



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

Review PIF 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

3/20/2024

Review completed by PM

4/26/2024

Program Manager

Ladu David Morris Lemi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

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

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes, However, Agency's ID is missing

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 22 2024

1b) N/A at PIF stage. Agency's ID will be generated at the PPG phase.

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

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

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes. However, there are no Outcome(s) and Outputs under the M&E.

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 22 2024

3.1 b) Thank you for your feedback. Comment addressed in the PIF and GEF Portal. Specifically, Outcome 4 now integrates M&E, and a new output 4.3 (A community-focused monitoring and evaluation framework that embeds continuous learning and feedback mechanisms within project activities developed and operationalised) has been introduced.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

The project emphasis on innovation, gender-responsive and inclusive climate-resilient adaptation approaches. However, no specific output has been dedicated to address gender specific matters. This project would be improved to incorporate gender aspects in all components and in outputs such as 1.2, 2.3, 3.2 among others.

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Thank you for integrating gender into the project.

However, the incorporated gender aspects have not been included in the Indicative Project Overview table and in the component descriptions. Please revise the Indicative Project Overview table with relevant gender aspects.

Additionally, under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results are monitored and reported on, and a Gender Action Plan is developed and budgeted.

GEFSEC, May 2 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 22 2024

Thank you for your feedback. All project components have been enhanced accordingly.

**highlighted sections in the PIF reflect the revisions/enhancements.

Component 1: Please see para 67 and 68

Component 2: Please see para 73, 74, 75, 76, 77

Component 3: Please see para 82

Component 4: Please see para 87 and 88

UNEP, 30 April 2024

Thank you for your feedback. Comment addressed. The project overview table has been revised accordingly and gender aspects integrated in all relevant sections. The Theory of Change diagram and narrative have also been amended. We fully understand that a Gender Action Plan is part of the list of key requirements leading to CEO Endorsement submission. We have added this in a new paragraph 116.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) No. The PMC contributions are above the permissible threshold of 5%. Both the GEF and Co-financing are set at 5.3%. Please reduce this percentage to a maximum of 5.0% or below.

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 22 2024

3.3 c) Thank you and well noted. PMC contributions for both GEF and co-financing have been reduced to 5.00%.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) No. Please provide a description/an outline of the relevant stakeholders to be involved in the implementation of this project and their respective roles.

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 22 2024

4.2 d) Thank you for your feedback. Comment addressed. Relevant stakeholders to be involved in the implementation of the project have been included. Please refer to Table 10 on pages 41-43.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes. Please also refer to (3.1 b above on missing outputs for M&E) and include in the theory of change.

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 22 2024

5.1 b) Noted and addressed. Please refer to the indicative project overview table (page 7) and the Theory of Change diagram (below para 61).

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) No

b) No information provided

c) Yes

d) Yes

The institutional setting and execution arrangement are missing. Please provide more details on the role UNEP and any other entity involved will play in the project implementation.

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

5.2 a, b) Noted and addressed. Please refer to para 93-96 for institutional setting and execution arrangement. Agency execution support is not expected during the project implementation phase. Also, UNEP's comparative advantage is articulated in para 103-104.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

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 screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

On point (b), we advise that in the key risk section you take the following actions.

1) Review the Overall risk rating, which is currently marked as Substantial? a rating higher than the rating of any other rated risk category. If you wish to stick to this higher rating, please describe the rationale to identify this rating, bearing in mind that ratings are specific to the residual risk which takes into account the anticipated implementation of mitigation measures.

2) Consider rating the Fiduciary risk category based on information available at PIF stage.

GEFSEC, May 2 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 30 2024

- 1) Thank you for your feedback on the project risks. Comment addressed. We have reviewed the overall risk rating for the project and marked it as moderate.
- 2) Fiduciary risk has also been added and rated based on the information available at this stage. Kindly refer to the comments provided in the risk table.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes (CC-1, CC-2)

Agency's Comments

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's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

The project states that "Global environmental benefits delivered by the proposed project include: i) biodiversity benefits from conserving and using savanna and forest resources", could you link this to the 23 GBF targets and highlight the targets that it is contributing to.

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 15 2024

Thank you for your feedback. Comment addressed. Please refer to Table 1 on pages 3-5.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

GEFSEC, April 29 2024,

Given the scope of this project, a broader stakeholder consultations with local communities and relevant civil society organization would be beneficial. Please justify the lack of consultation in project design and outline a more detailed plan for stakeholder consultations in project development, specifically as related to IPLCs and civil society.

GEFSEC, May 2 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 30 2024

Thank you for your feedback. Comment addressed. Please refer to para 112-114, and the revised table 13. A preliminary stakeholder engagement plan has also been included for local communities, indigenous people, CSO and NGOs which will be further refined at PPG stage.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

No

Agency's Comments
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

No

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments
UNEP, April 22 2024

Please refer to the indicative Focal Area Elements table on page 59

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

No

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

No

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

No.

The template utilized for the LoE removed the footnote. As a general rule, all Agencies were previously advised that LoE with modifications are not acceptable. Please submit a new LoE with the footnote in place or ask OFP to email GEF that he accepts original footnote to be part of the LoE.

GEFSEC, April 29 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP, April 22 2024

Thank you for your feedback. Comment addressed. A new OFP letter of endorsement has been submitted.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, March 25 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, May 2 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, May 2 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments
Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/25/2024	4/24/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/26/2024	5/1/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		