

# Tanzania's Climate Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF)

Review PIF 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**

9/8/2020

**Review completed by PM**

8/16/2021

**Program Manager**

Namrata Rastogi

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

## PIF

### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes, the project is aligned with the GEF climate change focal area elements.

#### Agency Response

##### Indicative project/program description summary

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: The organization of the components and outputs is slightly confusing. Please see suggestions below:

- Component 1 could focus on institutional arrangements and building capacity at the inter-ministerial level. As Output 1.2 is focused on the institutional arrangements for the national MRV system, we suggest this gets moved to the top (i.e. 1.1). This could be followed by the information platform (1.3) and the output on tracking international financial support and reporting climate expenditures and support needed and received (2.2).

- The second component could then be focused on building capacity and guidelines for GHG inventories (1.1), mitigation actions (2.1) and adaptation information (2.3) and the peer-to-peer exchange programs (2.4).

7/16/2021: The changes incorporated make the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives and the core indicators. This is cleared.

7/26/2021: Please rephrase the project objective so that it is not a statement but an objective, i.e. instead of "Tanzania complies..." we suggest rephrasing to "To comply..."

8/16/2021: The objective has been rephrased. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**August 6, 2021**

The project objective has been rephrased as suggested, which is much appreciated.

**24 June 2021**

The Table B as well as the Section 3. *Proposed Alternative scenario* of the PIF have been re-worked, and components and outputs have been restructured. Below are further details for each component:

**Component 1** has been reformulated as *Strengthening and formalizing Tanzania's institutional arrangements for the national MRV system, and enhancing access to national climate information?*, focusing on institutional arrangements and building capacity at the inter-ministerial level, as suggested.

Component 1 now comprises the following outputs, in reply to the concerns raised in the comment:

- **Output 1.1** *Technical assistance provided to the Government of Tanzania to review, update and formalize institutional arrangements concerning the national MRV system (previously output 1.2).*
- **Output 1.2** *A centralized national climate information platform and management system established and made available online by the National Climate and Monitoring Centre (NCMC) working in close collaboration with Vice President's Office, Division of Environment (previously output 1.3).*
- The choice was made to keep the output on tracking support needed and received together with NDC tracking as these are deeply interconnected elements of the global stocktaking exercise (now under output 2.4).

**Component 2** has been reformulated as *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.?*

Component 2 now comprises the following outputs, in reply to the concerns raised in the comment:

- **Output 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 (previously output 1.1).*
- **Output 2.2** *Technical assistance provided to develop appropriate GHG emissions modelling to inform decision-making (previously output 1.4).*
- **Output 2.3** *Technical assistance and training provided to the Government of Tanzania in the monitoring of indicators, tracking and reporting of progress of NDC mitigation actions (previously output 2.1)*

- **Output 2.4** Technical assistance and training provided to the Government of Tanzania to enhance tracking of financial support needed and received for NDC implementation (previously output 2.2).
- **Output 2.5** Technical assistance and training provided to the Government of Tanzania to track the integration of information on V&A into policy formulation; and enhance monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of adaptation activities at national and subnational levels for 'highly impacted sectors' as per the NDC (previously output 2.3).
- Peer-exchange activities such as participation in the CBIT Global Coordination Platform have now been integrated to training and capacity-building under Component 2, especially Output 2.3 on tracking NDC mitigation actions (to be further detailed at PPG stage). They are no longer a stand-alone output.

We have also taken the opportunity of this review sheet to update the CBIT Tanzania PIF in line with the latest GEF guidance on M&E. As such, the M&E budget has been segregated as a separate line in Table B. The US\$ 45,000 budgeted for M&E include the costs of the Inception Workshop, the Steering Committee meetings and the Terminal Evaluation, which were previously budgeted for under the different project Outcomes.

*Note: all the edits have been highlighted in yellow in the updated PDF version of the CBIT Tanzania PIF uploaded on the GEF portal.*

#### **Co-financing**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: Yes, co-financing of \$145,000 will be provided in-kind by the national government.

Agency Response

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: The proposed resources requested seem a little high for the proposed scope and considering ongoing support.

7/16/2021: Yes, this is cleared. We note that the co-financing amount has accordingly been reduced to \$113,850.

Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

Comment taken. The project budget has been reconsidered and the GEF project financing requested has now been lowered to USD 1,144,000. A new Letter of Endorsement signed by the GEF OFP is therefore being submitted with this updated PIF.

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: The amounts are being requested from the CBIT set-aside allocation. At the time of this review, there are sufficient resources to support this project.

Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

The GEF project financing requested has now been lowered to USD 1,144,000. As such, a new Letter of Endorsement signed by the GEF OFP is being submitted with this updated PIF.

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: Yes, a PPG of \$50,000 is being requested and is within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: Yes, a target for Core Indicator 11 is provided.

Agency Response

**Project/Program taxonomy**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/17/2020: Yes, the project is properly tagged.

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes, this section is well described. Please note that the final sentence seems to have been cut out. Please fix.

7/16/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

The final sentence of section 1) *The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed* has been fixed (p. 7).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Please address the comments below:

1. Please clarify the structure and roles of the National Committee on Climate Change and the National Climate Change Technical Committee and the National Climate Change Steering Committee, and their relationship to each other.
2. Please clarify why the Third National Communication and First Biennial Update Reports have suffered such delays in implementation. The PIF mentions that work on these two reports "is starting" but these projects were approved in 2013 and 2016.
3. Please provide an update on the status of the development of the updated National Climate Change Strategy which the PIF mentions was planned for review in 2019/2020.
4. Please add the first BUR to the table of baseline activities.

7/16/2021: Comments have been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

1. Clarification on the structure and roles of the different national committees has been added to Section 2. Baseline scenario (p. 8).

2. Clarification on the delays experienced in the Third National Communication and First Biennial Update Report has been added to Section 2. Baseline scenario (p. 8).

3. The status of the development of revision of the National Climate Change Strategy has been updated in Section 2. Baseline scenario (p. 9).

4. The first BUR has been included to the table of baseline activities (p. 12).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Please address comments below.

1. Output 1.1: We welcome the development of QA/QC procedures in line with IPCC 2006 guidelines. Please clarify if the TNC and BUR projects would address this. Also, consider other related elements to the GHG inventory that will help it to follow IPCC 2006 guidelines such as developing data collection procedures for activity data, methodologies for calculation etc. (as mentioned in the baseline section description). While this activity seems to be implied in the description of Output 1.1, we would like to ensure that it is specifically included within the potential activities.

2. Please further clarify what would happen to the National Carbon Monitoring Center in the proposed approach.

3. Output 1.3: It is not fully clear if and how the centralized national climate information platform and management system will incorporate information on support. Please clarify. This output also includes the development of a verification manual. It is not clear what this manual is, what it aims to achieve. Please provide additional information.

4. Please clarify how outputs 2.1 and 2.3 will coordinate with the work under the ICAT support and avoid duplication with ongoing efforts.

5. Please provide additional information on the baseline related to output 2.2 and tracking of international support in Tanzania.

7/16/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

1. The description of current Output 2.1 (previously Output 1.1) on GHG Inventories has been improved to contemplate related work under the TNC and BUR projects and to include needs identified in the baseline scenario in the list of potential activities.

2. Further clarification on the role of the National Carbon Monitoring Center would have through the proposed approach can be found in the baseline scenario (p. 9-10). A



reference to this has also been made under the description of current Output 2.1 (p. 22) (previous Output 1.1).

3. The content of previous Output 1.3 is currently under Output 1.2. The additional information added confirms that the centralized system will also comprise data and information on financial support needs and tracking of financial support received (p. 19). Moreover, still under Output 1.2, additional information has been provided on the national GHG manual to instruct users on feeding and operating the web-based National GHG Inventory platform which will be part of the centralized national climate information and management system. It will help ensure the development of long-term institutional memory, reducing the impacts of staff turnover and making the system sustainable over time (p. 20).

4. Reference to the ICAT initiative in Tanzania has now been removed from the PIF since the ICAT project is being cancelled, having produced no results nor deliverables.

5. Additional information on the baseline related to current output 2.4 (previously output 2.2) on tracking of financial support has been provided (p. 24).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes, overall the project is aligned with the climate change strategy.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes, this is well described.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Please address comments below:

1. The sustainability section states that "Since the proposed MRV will be seeking to be integrated into the existing M & E structures, performing any additional MRV function will not require new law." However, Output 1.2 and its description states that "Draft and submit for government/legislative approval an updated institutional framework outlining clear and detailed institutional roles, mandates and responsibilities of relevant ministries, agencies and external data providers for data production, collection and reporting for the national MRV system; and ensuring clear authority status to the Division of Environment (Vice President's Office) as the overall lead agency and to the lead agencies of the different sectors". Please clarify.

2. Under Potential for Scaling up please comment on key regional partners in this area of work with whom Tanzania could concretely work (particularly through the peer-to-peer output in the project) and consider including a reference to the Southern Climate Partnership Incubator Initiative which is briefly mentioned under the KM section.

7/16/2021: Comments have been addressed. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

1. The Sustainability section has been adjusted to correct this inconsistency and ensure clarity (p. 30).

2. Under Potential for Scaling up, the key regional partners and the Southern Climate Partnership Incubator Initiative have been included (p. 30). As mentioned earlier in the review sheet, the peer-to-peer work has now been included as an activity under Output 2.3 ? it is no longer a stand-alone output.

#### Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes, this project is national capacity-building project.

#### Agency Response

##### Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Please clarify which stakeholders listed were consulted during PIF preparation.

7/16/2021: Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

1. A *Table 3: List of stakeholders consulted during the PIF preparation* has been added to the stakeholders' section (p.33-34).

#### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes this is sufficiently described for this stage.

#### Agency Response

#### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Please clarify further how the project contemplated involving the Tanzania Private Sector Foundation. Please also comment on whether/how the private sector has been involved in previous reporting processes (as opposed to general climate change actions).

7/16/2021: Comment has been addressed. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

Further information on the engagement of the private sector in previous reporting processes has been provided in section 4. *Private sector* (p. 37).

## Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: This is sufficient for this stage. By CEO endorsement, please further elaborate, in particular with reference to the risks of the COVID pandemic per recently shared guidelines.

### Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

This is well noted. A detailed Covid-19 risk and opportunity analysis will be undertaken during the project development phase (PPG).

### Coordination

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Please provide additional information on how this project will coordinate with the ICAT support referenced in the baseline scenario, and with the Third NC and First BUR work. Please also include information on the role of UNEP as implementing agency.

7/16/2021: This is sufficient at this stage. At CEO endorsement, please provide a detailed explanation of the institutional arrangement for the project and coordination among other projects. Cleared.

### Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

Section ?6. *Coordination?* has been amended to include the role of UNEP as the implementing agency and to provide further information on how the CBIT project will build on the First BUR and Third National Communication activities so as to avoid

duplication of efforts (p. 39). Reference to the ICAT initiative in Tanzania has been removed since the ICAT project is being cancelled.

#### **Consistency with National Priorities**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes, the project is consistent with national priorities.

Agency Response

#### **Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes.

7/26/2021: The project should include plans for a "communication plan/strategy" for the project as part of the KM approach. Also clarify how this project's design is learning from building on experiences and lessons gained from similar past initiatives and investments.

8/16/2021: Comment has been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

#### **August 6, 2021**

A paragraph has been included in the Knowledge Management section of the PIF (p. 41) to provide a brief overview of the strategy to disseminate project results. This plan will be further elaborated during the PPG phase. However, given the special nature of CBIT projects, the project will not include a Communications Plan *per se*, since it is not meant to target a very broad audience beyond the ministries, agencies and other relevant national stakeholders directly involved in the project's implementation.

This CBIT Project builds indeed on lessons learned through the implementation of previous National Communications. Such analysis already is presented in section 2) *The baseline scenario* section of the PIF, especially concerning gaps and barriers identified through the above-mentioned initiatives. A reference to the lessons learned from the

NCs and the BUR has now also been made in the Knowledge Management section of the PIF (p. 42).

#### **Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes, the risks are assessed as low.

Agency Response

#### **Part III ? Country Endorsements**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Yes, the project has been endorsed by Faraja Ngerageza in March 2020.

9/16/2021: The Agency has provided a new LoE with the revised project financing request (letter dated June 21, 2021). The project has been endorsed by OFP Faraja Ngerageza in June 2021.

Agency Response

**24 June 2021**

The GEF project financing requested has now been lowered to USD 1,144,000. As such, a new Letter of Endorsement signed by the GEF OFP is being submitted with this updated PIF.

#### **Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/17/2020: Please address comments above.

7/16/2021: I recommend the project.

7/26/2021: Please address remaining comments above, highlighted in yellow.

8/16/2021: Comments have been addressed. PM recommends project.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

7/16/2021: As mentioned above in the comments, at CEO endorsement stage please provide a detailed COVID-19 risk and opportunity analysis as per recent guidelines; and provide detailed explanation of the institutional structure of the project including coordination.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/17/2020</b>	<b>6/24/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/16/2021</b>	<b>8/6/2021</b>

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/26/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/16/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**