Indigenous Peoples? self-identified priorities, governance, security of tenures, and traditional knowledge in the project (particularly component 1, 2 and 3), and including these as monitoring indicators of the project.

c) Yes, however, given the substantive integration of gender perspectives in the project components, outputs, please provide a detailed Gender Action Plan with accompanying budget, or to clarify how the project will ensure the implementation of the gender aspects of the project. Please include gender-specific indicators corresponding to the gender equality considerations included in the project components and outputs. Also include under M&E that gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan will be reported on in PIR, MTR, TE.

d) Yes

e) Yes

Agency Response
Response12/03/2026

b) Thank you for your comment. Indigenous Peoples? self-identified priorities, governance, security of tenures and traditional knowledge have been incorporated into the project design following community consultations (see Appendix 15: Stakeholder Consultation Report). The results framework in Annex C has been revised to better reflect inclusiveness in the participatory village land use planning process, customary land tenure and land use systems and the consideration of Indigenous and traditional knowledge in EbA planning and implementation. The indicator under Output 1.3 has been revised as follows.:

? Number of climate-resilient gender-responsive VLUPs developed or updated and integrating community-identified priorities and customary land use practices in accordance with Tanzania?s participatory VLUP national guidelines ?.

c) Thank you for your comment. A detailed Gender Analysis and Action Plan was completed and can be found in Appendix 5 - Attachment 5A and 5B: Gender Analysis and Action Plan. The detailed gender equality and social inclusion action plan and associated budget can be found in Table 3 (page 101), whereby gender-specific indicators relevant to the gender equality considerations included in the project components can be found.

Implementation of the GAP will be monitored through an adaptive monitoring and evaluation (M&E) approach embedded within the overall project Monitoring and Evaluation Budget and Workplan (see Appendix 6: Monitoring and Evaluation Budget and Workplan) as well as reported on in knowledge management activities, annual progress reports, the mid-term review and the terminal evaluation (see sub-section 11 in Appendix 5 - Attachment 5A and 5B: Gender Analysis and Action Plan, page 124 : ?*Gender performance will be regularly reviewed during quarterly project reviews, enabling adaptive management responses such as adjusting meeting times, locations or formats to improve accessibility for women and marginalised groups. Lessons and success stories from gender-responsive approaches will be incorporated into annual progress reports, mid-term and terminal evaluations and knowledge products on the AKMS platform, ensuring learning is shared across local, national and regional platforms*?.

4. Project Outline
A. Project Rationale
a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, March 18, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

b) No. (i) Please provide a list of identified stakeholders and the respective roles they will play in the projects. (ii) Additionally, please consider engage Indigenous Peoples as partners of the project, not just beneficiaries. (iii) Please also clarify if "free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) was obtained from Indigenous Peoples regarding project design and explain how results of consultations with Indigenous Peoples during PPG were integrated into project design.

c) N/A

Agency Response
Response12/03/2026

b) Thank you for your comment.

i-ii) Table 9 in ?Appendix 5 ? Attachment 5C and D: Stakeholder Engagement and Action Plan and SRM? provides a list of preliminary stakeholders, highlighting their potential roles in the project. Indigenous Peoples and Groups as stakeholders and not just direct beneficiaries have been included. Within the GEF CEO ER narrative, the stakeholder roles have also been described in the project outcome paragraphs (as footnotes), see paragraphs 58 (footnote 103), 60 (footnote 110), 62 (footnote 116), 69 (footnote 133) and 76 (footnote 149).

iii)

During project design consultations, formal consent to engage was first obtained from recognised village authorities who also helped mobilise the communities. Broader community discussions were carried out subsequently, using culturally appropriate and inclusive consultation methods to enable meaningful participation of Indigenous/local Peoples, including women, youth, and other marginalized groups. In the implementation phase, the project will apply full Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) before undertaking any activities involving land use planning (Outputs 1.2 and 1.3), restoration (Output 2.2), infrastructure (Output 2.3) or livelihoods (Output 2.4) where Indigenous/local territories, access or cultural resources may be affected, ensuring that Indigenous Peoples can freely accept, condition, or decline proposed project actions.

Documentation will include meeting records, attendance lists, consent forms (verbal or written, as locally appropriate) and feedback logs (Annex ii: FPIC process flow and documentation template). All IP-related engagement activities and FPIC documentation will be recorded and tracked using the project's safeguards monitoring system, as detailed in Section 9 of the Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework in Annex F.2.2. Moreover, Indigenous People and FPIC processes have been included in the gender equality and social inclusion action plan (Table 3; Appendix 5 - Attachment 5A and 5B: Gender Analysis and Action Plan).

Indigenous/local Peoples, including the Maasai, Hadzabe and Datoga, were consulted during the project design phase to validate socio-economic baseline findings (see Section 2.2, Annex F.2 ? ESMF and Appendix 15: Stakeholder Consultation Report). Consultation outcomes informed the project design, particularly under Components 1 and 2, and are reflected in the Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan (Table 3; Appendix 5a and b)and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Appendix 5d and 5e).

Consultations identified barriers to meaningful participation in land use planning and limited access to climate-resilient livelihoods, especially for women and youth, within Indigenous Peoples. In response, Component 1 strengthens the inclusivity of Village Land Use Planning processes by requiring active participation of marginalised groups at each stage and promoting equitable land allocation and the consideration of customary land tenure and land use systems. Activity 1.3.4 facilitates informed and voluntary access to Certificates of Customary Right of Occupancy (CCROs) for women and marginalised groups through clear information, local support and guidance on individual, joint or collective registration options. Where appropriate, collective

CCROs may be supported for pastoralist or Indigenous Peoples seeking to secure shared seasonal or communal rights.

Interventions reinforce existing inclusion mechanisms through targeted support to women?s and youth groups, leadership development and improved access to finance. Livelihood support under Components 1 and 2 prioritises women-led enterprises and channels training and seed funding through established community structures. Culturally appropriate facilitation methods and collaboration with trusted local and religious leaders are applied to strengthen trust and enable sustained participation.

5 B. Project Description
5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?
b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?
g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?
h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?
j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?
l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, March 18, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

b) Yes, however, it is not clear why the LDCF EBARR project implementation "resulted into limited uptake and replication" (under "Current adaptation landscape, page 16) and how this project will bridge. Additionally, the document states that Tanzania has capacity only at the national level (Barrier 2), even though the LDCF EBARR project had components for national and local capacity development. Could you provide more details why that project never resulted into improved capacity at the local level.

c) Yes

d) Yes

e) Yes

f) Yes

g) By establishing a gender-responsive, scalable, sustainable model for EbA and community-led land management.

h) No. Please address

i) Pending OP

j) Yes

k) No

l) By by embedding EbA into community-led VLUPs at scale to secure sustainable land use, shifts governance systems and institutionalization of EbA at the local level.

Agency Response
Response12/03/2026

b) Thank you for your comment. The reason why the LDCF EBARR project implementation "resulted into limited uptake and replication" and how the proposed project will bridge this, has been described below (i). Moreover, detail on the limitations that affected local-level capacity have also been described below (ii). To address these concerns, the narrative in the project document has been revised to better reflect these points. Kindly refer to Paragraphs 30 and 34 (pages 15 and 16).

(i) Limited Uptake and Replication under the LDCF EBARR Project

The LDCF-funded EBARR project was implemented in five dryland districts in Central Tanzania and Zanzibar and successfully demonstrated ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) approaches including land use planning in targeted landscapes. However, replication beyond the initial intervention sites was limited due to structural, programmatic and funding constraints rather than ineffectiveness of the interventions themselves. Key limiting factors included:

? Demonstration-oriented design: EBARR was primarily structured as a pilot initiative, with limited resources allocated to scaling mechanisms or structured replication frameworks.

? Geographic concentration: Interventions were confined to five districts in Central Tanzania and Zanzibar and were not designed as an ecosystem-wide or multi-district program.

? Absence of dedicated financing pathways for scale-up: The project did not establish financial instruments or budgetary allocations to support expansion beyond the original sites.

The proposed project directly addresses these barriers by moving from a localized pilot model to a landscape-scale approach across eight districts within the Serengeti ecosystem. Specifically, the project will:

? Institutionalize adaptation measures including land use planning and tenure systems within district planning and budgeting frameworks to ensure sustainability beyond the project lifetime.

? Enhance structured knowledge management and replication mechanisms across districts within the Greater Serengeti Ecosystem landscape.

? Strengthen vertical integration between national policy frameworks and sub-national implementation systems.

? Develop a sustainable financing mechanism to leverage co-financing and aligned sector investments to facilitate scaling climate-resilient land use planning and associated ecosystem-based adaptation measures.

This represents an incremental shift from site-based demonstration to ecosystem-level mainstreaming and replication/upscaling pathways.

(ii) Local-Level Capacity Constraints Despite EBARR Interventions

While EBARR included national and local capacity development components, the capacity gains at the district level were not fully institutionalized. Contributing factors included:

? Capacity-building activities that were largely training-based, with limited long-term mentoring or institutional embedding.

? High turnover of district technical staff, affecting retention of knowledge and continuity.

? Limited integration of EbA tools into formal district operational procedures and sector coordination mechanisms.

The proposed project incorporates lessons learned and adopts a more systemic capacity development model by: Embedding technical tools and adaptation guidelines within formal government systems and district planning cycles; Supporting training-of-trainers approaches and institutionalized knowledge transfer mechanisms; Establishing multi-sector coordination platforms across the eight districts. Providing sustained technical backstopping and implementation support to enhance absorptive capacity.

In summary, EBARR generated important demonstration outcomes in five dryland districts but was not structured to deliver ecosystem-scale mainstreaming or sustained replication. The proposed LDCF intervention builds on these lessons by addressing identified institutional, financial, and coordination barriers, by scaling adaptation across eight districts within the Serengeti ecosystem through strengthened institutional embedding and landscape-level planning and by addressing the main financing barrier for scale-up.

h) Thank you for your comment. Table 9 in ?Appendix 5 ? Attachment 5C and D: Stakeholder Engagement and Action Plan and SRM? provides a list of preliminary stakeholders, highlighting their potential roles in the project. Within the GEF CEO ER narrative, the stakeholder roles have been further described in the project outcome paragraphs (as footnotes), see paragraphs 58, 60, 62, 69 and 76.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project
a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been

included?
b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, March 18, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

b) UNEP is identified as having direct execution role for TA ($55,000). However, we advise that this TA service is not charged to the project budget, but should be internalized without having a dual roles in the project

c) Yes

Agency Response
Response12/03/2026

b) Considering the request not to have UNEP CFU executing the TA we have shifted the TA delivery to an international Restoration Factory partner. Paragraph 95 has been revised accordingly.

5.3 Core indicators
a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?
b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?
Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency ResponseN/A
5.4 Risks
a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?
b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?
c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency ResponseN/A
5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

N/A

Agency Response
6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities
6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

Agency ResponseN/A
6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes

Agency ResponseN/A
6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes (Targets : 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 22)

Agency ResponseN/A

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, March 18, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes, however, there is no response on the socio-economic benefits

Agency Response

Response12/03/2026

The socio-economic benefits of the proposed project have been listed in Paragraph 87 on page 38 of the CEO ER document.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, March 18, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

No. Please upload the gender action plan

Agency Response

Response12/03/2026

Kindly find the projects Gender Analysis and Action Plan in Appendix 5a and b of the Appendices document. It has also been uploaded as a separate document in the resubmission in the GEF Portal.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, March 18, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

No. While we acknowledge the inclusion of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the Appendices document (5c), please upload it as a separate document and ensure including Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous Peoples? groups as a part of stakeholders.

Agency Response
Response12/03/2026

Thank you for your comment. Engagement with Indigenous Peoples groups during project design and project implementation is reflected in different sections of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Appendix 5c and d) particularly on section 2.3.3 and section 3.1. Table 9 on page 139 has been edited to better reflect Indigenous Peoples? groups as a part of stakeholders.

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan included in the Appendices document has also be uploaded as a separate document in the resubmission in the GEF Portal.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes

Agency Response
Response12/03/2026

Please note the Annex F.2 ESMF and Annex F.2.2 Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework have been updated

8 Annexes
Annex A: Financing Tables
8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

No

Agency ResponseN/A
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

No

Agency ResponseN/A
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes

Agency ResponseN/A
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

No

Agency ResponseN/A
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

No

Agency ResponseN/A
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

No

Agency ResponseN/A
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes

Agency ResponseN/A
8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?
Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

Agency Responsen/a

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?
e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, April 09, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, March 23, 2026

Thank you for the submitted the letters. However, three co-financing entries of USD 5.25 M from the National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC); USD 3M from the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries; and USD 5M from the Ministry of Water should be ?Public Investment? instead of ?Grants? per the letters. Please revise. Also note that in the future, you should upload each co-financing letter against the registered entity in the portal instead of as a document.

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

No. Please provide letters confirming all the co-finance listed

Agency Response

Response 31/03/2026

Thank you for the guidance, the cofinancing table in Annex A of the CEO ER has been updated and Grant category replaced by Public Investment. Each cofinancing letter has been uploaded separately in the Portal.

Response12/03/2026

Kindly find the co-finance letters in Appendix 2: Co-financing commitment letters from project partners in the Appendices document. They have also been uploaded as a separate document.

Annex B: Endorsements
8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:
Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

N/A

Agency Response

N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes

Agency Response
N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes

Agency Response
N/A

Annex C: Project Results Framework
8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?
b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)
c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?
d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) Yes

Agency Response
N/A

Annex E: Project map and coordinates
8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

Yes

Agency Response
N/A

Annex G: GEF Budget template
8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?
b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?
c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, May 20, 2026

Cleared

GEFSEC, May 12, 2026

Please revise the CTA role as discussed and indicate to which project activity(ies) the resources previously allocated to the CTA has been reallocated to. Please also note that no part of the CTA resources should be reallocated to another personnel salary

GEFSEC, April 14, 2026

Thank you for your response to the comments.

Regarding the Project Manager and CTA roles, GEF prefers that only one position is permissible given the closeness of the two roles to each other and as compared to similar projects implemented in the same region. This will ensure that there is more resources for activities that will benefit local communities. Please remove one position and highlight in your next resubmission where you have retributed the resources saved from one of the positions.

GEFSEC, March 23, 2026

a) On the motorcycles, please provide an explanation to clarify the chain of custody for the purchased motorcycles following the completion of the project.

b) Thank you for the explanation on the need for a PM and a CTA - however, all projects in the region are working with only one top managerial/technical position. According to the TOR for the PM (Appendix 5e), there are no responsibilities related to technical delivery of work under the Component budget - however, Project Managers are required to have technical background related with the project's focal area. Please revise.

GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

a) Yes. However, there are several budget tables ? please use only the template included in Annex 7 of the Guidelines (accessible here) ? the categories formatting must be exactly followed. Please note that the length of the current budget table uses a wrong template that is nearly 30 pages. Please streamline explanation in the detailed description column, aiming to present each activity/position using a brief /short sentences.

b) (1) The budget category "Vehicles" has several items in a single row. Please split them into separate rows. Additionally, please note that the cost of vehicle should be taken care of using the co-financing component of the PMC as the GEF strongly discourages the use of its funds for purchasing vehicles.

(2) The project is outsourcing the communication and knowledge management activities to two firms/companies. Could you explain why there is additional budgeting to hire a Communication Specialist.

(3) Please remove the need to hire a company for translation and ensure that such need is factored into the top item as shown in the screenshot below and explain were you have moved the $8000 savings.

Contractual Services – Company	All-inclusive cost for a suitably qualified communications or knowledge management institution/NGO to deliver awareness campaigns, synthesise knowledge products and disseminate information on the AKMS platform. Costs include institution fees, travel, workshops/awareness raising campaigns in all wards/villages (including participant travel refunds for 60 people per village/ward)				68,000	**68,000**			**68,000**	Tanzania's Vice President's Office

Contractual Services – Company	Private firm for translation and adaptation of messages costed as $ 400/day. Sub-contract to communication firm for translation and adaptation of messages into Swahili and Maa (if necessary) for radio, village meetings and social				8,000	**8,000**			**8,000**	Tanzania's Vice President's Office

(4) The project intends to have a PM, and CTA .We advise that given the sign of the project, you should have only one position at that level either managerial or technical but not both. This is inline with similar projects implemented in the region.

(5) Procurement Officer must be fully charged to PMC.

(6) M&E Officer must be charged to the M&E component only not a component.

(7) Please provide explanation for the need of the 8 technicians.

(8) The Driver position must be charged to PM.

(9) As started earlier under institutional arrangement section, please note that UNEP's TA support ($55,000) must be internalized and not charged to project budget. Also, provide an explanation where you have reallocated this savings.

(10) Other costs relating to vehicle services must be removed from the budget and be taken care of by the co-financing as stated in comment (1) above. This savings should be reflected in the other project activities.

(11) Bank charges is an administrate cost charged to PMC not project component.

(12) Other costs related to airtime for monitoring purposes must be charged to M&E component only.

(13) As indicated in the previous comment in section [5.2b] UNEP should be excluded from having a budget responsibility for TA activities in the budget table and the allocated budget be reallocated to other activities.

(14) There are several activities presented as ?Contractual Services ? Company? which could be executed by consultant instead of a company (see some examples below).

Contractual Services – Company	All-inclusive cost for an independent firm to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the project's EbA approaches to assess their economic, social and environmental impacts, as well as synthesise findings into policy-relevant evidence. Refer to Gender Analysis and Action Plan for budget allocated to gender-specific activities under Activity 4.4.1.				40,000	40,000			40,000	Tanzania's Vice President's Office
Contractual Services – Company	All-inclusive cost for an independent firm to develop a scaling-up strategy that outlines institutional roles, financing entry points, enabling policy conditions, and a costed action plan for replicating and mainstreaming EbA interventions at scale. Refer to Gender Analysis and Action Plan for budget allocated to gender-specific activities under Activity 4.4.2.				40,000	40,000			40,000	Tanzania's Vice President's Office
Contractual Services – Company	Sub-contract to M&E firm to conduct mid-point results measurement and further training on data gathering plan					-	32,500		32,500	UNEP
Contractual Services – Company	Sub-contract to M&E firm to conduct End point results measurement					-	32,500		32,500	UNEP
Contractual Services – Company	Expert consultancy services for the development of the baseline study to set baseline values for project indicators, develop the M&E Framework for data collection and analysis and carry out socio-ecological baseline assessment at $43,375 including consultancy fees and travel costs to all districts.						43,375		43,375	Tanzania's Vice President's Office

c) Please provide the ToRs of all the positions that will be filled and receive financing from the GEF funds.

Agency Response

Response 14/05/2026

Taking into account GEF Sec comments regarding the CTA of this project, we have removed the international part-time consultant CTA position from the proposal.

However, and following discussion with the executing entity, in the absence of the CTA technical support, and aligned with the GEF Secretariat position that the Project Manager to be recruited should have both technical and managerial expertise to ensure cost effectiveness, it will be necessary to recruit a more senior Project Manager. The adjustment would reflect prevailing market rates for senior project managers of complex donor-funded projects in Tanzania.

Accordingly, US$ 72,000 of the US$ 180,000 allocated to IC CTA cost (40%), have been allocated to the Project Manager budget line 1101, while the remaining US$ 102,000 is allocated to project activities (60%) as follows:

US$ 36,000 allocated to the sub-granting mechanism under activity 3.2.1 (Budget line 2312)

US$ 44,475 allocated to a new budget line 3310 : Workshops for the participatory development of safeguards instruments (site-specific ESMP, Indigenous People Plan, Livelihood Plan, Resettlement and Access Restrictions Plan), cost of FPIC processes across 24 villages /8 districts, and training sessions to build the capacity of stakeholders for the implementation and monitoring of the safeguard instruments, GAP and SEP.

US$ 18,000 allocated to the sub-contract for rainwater harvesting systems and smart irrigation schemes (budget line 2304), as 1.5% contingency to account for potential variations in site conditions, material and transport costs, and to ensure quality and climate-resilient design standards are maintained during implementation in remote and environmentally variable contexts.

US$ 9,525 allocated to the sub-contract for drilling new boreholes/repairs (budget line 2304) , as 1.5% contingency to account for potential variations in site conditions, material and transport costs, and to ensure quality and climate-resilient design standards are maintained during implementation in remote and environmentally variable contexts.

Response 04/05/2026

Thank you for your guidance regarding the Project Manager (PM) and Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) roles. We would like to clarify that these two functions are distinct and strongly complementary, and both are critical to ensuring the timely, high-quality, and safeguards-compliant delivery of project results in the Tanzanian context, particularly given the specific characteristics of the project location and execution arrangements.

The roles differ fundamentally in scope and purpose as per the revised TOR in Appendix 5c. The full-time PM is responsible for the overall management of the project and project personnel and directly contributes to the delivery of project outputs, ensuring continuous coordination, compliance, and operational performance. In contrast, the CTA is an independent international part-time consultant reporting to the PM, who provides specialized expertise and strategic support but has no managerial responsibilities. The key functions include:

? independent technical oversight

? capacity building for the Vice President?s Office (VPO), the Project Management Unit (PMU), and partners

? quality assurance to ensure that Village Land Use Plans (VLUPs), ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) designs, and methodologies meet UNEP/GEF standards and international best practice

? dedicated support to safeguards compliance.

The safeguards dimension is of particular importance in this project. The Serengeti context involves complex issues related to land rights, land use and Indigenous Peoples, which present social and reputational risks if not carefully managed. Addressing these challenges requires continuous access to specialized expertise, sustained capacity building of the PMU, the Executing Entity, and VPO, and the benefit of an independent technical perspective from a senior international expert. The CTA plays a critical role in ensuring that these elements are addressed rigorously and consistently throughout project implementation.

The CTA has been budgeted as an international consultant, rather than a personnel position, with an average engagement of 60 days per year (USD 180,000).During the first two years the CTA?s engagement is more intensive, focusing on assessments and preparatory activities, capacity building for the PMU and partners, oversight of climate-resilient VLUP processes and the preparation of key safeguards instruments: Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMP), Indigenous Peoples Plans (IPP), Access Restriction Management Plans (ARMPs), and Livelihood Action Plans (LAPs), as well as facilitating the integration of FPIC processes where Indigenous Peoples are affected. In the later years, the CTA?s role focuses on technical oversight and quality assurance during implementation, particularly of activities under Output 2 and 3, following completion of VLUPs.

In response to the recommendation to optimize resource allocation, we have reduced the CTA input from 300 days over five years (USD 180,000) to 240 days over four years (USD 144,000). The resulting savings of USD 36,000 have been reallocated to Output 3.2, specifically to strengthen the sub-granting mechanism. This mechanism supports eligible village representatives and partner entities to develop and implement climate-resilient, gender-responsive VLUPs and EbA interventions, serving as a proof of concept to demonstrate impact and leverage future donor or public investment.

While we have made efforts to reduce the cost, we respectfully consider that removing the CTA international part-time CTA position all together would weaken independent technical oversight, safeguards compliance and the overall quality assurance of project outputs.

Moreover, in the absence of the CTA function there would be a need for significantly greater hands-on involvement from the UNEP Task Manager to fill the resulting gap in technical oversight and safeguards assurance. This would risk shifting functions that are intended to remain with the Executing Entity into UNEP?s implementation support role, thereby blurring the institutional separation or ?firewall? between execution and supervision.

Response 31/03/2026

a) a) Following completion of the project, the motorbikes will be transferred to the respective District Administrations for official use by district land, forestry, agriculture, and livestock officers. The motorbikes will support these officers in carrying out their routine responsibilities for continued support of the practices established by the project, including village outreach, extension services, capacity?building activities, and post?implementation monitoring. The motorbikes are to be used strictly for official duties, and transfer or use for any personal purposes will not be permitted.

The above text has been included under the vehicle post-project use section in Appendix 19.

b) The ToR of the Project Manager and the CTA in Attachment 5e in the Appendices document) have been revised and further detailed to ensure clear separation of roles and responsibilities in which the project manager TOR focuses on field level implementation, local stakeholder engagement and project management while the CTA focuses on establishing and maintaining technical excellence, engaging international partners for the sustainable financing mechanism and promoting learning in the PMU and beyond.

Based on experience in LDC settings, including prior experience with the GEF 5695 project in Tanzania, a CTA provides advisory inputs which will raise the strategic impact of the project and is critical to achieve effectiveness and efficiency while the project coordinator is focused on the day-to-day management and delivery of the project. In project situations where we have not had a CTA (a very limited number) we find that UNEP ends up stepping into the execution role and that breaches the boundary between execution and implementation.

Response12/03/2026

a) Only the GEF budget table using the template in Annex 7 of the Guidelines has been included in the resubmission of the proposal. The last column ?Budget notes? has been removed, as it's not part of the template. This has significantly reduced the length of the budget table. The explanation in the ?Detailed Description column? has been abbreviated as indicated. A track change version has been uploaded highlighting the rows revised for ease of reference.

b)

(1) The purchase of the vehicle has been replaced by the budget line ?Vehicle 4x4 long term rental for project implementation and monitoring? under Travel, which includes $60,000 for 5 ?years rental at an average of 100 days/year and fuel costs at $28,000.

We kindly request maintaining under Equipment the purchase of the 8 off-road motorbikes at a total of $24,000, one for the use of each district-level project technician. Off-road motorbikes are essential for routine access to remote villages, seasonal grazing corridors, and restoration sites where 4x4 vehicles cannot reliably reach, especially during rains, due to poor off-road conditions in the Greater Ecosystem area. Having project?dedicated motorbikes ensures continuity of field supervision, technical support to activities, community engagement, monitoring, and timely troubleshooting. Dedicated off-road motorcycles helps maintain a predictable schedule for community consultations, activity implementation and monitoring.

(2) The functions of the communication specialist have been merged into the contractual services provided by the firm/NGO under the sub-contract for communication and knowledge management activities. Accordingly, the budget of contractual services has increased to $ 124,900, which remains significantly lower than the cost of similar communication and knowledge management service delivery under the previous EBARR (GEF5695) project.

(3) The translation and message adaptation functions have been included in the sub-contract for communication and knowledge management activities. The $8000 savings have been allocated to increase the lines ?Training for Village Land Use Management Committees? and ?Training workshops (community-level on EbA and sustainable land management)?,

increasing the training sessions from 16 to 24 to enable the facilitation of training sessions in each village and enhance inclusive participation.

(4) Based on lessons learned from Tanzania?s GEF 5695 EBARR and GCF FP218 projects executed by the Vice President's Office of Tanzania, we strongly recommend considering maintaining both the full-time Project Manager under staff budget category and an international part?time Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) budgeted at 60 days/year (total 300 days over 5 years) under the consultant category. The Project Manager, while senior and having a technical background, cannot adequately fulfil both the operational management and the technical leadership functions required for this complex, multi?district, landscape?level climate resilience project. Both previous projects demonstrated the added value of the part-time CTA responsible for technical support to the PMU and quality assurance, resulting in improved delivery rate, improved quality of technical outputs and consultancy deliverables, improved compliance with ESMS and GAP, improved efficiency and coherence among project activities.

The Project Manager must be full-time because the project involves continuous coordination across eight districts, 24 villages, multiple ministries, NLUPC, VLUMCs, and partners. The PM is responsible for supervising the entire PMU, managing procurement, budgeting, financial reporting, safeguards (ESS, Gender, GRM), stakeholder engagement, field monitoring, PSC/PTC meetings, work planning, and mandatory UNEP/GEF reporting. These functions are operational, daily, and require uninterrupted presence and leadership.

By contrast, the part-time international Chief Technical Advisor provides specialized, high-level technical guidance that is fundamentally different from managerial duties. The CTA will ensure that VLUPs, EbA designs, rehabilitation strategies, studies, and monitoring methodologies meet international best practice, comply with UNEP/GEF standards, incorporate Indigenous Peoples? governance and traditional knowledge, and reflect cutting?edge climate adaptation science. The CTA provides advanced training, reviews consultant deliverables, strengthens M&E methodologies, supports conflict-sensitive and gender-responsive approaches, and ensures the scientific and methodological rigor of all outputs. These responsibilities require senior global expertise but not day?to?day presence; therefore, a part?time arrangement (60 days per year) is both adequate and cost?efficient.

Together, the PM and CTA form a complementary leadership structure essential to delivering a project of this technical depth and operational complexity. The ToR of the Project Manager and the CTA are included in Annex 5 e) of the Appendices document.

(5) Procurement Officer has been fully charged to PMC in the revised budget and reduced from $60,000 to $32,400 to align with the PMC 5% threshold.

(6) The M&E Officer has been fully charged to M&E component in the revised budget

(7) Eight District-level technicians (one per target district) are required to ensure effective decentralized implementation of project activities across geographically dispersed intervention areas. Given the project?s multi-sectoral scope including ecosystem restoration, climate-smart agriculture, water infrastructure, land-use planning, and community enterprise development?dedicated district-level technical oversight is essential to coordinate Local Government Authorities (LGAs), community groups, and sectoral partners, and to ensure

timely and quality delivery of outputs. These officers will support field supervision, community engagement, safeguards compliance, data collection, and results monitoring, thereby reducing implementation delays and operational risks. Their presence strengthens district-level ownership and institutional capacity, enhances sustainability beyond project completion, and ensures alignment with local development plans.

In addition, the deployment of eight District-level technicians represents a cost-efficient mechanism to manage implementation risks across eight geographically dispersed districts. Rather than relying on frequent travel by central PMU staff, which would increase operational costs and reduce responsiveness.

(8) The driver has been fully charged to PMC in the revised budget and reduced from to $48,000 to $30,400 to align with the PMC 5% threshold.

(9) Considering the request not to have UNEP CFU executing the TA we have shifted the TA delivery to an international Restoration Factory partner. The budget line description has been revised accordingly.

(10) The vehicle purchase and associated maintenance costs have been replaced by vehicle hire.

(11) Bank charges have been fully charged to PMC in the revised budget

(12) Data/airtime provision for community monitoring teams has been fully charged to M&E component in the revised budget

(13) Considering the request not to have UNEP CFU executing the TA we have shifted the TA delivery to an international Restoration Factory partner. The budget line description has been revised accordingly.

(14) Thank you for this helpful observation.

We have reviewed the activities listed under ?Contractual Services ? Company? and agree that, for some tasks, individual consultants can indeed be appropriate.

However, for the baseline study, mid-term and endline monitoring exercises, as well as the cost?benefit analysis and scaling-up strategy, we respectfully maintain that engaging a consulting firm offers clear technical, operational, and quality?assurance advantages.

Regarding the Baseline, mid?term, and endline results measurement, we find these exercises require multi?disciplinary expertise, including: a team leader with evaluation/impact assessment experience, GIS/spatial analysis specialists, community engagement experts, and enumerators and local facilitators

In this case a consulting firm is better positioned to mobilize this combination of skills as an integrated team, ensuring methodological consistency, timely delivery, data verification protocols and quality assurance. These functions are difficult to replicate with individual consultants working independently without a coordinating institutional structure.

Regarding the cost?benefit analysis and scaling-up strategy we agree that these tasks could also be also delivered by individual consultants, however our rationale for consider consulting firm or entity is based on the fact that both deliverables require specialized economic analysis capacity, potentially the ability to combine international expertise with strong national contextual knowledge and to ensure peer review and internal quality assurance mechanisms.

With the same logic we have also shifted the development of the climate-resilient VLUP training programme from individual consultant to service contract in order to mobilise expertise in village land use planning, climate change adaptation and adult learning methodologies.

c) The ToRs of GEF-funded positions were included in Appendix 5e of the Appendices document in the earlier submission. The ToRs of the PM and CTA have been slightly revised in this resubmission.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes
8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.
b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.
c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

N/A

Agency ResponseN/A
Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

TBD

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, Jan 23, 2026

TBD

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/23/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/18/2026	

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	**3/23/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**4/9/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**4/14/2026**	