

# Sustainable Land Management and improved Community Resilience in Dryland areas and livestock migratory hotspots of Tanzania

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

<b>GEF ID</b>	11489
<b>Countries</b>	Tanzania
<b>Project Name</b>	Sustainable Land Management and improved Community Resilience in Dryland areas and livestock migratory hotspots of Tanzania
<b>Agencies</b>	FAO
<b>Date received by PM</b>	6/10/2025
<b>Review completed by PM</b>	6/23/2025
<b>Program Manager</b>	Ladu David Morris Lemi
<b>Focal Area</b>	Climate Change
<b>Project Type</b>	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 Aug 10, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

No. The project mentioned PO-RALG and NLUPC as having execution role. If this is true, please list them as well under "Project Executing Entity(s)".

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. As detailed in Section B1, PO-RALG (Prime Minister's Office - Regional Administration and Local Government) and NLUPC (National Land Use Planning Commission) are indeed identified as executing partners within the Project Document with PO-RALG supporting district-level capacity building and NLUPC leading participatory land use planning and tenure activities (VLUP). The "Project Executing Entity(s)" section now explicitly lists PO-RALG and NLUPC.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

### 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 Aug 10, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

- a) Yes
- b) Yes
- c) Please make sure to indicate equivalent percentages instead of numbers for any representation of women beneficiaries. For example, in Outcomes 3.2 and 3.2, says 540 pastoralists, 120 technical. This needs to be provide in percentages and when say 40% and women and youth, you need to split further women % and youth %.
- d) Yes
- e) Yes

Agency Response

2025.07.24

Thank you. All beneficiary figures in all sections of the Prodoc have been provided disaggregated by sex and age and expressed as percentages.

### 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 Aug 10, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

- a) Yes, however, the drivers are spread throughout the document. It could be better to have a specific section that describes the key drivers that the project intends to address.
- b) Yes, however, there is no specific private sector entity named in the project. We prefer that at this stage of the project, specific private sectors to be engaged should have been identified.
- c) N/A

## Agency Response

2025.07.24

a) We agree with the observation. While the project rationale comprehensively describes the current situation and drivers, we have consolidated and presented the key drivers of environmental degradation and climate vulnerability -such as tenure insecurity, weak governance, overgrazing, and climate variability- in a dedicated paragraph at the beginning of the Project Rationale section for clarity.

b) Specific private sector actors have been identified and reflected in the narrative. The Tanzania Agricultural Development Bank (TADB) is explicitly identified as a co-financing partner and anchor institution for expanding adaptation-aligned financial services. Other local banks/microfinance institutions such as CRDB and NMB are also mentioned as potential partners for developing credit products. Furthermore, SMEs (Small and Medium Enterprises) are highlighted for their role in adopting resource-efficient production and processing methods. These actors are now more clearly highlighted in the relevant sections, demonstrating their identified roles as both stakeholders and financiers, contributing to the project outcomes.

### 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 Aug 10, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

- a) Yes, however, the ToC illustration is not readable. Please update
- b) Yes, however, although the project lists projects to draw lessons from, there is no elaboration or identification of specific lessons that project builds upon. Please provide specific lesson(s) from each of the listed projects.
- c) Yes
- d) N/A
- e) Yes
- f) Yes
- g) Yes
- h) Yes
- i) No. Please ensure that the key indicators in the Gender Action Plan are also reflected in the project results framework. The GAP indicated that "A specific budget will be allocated to meet gender targets and fund practical measures". It would be important to regularly monitor the GAP and include them in the PIRs, MTRs and TE, and highlight good practices and lessons learned/challenges.
- j) Yes
- k) No.
- l) Yes

Agency Response2025.07.24

- a) The Theory of Change diagram has been reformatted and high-resolution version is included in the annex.
- b) The specific lessons learned from previous projects are detailed in the "Lessons Learned from Past Projects" section, and these insights have now been further integrated into the project description.
- i) Specific key gender indicators from the GAP are explicitly reflected within the main Project Results Framework. Additionally, we confirm that the Gender Action Plan (GAP) outlines gender-responsive measures and indicators for each project output. While gender-sensitive indicators are already included in the Project Results Framework (Annex C) (e.g., CI-1, CI-4 with gender disaggregation and targets for women and youth representation). We also confirm that the project's M&E system has been designed to regularly monitor the GAP (M&E 1.3. Implementation and Tracking of the Gender Action Plan), with sex-disaggregated data, and that gender-sensitive

results will be highlighted in PIRs, MTRs, and TEs. Budget for gender-related activities has been allocated under the M&E section and the gender specialist recruited as part of the PMU will further ensure gender-responsive resource allocations.

k) We acknowledge this comment. As reflected in the risks section and in the section ?Alignment with Gef-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities?, the project does not contradict any existing national policies. On the contrary, it addresses several gaps that currently hinder effective climate adaptation and land degradation control. In particular, the project identifies institutional overlaps, weak coordination, and inconsistent gender integration across sectors as gaps. To explicitly address the "counteracting policies" concern, a statement has been added to clarify that while existing policies are largely supportive, the identified fragmentation of responsibilities, limited implementation of tenure frameworks (especially for pastoralists), and persistent gender inequalities act as systemic barriers that de facto counteract effective outcomes. The project's strategy to address these is by:

- Integrated Land-Use Planning and Governance Strengthening: Bridging fragmented responsibilities across land, livestock, and environmental sectors.
- Formalization of Land Tenure and Inclusive Decision-Making: Addressing limitations in implementation of land tenure frameworks, especially for pastoralist and customary land users.
- Targeted Interventions for Gender Equality: Directly addressing persistent gender inequalities in land access and governance.
- Improved Data Generation and Accessibility: Tackling gaps in climate risk and environmental data through community-based monitoring and advisory systems.

These interventions are designed to create a coherent and enabling policy environment rather than being counteracted by it.

## **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 Aug 10, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

- a) Yes
- b) Please indicate "Yes or No" to indicate if you plan to have execution role in this project.
- c) Yes, however, as indicated earlier, provide specific examples on how the project will cooperate with other previous projects.

Agency Response2025.07.24

- b) We confirm that FAO, as the GEF Implementing Agency, will **not** play an execution role in this project.

c) Specific examples of how the project builds upon and integrates lessons learned from past and current initiatives in Tanzania have been provided. Selected insights are woven directly into the narrative of each corresponding output to show how they inform practical implementation, while additional examples of how the project builds on past and current initiatives are detailed in the "Lessons learned from past projects" section. For example:

- The project complements initiatives like the GEF-7 Dryland Sustainable Landscape Impact Program (DSL-IP) child project and the WWF/GEF FOLUR child project by introducing an adaptation lens to livestock-sector resilience, integrating climate risk into land use planning, and targeting dryland systems not fully reached by other programs.
- It builds on the Ecosystem-based Adaptation for Rural Resilience in Tanzania (EbARR) project by applying tested methods in a climate risk context.
- It leverages existing national knowledge platforms and Communities of Practice from DSL-IP for effective information exchange and policy integration.
- It also draws on lessons from FAO's Sustainable Land Management Program (SLMP) and the Integrated Landscape Management in the Dry Miombo Woodlands project.

We have now ensured that these specific examples of cooperation are prominently stated to address the comment directly.

### 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 Aug 10, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

a) Yes, however, there is a change in some core indicators. For example, there is now no contribution to climate information services previously indicated in PIF yet outcome 1.2 will implement early warning and climate information systems. Please change the meta information indicator of SCCF-A to "False". Since there will be three private sectors to be engaged, the meta indicator for private sector should be "True" instead of false. Additionally, core indicator 1 is smaller than indicator 4. We think that this should be the other way.

b) Yes.

All sub-indicators are not documented. Please addressed

Agency Response2025.07.24

a) Thank you for the observations. The discrepancies stemmed from typographical errors during data entry and have now been corrected:

- Core Indicator 1 was mistakenly entered as 1,500 instead of the intended 1,500,000, as accurately presented in the narrative. This figure combines 36,000 direct beneficiaries from climate-resilient land use (CI 1.1) and 1,464,000 from improved climate information services (CI 1.3), in line with Outcome 1.2.

- The SCCF-A meta indicator has been corrected to ?False?.
- The Private Sector meta indicator has been updated to ?True?, reflecting the engagement of three enterprises.
- The mismatch between Core Indicator 1 and Core Indicator 4 has been resolved. The correct figures are now reflected in the results matrix and the GEF Portal.

b) Regarding sub-indicators, all are now fully developed and justified in the corresponding sections of the ProDoc.

#### 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, June 23 2025

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025

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, June 23 2025

Yes

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025**

N/A

Agency Response2025.07.24

Not applicable.

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

N/A.

Agency Response2025.07.24

Not applicable.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response2025.07.24

Not applicable.

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

N/A.

Agency Response 2025.07.24

Not applicable.

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

N/A.

Agency Response 2025.07.24

Not applicable.

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

N/A.

Agency Response 2025.07.24

Not applicable.

**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, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**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, Sept 25, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, August 10, 2025**

The following previous comment has not been addressed "Also, all the co-financing letters under Public investments do not specify the ongoing programs or activities that the public investment will support. Its required that the letters specify or describe the relevant projects of activities". Please note that the description of the mobilized investments in both the co-financing section and in the letters do not clearly state how they align with the GEF-funded project.

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

Please make sure that all in-kind co-financing are "Recurrent expenditures" while Public investment should be "Investment mobilized". For example, the VPO letter for the amount of \$15,959,235 indicates both in-kind and public investment. This needs to be entered in two different row with one for Investment mobilized and another as recurrent expenditure for the "in-kind" contributions.

Also, all the co-financing letters under Public investments do not specify the ongoing programs or activities that the public investment will support. Its required that the letters specify or describe the relevant projects of activities. Additionally, spell out VPO in full.

Agency Response

2025.09.17

Thank you. All co-financing entries have been now revised in line with GEF policy.

2025.07.24

Thank you. The investments were presented separated in ?Recurrent Expenditures? and ?Investment Mobilized? except for the initial placeholder letter from the Vice President?s Office (VPO) indicating a total of USD 15,959,235, which was not a formal co-financing letter but served to confirm expected contributions from the Ministry of Agriculture, and the beneficiary Local Government Authorities (LGAs). This placeholder has now been replaced by formal co-financing letters.

Additionally, each letter now clearly identifies the activity and projects co-financed through the public investment mobilized. For instance, the Vice President?s Office letter specifies contributions to the National Adaptation Plan, the Integrated Environmental Information Management System, and project management costs; the PO-RALG letter details activities such as participatory land tenure processes, CSA promotion, pasture establishment, and value chain improvements.

**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, June 23 2025**

N/A

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025**

N/A

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025**

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) Yes

Agency Response-

**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, June 23 2025**

Yes

Agency Response-

**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 October 09, 2025**

By reducing the cost of travel to 9% and opting for motorbikes for the purposes of extension services in addition to 1 car instead of two cars, I consider these as cost effective options.

Cleared

**GEFSEC Sept 25, 2025**

Thanks for addressing most of the comments with exception of two points.

3) The cost of travel has only been reduced by 0.4%, that is from 13.3% to 12.9%. While I acknowledge the need for travelling as stated, this cost is still high. For example, when the cost of personnel is added to the cost of travel, it means these salaries and DSA expenses will cost the project over 40.45% of the GEF grant without the identified Environmental problem being addressed. If the project budgets for DSA for officers from the various government ministries, how will the in-kind co-financing contribution be utilized?. GEF will be willing to approve a travel cost that is less than 9% at minimum.

4) In an exceptional case, we can approved only one vehicle (at \$85,000) and additional vehicles can be taken care of by the co-financing portion of the PMC. Please revised the budget line as stated.

**GEFSEC Sept 18, 2025**

Thanks for addressing the comment below. However, we still have the following comments to be addressed.

1) Please ensure that the titles of the positions in the budget are the same as in the ToR. For example, in the budget you have " National-level Sectors (Land and Water, Livestock and Fisheries, and Agriculture) Technical Advisor/expert" where as in the ToR you have " National-level Technical Focal Person: Land and Water, Livestock and Fisheries, and Crop Production Advisor"

2) Please see the information in the budget table below. 6 positions, each working for 50 months, the # of units should have been 300 not 360. The ToR also contradicts this by stating 7 positions with each working 60 months.

District-level Sectors (Land and Water, Livestock and Fisheries, and Agriculture) Technical expert ((6 positions - 1 per each district) × 50 person-months each; total 420 person-months; project duration: 60 months, concurrent))	Month	360	1,500	198,947	227,368	113,684
---	-------	-----	-------	---------	---------	---------

3) The budget allocated for travel is extremely high currently accounting for 13.3% of the GEF grant. Consider reducing this to a minimum. For example, since the project will hire District-level technical officers, I don't see the reason why their travel in those district need to be paid for. About \$155,000 has been allocated for Travel (transport, accommodation, and per diem) for national and regional officers from the various ministries, yet again there is allocation of \$52,000 for travel of Technical Government officers and Extension Officers. What is the category of the officers from the various ministries stated earlier?. Additionally, since the project will hire a Decision Support (DSS) Tool Expert, I don't see the reason why the project will have to pay \$78,000 for travel for officer to attend DSS use and Integration Training and another \$19,800 for DSS use and Integration Training.

4) Vehicle for field activities: I have taken note of the justification letter from the government pertaining this item. However, it is important to point out that, this project has a confirmed co-financing investment mobilized of \$23,440,691 as per the letters confirming co-financing. Part of this fund can take care of the vehicles especially those allocated for monitoring and evaluation. This is in line with the GEF policies.

5) The total budget for component 1 is missing \$1 when compared to the the table of component balances.

#### **GEFSEC Aug 10, 2025**

a) Yes

b) 1) The District-level Sector (Land, Water, Livestock and Fisheries, and Agriculture) Technical Advisor/expert position has been duplicated. Additionally, these roles will work for 10 years and 30 years on the project respectively. Please consider removing one and revising the number of months. 2) While the National Project Technical Coordinator position is charged 50% to project components, the related ToR is completely on administrative roles. Please charge this position 100% to PMC or revise the ToR indicating the specific deliverables to be delivered by this individual under the respected component. 3) Please consider reducing the monthly rates of \$3,500 and \$3,000 as these rates are at the high level. 4) The project has a high cost for travel at 15% of the GEF funding of which, i was unable to understand why attending UNFCCC COPs will have be paid for by the project. While all other training related travels have been specified, \$220,000 is being allocated for generic "training/workshops". Please remove this item. Additionally, all DSA related to supervision/monitoring should be covered under the "in-kind co-financing" as this is the only relevant item where such co-financing can be utilized. 5) Please charge the "Office running costs" 100% to PMC not project component. 6) The use of GEF funds to purchase project vehicles is strongly discouraged. You are advised that the GEF expects all Agencies to charge the costs related to vehicles to the co-financing portion of the PMC.

c) Yes. However, please ensure that the positions' titles in the ToR documents match those indicated in the budget document for easy understanding.

#### **GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

a) No. Please use the GEF budget template available at <https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-project-budget-template>.

b) We were not able to review the budget because its presented in a hard to understand partner's budget template. Please use GEF budget template and ensure that it is uploaded into Annex G in the portal.

c) To be reviewed once budget presented in the recommended template

## Agency Response

2025.10.07

3) and 4) Thank you. The purchase of one vehicle through project funds is essential to ensure adequate geographical coverage across the targeted implementation areas. Given the logistical demands and the need for reliable transportation to coordinate activities across multiple districts, the vehicle will serve as a critical asset for field monitoring, coordination, and timely delivery of project interventions.

Following your comments, and in close consultation with the executing partners, we have significantly optimized the transportation budget. Specifically:

1. Travel costs have been reduced to 9%, in line with the recommendation.
2. The number of vehicles has been reduced from 2 to 1, and we now propose the procurement of 7 motorcycles under minimal condition to ensure coverage of extension services for the 7 districts and 14 Wards where activities are planned. This revised approach not only maintains operational efficiency but has also generated additional savings of USD 57,000, which have been reallocated to strengthen core project activities on the ground.

2025.09.25

1) Thank you. We have corrected the discrepancy in the titles of project staff to ensure consistency between the budget and the Terms of Reference.

2) Thank you for pointing out the discrepancy. We have aligned the descriptions in the TORs and the budget, clarifying that it is six individuals working for 60 months for a total of 360 person-months. With this adjustment, the ToRs and the budget are now fully aligned.

3) We appreciate your concern regarding the proportion of travel costs. We have reduced these expenditures to the minimum level required to meet the project's operational needs. The budget reflects the reality of implementing activities across dispersed districts, where national and regional officers must provide oversight, technical backstopping, and quality assurance. Although local staff are present, their work is complemented by specialized technical inputs from central ministries, which require periodic travel across districts.

4) Having reduced travel costs, retaining a dedicated budget for project vehicles is essential to ensure the timely implementation of field activities (covering 7 drylands regions with challenging terrain), as well as for monitoring purposes. Co-financing will indeed cover additional transport-related expenditures (including a driver, fuel, maintenance, and insurance). However, relying solely on co-financing for vehicles would create a risk of delays and reduced functionality. The GEF Focal point is available to discuss this further should your office require additional reassurance.

5) Thank you. Corrected.

2025.09.17

On comments at b):

1) National and District-level Advisors were retained as distinct roles, each essential to project delivery. Budget entries now clearly indicate the number of positions, person-months, and levels of engagement. Wording across ToRs, budget, and narrative has been harmonized, and ToRs specify number, duration, and justification for each position.

2) The ToR of the National Project Technical Coordinator has been revised to include specific technical deliverables alongside administrative tasks. This justifies charging 50% to project components and 50% to PMC. [MV1] [JP2]

3) The proposed rates of USD 3,500 and USD 3,000 per month have been retained after review, as they reflect prevailing market benchmarks for the technical expertise required.

4) The original lump-sum allocation under Output 1.2.3 has been disaggregated into two budget lines:

? Travel: transport, accommodation, and per diem for national and regional officers (TMA, PMO, Disaster Management, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livestock, and selected district councils) to attend training and workshops on climate risk analysis, data interpretation, and integration of early warning into land use and SLM planning.

? Training delivery: standardized modules, facilitation, trainer fees, venues, training materials, and protocols to embed early warning and climate advisories in national systems.

Attendance at UNFCCC COPs has been removed from the project budget. All DSA for supervision and monitoring is now covered under in-kind co-financing.

5) Office running costs have been reassigned 100% to PMC.

6) Vehicle acquisition is fully justified by the remote and hard-to-reach project locations, where reliable transport is essential for implementation and supervision. While the costs of drivers, maintenance, and fuel are entirely covered through co-financing for the full project duration, the vehicles themselves remain an indispensable operational requirement. A partner's formal justification letter confirming this arrangement is provided in the annex. [MV5] [sa6]

c) The titles of positions in the ToRs have been aligned with those in the budget for consistency.

2025.07.24

The budget template has been updated and uploaded to Annex G. B.

**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, June 23 2025**

a) N/A

b) N/A

c) N/A

Agency Response-  
Additional Annexes  
**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation**  
**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, June 23 2025**

N/A

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>6/23/2025</b>	<b>7/24/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/10/2025</b>	<b>9/17/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/18/2025</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/25/2025</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/9/2025</b>	