

Tanzania's Climate Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10668

Countries

Tanzania

Project Name

Tanzania's Climate Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF)

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

10/18/2022

Review completed by PM

10/25/2022

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

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

10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, the project is aligned as presented in the PIF.

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

12/20/2022 EBF: Thank you for your response but the same formatting issue persists. Can you please try again fixing this?

10/31/2022 EBF: The project design is appropriate. However, the Project Description Summary table has formatting issues preventing it from being properly read (as shown in the screen captures below). Please make the necessary changes accordingly.

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To comply with the requirements of the transparency framework under the Paris Agreement on Climate Change

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1. Strengthening and formalizing Tanzania's institutional arrangements for the national MRV system and enhancing access to national climate information.	Technical Assistance	Government of Tanzania adopts formal institutional arrangements for the national MRV system and stakeholders have increased access to national climate data, climate policies and action.	1.1. Technical assistance provided to the Government of Tanzania to review, update and formalize institutional arrangements concerning the national MRV system. 1.2. A centralized national climate information	GET	280,000.00	38,500.00

Component 2. Strengthening data management for GHG inventories and tracking and reporting of the Nationally Determined Contribution implementation progress, targeting mitigation, adaptation as well as support needed and received.	Technical Assistance	Government and relevant stakeholders contribute to maintain state of the art GHG inventories, and to track and report progress in the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) implementation, on Mitigation, Vulnerability & Adaptation (V&A) as well as support needed and received.	2.1 Guidance developed and selected staff from key government agencies and other stakeholders trained in: GHG Inventory elaboration Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) and related guidelines. 2.2 Technical assistance provided to develop appropriate GHG emissions modelling to inform decision-making.	GET	715,000.00	65,000.00
---	----------------------	--	--	-----	------------	-----------

Monitoring and Evaluation	Technical Assistance Project is effectively monitored and evaluated	3.1 Monitoring and evaluation products are delivered (see section 9 and Annex J)	GET	45,000.00
---------------------------	--	--	-----	-----------

Agency Response

08 December 2022

The Project Description Summary table has been once again uploaded to the GEF Portal. We hope this will prevent the formatting issues from arising again.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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

12/20/2022 EBF: Thanks. Cleared.

10/31/2022 EBF: Please upload the co-finance letter in section C. At the moment, the document uploaded as evidence corresponds to the letter of endorsement.

Agency Response

08 December 2022

The co-finance letter has been uploaded to the GEF Portal.

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 10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, the financing presented is adequate and demonstrates a cost-effective approach. The allocations for Components 1 and 2 have changed, but the overall amount remains the same. Cleared.

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 10/31/2022 EBF: According to the table provided in Annex C, \$50,000 have been requested for PPG, \$37,791 have been spent to date, and \$12,209 have been committed but hasn't yet been spent. Cleared.

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 10/31/2022 EBF: It is noted that the distribution of male and female beneficiaries under Indicator 11 has changed compared to PIF. Now the project expects an equal share of men and women benefiting the project. The overall number remains the same compared to the PIF stage. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, this has been elaborated.

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

12/20/2022 EBF: All previous comments have been addressed. Cleared.

10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, with a couple of comments:

1. Table 1 is divided into Mitigation and Adaptation projects. Although National Communications and the ongoing first Biennial Update Report (BUR1) address both Mitigation and Adaptation, they have been categorized in Table 1 as National Communications belonging to the Mitigation projects and BUR1 as Adaptation. Please justify or amend as appropriate.
2. In Table 1. The preparation of the first National Communication received a GEF grant of \$434,439 plus the Agency fee through project GEF ID 2387 (not \$450,000). The second National Communication received a GEF grant of \$254,000 through project GEF ID 182 (not \$400,000). Unless additional resources were provided, please correct the amount in USD for the National Communications mentioned above.

Agency Response

08 December 2022

1. Table 1 has been amended to include a subtitle on Enabling Activities, where National Communications and the ongoing first Biennial Update Report (BUR1) projects are now listed below.

2. Thank you for this remark. The amounts in Table 1 have been corrected accordingly for the First and Second National Communications.

Moreover, text has been included to better reflect the legal and institutional framework, especially concerning the role of Environmental Management Units.

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

12/20/2022 EBF: All previous comments have been addressed. Cleared.

10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, with a few comments:

1. It isn't possible to read Figure 5 (Theory of Change). Please try reuploading it with a higher definition.
2. Output 1.1 mentions that it will *"propose and formalize processes and procedures for GHG data collection and reporting of GHG emission data"* and that it *"will deliver data-sharing agreements with all relevant data providers and government institutions as well as a clear definition of roles, mandates and responsibilities of the involved ministries, agencies and data providers such as local governments and the private sector, concerning the production and sharing of activity data in a timely and consistent manner"*

Please explain how the project will ensure that these processes and data-sharing agreements will be adopted and implemented by the relevant stakeholders and government institutions.

3. In line with the previous comment, Stakeholders section in the Engagement Plan mentions the following: *"The development of the Climate Change law proposal and national climate response implementation framework cannot be completed without a comprehensive stakeholder engagement process; a significant amount of budget for Outputs 1.1 and is earmarked for stakeholder consultations."*
Please clarify what will be the role of the project with regard to the development of the Climate Change law proposal and national climate response implementation framework.
4. Similar to the previous comment, please explain how Activity 1.1.3 will be able to strengthen and expand the role of the Environmental Management Unit. Does it require an executive order to grant such capacity for example? If so, how can the project ensure it can be accomplished?
5. If possible, we encourage you to be more ambitious with Deliverable 1.1.4. For example: *"At least 10 **signed** Climate Data Sharing Agreements..."*

Agency Response

8 December 2022

1. We have tried uploading Figure 5 (Theory of Change) with a higher definition. We hope it is now legible. Please note the GEF Portal does not seem to be able to upload large file sizes, so this is the best we were able to do. Alternatively, you may find this figure in the PDF version of the CEO Endorsement Document uploaded on the Portal.

2. Further information has been provided in the description of Output 1.1 on how the project will ensure that these processes and data-sharing agreements will be adopted and implemented, through the enforcement of the National Bureau of Statistics Act and the Environmental Management Act.

3. The project will propose a coherent draft legal framework to collect and manage GHG Inventory data and NDC tracking (mitigation action, vulnerability & adaptation, and support needed and received), including gender considerations as per activity 1.1.3. Considering that the Environmental Management Act (2004) is undergoing a review process, the project will propose draft amendments to the legal framework where and if needed to specifically enable the implementation of the ETF in Tanzania.

4. The description of activities and deliverables 1.1.3, 1.1.6 and 1.1.7 has been amended to better reflect the legal and institutional framework, especially concerning the sectoral and local role of Environmental Management Units. According to the legal framework in place, Environmental Management Units in mainland Tanzania and Environmental Management and Climate Change Units in Zanzibar coordinate all matters related to environment and climate change within each respective ministry or local government authority.

The CBIT project will strengthen capacities of the environmental management units to collect climate data at sectoral and local levels and share them with the NCMC and the Division of Environment for the implementation of the ETF. In this context, the Division of Environment under VPO is the one responsible for coordinating ETF-related work, being the national focal point for the UNFCCC. The NCMC is the technical arm of VPO, being responsible for compiling information of the MRV system. The strengthening of the Environmental Management Units' capacities to perform data collection and sharing for the ETF will be supported by their revised legal mandates, and enabled through an inter-ministerial coordination framework and the application of VPO executive orders.

5. Deliverable 1.1.4. has been amended to read "At least 10 signed Climate Data Sharing Agreements", as suggested.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, this has been elaborated.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, this has been elaborated.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, this has been elaborated.

Agency Response

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

10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, this is well elaborated.

Agency Response

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

10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, this has been provided.

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

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

12/20/2022 EBF: All previous comments have been addressed. Cleared.

10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, with a comment:

1. Please explain if the project has engaged or will engage with indigenous peoples and local communities.
2. The first paragraph of the Engagement Plan may have an incomplete sentence that currently reads: "Other national experts and the private sector." Please clarify if these stakeholders were also part of the first workshop.
3. Please refer to the third comment in the proposed alternative scenario section related to the "Climate Change law proposal and national climate response implementation framework" and make sure your response is consistent in this section as well.

Agency Response

8 December 2022

1. The consultations at PPG stage did not happen at the local level. However, the ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government (PO-RALG) was involved in such consultations, as per the Stakeholders section. Table 5: List of Institutions and their roles in the CBIT project has been amended to inform that it is expected that local communities will be involved in project implementation, given their role in monitoring progress of forest carbon stocks changes over time in the scope of existing forestry projects, under which they have been trained (as part of the Participatory Community Forest Management in Mainland Tanzania and in Zanzibar). Please note that Tanzania does not refer to 'indigenous people' in its terminology, but to 'local communities'.
2. The first paragraph of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan has corrected the spelling error identified. These stakeholders were part of both the consultation and validation workshops, as per corresponding reports and lists of participants.
3. The stakeholder section has been amended, where reference to the Climate Change Law has been replaced by 'a coherent draft legal framework to collect and manage GHG Inventory data and NDC tracking (mitigation action, vulnerability & adaptation, and support needed and received), including gender considerations' as per activity 1.1.3. Considering that the Environmental Management Act (2004) is undergoing a review process, the project will propose draft amendments to the legal framework where and if needed to specifically enable the implementation of the ETF in Tanzania.

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

10/31/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

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

10/31/2022: Yes, this has been elaborated.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/31/2022: Yes, this has been elaborated. We note the mention of COVID-19 related risks and opportunities are provided.

Agency Response

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

12/20/2022 EBF: Noted. Coordination with BTR1 is very important. Cleared.

10/31/2022: We understand that Tanzania is part of the "Umbrella Programme for Preparation of Biennial Transparency Reports (BTRs) and National Communications (NCs) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)" (GEF ID 10973). Although this umbrella program has yet to be approved, it will allow the country to receive support to prepare its first Biennial Transparency Report.

For this reason, we kindly request that you make sure that the coordination section and other relevant sections of the proposal explain how the project would coordinate or contribute to the potential preparation of Tanzania's first BTR.

Agency Response

08 December 2022

The Coordination section has been amended to better explain coordination between the CBIT and BTR1 projects. The CBIT project is expected to strengthen the national institutional and legal framework so as to support the preparation and submission of the BTR to the UNFCCC, through activities that will deliver results still in the first year of project implementation, from which the First BTR project will benefit. With regards to the enhancement of technical capacities (online integrated platform, tools, templates, guidelines and improvement plans), the results are mostly expected to be delivered in years 2 and 3 of CBIT project implementation. Thus, the CBIT project will coordinate with the BTR1 project to better understand gaps and needs in the actual preparation of the BTR report, to train the stakeholders involved in BTR preparation, and to start testing and operationalising the different tools and procedures proposed. Both projects will be under the responsibility of the same Executing Agency, which is VPO, Division of Environment, UNFCCC focal point.

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

10/31/2022: Yes, this has been provided

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

12/20/2022 EBF: All previous comments have been addressed. Cleared.

10/31/2022: Yes, with a couple of comments:

1. The table in the Knowledge Management section corresponds to Table 11. Please correct the caption since it refers to Table 10.
2. The indicative budget of the table mentioned above adds up to \$350,000. However, the last sentence of this section states that the "knowledge management and knowledge products are estimated at approximately US\$ 360,000". Please correct accordingly.

Agency Response

08 December2022

1. The caption of Table 11 in the Knowledge Management section has been corrected.
2. The last sentence of the Knowledge Management section has been corrected according to the indicative budget of the table, which adds up to \$350,000.

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

10/31/2022: Yes, this has been marked as low. Cleared.

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

12/20/2022 EBF: Noted. Cleared.

10/31/2022: Yes, with a comment:

1. The project has allocated \$45,000 for M&E. However, in the table provided in the M&E section the budget for M&E adds up to \$44,250. Please correct or explain why the budget in this table doesn't add up to \$45,000.

Agency Response

08 December 2022

The Table provided in Annex J: M&E Budget and Workplan has been corrected according to the costs of the Final closing workshop allocated in the project budget annex (\$3,750). With this correction, the budget for M&E in the table now adds up to \$45,000.

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

10/31/2022: This has been elaborated. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2022: The budget in Annex E is off margins. Please correct.

10/31/2022: Yes, all relevant annexes have been provided.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2022 EBF: Thank you for re-uploading the Project Results Framework. However, now it is off margins. Please correct.

10/31/2022: Please address the following comment:

1. The Project Results Framework has been provided in Annex A. However, it is not possible to read it. Please try reuploading it with a higher definition.

Agency Response

08 December2022

We have re-uploaded it in the portal with the best definition possible. Any higher definition would not allow us to upload the picture on the portal. Large size files do not seem to work on the portal. Alternatively, you may find this Annex A in the PDF version of the CEO Endorsement Document uploaded on the Portal.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 10/31/2022 EBF: According to the table provided in Annex C, \$50,000 have been requested for PPG, \$37,791 have been spent to date, and \$12,209 have been committed but hasn't yet been spent. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 10/31/2022 EBF: Yes, this has been provided.

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

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 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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2022 EBF: Please refer to the comments above related to the formatting of Table B, the Project Results Framework and Annex E.

10/31/2022 EBF: Please address the comments above.

**** Please highlight in green the changes made on the portal version of the CEO approval document for ease of reference. ****

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/31/2022	12/9/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/20/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations