



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

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11489

Countries

Tanzania

Project Name

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

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/15/2023

Review completed by PM

3/29/2024

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, January 31, 2024

- Yes

- Please include GEF Agency ID

- The number of executing partners listed in the portal exceeds those listed in the LoE. Kindly revise the information in the portal to match that of the LoE.

- Under Indicative Project Overview table, revise the figures for M&E (567,312.00) and PMC (381,866.00).

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments Addressed on 2024.03.28.

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, January 31, 2024

Please provide more details on the project background and the climate adaptation challenges currently being experienced and your proposed intervention.

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments Addressed on 2024.03.28.

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, January 31, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments-

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, January 31, 2024

-Yes. However, there is need to integrate gender specific considerations in component 2. Output 2.2.2 for example could be modified to "identify and implement gender sensitive alternative income generating activities". Also highlight gender in component 3 (i.e. output 3.2.1).

-Additionally, incorporate gender equality and women's empowerment in the following: Outputs 1.1.4, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6, among others. Please also ensure a gender-responsive M&E and that lessons learned and results on gender are captured and reported on.

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments Addressed on 2024.03.28.

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, January 31, 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency's Comments-

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, January 31, 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, January 31, 2024

- a) Yes
- b) Yes
- c) No
- d) No

Please provide information on element c and d. The section on "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" has not been completed and no information on stakeholder arrangement has been provided.

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments Addressed on 2024.03.28.

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, January 31, 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments-

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, January 31, 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, January 31, 2024

- a) No information provided
- b) No information provided
- c) No
- d) Yes, however, more information is needed as in bullet 2 below.

1- Please address points a, b, and c, including implementation arrangement and analysis of previous projects.

2- Better description of the project's overall KM&L approach that addresses key GEF KM&L expectations which may include:

- an overview of 'existing' lessons and best practice that inform the project concept
- plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations (by the GEF or other institutions)
- processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation
- tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites
- knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at community, national and international levels as appropriate)
- a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project/program impact and sustainability
- plans for strategic communications and outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of project outputs/results/lessons

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments Addressed on 2024.03.28.

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, January 31, 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, January 31, 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, January 31, 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes, however, the project indicates that "Land tenure conflicts are prevalent, especially among pastoral and agro-pastoral communities". Conflict has not been identified as a potential risk to the project implementation. Please clarify this.

c) the project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate in the environmental screening template provided. However, the environment and social risk in the Key risks section in the Portal said "low" risk in environmental and social risk. Please revise and make these risks consistent.

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments
Addressed on 2024.03.28.

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, January 31, 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, January 31, 2024

Yes

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, January 31, 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, January 31, 2024

Component 2 of the project specifies contributing to the Biodiversity Focal Area (Page 32). Could you specify which of the BD targets the project will contribute to?

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Biodiversity as a FA removed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Addressed on 2024.03.28.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, January 31, 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, January 31, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments-
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, January 31, 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments-
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, January 31, 2024

Yes (CCA-1 & CCA-2)

Agency's Comments-
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, January 31, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments-
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, January 31, 2024

N/A

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, January 31, 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments-
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, January 31, 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, January 31, 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, January 31, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments-

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?s(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 January 31, 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 January 31, 2024

Since the uploaded LoE is not opening, please re-upload the letter again.

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments Addressed on 2024.03.28.

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC January 31, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments-

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 January 31, 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, January 31, 2024

No, please upload the map/coordinates of the proposed project location

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Geo coordinates provided

Cleared

Agency's Comments The coordinates were included in the initial submission.

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, January 31, 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, January 31, 2024

Yes, however, component 2 of the project specifies contributing to the Biodiversity Focal Area (Page 32) and the BD marker is not selected. Could you clarify why this is not the case here?

GEFSEC, March 29, 2024

Biodiversity as a FA removed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments Addressed on 2024.03.28.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, January 31, 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

January 31, 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, April 08, 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, April 08, 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments-
Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/22/2024	3/28/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/29/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		