

Biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and enhanced water security in Lake Tanganyika basin

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10388

Countries

Regional (Burundi, Congo DR, Tanzania, Zambia)

Project Name

Biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and enhanced water security in Lake Tanganyika basin

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/2/2021

Review completed by PM

5/1/2023

Program Manager

Astrid Hillers

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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
(12/16/2021) Yes.

IW: The project remains aligned with the GEF focal area elements for IW in supporting transboundary cooperation to implement SAP priorities and strengthen the LTA capacities.

BD: The project is well aligned with the BD focal area priorities, with substantial activities proposed for enhancing the conservation status of three protected areas (PAs) and their respective buffer zones in a key biodiversity area of global significance. The GEBs associated with the Biodiversity focal area is the improved management effectiveness of at least 553,775 ha of high biodiversity value areas of the three protected areas, and also the implementation of sustainable land management practices, and conservation and management measures, in at least 20,000 ha of protected area buffer zones.

(2/28/2023)

1. Please update the expected start and end dates.
2. Please review and add Rio markers for BD and LD.

(4/25/2023)

Comments addressed. Cleared.

(5/1/2023)

Please update *after* endorsement with actual start dates.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. Noted.

Response to 2/28/2023

1. Please update the expected start and end dates.

A force majeure extension was requested for this project in order to address the delays incurred through the COVID pandemic and to fully answer the key GEF review comments. An additional layer of multi-stakeholder consultations and data collection was conducted in support of consolidating the project documentation.

The expected start and end dates have therefore been updated accordingly in the CEO endorsement package and the PRODOC to June 2023 and May 2028 respectively.

2. Please review and add Rio markers for BD and LD.

The Rio markers for biodiversity and land degradation are now well reflected in the CEO endorsement document Annex G. These have also been transferred to the portal

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

(12/20/2021)

- Table B remains aligned with what was submitted at PIF stage. What is described in table B and the project components remains ambitious. Please see question 3 part II of the review sheet for more detailed comments.

- PMC: Guidance is provided on the Council decision GEF/C.39.9, including that there should be proportionality between the PMC covered by co-financed amounts

and the PMC covered by the GEF funding, currently the amounts are very similar. Please explain.

(2/15/2022) Comment on proportionality of PMC addressed, but please note and address the comments on the budget below:

1. There are differences between the totals (e.g. component totals) provided in the budget in Annex E and the GEF Project Financing column in table B. Please review and correct where necessary.
2. A number of staff positions are charged across components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 3.6 million and close to 6.2 million of co-financing is represented in grants. Please revise and explore options.

(4/25/2023)

1. Not addressed:

The budget totals (excel table) are:

TOTAL	4,576,517	4,005,686	3,541,823	1,501,678
-------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

- i. These do not align with the component and PMC totals in table B/project description summary (please also update or delete the project start and end dates in the budget table as these differ from the ER).
- ii. The M&E line in the budget is not shown in a sub-component of table B, which may be one reason that these numbers do not lign up.

PLEASE ADDRESS.

2. The amounts are roughly in the same proportion (co-finance to grant =4.24 and PMC Co-finance to PMC=4.5). This can be accepted.

Please though explain if you have explored to leverage grant co-finance to cover staff costs. We note that the TORs split technical and coordination tasks for the project coordinator/lead and the financial and contracts manager. It is not clear that the financial and contracts manager has significant contributions to the technical components. Same for safeguards officer TORs.

(i) Please align the TORs and budget to only charge staff component related technical work to components. and

(ii) Explore/explain whether cash/grant co-finance will be able to cover some of the PMC costs of this project.

(5/1/2023)

1. Thanks for addressing. Also, M&E costs plus the component 4 total in the budget table now add up correctly to the total of component 4 in table B.

Comments addressed.

2. The explanation of the staff allocation is noted and the finance and admin's roles not primarily to be part of the project management but to create and enhance procurement and FM rules and procedures in the Lake Tanganyika authority (LTA) and national counterparts in order to provide an end of project situation where LTA will be capacitated to administer project funds of similar size by itself.

Comments addressed.

Agency Response

- Noted.

- Thank you for the reminder. The PMC co-finance amounts have been revised accordingly to reflect proportionality.

Response to (4/25/2023)

1. Not addressed:

The budget totals (excel table) are:

TOTAL	4,576,517	4,005,686	3,541,823	1,501,678	694,391	278,987	14,599,083
-------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	---------	---------	------------

i. These do not align with the component and PMC totals in table B/project description summary (please also update or delete the project start and end dates in the budget table as these differ from the ER).

Answers.

(i) The discrepancies in the totals in the budget sheet in Appendix 1 and the GEF Project Financing column in table B have been reviewed and aligned. Please see the revised

CEO Endorsement document, the ProDoc and the budget sheet. The start and end dates have also been amended in the budget sheet.

ii. The M&E line in the budget is not shown in a sub-component of table B, which may be one reason that these numbers do not lign up.

PLEASE ADDRESS.

Answer.

(ii) The M&E line amounting to US\$278,987 is embedded in project component 4 on Transboundary coordination, information management and monitoring and evaluation. The allocation of resources per component has been updated in line with the provisions of the budget and these numbers lign up in the revised CEO Endorsement Document and the ProDoc.

2. The amounts are roughly in the same proportion (co-finance to grant =4.24 and PMC Co-finance to PMC=4.5). This can be accepted.

Answer:

Noted

Please though explain if you have explored to leverage grant co-finance to cover staff costs. We note that the TORs split technical and coordination tasks for the project coordinator/lead and the financial and contracts manager. It is not clear that the financial and contracts manager has significant contributions to the technical components. Same for safeguards officer TORs.

Answer:

Correct. A number of staff positions are partially charged across the project components and PMC. This is particularly the case for the project coordinator, the finance and contracts manager, and the safeguard officer. It is important to note that in addition to the classical tasks one would expect from these positions, their inputs will be directly required in specific technical areas across the project components. The project is designed to have as much technical expertise in-house as possible to avoid the inevitable delays in identifying external technical support which is not always available in this challenging environment, especially in Burundi and DR Congo. The specific additional tasks have been embedded in the terms of reference to reflect these contributions and the project will ensure that the incumbents have the right profile and technical expertise.

(i) Please align the TORs and budget to only charge staff component related technical work to components. and

The TORs have been revised and aligned with the budget. The expected contributions of the staff concerned to the project components have been outlined (See revised Appendix 10). This is the case for the project coordinator [75% components: 25% PMC], the finance and contracts manager [65% components: 35% PMC], and the safeguard officer [75% components: 25% PMC].

(ii) Explore/explain whether cash/grant co-finance will be able to cover some of the PMC costs of this project.

Answers:

In relation to the allocation of the costs associated with the project's execution between the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC, the grant portion of the co-financing are restricted funds and the partners committing these resources will be implementing the relevant activities directly in close collaboration with the GEF project. It is therefore likely that although some flexible arrangements might be explored when the project eventually unfolds, the resources released by those partners will be directed towards specific activities in the field rather than towards the GEF project staff time.

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

tha(12/21/2019) in table C and to allow alignment with letters of co-finance:

- Column of "Name of co-financiers": Please provide the name of country and not only ministries to allow alignment of table C with the letters of co-finance.
- Please add an indication (can be by email from the original entity) on the nature of co-finance in the few cases where it is missing: e.g. the Burundi Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock classifies its co-finance as 'public investment' while table D indicates the same as in-kind and recurring expenditure.
- Please provided a clearer explanation of specific co-finance classified as investment mobilized. The text below table C cuts across all co-financiers and includes e.g. operational expenses which rather appear to be recurring expenditures. Please aid in clarifying this and add some additional explanation for each. Thank you.

(2/17/2022)

- Thanks for organizing the letters of co-finance in order of table C in one file. With 91 pages of Letters this has been very much appreciated and helpful.

- The EU letter of co-finance does not indicate whether their co-finance appears to be via recurring expenditures or grant/investment mobilized. Can you request an email to have them confirm that this is in-kind/recurring expenditures as indicated in table C?

- Please translate all letters which are provided in French in English. The translation does not have to be done by an official translator and can be done agency internal/informal. Please upload. This will also aid to see the explanation on what is included in the investment mobilized co-finance.

- The letter from the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock, Zambia, states a total co-finance of USD 510,000.- whereas the co-finance table C in the ER as well as the co-finance spreadsheet in Annex 2 lists and amount of USD 520.000.-

- The same spreadsheet also shows a few lines co-finance via "...Retrocessions, equalization,..." among other. Can you explain what these terms mean?

(2/28/2023)

1. The EU co-finance letter states that the co-finance provided is grant/investment mobilized via two related regional projects. Table D though lists the EU co-finance as recurring/in-kind. **Please address.**

2. Thank you for providing the translation of the letters into english.

3. The explanation and correction of the letter from Zambia is noted. While the letter is in the portal the file appears to not open and we trust it lists the amount consistent with table C. We recall that the difference between the two sum were minor.

4. Thanks for the additional explanation of these terms.

5. The co-finance indeed is extremely complex and by now many of the letters are quite dated and the co-finance at this point may longer align with the project implementation time frame or have changed for other reasons.

Specifically, in reviewing the 69 co-financing letters, we found all letters with dates in 2021 and some in early 2022. Please provide an updated estimation of the actual amount that you (with the help of the co-financier if possible) think will really go to the project considering the timeframe of both the co-finance and the GEF project? for all co-financing letters that still consider the full amount as co-finance (an alternative would be to ask for updated letters, but this is cumbersome).

6. UNEP co-finance: Please revise ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? as this co-finance is labeled as in-kind.



(4/25/2023)

1. - 4. and 6: Comments addressed.

5. The explanations are noted and simplification of the co-finance arrangements will aid in the management and supervision of the project. As the co-finance amount for BUCODAC with around 3.9 million in-kind/recurrent and 3.7 million in grant/investment mobilized is there a confirming additional communication from BUCODAC to confirm these figures they will coordinate to leverage ?

(5/1/2023) and (5/4/2023)

- Clarification for BUCODAC noted. **Comment addressed.**

(1.) Nevertheless, there are still discrepancies between other letters and the co-finance table -see below:

•Some letters of co-financing indicate both cash and in-kind co-financing, but have been entered as a whole, please enter these separately (see below). When making this change and separate in-kind and cash, THE CO-FINANCE TOTALS IN THE CO-FINANCE TABLE SHOULD NOT CHANGE.

1. The letter of co-financing indicates both cash and in-kind co-financing. Please break 1,800,000 accordingly and enter the two amounts. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/25/2021.

Recipient Country Government	President?s Office, Regional Administration and Local Government (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,800,000.00
---------------------------------	---	---------	---------------------------	--------------

2. The letter of co-financing indicates both cash and in-kind co-financing. Please break 2,680,200 accordingly and enter the two amounts. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/25/2021.

Recipient Country Government	President's Office, Kibondo District Council (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,680,200.00
------------------------------	---	---------	------------------------	--------------

3. The letter of co-financing indicates both cash and in-kind co-financing. Please break 2,000,000 accordingly and enter the two amounts.

Recipient Country Government	Kigoma region, Kasulu district (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
------------------------------	---	---------	------------------------	--------------

4. The letter of co-financing indicates both cash and in-kind co-financing. Please break 2,000,000 accordingly and enter the two amounts. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/28/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Vice President's Office (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------	------------------------	--------------

5. The letter of co-financing indicates both cash and in-kind co-financing. Please break 687,000 accordingly and enter the two amounts. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 11/16/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Lake Tanganyika Basin Water Board (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	687,000.00
------------------------------	--	---------	------------------------	------------

6. The letter of co-financing indicates both cash and in-kind co-financing. Please break 2,000,000 accordingly and enter the two amounts. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/25/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Water (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
------------------------------	------------------------------	---------	------------------------	--------------

7. The letter of co-financing indicates both cash and in-kind co-financing. Please break 2,000,000 accordingly and enter the two amounts. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 11/23/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (TFS) Agency - Tanzania	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
------------------------------	---	---------	------------------------	--------------

8. The letter of co-financing indicates both cash and in-kind co-financing. Please break 2,150,000 accordingly and enter the two amounts. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/27/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority (TAWA)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,150,000.00
------------------------------	---	---------	------------------------	--------------

9. The letter of co-financing indicates both cash and in-kind co-financing. Please break 950,000 accordingly and enter the two amounts. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 01/25/2022.

Recipient Country Government	Tanzania Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	950,000.00
------------------------------	--	---------	------------------------	------------

(2.) **Cofinance- confirm for those with old letters:** letters of support with the old dates are not updated. Please request an updated estimation of the actual amount that the Agency (with the help of the co-financier if possible) think will really go to the project considering the timeframe of both the co-finance and the GEF project. This applies to the below co-financing letters with old dates. CHRISTINE/DANIEL: WHILE THE CO-FINANCE WAS RESTATED IN THE LAST REVIEWS SHEET RESPONSE, YOU MAY WANT TO COPY THE SAME TEXT INTO THE TEXT UNDER THE CO-FINANCE TABLE. PLEASE NOTE THOUGH THAT THE AMOUNTS GIVEN IN THE STATEMENT IN THE LAST REVIEW SHEET APPEAR TO NOT ALIGN TO THE ACTUAL FIGURES WHEN ADDING UP THE AMOUNTS IN THE CO-FINANCE LETTERS. PLEASE AFTER REVISING THE CO-FINANCE TABLE, MAKE SURE ALL \$ FIGURES ARE CONSISTENT.

In the last review sheet you stated: **Answer:** The co-financing commitments have been checked and rearranged in line with the information available at the time of this latest review. The in-kind contributions from the various stakeholders that amount to US\$47,878,828 or 77% of all the pledges are recurrent expenditures that remain valid and will be available during the timeframe of the GEF project. The grant amounts of US\$14,218,289 or 23% of the pledges are still running and will support the GEF project activities (see Table 14 in the Prodop & Section C on the confirmed sources of co-financing for the project by name and by

type in the CEO Endorsement package). Both the in-kind and cash contributions to the GEF project will be checked at MTR and the information updated accordingly.

Yet, when adding up the actual cash and in-kind the numbers appear to differ ? see below.

Please double check for consistent \$ figures across all tables, the letters and the reconfirmation of co-finance. By our quick check:

47,635,728.00 recurrent expenditures (in-kind)

14,461,389.00 investment mobilized (grant)

Please note the letters with dates older than one year below:

1. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 12/20/2021.

Civil Society Organization	R?seau Local de Protection des Civils (RLPC) - DRC	Grant	Investment mobilized	210,000.00
Civil Society Organization	R?seau Local de Protection des Civils (RLPC) - DRC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	380,000.00

2. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 11/05/2021.

Civil Society Organization	Action Communautaire Verte (DRC)	Grant	Investment mobilized	88,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Action Communautaire Verte (DRC)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	110,267.00

3. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/19/2021.

Civil Society Organization	Action F?minine pour le D?veloppement Communautaire (AFDCO) - DRC	Grant	Investment mobilized	147,489.00
----------------------------	---	-------	----------------------	------------

Civil Society Organization	Action F?minine pour le D?veloppement Communautaire (AFDCO) - DRC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	287,616.00
----------------------------	---	---------	------------------------	------------

4. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/20/2021.

Donor Agency	European Union	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	8,900,000.00
--------------	----------------	---------	------------------------	--------------

5. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/27/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock - Burundi	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	15,506,000.00
------------------------------	--	---------	------------------------	---------------

6. The date of co-financing letter is missing below. Please request agency to confirm or update the date.

Civil Society Organization	The Nature Conservancy	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
----------------------------	------------------------	---------	------------------------	--------------

7. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 02/01/2022.

GEF Agency	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	500,000.00
------------	---	---------	----------------------	------------

8. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/06/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (DRC)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,500,000.00
------------------------------	---	---------	------------------------	--------------

9. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 11/11/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock (DRC)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,550,000.00
------------------------------	---	---------	------------------------	--------------

10. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 01/19/2022.

Recipient Country Government	Lulenge Sector (Territorial Decentralized Entity) - DRC	Grant	Investment mobilized	241,300.00
Recipient Country Government	Lulenge Sector (Territorial Decentralized Entity) - DRC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	254,960.00

11. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 12/08/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Mutambala Sector (Territorial Decentralized Entity) - DRC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	354,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Mutambala Sector (Territorial Decentralized Entity) - DRC	Grant	Investment mobilized	489,174.00

12. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 01/24/2022.

Recipient Country Government	NGANDJA Sector (Territorial Decentralized Entity) (DRC)	Grant	Investment mobilized	243,100.00
------------------------------	---	-------	----------------------	------------

Recipient Country Government	NGANDJA Sector (Territorial Decentralized Entity) (DRC)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	253,400.00
------------------------------	---	---------	------------------------	------------

13. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 12/09/2021.

Recipient Country Government	Tanganyika Sector (Territorial Decentralized Entity) (DRC)	Grant	Investment mobilized	121,445.00
Recipient Country Government	Tanganyika Sector (Territorial Decentralized Entity) (DRC)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	328,555.00

14. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 10/14/2021.

Civil Society Organization	World Wide Fund for Nature (DRC)	Grant	Investment mobilized	617,297.00
----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------	----------------------	------------

15. The date of co-financing letter for the below is 11/02/2021.

(5/8/2023)

1. The explanation of co-finance under table C gives non-consistent numbers and totals. The total of grant/investment mobilized and co-finance either add to USD 63,550,675 which is the number that corresponds to tables B and C but also is given as 62,089,117 U\$.

2. The agency response mentions email communication from Burundi and Tanzania but this has not been uploaded with the new submission. Co-finance split in recurring and investment mobilized should simply be split according to the current letters of co-finance.

3. Under table C there is a reference to an additional table "below". As the system does not let you attach a table right there, please provide a reference where that table can be found in the ER and/or the agency prodoc.

(5/8/2023) Comments addressed and ER revised accordingly.

Agency Response

- Thank you. This has been corrected on the portal in line with the information provided in table C of the CEO ER.

- E-mail communications from Burundi and Tanzania have been uploaded providing confirmation on the nature of co-finance where it was missing or was unclear; table C and the co-financing budget in Appendix 2 of the Project Document have been updated accordingly.

- Thank you. We have engaged our partners in DRC and Tanzania to clarify accordingly. Tanzania has provided an e-mail confirming that indeed their co-finance refers to recurring expenditures while DRC has provided further detail on how they have identified the investment mobilized. This information has been summarized under table C in the CEO ER as reflected in Appendix 2 of the ProDoc.

Response to (2/17/2022)

The EU co-finance letter has been adjusted (Copy is available).

- Translation of letters into French has been done (19 letters from DRC were translated into English).

Co-finance via "...Retrocessions, equalization,..." among other: The terms designate different official sources of income to the Territorial Decentralized entity (i.e. administrative sectors).

- The letter from the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock, Zambia has been corrected. Spreadsheet in Annex 2 to be adjusted to indicate the amount mentioned in the letter from Zambia (The total used in excel per component is okay but the sum in the letter was wrong. We have requested from Zambia a corrected letter and replaced the wrong one).

Co-finance for this project is extremely complex and UNEP worked at aggregating the list of relatively small co-finance amounts to facilitate monitoring during project implementation. Due to the complexity and countries willingness to show ownership, we have summarized the co-financing according to three categories (Government institutions, NGOs, and Private Sector) but kept the original co-financing list and letters for more clarity on reporting and management once the project will be approved.

Link to the excel is below:

https://iucnhq-my.sharepoint.com/:x/g/personal/ndolia_iucn_org/EXVlnK4MZnVNj4i7pXE4eSsBUI8QjW3he7AMpV9storb7Q?e=dE1eBR

The Project Manager will use such documents to coordinate and report on the co-finances. In addition, in DRC where co-financing letters were received for relatively small amounts, BUCODAC which has been supporting the project technical working group in DRC to coordinate inputs will continue to do so.

Response to 2/28/2023

1. The EU co-finance letter states that the co-finance provided is grant/investment mobilized via two related regional projects. Table D though lists the EU co-finance as recurring/in-kind. **Please address**

Answer: This has now been addressed: the designation of the EU co-financing has been modified from in kind contribution/recurrent expenditure to a grant/investment mobilized in the CEO Endorsement package (Section C) and in table 14 in the PRODOC.

2. Thank you for providing the translation of the letters into english.

Answer: Noted with thanks.

3. The explanation and correction of the letter from Zambia is noted. While the letter is in the portal the file appears to not open and we trust it lists the amount consistent with table C. We recall that the difference between the two sums were minor.

Answer: The working version of the Zambia letter, consistent with the amount in table C, is now attached in the portal.

4. Thanks for the additional explanation of these terms.

Answer: Noted with thanks

5. The co-finance indeed is extremely complex and by now many of the letters are quite dated and the co-finance at this point may longer align with the project implementation time frame or have changed for other reasons.

Specifically, in reviewing the 69 co-financing letters, we found all letters with dates in 2021 and some in early 2022. Please provide an updated estimation of the actual amount that you (with the help of the co-financier if possible) think will really go to the project considering the timeframe of both the co-finance and the GEF project for all co-financing letters that still consider the full amount as co-finance (an alternative would be to ask for updated letters, but this is cumbersome).

Answer: The co-financing commitments have been checked and rearranged in line with the information available at the time of this latest review. The in-kind contributions from the various stakeholders that amount to US\$47,878,828 or 77% of all the pledges are recurrent expenditures that remain valid and will be available during the timeframe of the GEF project. The grant amounts of US\$14,218,289 or 23% of the pledges are still running and will support the GEF project activities (see Table 14 in the Prodoc & Section C on the confirmed sources of co-financing for the project by name and by type in the CEO Endorsement package). Both the in-kind and cash contributions to the GEF project will be checked at MTR and the information updated accordingly.

In relation to the contributions from the different civil society organizations in the DR Congo, an agreement was reached during the LTA Management Committee meeting in December 2022 in Bujumbura that all the contributions from the 18 other NGOs (in-kind and in cash), will be coordinated and reported by BUCODAC which will serve as the network lead. BUCODAC was already instrumental during the project preparatory phase and availed some of their equipment for fieldworks.

6. UNEP co-finance: Please revise ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? as this co-finance is labeled as in-kind.

Answer:

This has now been updated to the category of recurrent expenditures in Table C of the CEO ER and the Prodoc.

Response to (4/25/2023)

1. - 4. and 6: Comments addressed.

5. The explanations are noted and simplification of the co-finance arrangements will aid in the management and supervision of the project. As the co-finance amount for BUCODAC with around 3.9 million in-kind/recurrent and 3.7 million in grant/investment mobilized is there a confirming additional communication from BUCODAC to confirm these figures they will coordinate to leverage ?

Answer:

We have received confirmation from the network of institution of BUCODAC (Advisory Office for Sustainable Development in Central Africa), committing to coordinate and report on US\$7,611,322 as co-financing towards the project including: (i) US\$3,896,855 in-kind and (ii) US\$3,714,467 in grant (investment mobilized). Please see copy of the letter submitted in the portal and available [HERE](#) (click on the word HERE for the link to the document)

Answer: (5/1/2023) and (5/4/2023)

Response:

Table C in the CEO Endorsement Document and Table 14 in the Prodoc have been updated and the co-financing rearranged in terms of grant/cash and in-kind. In reviewing all the co-financing letter to sort out the discrepancies, a significant error related to the co-financing commitment of the European Union was noted. In reality, the currency in this letter is the EURO which all along as been reported as USD. This was corrected and the USD equivalent of the ?8,900,000 computed as USD10,361,558 on the 20/10/2021 when the letter was signed using the currency converter at <https://www.oanda.com/currency-converter/en/?from=EUR&to=USD&amount=8900000>. All the tables have been amended accordingly and the total co-financing arrangement in USD amounts to 63,550,675 (US\$17,284,447 in cash and US\$46,266,228 in-kind).

2) **Answer:** The co-financing commitments have been checked and rearranged in line with the information available at the time of this latest review. The in-kind contributions from the various stakeholders that amount to US\$46,266,228 or 72.8% of all the pledges are recurrent

expenditures that remain valid and will be available during the timeframe of the GEF project. The grant amounts of US\$17,284,447 or 27.2% of the pledges are still running and will support the GEF project activities (see Table 14 in the Prodoc & Section C on the confirmed sources of co-financing for the project by name and by type in the CEO Endorsement package). Both the in-kind and cash contributions to the GEF project will be checked at MTR and the information updated accordingly.

This is noted and all the commitments will be checked and updated at MTR

All the discrepancies have been sorted and the recurrent expenditures (in-kind) amount to US\$46,266,228 and the investment mobilized (grant) amounts to US\$17,284,447 as supported by the co-financing letters.

Answer to (5/1/2023) and (5/4/2023)

The following explanatory note has been added below the table in section C: Confirmed sources of co-financing for the project (page 7 of the CEO endorsement document):

The co-financing commitments have been checked and rearranged in line with the information available at the time of this latest review. The in-kind contributions from the various stakeholders that amount to US\$46,266,228 or 72.8% of all the pledges are recurrent expenditures that remain valid and will be available during the timeframe of the GEF project. The grant amounts of US\$17,284,447 or 27.2% of the pledges are still running and will support the GEF project activities (see Table 14 in the Prodoc & Section C on the confirmed sources of co-financing for the project by name and by type in the CEO Endorsement package). Both the in-kind and cash contributions to the GEF project will be checked at MTR and the information updated accordingly.

Recipient Country Government	Tanzania Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries	In-kind	Recurrent expenditure	790,000
		Grant (cash)	Investment mobilized	160,000
Recipient Country Government	Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority (TAWA)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditure	2,042,500
		Grant (cash)	Investment mobilized	107,500
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (TFS) Agency - Tanzania	In-kind	Recurrent expenditure	1,871,300
		Grant (cash)	Investment mobilized	128,700
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Water (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditure	1,871,300
		Grant (cash)	Investment mobilized	128,700
Recipient Country Government	Lake Tanganyika Basin Water Board (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditure	600,000

		Grant (cash)	Investment mobilized	87,000
Recipient Country Government	Vice President's Office (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditure	1,871,300
		Grant (cash)	Investment mobilized	128,700
Recipient Country Government	Kigoma region, Kasulu district (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditure	1,871,300
		Grant (cash)	Investment mobilized	128,700
Recipient Country Government	President's Office, Kibondo District Council (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditure	2,488,000
		Grant (cash)	Investment mobilized	192,200
Recipient Country Government	President's Office, Regional Administration and Local Government (Tanzania)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditure	1,500,000
		Grant (cash)	Investment mobilized	300,000

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

(12/20/2021)

1. Table B: Please change the programming of funds columns for all BD and LD allocations. These are not from the global set-aside but are **STAR** allocations.

2. Comments on project design including cost effectiveness are included in the comments under question 3 part II.

(3/3/2022)

1. Addressed.

2. See comments under question 3 part II.

Cleared.

Agency Response

1. We have reached out to GEFSEC colleagues, and the issue has been corrected on 27 January in connection with a system error outside our control.

2. Noted. Thank you.

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

(12/20/2021) PPG utilization is likely captured in annex C of the ER yet that Annex seems to be 'cut off' in the ER and is not legible. Please simply re-paste this table into the portal. Thank you.

(3/3/2022) it still does not appear in the portal. Can you add a page break or paste in on the next page ? Please reach out to the GEF portal help desk if you need support to make this happen.

(2/28/2023) Please provide some itemization by eligible expenditure categories of the PPG funds to indicate and allow review of what these funds were used for.

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$300,000

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent to Date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Local and International consultants	152,000	150,000	2,000
Travel	20,000	1,243	18,757
Transfers and Grants to Implementing Partners	88,000	71,404	16,596
Meetings/Conferences	40,000	28,689	11,311
TOTAL	300,000	251,336	48,664

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$300,000

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>	
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent to Date</i>
Local and International consultants	152,000	150,000
Travel	20,000	1,243
Transfers and Grants to Implementing Partners	88,000	71,404
Meetings/Conferences	40,000	28,689
TOTAL	300,000	251,336

(4/25/2023)

- Please review the Project Cycle guidelines and note that neither UNEP personnel/staff nor consultants that work for UNEP core functions can be paid via the PPG grant, but would need to be charged to the agency fee (IF that is what is meant by "UNEP consultant"; consultants hired to specifically work on the project preparation are of course eligible).

- Audit - see above.

- Please provide a few words of detail on the lump sum transfers and grants to Implementing partners to detail what these transfer are made for in relation to project preparation. Same for the consultant.

Thank you.

(5/1/2023) and (5/4/2023)

While now there are more details, there is one item that is not allowed to be covered by GEF Funds (should be covered by the Agency Fee) as mentioned before: Implementing Agency's consultants / staff. Per the below, one understands that 'UNEP International Consultants' were covered with PPG funds ? please amend.

According to our discussion a couple of days back: this in fact is the **International Consultant (leading the PPG preparation in behalf of the executing agency)** and NOT a UNEP staff or quasi staff. Delete 'UNEP' in the table and please explain the role of the consultant in the review sheet and why the labeling of 'UNEP consultant' was used. Please note that this lead us to assume that the PPG funds were in fact used for a consultant that works for UNEP on this and other day-to-day support to UNEP and hence should then be paid by agency fees. Please clarify in the response to the comment in the review sheet.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$300,000

UNEP Budget Line	Total budget	Cumulative expenditure	Unspent as of 15 th April 20
<u>Staff & Personnel</u>	<u>79.015</u>	<u>79.015</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Consultants</u>	<u>51.948</u>	<u>51.948</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Audit</u>	<u>10.632</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10.632</u>
<u>Transfers & Grants to Implementing Partners (TNC, WWF, and National technical working groups)</u>	<u>77.704</u>	<u>77.704</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Travels (PPG Inception, validation, and coordination meetings)</u>	<u>30.701</u>	<u>30.701</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>UNEP International Consultants</u>	<u>50.000</u>	<u>50.000</u>	<u>0</u>
Grand Total	300,000	289,368	10,632

Agency Response

Thank you. Annex C has been updated and pasted into the portal.

Response to (3/3/2022)

Annex C is now showing in the portal

Response to 2/28/2023

Please provide some itemization by eligible expenditure categories of the PPG funds to indicate and allow review of what these funds were used for.

Answer:

The table below was created and pasted into the CEO endorsement package. The final audit for the PPG operations is yet to be completed at the time of this review and a budget of US\$10,632 has been set aside for this activity. UNEP will close the PPG in its internal system as soon as the audit report is produced and validated.

<u>UNEP Budget Line</u>	<u>Total budget (USD)</u>	<u>Cumulative expenditure (USD)</u>	<u>Unspent as of 15th April 2023(USD)</u>
<u>Staff & Personnel</u>	<u>79,015</u>	<u>79,015</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Consultants</u>	<u>51,948</u>	<u>51,948</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Audit</u>	<u>10,632</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10,632</u>
<u>Transfers & Grants to Implementing Partners (TNC, WWF, and National technical working groups)</u>	<u>77,704</u>	<u>77,704</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Travels (PPG Inception, validation, and coordination meetings)</u>	<u>30,701</u>	<u>30,701</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>UNEP International Consultant</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>0</u>

<u>Grand Total</u>	<u>300,000</u>	<u>289,368</u>	<u>10,632</u>
---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Response to (4/25/2023)

- Please review the Project Cycle guidelines and note that neither UNEP personnel/staff nor consultants that work for UNEP core functions can be paid via the PPG grant, but would need to be charged to the agency fee (IF that is what is meant by "UNEP consultant"; consultants hired to specifically work on the project preparation are of course eligible).

Answer:

The updated version is provided in the table in the annexure in the GEF portal and in the CEO Endorsement Document (Page 61). The amount of US\$50,000 reported in the table refers to the UNEP consultant hired to specially work on the project preparation and reviews. The other amount of US\$51,948 also listed as consultants refer to the different other assignments commissioned for the project preparation including fieldwork, etc. Some additional wording is provided below on this matter as requested.

- Audit - see above.

Answer:

The audit of the PPG is delayed at the time of this review and an amount of US\$10,632 has been set aside for it. UNEP will close the PPG in its internal system as soon as the audit report is finalised and validated.

- Please provide a **few** words of detail on the lump sum transfers and grants to Implementing partners to detail what these transfer are made for in relation to project preparation. Same for the consultant.

Answer:

Six (6) local consultants were hired in the riparian countries to collect data a suite of information and contribute to the project preparation all along the PPG for a total amount of US\$51,948. These included consultant 1(US\$13,059); consultant 2 (US\$10,589); consultant 3 (US\$3,823); consultant 4 (US\$4,359); consultant 5 (US\$14,118); and consultant 6 (US\$6,000).

An international consultant hired for US\$50,000 including travels and Daily Subsistence Allowance was hired to prepare the project documentation in readiness for submission to the GEF Sec.

Thank you.

(5/1/2023) and (5/4/2023)

Answer to (5/1/2023) and (5/4/2023)

The term "UNEP International Consultants" in the table is indeed misleading as this does NOT refer to UNEP staff but to an international expert hired and directly reporting to UNEP during the PPG. It refers to **ONE International Consultant** in charge of leading the PPG roadmap, with clear TOR targeting the PPG phase and the development and finalization of the full-sized project document, in close cooperation with the executing agency and the national experts. No PPG funds were used for day-to-day support to UNEP.

The misleading word ?UNEP? has now been deleted from the table in Annex C of the CEO endorsement document and replaced with: International Consultant (PPG regional coordinator).

UNEP Budget Line	Total budget	Cumulative expenditure	Unspent as of 15th April 2023
Staff & Personnel	79,015	79,015	0
Consultants	51,948	51,948	0
Audit	10,632	0	10,632
Transfers & Grants to Implementing Partners (TNC, WWF, and National technical working groups)	77,704	77,704	0
Travels (PPG Inception, validation, and coordination meetings)	30,701	30,701	0
International Consultant (PPG coordination)	50,000	50,000	0
Grand Total	300,000	289,368	10,632

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
(12/20/2021)

1. Core indicators do align with what was provided in the PIF and should be validated and updated at MTR.
2. Please provide the IDs for the protected areas for protected areas under indicator 1.2.

(3/3/2022) Addressed.

Agency Response

1. Noted.

2. The WPDA IDs for the three project-supported protected areas have now been included in Annex F (*Core Indicator Worksheet*) of the GEF CEO ER.

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

(12/20/2021)

1. While the agency prodoc is providing an elaboration the endorsement request (ER) in the portal is missing to summarize this.

Please note that the ER is a free-standing document and needs to be readable as such by itself. It therefore needs to mirror or at least provide a summary of what is elaborated in the prodoc. Please address and assure that the ER is completed with this understanding.

(3/3/2022) Addressed.

Agency Response

1. Thank you for the reminder. A summary of the global environmental problems, including the root causes and barriers, has now been included under Part II (Project Justification), Section 1a. (Project Description), Sub-section 1) of the GEF CEO ER.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/20/21) Yes, the baseline and associated baseline projects are described in the agency prodoc. Please through elaborate on synergy and cooperation with the Congo basin IP.

(3/3/2022) Addressed.

Agency Response

UNEP as the lead agency and hub for the CBSL IP, will facilitate close coordination, and the sharing of tools and resources, between this project and the CBSL IP, plus other related projects in the basin, as relevant.

Section 2 (Background and Situational Analysis) Sub-section 2.7 (Linkages with other GEF and non-GEF interventions) of the UNEP ProDoc has now been updated.

Part II (Project Justification), Section 1a. (Project Description), Sub-section 4) and Section 6 (Institutional Arrangements and Coordination) of the GEF CEO ER have now been updated.

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

(12/20/2021)

- Component 1: How will the CMIs be selected ? The prodoc mentions a consultative process but does not suggest the establishment of transparent criteria. Among these, will communities be asked to provide a certain level of contributions (cash or in-kind)? Please explain.

- Component 1 (but similarly applies to components 2 and 3 - see comments below): Conflicts may arise from tightening regulations to curb illegal fishing activities (or in other components to enforce use restrictions and prevent illegal activities and/or encroachment in protected areas). Please explain (and point to associated budget) for appropriate level and independent grievance structures that can be accessed communities. Furthermore, how will the project determine adequate and accessible compensation in cases of use restriction and lost income by parts of the communities ? Please elaborate. There may be lessons to be learned from similar projects, such as the AfDB and GEF financed Lake Edward/Albert lake fisheries project.

- Component 2 includes a proposed outcome of ?at least 200 field rangers trained, equipped and deployed in the core conservation zones of three protected areas?. Given the potential social implications of investments on law enforcement, please provide additional information on the proposed training and deployment of rangers and associated safeguards measures. Please provide details on the mitigation measures for potential conflicts with local communities and detailed information on implementation of grievance redress mechanism at the local level in the three PAs and respective buffer zones.

- The TAWA Concession, at MGR Reserve in Tanzania, is mentioned as a potential ?responsible partner? for implementation of Components 2. Please note

the GEF does not finance any activities related to trophy hunting? and/or associated institutions. Given the controversial nature of concessions for tourism hunting in Tanzania, please provide additional information and justification for this proposed partnership.

- It is highly recommended that the project ensures full community participation in the management committee of each PA. Project staffing should include social specialists to provide support and guidance to all aspects of community-related activities. Engagement with the GEF-funded Global Wildlife Program (GWP) is recommended, particularly with the communities of practice? on Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) and Nature Based Tourism (NBC), for best practices and knowledge management experiences in over 30 countries (<https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/24805f3c02de835dcd8bc642f95952b5-0320072021/original/GWP-Annual-Report-2020-low-res.pdf>).

- Rusizi National Park: there is mention of the use of chemicals to fight invasive species. Please note, that GEF cannot finance the use of persistent or toxic chemicals (see paras 203 and 206 in the prodoc and also footnote 36 mentioning foliar spray which indicates a wide spreading application). Please explain.

- Component 3: Reduction of the sediment load in the lake is one of the major rational for LD finances measures. Please point out if/how this decrease of sediment delivery is measured and captured in the RF (and not only the "ha/areas of buffer zones established" measured).

- Component 4 includes an outcome related to the establishment of a CTF Annual income (in USD) available to finance the costs of the transboundary governance structures to fulfil their responsibilities for coordinating, overseeing and monitoring the implementation of the Convention - by EOP an annual amount of USD 520,000 is available from the CTF to supplement the costs of administering the Convention?. However, no further detailing of such CTF is provided in the document. The creation and capitalization of a CTF to support the LTA with an income of at least USD 520,000/ annum by end of project is not a trivial activity. A quick estimate based on average performance of CTFs indicates the need for an endowment of at least USD 15 Million to generate similar revenues. Please, provide more detail on the CTF's proposed structure, potential donors, financial and operational governance, place of incorporation, staffing and other basic elements. Please also provide details on the budget allocated for this activity.

- Results Framework (RF): the level of detail in the RF as presented in the ER does not reflect the activities outlined in the prodoc; same for the budget in which the details in the project description cannot be easily correlated to the budget or RF. Is there a more detailed version that is not attached here and provides a base for the project design ? Just as an example: component 3 describes a multitude of community services that would need to be budgeted for. Can you elaborate on how

the connection of project component description/design, RF and budget can be made more clear?

(3/3/2022)

1. Comment on CMI selection addressed.
2. Comment on possible compensation: Addressed in the ESMF and agency response : " ... The project will conduct a census or social assessment to identify the persons who will be affected by the project, determine who will be eligible for compensation/assistance and set out set out a plan and procedures/standards for compensation and/or livelihood restoration...."
3. Comment addressed in the agency response and ESMF. Please note that this will be a risk during project implementation and UNEP will need to continuously assure staff sensitization and functioning local grievance mechanisms.
4. Comment on TAWA and concessions for hunting: the comment is addressed yet will require - as mentioned - further validation in the inception phase.
5. Comment on participation addressed by the agency. It is noted that the agency is acknowledging the complexity of this and efforts to be supported for effective community participation.
6. Comment on use of glyphosphate and triclopyr-based herbicides: given the wide-spread concerns on the toxicity of these chemicals we appreciate that there will no funding for herbicide use been provided within the project.
7. Response noted and the indicator of ppm (mg/L) to monitor the effectiveness of the buffer zones on the reduction of sediment load. Cleared.
8. CTF : Partially addressed. More substantive information on the proposed CTF has been provided, but still it is not clear what budget is allocated for this output.
9. Not addressed. The agency response and challenges encountered are noted, but with only an outcome level results framework and this type of high level budget it is impossible to review the flow of funds and appropriate allocation of the GEF funds to achieve what is described via the prodoc. The additional time requested and provided to submit the ER provides time to get this in more detailed shape and enable the project to start without further delays once endorsed. I suggest we have

a discussion between GEFSEC reviewers and your team to discuss a way forward as soon as possible.

Please also in the terms of reference of key staff and especially those that are partly charged to PMC and part to project components, please clearly separate the tasks charged to PMC/coordination from the technical tasks covered by the project components. There is no TOR for the financial and contracts manager and it is not clear why any portion of the position charged to the components. This seems to be a position that is best covered entirely by PMC.

(2/28/2023)

re. 8.: The explanation of the process to design the TF is noted including the execution by Cafe which is detailed in the prodoc under outputs 4.1.2.. Please point to information on how much of the grant is allocated to the design to the CTF. From the prodoc we understand that none of GEF grant will be used as seed finance to the CTF (see para 259 of the prodoc). How much of a minimum contribution from other sources is expected at minimum to provide a viable base for the operationalization of the fund ?

re. 9: Staff positions

(i) the project coordinator is charged in part to the components and part to PMC. It was requested to clearly separate technical tasks (which could be charged to the components) from coordination tasks which fall under PMC. Based on the current TORs it appears that his/her tasks all fall under the broader category of project management and should be charged accordingly to the PMC costs.

(ii) the financial and contracts manager should be charged to PMC.

10. Budget

(i) please add a column for "responsible party" which lists the budget holder/responsible party for each budget line.

(ii) the procurement of vehicles from the GEF grant is not encouraged. Please explore if this can be covered via co-finance.

(iii) the budget line of 90K for " Vehicle operations and maintenance including fuel and maintenance" appears unreasonably high and likely a typo. Please revisit.

(iv) Why is the human rights consultant charged to M&E costs?

(v) Please provide detail (e.g. point to the TORs/a description and expenditure categories) for the subcontracts for cooperating agencies which are substantial (up to USD 1.7 million)

(vi) The financial and contracts manager should be charged to PMC unless this includes technical work of institutional strengthening at LTA which then also needs to be clearly outlined and separated in the TORs for this position . Also, please explain what level this position is rated at with 530 K for 5 years in costs.

(4/25/2023)

8. Thank you for pointing out the budget line and allocation for the TF design. *Comment addressed at ER stage.*

One early task should be to estimate what returns are needed from an endowment to make the CTF viable (e.g. how much funds need to be raised not only to cover some operating costs (incl. personnel) but foremost to have enough income from investing these funds year over year to be able to disburse what total of grants each year. You may want to arrange learning exchanges with other CTFs on conducting a feasibility study and design of the fund and make decisions on e.g. portion to be a revolving fund and portion as sinking fund (as applicable).

10. Budget:

(i) Addressed - UNOPS as executing agency is responsible for all budget

(ii) Vehicle need is noted and approved given the limited capacities of LTA and its budget as well as the country's in the region.

(iii) Noted that this is a budget figure only that will be adjusted according to needs but for now complies with the UN Department of Safety and Security guidance on duty of care. While this appears very high consecutive yearly and MTR budget revisions will adjust the budget based on needs.

(iv) Noted and addressed.

(v) The total amount of sub-contracts (budget lines 2101 to 2115) is 9.3 million and covers all components. Please confirm that these contracts (largest appearing as 1.7 million; budget line 2107) will be awarded in alignment with UN applicable procurement thresholds and procedures.

(vi) Please answer together with comment 2 in Part I question 2 (with regard to table B and PMC). There is not need to answer this twice. The TORs for the

financial and contracts manager indicated that she/he will perform 65 % technical tasks, yet the TORs as written do not support that. It is not clear that the financial and contracts manager has such significant contributions to the technical components. Same for the safeguards officer TORs and charges who seems to mainly perform project management and not technical tasks yet only around 20 % of his/her times is charged to PMC .

(5/1/2023) Comments have been addressed. Cleared,

Agency Response

1. The selection of CMI members is addressed in the revised ProDoc (paragraph 165) as follows:

?Selection of new CMI members will take place in a participatory manner during open meetings coordinated by the responsible local authority in each site, taking into account the expected role and responsibilities of each member, while adhering to the qualification criteria and following the procedures outlined in the LTA Harmonized Guidelines.? As specified in the LTA Harmonized Guidelines and the ProDoc, the roles and responsibilities of CMI members related to the management of the community-based fisheries co-management areas include only in-kind contributions (e.g., time investment to support development and implementation of management plans). In principle, the LTA Harmonized Guidelines do not stipulate financial contributions from CMI members. However, the project recognizes that longer-term sustainability of CMIs hinges on the continued availability of sufficient financial resources. We have therefore revised paragraph 165 (activity viii) of the ProDoc by adding the following text: ?Opportunities will be explored for use of revenue collection and earmarked savings, as well as sustained external funding to enable purchase of equipment and fuel, communication facilities, and compensation of CMI members for their in-kind investments.?

2. Agreed. Component 1 integrates lessons learned from fisheries co-management and conflict resolution mechanisms in other projects. Paragraphs 165 and 176 in the ProDoc describe the multiple strategies that the project will employ to mitigate conflict at the local/CMI level. These include facilitating stakeholder participation in critical processes, reduce conflict potential, increasing capacities for conflict-resolution and mediating ?conflicts arising from the management, control and monitoring of fisheries resources in community-based fisheries co-management areas? at the local/CMI and CMINAC level. All these activities have associated budgets reflected in Appendix 1 of the Prodoc and its table on the Portal. The theory behind the establishment of community-based fisheries co-management areas is built on the principle that well-managed areas (which include no-fishing and limited fishing zones) will result in an increase of fish stocks as a result of the ?source and sink metapopulation? concept, whereby some subpopulations are being steadily harvested and others serving as stabilizing sources (e.g., Appendix 22.1 Chapter 6). As such, there is an implicit assumption that potential temporary loss of income resulting from restrictions will ultimately result in both environmental and financial benefits. These principles are intuitively understood by fishers in Lake Tanganyika and have been used in traditional fisheries management for centuries (this is further described Appendix 22.1 of the ProDoc). The project does not intend to compensate for (perceived, short-term) loss of income by (parts of) the community, rather to emphasize the expected longer-term benefits for the larger community during its participatory management planning, implementation and enforcement processes. The following revisions were therefore made:

- Table 5 of Appendix 18 (ESMF) of the ProDoc was revised to emphasize the principles and assumptions outlined above.
- Table 9 paragraph 273 of the ProDoc was revised as follows: The project will ensure that the affected user groups and other key stakeholders *obtain sufficient understanding of the intended longer-term environmental and economic benefits of protected area management*?, participate actively in the process of identifying use zones, and mutually agree on the approach to the demarcation of the use zones, before its implementation.

Accordingly, the grievance mechanism that the project will put in place will have a multi-stage grievance resolution process accessible to communities:

- Project site level: To ensure that grievances arising at project sites are effectively managed, the project could facilitate the establishment of a site-level grievance and complaints committee.
- Community Level: Where traditional dispute resolution mechanisms or other community (informal) or administrative (formal) justice systems exist, the project will build on them to ensure adequate access to grievance redress by communities in the project target areas.
- Executing agency level: Complaints from the site or community level that have not been successfully resolved could be escalated to the executing entity grievance and complaints committee to further reviewing the conflict and assist in resolving it.

Concerning how the project will determine adequate and accessible compensation in cases of use restriction and lost income by parts of the communities, UNEP will ensure that the project grievance mechanism will address specific concerns in relation to compensation or livelihood restoration issues in a timely manner. The project will conduct a census or social assessment to identify the persons who will be affected by the project, determine who will be eligible for compensation/assistance and set out a plan and procedures/standards for compensation and/or livelihood restoration. Where the project will involve only economic displacement, a *livelihood plan* will be developed. Where restrictions involve access to legally designated parks or protected areas, the plan will be in the form of a *process framework*. These plans will be costed and included in project implementation plans.

3. Agreed. This has already been explicitly identified as an overall project risk in the UNEP ProDoc and the GEF CEO ER. It is also identified as an environmental/social safeguards risk in the UNEP Safeguard Risk and Identification Form (SRIF) annexed as Appendix 17 to the UNEP ProDoc. Specific risk management and mitigation measures to ensure that potential risks posed by project-related security or enforcement arrangements have been identified. Project-supported personnel will be appropriately vetted and trained. The project will undertake an Environmental and Social Due Diligence at project inception to establish the need for a *Law Enforcement Risk Assessment* (LERA). For precautionary reasons, the potential of conflicts related to enforcement will also be actively monitored on an ongoing basis by the regional PCU throughout the project implementation phase. Risk management and mitigation measures will be regularly reviewed and updated by the Safeguards Officer.

The project has also made explicit provision in the project design (and associated budget) for the implementation of: (i) the development of a human-rights Code of Conduct for all ecoguards, rangers, fisheries monitors, forest guards and game scouts supported by the project for deployment in the fisheries co-management areas and in the core conservation zones, multiple use zones and buffer zones of the project-supported protected areas (Output 4.1.4); (ii) the establishment and management of a human rights due diligence process for all these monitoring and enforcement personnel (4.1.4); (iii) the delivery of accredited human-rights training for all these monitoring and enforcement personnel (Outputs 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 2.1.1 and 3.1.1) in the four riparian countries; and (iv) the integration of the human-right Code of Conduct and due diligence processes into the management agreements with all the responsible project partner institutions.

The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) annexed to the UNEP ProDoc as Appendix 18 specifically elaborates on the issue of the project-level Grievance Mechanism - see Chapter 8.2. of the ESMF. The UNEP institution-wide Grievance Mechanism will be complemented by a project-level grievance mechanism that is accessible to local stakeholders in all sites where project interventions are implemented. This ensures that procedures are appropriate for the local context, are culturally adequate with arrangements that meet the requirements of the Indigenous Peoples Standard. At inception phase, the project-level grievance mechanism will be further elaborated to provide details on how it will be operationalized specifically at community and site level. In this context, the project will build on grievance redress mechanisms that already exist in the three PAs. Where these do not exist, the project will facilitate the establishment of a collaborative grievance and complaints committee that will endeavor to resolve grievances as part of ongoing project management in the PA. Under this mechanism, aggrieved parties/groups will launch their complaints/grievances with the committee charged with such responsibility in the respective PAs. The project, in collaboration with PA authorities will ensure full disclosure of the procedures and processes of this mechanism among local communities. In the event that resolution of the grievance fails at this level, then the grievance can be escalated to the grievance management committee at the level of the PCU.

4. In discussion with a range of stakeholder groups in Tanzania (through the National Working Group constituted during the PPG phase), the Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority (TAWA) ? as the current responsible conservation management authority for the MGR ? was proposed by the VPO (the Convention Focal Point) as the most suitable and appropriate ?implementing partner? institution for the implementation of activities within the MGR under component 2.

There is however no intent to enter into any implementation arrangement with a hunting concessionaire. We have reviewed the documentation to ensure that no mention is made of any hunting *concessionaire/s* in MGR as prospective project implementing partners in the project documentation.

It must please be noted that the PCU will also conduct a due diligence and capacity assessment of prospective implementing partners for activities in and around MGR during the project inception phase, before concluding any SLA or MOA/U?s. The selection of the preferred implementing partner for Component 2 outputs and activities in the MGR will also need to be ratified by the PSC.

5.

(a) Agreed. While it is the explicit intent of the project to secure the meaningful and ongoing involvement of affected communities in the management committee (or equivalent) of each PA over time, it must be understood that this may be a long and complex process that could include facilitating *inter alia* development of the enabling policy environment, institutional culture shifts, building of trust between communities and PA management agencies, improved capacities for collaboration and cooperation, equitable community representation, establishment of clear roles and responsibilities, clear accountability for decisions, management of expectations, etc.

(b) Agreed. The PCU currently includes a Gender Officer and Safeguards Officer who will provide overall support to the implementation and oversight of community-based activities *in situ*. A team of social and environmental safeguards specialists will also be contracted to support the PCU in developing the safeguard guidance for all community-related project activities. It will ? depending on the nature and scale of community-based outputs and activities ? further be a technical requirement that the designated implementing partners for the different outputs must include specialist social development experience and expertise in their teams. The M&E specialist contracted to the PCU will ? as part of their responsibility ? also collate information on the socio-economic benefits derived from the project.

(c) Agreed. It is also envisaged that these global communities of practice platforms (such as BIOFIN and GWPKP) ? notably in respect of wildlife crime, wildlife conservation, HWC, empowerment of local communities and forest-dependent people and NBT ? may also be accessed by the project through other regional knowledge management platforms (such as AGLI, ACTN, Africa Knowledge Platform, African Natural Resources Centre, GGKP, African Nature Based Tourism Platform and F4B) to provide suitable examples of local adoption in Sub Saharan Africa.

6. Herbicides are considered among the most effective and resource-efficient tools to treat invasive species, hence its inclusion into the integrated IAP control program in RNP[1]¹. Most of the commonly known invasive plants are treated using only two herbicides - glyphosate and triclopyr, neither of which are currently classified as Persistent, Bio-accumulative and Toxic Chemicals (PBTs) - see <https://www.epa.gov/toxics-release-inventory-tri-program/persistent-bioaccumulative-toxic-pbt-chemicals-covered-tri>. Triclopyr-based herbicides (such as *Garlon*) are selective and reportedly have no significant impact on ecosystem, human and animal health. The increased use and excessive dosage of glyphosate-based herbicides (such as *Roundup*) around the world has however caused some recent concern regarding its effects on human health and the environment (see Gandhi et al 2021[2]²).

In response to the comment, and as a pre-emptive precautionary measure, the project will now only support labor-intensive mechanical clearing methods (hand pulling, bark stripping, mechanical cutting, etc.) in RNP. All references in Output 2.1.2 to any herbicide treatment of invasive alien plants in RNP have thus been removed from the UNEP ProDoc.

7. In response to this comment, a new objective indicator-level indicator - *Percentage reduction in suspended sediment concentration (as measured in ppm) in the rivers of the micro-catchments downstream of the project-supported areas under Components 2 and 3* ? has now been added to the Results Framework in the ProDoc (Appendix 4) and GEF CEO ER (Annex A), with an EOP target of at least a 25% reduction in suspended sediment concentration. Table B and incremental cost reasoning in the GEF CEO ER, and incremental cost reasoning in Section 3 (Intervention Strategy) of the ProDoc, have also been revised accordingly.

8. Output 4.1.2 has been developed to help build on the preparatory work already undertaken by LTA for the establishment of a CTF for Lake Tanganyika and its basin under the Convention. Additional information is provided under output 4.1.2. in the body of the UNEP ProDoc; including information on the proposed structure of CFT and how it intends to meet the aim of raising sufficient funds, putting in place a sustainable resource mobilization strategy with innovative measures that will ensure leveraging of resources. The additional information also includes detail on LTAs current fund status including proposals for operational guidelines and processes for the long-term efficiency of the CTF.

There is also extensive experience and documentation of global good practices in the design, development and operation of CTF's. The GEF-supported activities under Output 4.1.2 have specifically been designed to conform with the *Practice Standards for Conservation Trust Funds* developed by the Conservation Finance Alliance (see https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57e1f17b37c58156a98f1ee4/t/5953eae486e6c0fb1c81cb93/1498671896001/CFA_Standards_full-compressed.pdf).

Please note that the CTF is not being conceptualized by the project (and the associated EOP targets) as an endowment fund. It is considered more prudent that the CTF rather be designed

as a mixed fund, comprising *sinking funds* (capital investment, plus income, that is disbursed over a relatively long period [or a period determined by the contributor to the fund, such as a donor agency]) and *revolving funds* (funds are regularly replenished through transboundary fees, taxes, levies or payment for ecosystem services and earmarked for defined objectives of the SAP). The indicator for the EOP target has thus been premised on the assumption that ? for example ? donor funding for transboundary lake management could be routed through the sinking fund portion of the CTF. Similarly ? for example - the riparian countries annual contributions to the LTA could be administered through the revolving fund portion of the CTF. It is agreed that a 5-year EOP target of USD520,000 for an endowment-type CTF is wholly unrealistic if the CTF is not yet even established.

9. The Results Framework (RF) presents the objective- and outcome- level indicators and targets for the project. At project inception, the PCU will (in consultation with each pre-selected ?responsible partner?) develop an output-based indicator framework that then defines the indicators and deliverables at the output level. This output-based indicator framework will, once developed, then align more directly with the outputs and activities described in the ProDoc (as requested in the comment).

At the output level, the UNEP ProDoc describes the activities under the output that will be funded from the GEF funding and the implementation modality for the costs associated with these activities (e.g., procurement of services, procurement of equipment and materials, travel costs, meeting costs, labor costs, etc.).

Currently, as correctly indicated in the comment, only a consolidated, high-level budget is presented in the UNEP ProDoc. It was envisaged that, during the PPG, a more detailed project management- and output-based budget would also be prepared by the Executing Partner (i.e., UNOPS for PM and the implementation of output 4.1.4) and the different institutions selected as the responsible partners for the different suite of outputs and activities (e.g., TNC for the implementation of Output 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 in Tanzania, ICCN for the implementation of outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 in INR in DRC, LTA for the implementation of outputs 4.1.1 ? 4.1.3, etc.). These budgets would then have provided the next level of detail to complement the high-level budget presented in the UNEP ProDoc. Unfortunately, the multiple challenges and delays posed by the impacts from COVID19 prevented the LTA and the national working groups in the riparian countries to finalize details on all the designated responsible partner institutions for all the project outputs and activities prior to submission of the project documentation. The consequence is that we were unable to present a more detailed output-based budget in the project documentation. The selection of the responsible partner institutions for different outputs and the finalization of a SLA/MOU/MOA with these institutions ? which will include a detailed budget breakdown and output-based indicator framework ? is thus a very high priority for the PCU during the project inception phase.

[1] The project would also have used the following herbicide application methods (as relevant to the targeted invasive plant species), and only as required: foliar application (when the herbicide is directly applied to the leaves of the plant); cut stump treatment (when the herbicide is applied to the cut stump to prevent coppicing); basal bark treatment (when the herbicide is applied directly to a plant stem) and stem injection (when the herbicide is injected into the plant stem). The project would not have used ?blanket spraying? or ?broadcast spraying? applications

[2] <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2667010021001281> (note: an important aspect of the toxicity of glyphosate-based herbicides is the use of adjuvants in the technical formulations).

Response to (3/3/2022)

The proposed alternative scenario is sound and adequate and is built around the Theory of Change diagram and narrative set out in Annex E. In line with the proposed Theory of Change, the project will be implemented at two spatial scales:

(i) at the regional scale of Lake Tanganyika, the project will initiate the process of building a network of community-based 1. co-managed fisheries areas in the key fish biodiversity areas of the littoral zone of Lake Tanganyika. The strategic focus of GEF support for fisheries co-management in the four riparian countries will be on strengthening the capacities of, and building collaboration and co-operation between, the LTA, government fisheries institutions and the local fishing communities [6] in order to minimize resource use conflict, improve good governance and encourage proactive leadership on the conservation and management of fisheries resources.

ii. at the local scale of the selected Protected Areas (PAs), and their buffer zones, in each of the three participating riparian countries (Burundi, DRC and Tanzania)[7], the project envisages the participative implementation of a suite of complementary management interventions within each targeted PA to address the key threats and barriers to the conservation and sustainable use of the lake and its basin area. Fundamental to the outputs and activities to be implemented in each of the PAs is the underlying premise that, by meaningfully involving communities in the management and control of the natural resources of the protected areas and their buffer zones, and then supporting households within these communities to sustainably increase their productivity and incomes from these natural resources, this will provide sufficient incentive for those communities to continue to invest in the long-term stewardship of these protected areas beyond the term of the project.

The four Components of the project are now sufficiently explained with a chronological order of outcomes and outputs under each component and associated activities.

Component 1. Addressing identified transboundary threats to lake biodiversity

Component 2. Protection of core conservation zones in three protected areas

Component 3. Sustainable natural resource use in three protected areas and their buffer zones

Component 4: Transboundary coordination, information management and monitoring and evaluation

Response to 8 and 9 ? UNEP and UNOPS

Answer to 8: after discussion with the BD GEF Sec contact (7 April) Adriana Moreira: (i) generally the need for more detail on the CTF learning from the 30 years? experience of other African CTFs, refer to the network of CAF? and experience shared on fund creation, governance, efficiency (ii) to ensure sustainability for LTA after the project end UNEP more detail in the budget is required on how the funds are to be used, transparency, financial flows, who does what, (iii) also to reflect on the opportunity to allocate GEF grant not only to the structuring but also as capitalization to the fund itself.

The Conservation Trust Fund will operate within the framework of The Consortium of African Funds for the Environment (CAF?). CAFE is a membership-based network of Environmental Funds (EFs) or Conservation Trust Funds (CTFs) in Africa that has been in operation since 2011 whose mission is to build a learning community that shares best practices and pursues innovative finance mechanisms in order to foster conservation, environmental management and sustainable development in Africa (<https://cafeconsortium.org/index.php/members/>). CAF? has a total of 19 Member Funds that, among others, support over 90 parks and reserves which cover over 160,000 km² across 20 countries and manage over USD300 million in endowments and additional funding in donor financing in Africa. Some of the member trusts operating in the Lake Tanganyika region are ;(1) The Tanzania Forest Fund (2) The Okapi Fund is the first Conservation Trust Fund in the DRC (3) The Sangha Tri-National Foundation (FTNS) that operates in Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo and Central Africa Republic. All the three Trusts are a great success as they have continued to grow from strength to strength over the years and have mobilised significant levels of finance for conservation and are sustainable operations. So, since the Lake Tanganyika Authority will operationalise the Conservation Trust Fund within the CAF? Framework, there is a very high chance of success and of the CTF being a sustainable operation). GEF funds will only be used to catalyse the formation of the CTF

CTF activities will be:

- ? *Feasibility to set up the TF (The feasibility study will require resources allocated to it from other lines)*
- ? *Establishing a Steering Cttee & Strategic Plan which can be led by the PM (The Governance set up and Strategic plan should be led by the PMU Manager and is already covered in the cost for Component 4)*
- ? *Consultations for the development of the Financial Plan (Same for the Financial planning thought this primarily be workshop expenses and a consultant's time for a few weeks)*
- ? *Branding (Branding can be extended under Sundries line - publications & Promotional Materials to 4.1.2)*
- ? *Capacity Building (Capacity Build the financial planning and management capacities (i.e., training, mentoring, financial systems, etc.) of the Board of Trustees, Advisory Committee/s and the Fund Administrator to mobilise resources for the fund can be partially covered under the PMU's responsibilities, however some resources for expert inputs would also be advisable)*

Answer to 9: UNEP and UNOPS have worked with partners to provide the necessary detail including complementing ToRs and additional information on the technical and administrative repartitioning within the budget .

Detail on e.g., UNOPS for PM and the implementation of output 4.1.4.; TNC for the implementation of Output 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 in Tanzania; ICCN for the implementation of outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 in INR in DRC; LTA for the implementation of outputs 4.1.1 ? 4.1.3; etc.).

(NB: Financial and contracts manager TOR are already listed in Annex)

Response to 2/28/2023)

re. 8.: The explanation of the process to design the TF is noted including the execution by Cafe which is detailed in the prodoc under outputs 4.1.2. Please point to information on how much of the grant is allocated to the design to the CTF. From the prodoc we understand that none of GEF grant will be used as seed finance to the CTF (see para 259 of the prodoc). How much of a minimum contribution from other sources is expected at minimum to provide a viable base for the operationalization of the fund ?

Answer: The GEF Project budget line 2114 on transboundary coordination (component 4) allocates US\$100,000 for the design of the CTF and no GEF resources have been allocated as seed funding.

In terms of the operationalization of a Trust Fund, UNEP discussed with LTA and partners during the LTA Management Committee meeting in December 2022 in Bujumbura of the possibility of establishing a lean structure to lead the CTF once established. Such a structure would comprise a coordinator and an accountant/administrator for an anticipated annual budget of US\$96,000 including staff salaries and office operations. The Lake Tanganyika state parties also indicated that they will avail a minimum of US\$200,000 from their country's contributions towards the operationalization of the CTF to show commitment and encourage external contributions. These and possibly other options involving leveraging funds with other donors and partners, will be fully explored during the inception phase and then in the design phase including the estimate of the funding needs of the CTF.

re. 9: Staff positions

(i) the project coordinator is charged in part to the components and part to PMC. It was requested to clearly separate technical tasks (which could be charged to the components) from coordination tasks which fall under PMC. Based on the current TORs it appears that his/her tasks all fall under the broader category of project management and should be charged accordingly to the PMC costs.

Answer:.

The project coordinator, in addition to her/his coordination role, will provide direct technical support to the delivery of the different components (1-4). The Terms of Reference have been updated to provide a more comprehensive and detailed description of the duties and how these are technical as well as coordination responsibilities. The revised ToR of the position, allocating 75% of her/his time to these tasks, as s/he has to support the implementation of this complex bi-focal area project in 4 countries requiring intense time and effort, including stakeholder coordination, close communications with/ providing guidance and management to the liaison associates, coordinating and managing the work of Implementing partners, consultants and sub-contractors. Additionally, there is an important task of supporting/training/championing of LTA to strengthen administrative and financial processes in order to work towards sustainability beyond the project implementation. 25% of her/his time is allocated to project management (PMC).

?Supervise and coordinate the work of all project staff, responsible implementing partners, consultants, and sub-contractors, ensuring timing and quality of all outputs in line with the approved Project Document.?

ToRs (click on the text for the link to the document)/[budget](#) reflect the % allocations between PMC and Technical responsibilities. TOR: [Appendix 10_GEF 10388_Lake Tanganyika_UNEP PRODOC_Appendix 10_Terms of Reference CLEAN VERSION.docx](#)

(ii) the financial and contracts manager should be charged to PMC. Similarly, for the financial and contracts manager, s/he will support Implementing Partners, consultants and sub-contractors in complying with specific financial planning and reporting requirements by providing feedback to the requests, submissions and/or providing guidance as needed. 35% of their time is allocated to project management (PMC) and 65% of their time is dedicated to support the delivery of project components 1-4. Additionally, there are tasks relating to supporting/training/championing of LTA to strengthen administrative and financial processes.

10. Budget[\[1\]](#) [\[2\]](#) [\[3\]](#) [\[4\]](#) [\[5\]](#)

(i) please add a column for "responsible party" which lists the budget holder/responsible party for each budget line.

(ii) the procurement of vehicles from the GEF grant is not encouraged. Please explore if this can be covered via co-finance.

(iii) the budget line of 90K for " Vehicle operations and maintenance including fuel and maintenance" appears unreasonably high and likely a typo. Please revisit.

(iv) Why is the human rights consultant charged to M&E costs?

(v) Please provide detail (e.g. point to the TORs/a description and expenditure categories) for the subcontracts for cooperating agencies which are substantial (up to USD 1.7 million)[\[6\]](#)

(vi) The financial and contracts manager should be charged to PMC unless this includes technical work of institutional strengthening at LTA which then also needs to be clearly outlined and separated in the TORs for this position. Also, please explain what level this position is rated at with 530 K for 5 years in costs.

Answer:

(i) This has been addressed in the revised budget and reflected in the PRODOC and in the CEO endorsement package.

(ii) Please elaborate on the justification for the need of this vehicle, considering the complexity of this regional project in terms of monitoring activities on the ground in remote areas in participating countries and the fact that LTA, local- government authorities cannot cover this cost? and supervision to project pilots is essential?

Answer: A vehicle is needed from the GEF grant to support the project operations as the member countries are not able to purchase one. An attempt to secure a spare vehicle from LTA management failed during the coordination meeting in December leaving no other option than to purchase one from the project budget to support field operations.

(iii) In terms of running costs, the vehicle needs periodic and ad-hoc maintenance especially in this case where long distance travels to remote areas with poor road conditions are envisaged to attend meetings in other 3 project countries and carry out routine project monitoring visits. We budgeted USD 1,500 per month for fuel and maintenance to cater for long distance (cross border) trips for meetings and monitoring purposes by LTA. We need sufficient allocation of costs for maintenance in line with the UN Department of Safety and Security guidance on duty of care, considering the long distance, road conditions, lack of availability of quality workshops for repairs or maintenance during the travels and need for maintenance after each long-distance trip. We can revisit the actual usage of this budget line as well as forecasted requirements in the remainder of the years at the Mid Term Evaluation and will re-allocate to other budget lines if necessary.

(iv) Human Rights will be among the indicators to be incorporated into the Programme's M&E framework. The Human Rights officer (consultant) will be responsible for developing tools and guidance to mainstream Human Rights into targeted activities and provide capacity development support as well as check for compliance.

(v) The potential implementation partners in each of the participating countries have been identified and approved by beneficiary countries during the PPG and the LTA Management Committee of NDecember 2022: See document GEF 10388_Lake Tanganyika_UNEP PRODOC_Appendix 9_Decision making flowchart and organisational chart REV CH

The responsible national partners are regrouped and shown in Appendix 9 of the PRODOC and in the CEO endorsement (see diagram below).

These key implementation partners of the project have been part of the development of this project from the onset and actively involved in the PPG phase. Their specific role in the implementation of the project activities is largely based on their experience in the specific national and regional contexts, their contribution to the PPG, their STAR allocation and Co-finance commitments.

Key national partners that will support the implementation of project activities (with respect to the budget categories under sub-contracts (2100)

- **DRC**

ICCN (C2)

WWF (C3)

BUCODAC-DASOD (C3)

WWF (C1 + C3)

LHTFHC (C1)

- **Tanzania**

MLF (C1)

TAFIRI (C1)

TNC (C1)

LT Basin National Waterboard Kigoma (C2 + 3)

TAWA (C2)

IUCN (C2 + C3)

- **Burundi**

TBD (C1)

OBPE (C2)

MINEAGRIE (C3)

- **Zambia**

FZS (C1)

MFL (C1)

Table 1: List of Outcomes, Outputs, key deliverables and benchmarks in the 4 Lake Tanganyika state parties provides additional detail on who does what with respect to the different outcomes and activities.

During the first stages of development of the project and negotiations with all the 4 partner states, Zambia did, at that time, not provide STAR allocation which is reflected in limited interventions corresponding limited budgets. During PPG particular efforts were made to bring in some balance and equity among countries which contributed funds.

(vi) Master's degree in business administration; a BCom/BAcc degree (or equivalent) may be accepted if combined with 2 additional years of experience.

As also stated above under section #9 (ii), for financial and contracts manager, s/he will support IPs, consultants and sub-contractors in complying with specific financial planning and reporting requirements by providing feedback to the requests, submissions and/or providing required guidance as may be required. The capacity of IPs etc. shall be assessed after the project is initiated in order to determine the level of engagement required for the financial and contracts manager to provide more hands-on support to each group of beneficiaries.

Level of the position: At least 2 years' financial management and/or accounting experience in the financial management of large, multi-stakeholder donor-funded environmental or sustainable development projects.

Response to (4/25/2023)

8. Thank you for pointing out the budget line and allocation for the TF design. Comment addressed at ER stage.

One early task should be to estimate what returns are needed from an endowment to make the CTF viable (e.g. how much funds need to be raised not only to cover some operating costs (incl. personnel) but foremost to have enough income from investing these funds year over year to be able to disburse what total of grants each year. You may want to arrange learning exchanges with other CTFs on conducting a feasibility study and design of the fund and make decisions on e.g. portion to be a revolving fund and portion as sinking fund (as applicable).

Answer:

This is well noted with thanks.

10. Budget:

(v) The total amount of sub-contracts (budget lines 2101 to 2115) is 9.3 million and covers all components. Please confirm that these contracts (largest appearing as 1.7 million; budget line 2107) will be awarded in alignment with UN applicable procurement thresholds and procedures.

Answer:

We can confirm that all the sub-contracts (budget lines 2101 to 2115) amounting to US\$9.3 millions will be awarded to partners in line with the UN Environment applicable procurement thresholds and procedures.

(vi) Please answer together with comment 2 in Part I question 2 (with regard to table B and PMC). There is not need to answer this twice. The TORs for the financial and contracts manager indicated that she/he will perform 65 % technical tasks, yet the TORs as written do not support that. It is not clear that the financial and contracts manager has such significant contributions to the technical components. Same for the safeguards officer TORs and charges who seems to mainly perform project management and not technical tasks yet only around 20 % of his/her times is charged to PMC .

Answer:

This question has been addressed above and the relevant TORs have been revised substantively and align with the budget to reflect all the different contributions to the components. Copies of the revised TORs are submitted in a single file.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(12/20/2021) Yes, please also see part 1/question 1.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. Noted.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(12/20/2021)

- the incremental reasoning has been elaborated and summarized in a table which provides detail on this.

- co-finance is from a very large range of co-financiers and a short/concise overview table of the substantive (content/descriptive) nature of the co-finance and its relation to the project would be extremely useful.

(3/3/2021)

Thank you for providing the table which is very useful. The co-finance is likely the most complex we have seen in the IW Africa portfolio and MTRs and TEs need to devise a transparent overview to monitor the realization of investment mobilized and in-kind co-finance. All other questions on co-finance have been raised already in Part 1 and will not be repeated here to avoid redundancy.

(4/25/2023) See above.

(5/1/2023) Addressed - see above. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Noted

2. Thank you for the suggestion. A brief overview table has been integrated under the co-financing table C in the CEO ER.

Response to (3/3/2021)

Thank you, this is well noted and will be reflected in the overall planning as well as particularly in the MTR and TE.

Explanations are given above. A summary table with narrowed down classification was provided and can be found below:

https://iucnhq-my.sharepoint.com/:x:/g/personal/ndolia_iucn_org/EXVlnK4MZnVNj4i7pXE4eSsBUI8QjW3he7AMpV9storb7Q?e=dE1eBR

In summary: (i) the GEF will allocate USD 4,842,280 to establishing and operationalising a regional network of community-13,268,648; (ii) the GEF will allocate USD 3,986,774 for improving the protection of, and enhancing the delivery of ecosystem services from, core conservation zones of protected areas (Component 2), with counterpart funding of USD 26,376,019; (iii) GEF will allocate, USD 3,431,966 for promoting the adoption of more sustainable approaches to natural resource harvesting and agriculture in the buffer zones of protected areas (Component 3), with counterpart funding of USD 16,958,032; and (iv) GEF will allocate USD 1,642,870 for improving coordination between and information-sharing among transboundary partners (Component 4), with counterpart funding of USD 4,927,954. The project's co-finance leveraged through this project is USD 62,198,153.

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

(12/20/2021) yes, though please also review again the list of benefits listed in section 10 and assure relation to the project description and RF.

(3/3/2022) Not addressed. Please cross-reference the list of benefits in section 10. of the endorsement request to the respective sub-components (and/or outputs) - which should also correspond to the results framework. The comment above remains to be addressed.

(3/3/2023) Overall addressed, but please respond to the two points below:

1. Still to be addressed: Please cross-reference the list of benefits in section 10. of the endorsement request to the respective sub-components (and/or outputs)
2. Please make sure key/targeted benefits of the project are captured in the RF.

(4/25/2023) Addressed.

Note: During implementation the yearly workplans and its monitoring should provide a much more granulated overview of what will be achieved in each year in order to have a clear path to achieving the more high level midterm and end of project targets specified in the current RF.

Agency Response

Part II (Project Justification), Section 1a. (Project Description), Sub-section 4) of the GEF CEO ER have now been updated to include project beneficiaries and progress in implementing the SAP.

Response (3/3/2022)

- List to be cross referenced to benefits
- Corresponding to results framework link to RF discussion
- Yes, there is further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits:

3.1.3 Expected global environmental benefits explains in detail the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits (number 137 to 143): The project will contribute to addressing threats that are ranked as the highest priority in the SAP for Lake Tanganyika and its basin. The global benefits of improving collaboration and cooperation in transboundary lake management will include: securing the integrity of the ecosystem services delivered by the lake and its basin; conservation of the freshwater and terrestrial biodiversity of the lake and its basin; improving the management of fish stocks; maintenance of the lake catchment area of the lake and improving water quality in the lake; protection of river flow and reduction of sediment loads reaching the lake from the lake basin; improved control of invasive alien plant species in the lake basin; more equitable use of natural resources in the lake and its basin; improved sequestration of carbon, particularly in intact forests, grasslands and wetlands ; and increased resilience of the lake ecosystems and of men and women resident in coastal and inland communities to the impacts of climate change.

Further response 3/3/2023

Overall addressed, but please respond to the two points below:

1. Still to be addressed: Please cross-reference the list of benefits in section 10. of the endorsement request to the respective sub-components (and/or outputs)

Answer: A consolidated table showing a cross reference between beneficiary in the endorsement document has been prepared and appended to this review sheet (see Appendix 1 in this review sheet)

Appendix 1:

The Table shows a cross reference between beneficiaries in the endorsement document and Outputs

Project component	Outputs	Output Indicator	Beneficiaries
1. Addressing identified transboundary threats to fish biodiversity	1.1.1 Prospective sites for community-based fisheries co-management areas are identified and characterised, the mechanisms for their co-management consultatively developed, and management plans are prepared, with men and women actively involved	(i) Number of Prospective sites for community-based fisheries co-management areas identified and characterised (ii) Number of management plans prepared, with men and women actively involved	CMI members for co-managed fisheries areas
	1.1.2 Fisheries development and management plans for community-based fisheries co-management areas are under implementation, with use zones demarcated, fish biodiversity protected, use zoning and fisheries regulations enforced, and fish catches monitored	Number of Fisheries development and management plans for community-based fisheries co-management areas that are under implementation.	CMI members for co-managed fisheries areas Community fisheries monitors

	1.1.3 The capacities of national and local government fisheries institutions are strengthened to support the effective functioning of CMIs and their networks in the implementation of sustainable fisheries practices	Number of national and local government experts working in national government offices trained to plan to support the effective functioning of CMIs and their networks in the implementation of sustainable fisheries practices.	(iii) professional and technical staff of public fisheries institutions supporting CMIs and CMINs
2. Protection of core conservation zones in three protected areas	2.1 Improved protection of, and enhanced delivery of ecosystem services from, the core conservation zones of protected areas contributes to enhancing the biodiversity and water security of the Lake Tanganyika Basin	<i>Outcome indicator 5:</i> Extent (in ha) of core conservation zones in three terrestrial protected areas under an active management regime[1] (and METT score)	iv) protected area monitoring and enforcement personnel (permanent and contractual) staff
		<i>Outcome indicator 6:</i> Patrol distance covered by the patrol teams with increased patrol efficiency by community rangers/guards/scouts that are adequately trained, equipped and deployed in the core conservation zones of the three protected areas	v) protected area monitoring and enforcement personnel (permanent and contractual) staff

		<p><i>Outcome indicator 7:</i> Extent (in ha) of degraded or invaded natural habitats under an active restoration and rehabilitation programme in the core conservation zone of the three protected areas</p>	<p><i>vi) contractual labour, artisans, supervisors, technicians and professionals for construction, maintenance and conservation works; (vii) park/reserve management committee members;</i></p>
		<p>Proportion of workers involved in project-supported activities related to NR protection, conservation, and value-added activities that are women and FHH (%)</p>	<p>v) village-based game guards and forest guards</p>
<p>2. Protection of core conservation zones in three protected areas</p>	<p>2.1.1 The institutional and individual (including women and youth) capacities to monitor and control illegal activities and land encroachment in core conservation zones of protected areas is strengthened.</p>	<p>Number of national and local institutional and individual (including women and youth) whose capacities to monitor and control illegal activities and land encroachment in core conservation zones of protected areas is strengthened. Number of national institutions with capacity to Monitor and control illegal activities and land encroachment.</p> <p>Number of community members trained</p>	<p>vi) contractual labour, artisans, supervisors, technicians and professionals for construction, maintenance and conservation works</p>

	2.1.2 Degraded ecosystems and habitats in the core conservation zone of protected areas are restored and rehabilitated, with active participation of men and women, including FHH.	Number of hectares in the degraded ecosystems and habitats in the core conservation zone of protected areas restored and rehabilitated, with active participation of men and women, including FHH.	vii) park/reserve management committee members; (viii) community members impacted by crocodile attacks.
3. Sustainable natural resource use in three protected areas and their buffer zones	3.1.1 The adoption of more sustainable natural resource harvesting approaches, and good crop and livestock agricultural practices, in the protected area buffer zones contributing to reduced threats to the biodiversity and improved water security in the Lake Tanganyika Basin adopted	<i>Outcome indicator 8:</i> Extent of land (ha) in the multiple use and buffer zones of the three protected areas with improved conservation status and more sustainable natural resource use	(xi) livestock and crop farmers; (xii) households securing small grants or loans from VLSAs
		<i>Outcome indicator 9:</i> Extent of land (ha) in the multiple use and buffer zones of the three protected areas with more sustainable farming practices	

		<p><i>Outcome indicator 10:</i> Number of households (including women-headed households) directly participating in, and benefitting from, project support to the adoption of more sustainable natural resource management and use, and more sustainable farming practices, in the multiple use, buffer and lake floodplain zones of the three protected areas</p>	
		<p><i>Outcome indicator 11:</i> Extent (ha) of natural habitats in the multiple use, buffer and lake floodplain zones of the three protected areas under an active restoration and rehabilitation programme leading to reduced threats to biodiversity and improved water security</p>	
		<p><i>Proportion of community forest established, and Village Land Use Plans (VLUP) renewed with men's and women's groups active involvement (ha/%)</i></p>	
3. Sustainable natural resource use in three protected areas and their b,buffer zones	3.1.2 The sustainability of natural resource management and use by communities living in, or using natural resources from, the buffer zones of PAs is improved	Area of land (ha) under sustainable natural resources management being utilised by communities living in or using natural resources, from the buffer zones of Pas.	ix) village-community forest management bodies for community forests and village forests. (x) households obtaining livelihood-based technical and financial support

	3.1.3 More sustainable and productive farming practices are being adopted by, and other income sources developed for, communities living in the buffer zones of PAS.	Number of households (including women and men) living in the buffer zones of Pas adopting sustainable productive farming practices including other income sources.	(xi) livestock and crop farmers; (xii) households securing small grants or loans from VLSAs
4. Transboundary coordination, information management and monitoring and evaluation	4.1 Improved coordination and information-sharing among riparian countries, the LTA, donors and other stakeholders leads to more effective partnerships in the implementation of the SAP and NAPs for Lake Tanganyika and its Basin	<i>Outcome indicator 12:</i> Status of trans-boundary plans, systems, protocols, procedures, and guidelines that enable and support the implementation of the Convention (where 0 = non-existent; 1= drafted/designed, but not yet adopted; 2= adopted/designed, but outdated or not yet implemented; and 3 = under implementation)	(xiii) members of the Conventions various management committees
		<i>Outcome indicator 13:</i> Annual income (in USD) available to finance the costs of the transboundary governance structures to fulfil their responsibilities for coordinating, overseeing, and monitoring the implementation of the Convention	
		<i>Outcome indicator 14:</i> Functional status of the governance structures under the Convention (where 0 = not constituted; 1 = constituted, but do not meet; 2 = constituted, but only meet intermittently; 3 = constituted, and meet regularly)	

		<i>Proportion of the SAP's new strategic actions effectively including performance indicators related to women participation in NR management</i>	
4. Transboundary coordination, information management and monitoring and evaluation	4.1.1 <i>A performance monitoring system to track and report on the implementation progress of the SAP is developed and maintained.</i>	<i>A fully developed, functioning and well-maintained performance monitoring system that is being used to track and monitor the implementation progress of the SAP</i>	<i>(xiii) members of the Conventions various management committees; and (xiv) LTA staff.</i>
	4.1.2 <i>A financing mechanism to improve the sustainability of financial support for transboundary water cooperation and basin development in Lake Tanganyika is developed</i>	<i>Number of financing mechanism (A Sustainable Conservation Trust Fund) developed</i>	
	4.1.3 <i>The governance capacity to oversee, support and coordinate the implementation of the Convention on Sustainable Management of Lake Tanganyika is further enhanced</i>	<p>Annual Country contributions to the Lake Tanganyika Authority in line with the regional agreement</p> <p>Amount of money spent on Capacity building to various governance structures of the Lake Tanganyika Convention</p> <p>Report on the Feasibility assessment for Cage aquaculture</p>	<i>(xiii) members of the Conventions various management committees; and (xiv) LTA staff.</i>

	<i>4.1.4 A project-based monitoring, reporting and evaluation program is maintained</i>	<i>A fully developed, functioning and well-maintained performance monitoring system that is being used to track and monitor the implementation progress of the SAP</i> <i>Availability of M&E System</i>	
	<i>4.1.5 Enhanced South To south cooperation through knowledge sharing</i>	<i>(i) Attendance of at least 80% of regional knowledge management and learning activities among RBOs and RECs organized by Africa Network of River Basin Organisations (ANBO)</i> <i>(ii) 100 % participation and usage of the IW: LEARN Global Platform</i>	
	<i>4.1.6 Enhanced communication with LTA stakeholders</i>	<i>LTA Website Regularly updated</i>	
		<i>Public Outreach materials available in the 4 LTA basin states</i>	

[1] The core conservation zones of the protected areas under an 'active management regime' will have *inter alia* an: approved management plan, allocated operating budget, dedicated staff complement, regular daily patrols, and active conservation management interventions underway. The overall management effectiveness of the PA will be rated in the METT evaluation

2. Please make sure key/targeted benefits of the project are captured in the RF.

Answer: This has been addressed and added to the Results Framework in the Endorsement Document (Annex A), Annex 4 of the PRODOC.

Part II (Project Justification), Section 1a. (Project Description), Sub-section 4) of the GEF CEO ER have now been updated to include project beneficiaries and progress in implementing the SAP.

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
(12/20/2021)

1. Conservation TF: One of the main pillars of this section is the proposed CTF that will provide "a long-term sustainable financing mechanisms to co-finance the costs of implementing the SAP", and "annual income (in USD) available to finance the costs of the transboundary governance structures to fulfil their responsibilities for coordinating, overseeing and monitoring the implementation of the Convention". As per the comments above, this mechanism needs to be detailed. What are the incentives for private sector participation in such fund? What is the governance mechanism/policy that ensures the transparency in the financing of the SAP governance structures? The project runs a risk of generating expectations around this revenue generating mechanism and can benefit for more clarity on this important activity.

2. Another point on sustainability re. LTA:

i. Under component 4, please include capacity building for LTA to be able to enhance FM, procurement and overall accounting skills so that in future LTA can be acting as direct executing agency without an intermediary such as UNOPS. Will the project provide LTA with some limited funds for direct execution that will be ramped up over time to build a track record of enhanced capacity of LTA in that regard?

ii. What are the current country contributions to the LTA and its core functions? Will there be a dialogue with countries to over time and with added benefits to communities from cooperation to ramp up LTA country contributions (especially as the CTF will take time to be funded and be operational - see earlier comments).

(3/3/2023)

1. Please include in the RF indicators and targets of successful operationalization of the TF. Right now component 4.1.2 just provides a binary measure of "0" = does not exist or "1" does exist. What do you expect by midterm: e.g. such as the governance structure and legal establishment in place. What level of contributions to the TF at midterm and at end of project? Where do you capture what will have been funded and for what and who?

2. Comment addressed.

(5/1/2023) Comment addressed. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

1. Noted. Please refer to the agency response to the GEFSEC review comment 3 (sub-comment 8) for Part II of the GEF CEO ER (see above).

2.

(i) Output 4.1.3 of the UNEP ProDoc has now been updated to include capacity-building support to LTA in financial planning and management, project management and procurement, and contract management.

It is envisaged in the project implementation arrangements that the LTA Secretariat will be the responsible implementing partner for all activities under Outputs 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 under Component 4 (i.e., "direct execution?"). The administrative and management costs of fulfilling this role as an implementing partner have been embedded within the budget allocation. The PCU will also be physically located in the LTA offices in Bujumbura, and they may also provide further administrative, financial, and technical backstopping support to LTA in the implementation of these outputs.

(ii) The four riparian countries are required to contribute an amount of USD 303,900 per year to cover LTA salaries at both regional and national levels (5% of this amount is used for operational costs of the LTA). This funding commitment is however not always forthcoming from the riparian countries (sometimes only 25% of this funding commitment is received in a financial year), resulting in significant financial shortfalls in the LTA budgets. Output 4.1.2 and Appendix 22.5 of the UNEP ProDoc provide further contextual information on the financial constraints facing LTA.

The dialogues about the financial sustainability (including the establishment of the CTF) of the LTA will be supported by the project under Output 4.1.2 and 4.1.3. Output 4.1.3 has now been updated to make explicit provision for hosting these discussions about long-term funding of LTA, at the level of the COM, NSC and MC. It may even be prudent for the project to support the constitution and functioning of a working group under the COM or MC to make specific recommendations on measures to improve the financial sustainability of the LTA. The feasibility of this will be assessed during the project inception phase (within 6 months from the project start).

Further response 3/3/2023

Answer: An Indicator 4.1.4 Progressive increase in the amount of money spent on various governance structures of the Lake Tanganyika Convention from the Conservation Trust Fund has been added to the Results Framework. This will be 0 USD at baseline, 50,000 USD at Mid Term and 300,000 USD at project closure.

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

(12/20/2021) Yes, maps have been provided.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Noted.

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

(12/20/2021) This is elaborated in Annex/appendix 15 and anticipated range of mechanisms for engagement summarized in table 12, page 96 of the agency prodoc. The description is very wide and a clearer relation to the components would be very helpful.

1. Please add a column to table 12 on the role of the mentioned stakeholders in relation to specific project sub-components and outputs (such as information from table 8 in the annex 15).

(3/3/2022) This comment is partially addressed in the table. Please provide a clearer idea of the role of key stakeholders in carrying out project activities. Again, we just a discussion between GEFSEC and the UNEP team to discuss this, the budget and the results framework.

(3/3/2023)

Thank you for adding the column in the stakeholder table. Please be more specific on what is meant with "contribute to" for many of the stakeholders who are to be actively involved in the project activities.

(4/25/2023)

This has been addressed in the additional annexes provided to outline the role of stakeholders in project components.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment.

1. Table 12 in the agency Prodoc and the stakeholder table in the CEO ER section 2 include now further information on the envisaged role of the mentioned stakeholders in the delivery of project components and outputs. This information is limited to the context described in connection with our response above on your comment 9 on the RF of section 3 of this review sheet. It will be validated and clarified further as part of the prioritization exercise during the project inception phase.

Response to (3/3/2022)

- The current CEO endorsement document contains the project description that identifies stakeholders in each of the output including activities involving communication with which stakeholders
- The Stakeholder analysis that was done during PPG should be added as an annex to the PRODOC. The analysis has the details of which stakeholders will be engaged at the Regional level, national level and local level and an elaborate engagement plan with the mechanisms of engagement and identifies the information types that will be disseminated at different stages of implementing the engagement plan
- Consultations with all participating countries as well as LTA Management Committee took place over the last months and a more detailed organigram on implementing arrangements was developed together (attach or insert updated organigram)
-
- This is to be developed with partners at the proposed technical workshop (LTA to suggest dates)

Response to 3/3/2023

Thank you for adding the column in the stakeholder table. Please be more specific on what is meant with "contribute to" for many of the stakeholders who are to be actively involved in the project activities.

Answer: The expression of "Contribute to" was used to mean technical and financial contribution or support to an activity provided by one party among many contributors to the

same activity. It intends to mean that the overall goal or impact shall not be achieved by the single contribution from one institution but from multiple contributors and long term impact could be even beyond the project timeframe.

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

(12/20/2021) Annex 12 of the prodoc provides a gender analysis and action plan.

1. While core indicator 11 on beneficiaries provides disaggregation by gender, the main project RF provides no further tracking on participatory and process indicators to get to outputs and therefore also no indication on gender disaggregation. Please elaborate why UNEP chooses to not integrate the accounting for such participation and processes - incl. the gender dimensions - in the overall project results framework. This seems to run against the goal of gender mainstreaming. Please elaborate/enhance.

(3/3/2022) Thank you for adding to the existing results framework. As it stands we will need to see additional detail overall of the results framework and budget for the project and - as mentioned above - suggest a discussion with your team, if you so feel that would be useful.

(3/3/2023)

1. Please provide in the Portal under the section "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment", a summary of the challenges, strengths and opportunities for enhancing gender equality and women's empowerment in the Lake Tanganyika basin.

2. Please strengthen the gender dimension in the Results Framework (RF). While e.g. (and this is an example) the fisheries management plans are to be developed and executed with the active involvement of women, the RF then only seems to account for the # of plans and not the active/meaningful involvement of women in the process. Please address here and in similar cases.

(4/25/2023) Both questions are in principle addressed even though not with much elaboration or detail. At this stage the emphasis needs to shift to the inception phase. Please reflect attention to inclusion of women both in participation and benefitting from the project in the

inception report and in PIRs so that progress is documented and can be transparently shown at MTR stage.

Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Many thanks for this comment, which we agree with. As per our response to comment 9 above on the main project Results Framework (RF) of section 3 of this review sheet, the RF presents the objective- and outcome- level indicators and targets for the project. One of the priorities during project inception will be to develop an output-based indicator framework that then defines the indicators and deliverables at the output level and that integrates the output indicators from the Gender Action Plan (pages 36-42 of Appendix 16 of the agency ProDoc). This exercise will help to align the RF with the outputs and activities described in the ProDoc and across all Appendices (as requested in the comment). In the meantime, the RF in both Appendix 4 of the ProDoc and Annex A of the CEO ER has been slightly revised (in yellow highlights) as an initial attempt to reflect the logic of the contribution of towards the project outcomes in the RF (e.g. Outcome indicators 6 and 12).

Response to (3/3/2022)

The Gender analysis undertaken during the PPG has been thorough in that it has The Gender Action Plan (GAP) that has been developed as a support instrument to all Executing Entities (EE) to implement project intervention for gender equality and women's empowerment, according to planned activities of the project. However, there will be need at the start of the project to (1) Recruit a gender Specialist to take this work forward. (2) Need to establish a baseline for the Gender Action Plan that will need to run side by side with the Results Framework. In addition, the gender action plan has Indicators that will be used to monitor all the gender elements across all outputs and has been costed as well.

Response to (3/3/2023)

1. Please provide in the Portal under the section "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment", a summary of the challenges, strengths and opportunities for enhancing

Answer: Major gender challenges include (i) women's vulnerability to natural resource (Land, Forest, Agriculture, SSF) in terms of access, use, management and control, (ii) women face socio-economic barriers that affect their productivity, (iii) women and girls face harmful social norms that sustain GBV, and (iv) availability of gender-disaggregated data and information to inform gender analysis.

To address these, the project suggests interventions recognising that there are gender-based differences in the roles, responsibilities and contributions of men and women. The project promotes women and other vulnerable groups in relevant local decision-making bodies as well as in all decisions-making processes related to the implementation of the project. The project also promotes interventions that assist women in nature-based livelihood diversification, help women be aware of their rights, and strengthen communication advocacy on GBV prevention and support. The project finally adopts collection of gender-disaggregated data during project implementation. (This is also reflected in the CEO endorsement document). Particular attention will be given in the inception phase to ensuring gender mainstreaming including challenges, strengths and opportunities are well integrated into project implementation.

-

2. Please strengthen the gender dimension in the Results Framework (RF). While e.g. (and this is an example) the fisheries management plans are to be developed and executed with the active involvement of women, the RF then only seems to account for the # of plans and not the active/meaningful involvement of women in the process. Please address here and in similar cases.

Answer: This is also reflected in the revision of the CEO endorsement document.

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
(12/20/2021)

1. Please see the earlier question about incentives for the private sector to contribute to the CTF
2. There are many good ideas listed in the endorsement request , yet so far there is little indication in the project description to indicate clear mechanisms for the engagement with the private sector in the project description while certain activities and outputs, such as e.g. cage agriculture pilots and ecotourism clearly seem to point in that direction. A private sector engagement strategy should be developed during the inception phase and presented to the PSC at the inception meeting and be operational with clear activities committed early in the project (year 1 or 2). Please comment.

(3/3/2023) Response noted.

(3/3/2022) The response is noted as well as the commitment that is noted in the endorsement request to develop a private sector engagement strategy during the inception phase of the project.

Cleared

Agency Response

1. Thank you. Please refer to the earlier response.

2. This is a sound proposal, thank you. Because of the complexity of the area (social, language, culture, political, civil conflicts, access to information, etc.) and the significant local travel constraints (long distances, Covid travel restrictions, accessibility to rural areas, flooding, etc.), much of the consultation work undertaken during the PPG phase was focused on rural communities, local community-based organizations, donor/funding institutions, LTA, and government institutions (at different spheres of governance) with limited focus on prospective private sector partners. As indicated, the private sector will however be important stakeholders during the project implementation phase.

Part II (Project Justification), Section 4 (Private Sector Engagement) of the GEF CEO ER has now been updated to include the development of an overarching strategy to guide the constructive engagement and participation of the private sector in the implementation of project activities by the different responsible partner institutions. The UNEP ProDoc has also been updated to include this as an explicit activity under Output 4.1.4.

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

(12/20/2021) Risks have been described in the prodoc and ER. As commented earlier the establishment of community accessible/local grievance and compensation structures seem crucial for the project and the risks of enforcement conflicts is mentioned. Another risk which is hard to predict in the region and the prodoc acknowledges is the history of instability and local conflicts in the region. Please comment.

(3/3/2022) Comment addressed in the ESMF annexed to the prodoc.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agreed. As indicated in our earlier response, the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), annexed to the UNEP ProDoc as Appendix 18, specifically elaborates on the issue of the project-level Grievance Mechanism - see Chapter 8.2. of the ESMF. The UNEP institution-wide Grievance Mechanism will be complemented by a project-level grievance mechanism that is accessible to local stakeholders in all sites where project interventions are implemented. This ensures that procedures are appropriate for the local context, are culturally adequate with arrangements that meet the requirements of the Indigenous Peoples Standard. At the inception phase, the project-level grievance mechanism will be further elaborated to provide details on how it will be operationalized specifically at the community and site level. Indeed, the project fully acknowledges the complexity of working in this region and has therefore sought to involve a wide range of regional and local stakeholders and to establish strategic partnerships over the last 3 years to mitigate this risk to

the extent possible. These measures are reflected in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and related Safeguards documentation (Appendices 15 to 18 of the agency ProDoc). Further information related to the risks linked to migration and different types of instability has been commented on in Annex B of the CEO ER as part of the responses to Council Members.

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

(12/20/2021) Yes, coordination needs are described as well as institutional structures. The sustainability of e.g. CMIs and also LTA finance would benefit from some more description. UNOPS as an intermediary is an interim arrangement and does not in itself provide a base for sustainability of activities post project closure.

(3/3/2022) The comment is partially addressed. The intention to find sustained finance for recurring costs of CMIs during the project is noted. By MTR this needs to be clarified and start to roll out in order to assure sustainability of efforts by the end of the project. Please include this in the TORs for the MTR.

Furthermore, the efforts to enhance the LTA management capacity incl. its FM, procurement and monitoring capacities are now reflected in the project document (and need to appear in the budget and RF). How will the fact be dealt with that countries are in serious arrears with their contributions to the LTA ? Will the project build in a time bound plan and what are envisioned approaches to create incentives in the project design for countries to catch up on arrears over time ?

(3/3/2023) Response noted and addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you for your comment.

CMIs: To enable longer-term sustainability and self-sufficiency of CMI's, the project will invest in capacity enhancement, including through a series of information-sharing, training, skills and mentoring sessions, as well as identification of financing options to sustain funding to enable the purchase of equipment and fuel, communication facilities, and compensation of CMI members for their in-kind investments (paragraph 165, activity iii and viii).

Forest Concessions: The Decree establishing the modalities for the allocation of Local Community Forest Concessions leaves the choice of the type of management structure to the communities. It can be a non-profit organization, a CLD (Local Development Committee), or a cooperative. When this management committee is set up, it is given a statute and internal regulations that set out the management method and the limits of its powers. In most cases, the management committee has a five-year mandate, renewable once. The sustainability of local community forests and its management structure is subject to the following: (i) obtaining a forest concession title allows communities to secure their space against any partial or total eviction from their concession (it is specifically mentioned in the decree that the local community forest concession remains an indivisible property of the entire local community); and (ii) the management committee of the concession derives its sustainability from the satisfactory implementation of its mandate through respecting the statutes and internal regulations of the association, implementing the simple management plan (for a period of 5 years), the implementation of profitable projects for the benefit of the communities, and the proper distribution of equitable benefits within the community. This management committee needs to be well trained to play this role, which is why the project has planned to train community members in community forest management.

LTA: To ensure the sustainability of LTA programme oversight and effective coordination and management, the project will also provide targeted training to the LTA staff including financial management, monitoring reporting and program evaluation including guidance to national entities. This will contribute to enhanced governance and institutional capacities needed to ensure the sustainability of activities post-project.

Response to (3/3/2022)

Yes, the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described in SECTION 4: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS. The role of UNEP, UNOPs, The Lake Tanganyika Authority Secretariat and Lake Tanganyika Management Committee in each Lake Tanganyika Riparian state and the lead ministries in each Country

Yes, thank you the point is very much taken onboard.

The following indicators have been developed to help monitor the enhanced capacity of the Lake Tanganyika Authority in Component 4 of the project: (1) A fully developed and functioning governance system to enhance the overseeing, supporting and coordination of the implementation of the Convention on Sustainable Management of Lake Tanganyika

(2) Amount of money spent on providing support to various governance structures of the Lake Tanganyika Convention (targeted to increase significantly from baseline, through Mid Term to Project Termination)

(3) To measure Enhanced South To south cooperation through knowledge sharing: Active participation in regional knowledge management and learning activities among RBOs and RECs organized by Africa Network of River Basin Organisations (ANBO) and usage of the IW: LEARN Global Platform

(4) To Enhanced communication with LTA stakeholders: (a) LTA Website Regularly updated, (b) Public Outreach materials available in the 4 LTA basin states provided by the LTA

Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Yes. You have a whole section covering that in the PRODOC: 2.7 Linkages with other GEF and non-GEF interventions:

113. The project will contribute to the GEF International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN) by collecting and sharing best practices, lessons learned, and innovative solutions to common problems across the GEF International Waters portfolio. Adequate funding has been committed in the project budget to information and knowledge sharing with the broader GEF IW community, as well as the participation of LTA and the riparian countries in IW-LEARN facilitated capacity building and exchange programmes (see also 3.10 below).

114. The project will strengthen the capacity of the LTA Secretariat to contribute to the ongoing development of the internet-based information exchange African Great Lakes Information (AGLI) Platform. It will also assist LTA to participate in events hosted by, and share knowledge and information with, the African Network of Basin Organisations (under the umbrella of the International Network of Basin Organisations).

115. The project will seek to align its activities and interventions with the recommendations of the African Landscapes Action Plan (ALAP) Phase 3 (2019-2021) in the following strategic areas of the ALAP: ?strengthen landscape partnerships and governance?; ?mainstream biodiversity conservation and climate-smart agriculture through integrated land management?; and ?mobilize business and finance in support of sustainable landscapes?. The project will also support the three participating riparian countries of Tanzania, DRC and Burundi in meeting their restoration and rehabilitation of deforested and degraded landscape commitments under the framework of the African Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative (AFR100).

116. The project will seek to partner with the Central African Program for the Environment (CARPE) through the Congo Basin Forest Partnership (CBFP) - an association of over 70 governments, institutions, organizations and private sector partners - to ensure that the project's forest conservation and sustainable management activities in the DRC are fully aligned with and complement the project objectives and activities of CARPE. The project will also participate in, and contribute knowledge to, the networks and dialogue platforms being maintained within the framework of the GEF-funded Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (CBSL IP).

117. The project will also participate in, and contribute knowledge to, the networks and dialogue platforms being maintained within the framework of a range of GEF-funded programs and projects such as the Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (CBSL IP), the Regional Project on Transformational Change in Sustainable Forest Management in transboundary Landscapes of the Congo Basin, Community-based management of land and forests in the Grand Kivu and Lac T?l?-Tumba landscapes in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Integrated Community -Based Conservation of Peatlands Ecosystems and Promotion of Ecotourism in Lac T?l? Landscape of Republic of Congo. UNEP as the lead agency and hub for the CBSL IP and implementing agency of the other projects, will facilitate close coordination, and sharing of tools and resources, between the project and the CBSL IP and the other mentioned projects.

118. The project will maintain a close collaboration with the USD 5.7 million GEF-funded Lake Kivu and Rusizi River Basin Water Quality Management Project across the areas of common interest, notably in respect of building the transboundary cooperative governance capacities of Lake Kivu and River Rusizi Basin Authority (ABAKIR) and the individual riparian countries (specifically Burundi and DRC), improving the monitoring of water quality in the lake and its basin, and land-based management measures in the basin area to reduce pollution into Lake Kivu.

119. The project will, wherever practicable, also seek to align its outputs and activities with the vision and programmes of the: (i) International Congo-Ubangui- Sangha Commission (CICOS) , a River Basin Commission set up as a specialised agency of the Central African and Monetary Economic Community (CEMAC), whose mandate is to coordinate and facilitate an integrated water resource management approach in the Congo basin; (ii) Nile Basin Initiative, an intergovernmental partnership of 10 Nile Basin countries Burundi, DR Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, The Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda) that provides a forum for consultation and coordination among the Basin States for the sustainable management and development of the shared Nile Basin water and related resources; and (iii) Communaute? Economique des Pays des Grands Lacs (CEPGL), a sub-regional organization constituted to promote regional economic cooperation and integration.

120. At the trans-boundary scale of Lake Tanganyika and its basin, the LTA will coordinate and align the project activities with all other complementary regional initiatives, projects and programs - including LATAFIMA, LATAWAMA, FISH4ACP, LTEMP and PICAGL ? to ensure complementarity and to avoid duplication and overlaps. At the national scale of Lake Tanganyika and its basin, the national working group constituted under the project for each riparian country (see Section 4 of the PRODOC) will be responsible for coordinating and aligning the project activities with all other complementary national and local initiatives, projects and programs to ensure complementarity and avoid duplication and overlaps.

The fact that countries are in serious arrears with their contributions to the LTA will need to be addressed through the planned capacity building and institutional strengthening of LTA as an institution to deliver the services the countries will be willing to pay for. As such the project will support to strengthen LTA to deliver its mandate and governance process to incentivize countries to contribute;

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

(12/20/2021) Yes, there is description of the alignment with national reports under the conventions and additional elaboration of relevant policies and strategies is contained in the TDA and SAP which will be updated in the project .

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you. Noted.

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

(12/20/2021) yes, a KM approach is presented. Please show the fund allocation of 1 % for IW-Learn participation in the budget.

(3/3/2022) Thank you - the deliverables are outlined below and in the ER and the budget allocation noted in the overall/high level budget. Please also IW participation include in the revised results framework in the resubmission.

(3/3/2023) Thank you. Comment largely addressed. Please provide an approximate timeline for the delivery of KM activities and deliverables. It would also be helpful if you could clarify the budget allocated to KM and communications activities.

This can be done by including a simple budget table in the KM section and providing a timeline for key KM and communications deliverables.

(4/25/23) Thanks for the further elaboration on the KM budget. Agreed that the timeline of deliverables will be specified in the overall and annual detailed work plans during implementation.

Cleared.

Agency Response

A separate budget line for IW Learn has been included in the budget under UNEP Budget Code 2205 with a total of USD 76,413 representing 1% of the IW project financing amount for IW in line with table D of the CEO ER. The project will collect and share best practices, lessons learned, and innovative solutions to common problems across the GEF International Waters portfolio through the Global Environment Facility's (GEF) International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW: LEARN). The Project will specifically contribute to, and participate in, the following IW: LEARN activities: (i) participation in the GEF International Waters Conferences (landmark biannual events of the IW portfolio), with representation from the riparian countries and members of the PCU; (ii) production of Experience Notes (short case studies) to showcase worthy results and particular topic of relevance; (iii) use of IW: LEARN website toolkit to build the project website, which will ensure coherent styling of online presence with GEF IW portfolio and sustainability (though hosting provision) after project completion; (iv) participation to IW: LEARN Twinning.

learning exchanges and other knowledge events with other GEF relevant projects and programmes; (v) contribution to the knowledge portal IW:LEARN.net with specific content (e.g. updated SAP, transboundary data and maps, the State of Lake reports, etc.); (vi) contribution to social media, news, events, etc.; and (vii) participation in GEF Communities of Practice (CoPs), when relevant.

Response to (3/3/2022)

In order to ensure that Knowledge management element is monitored well in the implementation process; The following outputs have been added in the Results Framework: **output 4.1.5 Enhanced South To south cooperation through knowledge sharing** and **output 4.1.6 Enhanced communication with LTA stakeholders** in the updated Results Framework that have been added

Response to (3/3/2023)

Thank you. Comment largely addressed. Please provide an approximate timeline for the delivery of KM activities and deliverables. It would also be helpful if you could clarify the budget allocated to KM and communications activities.

Answer:

This has now been incorporated into the [Revised budget](#) (click on the text for the hyperlink). The breakdown of the KM budget under the budget line 2205 has been subdivided as 2205-1, 2205-2 and 2205-3. These activities correspond to the Component 4 of the Results Framework. The activities will be recurrent throughout the implementation period and will be implemented according to the workplan. We will develop the exact schedule of the events accordingly and for the next 5 years (including forthcoming external events where the project will participate). As reflected in the Results Framework, the number of events budgeted for attendance (16 over the course of 4 years) is tentative at the moment, as is the related travel and the number of participants per meeting (2).

In relation to communication activities LTA will hire a Communication Expert to coordinate the communication strategy and workplan, s/he will be supported by the Project Management core staff in order to ensure effective implementation of the communication activities.

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

how(12/20/2021)

An assessment is provided in Annex 17.

1. Please elaborate on the use of chemicals as per our earlier comment in reference to the project document and use of chemicals to address invasive species, yet the UNEP SRIF states that no hazardous chemicals are used. Please explain and revise accordingly.

2. Please explain what kind of grievance as well as compensation mechanisms will be set up (see earlier comments) and if these are budgeted for.

(3/3/2022)

1. Comment addressed

2. Comment addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

1. The use of herbicides for the control of invasive alien plants in RNP has now been removed from Output 2.1.2 in the ProDoc (please also refer to the earlier response to this comment).

2. As indicated in the response above (section 3), Appendix 18, the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), annexed to the UNEP ProDoc, elaborates on the project-level Grievance Mechanism. The project has budgeted for a UNEP institution-wide Grievance Mechanism to be complemented by a project-level grievance mechanism that is accessible to local stakeholders in all sites where project interventions are implemented.

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

(12/20/2021) Yes, there is a budgeted M&E plan. Please note that per GEF policies no GEF grants can be executed by the GEF agencies and any deviation from this policy would need to be requested as an explicit exception on managerial level at GEFSEC. This seems to be the case for the MTR and TE of the project. Please address or have the funds be executed by UNDOPS while the TORs and consultant selection could be overseen by the UNEP evaluation office.

(3/3/2022) This is acceptable. Comment addressed.

(3/3/2023) Sorry, I thought this was addressed before but

1. In the ER (page 38 in letter format) still shows UNEP in the budgeted M&E table as the responsible party.

2. The M&E budget in the table of the ER (page 38) cannot be aligned with the line items for M&E in the budget annex. The totals also differ: USD 225 000 in the budgeted M&E table in the ER versus USD 242 934 in the project budget template.

(4/25/2023)

1. While this differs from your previous response (see below) it is acceptable. Please then change the responsible party in the budget table from UNOPS to UNEP (budget line 5502 and 5503).

2. While that has been done in the file that is linked in the response below, the ER in the portal still shows the following table below. In that the line items for the MTR and TER differ from the budget table lines and so does the M&E total.

The budget (and indicative timeline) for M&E activities is summarized below:

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget from GEF	Budget co-finance	Time Frame
Inception Meeting	UNOPS Project Coordinator	25,000		Within 2 months of project start-up
Inception Report	Project Coordinator	None		1 month after project inception meeting
Measurement of project outcome indicators, progress and performance indicators, and GEF tracking tools	Project Coordinator will collate the monitoring data provided by the Responsible Partners (for project outputs and activities) and the national Liaison Associates (by country)	None		Outcome indicators: start, mid and end of project Progress/perform. Indicators: annually
Semi-annual Progress/ Operational Reports to UNEP	UNOPS Project Coordinator	None		Within 1 month of the end of reporting period i.e., on or before 31 January and 31 July
Project Steering Committee meetings	Project Coordinator LTA Convention Focal Points	35,000		Once a year minimum
Reports of PSC meetings	Project Coordinator	None		Annually
PIR	Project Coordinator Financial and Contracts Manager	None		Annually, part of reporting routine
Monitoring visits to field sites	UNOPS Project Coordinator	65,000		As appropriate
Mid Term Review/Evaluation	UNEP Independent evaluation consultants	40,000		At mid-point of project implementation
Terminal Evaluation	UNEP Independent evaluation consultants	45,000		Within 6 months of end of project implementation
Project Final Report	UNOPS Project Coordinator	None		Within 2 months of the project completion date
Co-financing report	UNOPS Financial and Contract Manager	None		Within 1 month of the PIR reporting period, i.e., on or before 31 July
Total M&E Plan Budget		225,000[1]		

(5/1/2023) Thanks for explaining and pointing out the note above the M&E table on how the items in that table and the budget lines in the project budget differ. While this not ideal and should usually be revised ahead of endorsement, please make this revision in the final project document before UNEP signature with the executing agency.

Cleared.

Agency Response

The budgeted M&E plan (Appendix 7 of the agency Prodoc) has been revised to reflect that the budget for MTR of the project will be executed by the Executing agency UNOPS while the TORs and consultant selection will be overseen by UNEP and the TE will be done through the UNEP Independent Evaluation Office.

Response to 3/3/2023

1. In the ER (page 38 in letter format) still shows UNEP in the budgeted M&E table as the responsible party.

Answer: MTR and TE are the responsibility of UNEP as Implementing Agency and this has been maintained in the M&E table

2.The M&E budget in the table of the ER (page 38) cannot be aligned with the line items for M&E in the budget annex. The totals also differ: USD 225 000 in the budgeted M&E table in the ER versus USD 242 934 in the project budget template.

Answer: This has been adjusted and the M&E budget currently stands at USD 278,987. Please refer to the updated M&E table in the CEO Endorsement Document here: [FSP CEO Endorsementdocument_GEF 10388 Lake Tanganyika 17 April 2023.docx](#)

Response to (4/25/2023)

1. In the ER (page 38 in letter format) still shows UNEP in the budgeted M&E table as the responsible party.

Answer:

This is amended in the ER

2.The M&E budget in the table of the ER (page 38) cannot be aligned with the line items for M&E in the budget annex. The totals also differ: USD 225 000 in the budgeted M&E table in the ER versus USD 242 934 in the project budget template.

Answer:

The M&E budget in the annex (Excel) amounts to US\$278,987). But the M&E activities listed in the ER cost only US\$206,894 and include the inception meeting (US\$36,448), the Project Steering Committee Meetings (US\$46,862), the field monitoring visits (US\$63,811), the mid term review (US\$29,675) and the terminal evaluation (US\$30,098). These exclude staff time and the national and regional travels budgeted elsewhere.

(4/25/2023)

1. While this differs from your previous response (see below) it is acceptable. Please then change the responsible party in the budget table from UNOPS to UNEP (budget line 5502 and 5503).

Answer:

Amended in the budget table

2. While that has been done in the file that is linked in the response below, the ER in the portal still shows the following table below. In that the line items for the MTR and TER differ from the budget table lines and so does the M&E total.

Answer:

This has been fixed and the table amended to reflect the activities listed.

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

(12/20/2021) Please review the list of benefits listed in section 10 and assure relation to the project description and RF. **For example**, If living conditions for fishing communities and people around protected areas are to be improved then this would need to be tracked and a baseline established at the beginning of the project. Please review the list of benefits and make sure relevant baselines are included..

(3/3/ 2022) Partially addressed. As commented in several answers before the Results framework requires additional details to track the delivery of the project.

(3/3/2023) The RF remains unusually high level and is not well suited to monitor the projects impacts. It is noted that the annexed table of "List of outcomes and outputs" is much more informative (and so is the description/prodoc text). Its is encouraged to have the RF capture more than basically the GEF core indicator delivery as it is a major project management tool.

(4/25/2023) This has been strengthened and e.g. household surveys included to capture socio-economic benefits.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. Part II (Project Justification), Section 1a. (Project Description), Sub-section 4) of the GEF CEO ER have now been updated to include project beneficiaries and progress in implementing the SAP. Concerning the example mentioned, the project has made provision to establish baselines and monitor the range of project benefits related for example to CMI or Forest Concessions in connection with the selection processes during the project inception phase.

Response to (3/3/ 2022)

Yes, the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project and there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs as follows:

Output 2.1.1 *The institutional and individual (including women and youth) capacities to monitor and control illegal activities and land encroachment in core conservation zones of protected areas is strengthened*, you have the following statement that speaks to social economic benefits:

MOYOWOSI GR

193. The project will actively promote engagement of women and youth (of working age) as game scouts, supervisors, technicians, artisans and labourers in project-supported construction, maintenance, and conservation activities undertaken in MGR, and will ensure that women-owned or managed businesses participate equitably in supply of equipment and materials for infrastructure and equipment upgrades.

Under **Itombwe National Park in DRC**, you have the following statement speaking to social economic benefits: 220. The project will actively promote the engagement of women in the supply of equipment and materials under this output, and the employment of women and youth (of working age) as temporary supervisor and labour staff.

Under **RUSIZI National Park in Burundi**, you have the following statement speaking to social economic benefits: 215. The project will actively promote the engagement of women in the supply of equipment and materials under this output, and the employment of women and youth (of working age) as temporary supervisor and labour staff.

Output 3.1.1 *The sustainability of natural resource management and use by communities living in, or using natural resources from, the buffer zones of PAs is improved*

In Ruzizi in Burundi, 237 the responsible partner may establish and administer a livelihoods development fund that disburses small grants to communities and households to initiate and develop environmentally friendly income-generating opportunities in the multiple use zone of the park and/or in the floodplain buffer areas. The responsible partner will also be required to provide livelihoods training and technical backstopping support to the grant beneficiaries.

Output 3.1.2 More sustainable and productive farming practices are being adopted by, and other income sources developed for, communities living in the buffer zones of PAs.

238: Under this output, the project will work with farming communities in the multipurpose use and buffer zones of INR and MGR to promote more sustainable farming practices that improve soil health and minimize soil erosion [1] ? including Conservation Agriculture (CA), Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) and/or Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) ? and that could increase agricultural output without putting the land and water resources in the lake catchment area under further stress. It will then help link these farmers with markets for their produce to ensure that they receive better returns, and further incentivize their investment in reducing land degradation in the lake catchment. It will also assist these farming communities to develop alternative, environmentally-friendly income-generating opportunities to further supplement their household income. Emphasis will be placed on the use of participatory methods and tools, appropriate to ensure an inclusive manner that promotes benefits for both local communities? men and women, and that engage both as natural resource users and as managers

242: The responsible partner will procure quality seeds and planting material for farmers from accredited state and private sector suppliers.

Moyowosi Game Reserve (MGR) buffer zone, Tanzania

247: The responsible partner may procure quality seeds and planting material for crop farmers and basic livestock medicines for livestock farmers from accredited state and private sector suppliers

[1] These practices may include: changing from ?slash and burn? to more intensive crop agriculture; reducing tillage for crops, increasing use of manure, compost and mulch for crops; cover cropping; alley-cropping; crop rotation; intercropping; increasing crop diversity (between and within species); reducing use of pesticide for crops; deferred livestock grazing; adoption of community grazing management arrangements; rotational livestock grazing regimes; maintaining stocking rates; etc..

Response to (3/3/2023)

The RF remains unusually high level and is not well suited to monitor the projects impacts. It is noted that the annexed table of "List of outcomes and outputs" is much more informative (and so is the description/prodoc text). Its is encouraged to have the RF capture more than basically the GEF core indicator delivery as it is a major project management tool.

Answer: Output Indicators beyond the GEF Core Indicators have been added in the Updated Results Framework. This is now reflected in the CEO Endorsement package and the ProDoc.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(12/20/2021)

- Yes, the required annexes are provided.

Comments on budget:

1. Please annex and indicate in the TORs for key staff which percentage of salary is allocated to project management (PMC) and which to project components in accordance with the split shown in the budget.

2. Please explain why indirect costs for UNOPS shown in the budget are not part of PMC.

3. (earlier comment re. PMC and relation to co-finance)

1. Thank you for providing the TORs of some of the key staff. Please note the earlier comment and address under question 3 above (comment in qu. 3 above " the terms of reference of key staff and especially those that are partly charged to PMC and part to project components, please clearly separate the tasks charged to PMC/coordination from the technical tasks covered by the project components. There is no TOR for the financial and contracts manager and it is not clear why any portion of the position charged to the components. This seems to be a position that is best covered entirely by PMC.")

2. Thanks for uploading a revised Annex 1. Please comment on how the previously listed indirect costs have been handled in the revised budget?

3. Comment addressed.

(3/3/2023)

1. Please check the file (which BTW is named Annex 10, yet the word version when opened says Annex 7): there is no separation of the technical tasks performed by the project coordinator versus the management tasks which are charged to the PMC as per Annex E/budget table.

2. The question is the same for the file uploaded on 2/15/2023.

(4/25/2023) Commented on earlier in the review sheet. No need to repeat here.

Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The revised ProDoc Appendix 10 includes respective percentages of salary to PMC in line with the revised budget in yellow highlights.
2. Apologies. This was an error and the correct budget version of Appendix 1 of the agency ProDoc has been uploaded.
3. Thank you. This has been corrected in the revised Appendix 2 of the agency ProDoc, Co-financing budget and across the ProDoc and CEO ER with yellow highlights.

Response to (3/3/2023)

1. Please check the file (which BTW is named Annex 10, yet the word version when opened says Annex 7): there is no separation of the technical tasks performed by the project coordinator versus the management tasks which are charged to the PMC as per Annex E/budget table.

Answer: This has been addressed above

2. The question is the same for the file uploaded on 2/15/2023.

Answer: As mentioned above: Project Coordinator: 25% of salary allocated to project management (PMC) and 75% dedicated to support the delivery of project components 1-4. Financial and contracts manager: 35% of salary allocated to project management (PMC) and 65% dedicated to support the delivery of project components 1-4. This has now been amended in the CEO endorsement including in the Annex E/budget table.

Additionally, the updated version of the Terms Of Reference (Appendix 10) including correction of title and additions for clarity in the description of duties is here: [Appendix 10_GEF 10388_Lake Tanganyika_UNEP PRODOC_Appendix 10_Terms of Reference CLEAN VERSION.docx](#)

Response to (4/25/2023)

Commented on earlier in the review sheet. No need to repeat here.

Answer:

Noted

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(12/20/2021) The project RF is annexed.

- Please see earlier specific comments with regard to the RF (no need to repeat these here).

(3/3/2022)

Ditto - the Results Framework needs to track what each component and sub-component delivers over time including with appropriate indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification.

(3/3/2023) See earlier comments, including:

The RF remains unusually high level and is not well suited to monitor the projects impacts. It is noted that the annexed table of "List of outcomes and outputs" is much more informative (and so is the description/prodoc text). Its is encouraged to have the RF capture more than basically the GEF core indicator delivery as it is a major project management tool.

(4/25/2023) Commented on earlier in the review sheet. No need to repeat here. Cleared.

Agency Response

Noted. Please refer to earlier responses on the RF.

Response to (3/3/2022)

The Results Framework has been developed further to include output indicators

Response (3/3/2023)

See earlier comments, including:

The RF remains unusually high level and is not well suited to monitor the projects impacts. It is noted that the annexed table of "List of outcomes and outputs" is much more informative (and so is the description/prodoc text). Its is encouraged to have the RF capture more than basically the GEF core indicator delivery as it is a major project management tool.

Answer: Output Indicators beyond the GEF Core Indicators have been added in the Updated Results Framework (see answer to comment above).

Response to 4/25/2023) Commented on earlier in the review sheet. No need to repeat here. Cleared.

Answer:

Noted

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/20/2021) Yes, overall addressed though the project component description remains dense and envisioned activities in the prodoc not clearly trackable against the RF and budget as commented earlier.

(3/3/2022) See above: "envisioned activities in the prodoc not clearly trackable against the RF and budget as commented earlier. " this is still the case and we encourage to have a dialogue for resubmission.

(3/3/2023) comments provided via the review sheet above.

(4/25/2023) comments provided via the review sheet above.

(5/1/2023) Comments addressed.

Agency Response

Noted. Please see our responses to earlier comments.

Response to (3/3/2022)

- Project activities have been developed in each output

Response to (4/25/2023)

comments provided via the review sheet above.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/20/2021)

Please answer comments for each council member separately. This way council members can transparently and much more clearly see that their comments have been acknowledged and addressed. Thank you !

Council comments:

<https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/#!/general/comments/f613f5f5-91eb-e911-a83d-000d3a37557b>

(3/3/ 2022) Thank you for adding these responses for Council member comment !

The responses will be much clearer once the Results Framework and budget are provided in more detail and enable the tracking of component and subcomponent deliverables and including the budget for activities.

(3/3/2023) Please also provide answers to the comments of US, UK and France in annex B of the portal.

(4/25/2023)

1. Please answer to comment from France:

Comment by Stéphanie BOUZIGES-ESCHMANN, Secretary general, Secrétariat du Fonds Français pour l'environnement Mondial, Agence Française De Développement, Council, France made on 6/24/2020 ☐

Comment:

? Favorable opinion with recommendation: include a sanitation-wastewater treatment dimension with a view to improving resource quality.

2. What is labeled as comments from Denmark and Norway are comments from Norway (just their first sentences is missing).

3. The Heading of Council comments for Denmark and Norway appears twice and so do other Council comments. Please correct what comments are addressed where and consolidate comments from the same Council member as applicable.

4. Please make sure that some of the comments need to be addressed more transparently.

for example:

- both Norway, France, and Canada point to the need to address e.g. water quality. Norway encourages a better discussion on transboundary cooperation on the wider issues of water resources which could be answered more comprehensively to address comments. Please reread comments and responses to fully address comments.

- Germany is pointing out the need to address conflict and migration, as well the limits to finance from some specific partners (and so do other Council members). The response includes to point to the CTF which the project is now only contributing to its design, while fund raising then still has to follow.

- ...

Agency Response

Agreed. Annex B of the GEF CEO ER has now been updated to separate the responses to the council member comments by country.

Response to (3/3/ 2022)

Response has been given as an attachment - (Lake Tangayika Table of GEF COUNCIL COMMENTS AND RESPONSES)

Response to (4/25/2023)

1. Please answer to comment from France:

Comment by Stéphanie BOUZIGES-ESCHMANN, Secretary general, Secrétariat du Fonds Français pour l'environnement Mondial, Agence Française De Développement, Council, France made on 6/24/2020

Comment:

? Favorable opinion with recommendation: include a sanitation-wastewater treatment dimension with a view to improving resource quality.

Answer:

This comment is well noted, and particular attention will be given during the inception phase to assess the most appropriate way to include the sanitation-wastewater treatment dimension in the project workplan. This issue is a priority under the Strategic Action Plan for Lake Tanganyika.

2. What is labeled as comments from Denmark and Norway are comments from Norway (just their first sentences is missing).

Answer:

Well noted, this has been addressed.

3. The Heading of Council comments for Denmark and Norway appears twice and so do other Council comments. Please correct what comments are addressed where and consolidate comments from the same Council member as applicable.

Answer:

Well noted, this has been addressed.

4. Please make sure that some of the comments need to addressed more transparently.

for example:

- both Norway, France, and Canada point to the need to address e.g. water quality. Norway encourages a better discussion on transboundary cooperation on the wider issues of water resources which could be answered more comprehensively to address comments. Please reread comments and responses to fully address comments.

Answer:

Additional information on water quality has been added in section 13 of the responses to the council members' comments. The project is planning to draw on the past and ongoing relatively large-scale investment in water quality by other partners to enhance the quality of the relevant deliverables.

- Germany is pointing out the need to address conflict and migration, as well the limits to finance from some specific partners (and so do other Council members). The response includes to point to the CTF which the project is now only contributing to its design, while fund raising then still has to follow.

Answer:

Additional information on the anticipated approaches to address the issues of conflict and migration has been provided in the responses to the council comments (section 24).

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/20/2021) Please respond to STAPs suggestion to consider carbon benefits from improved land management.

(3/3/ 2022) Noted and addressed.

Agency Response

Annex B of the GEF CEO ER has now been updated to include a specific response to the STAP suggestion.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(12/20/2021) PPG utilization is likely captured in annex C of the ER yet that Annex seems to be 'cut off' in the ER and is not legible. Please re-paste this table into the portal. - see earlier comment.

(3/3/2022) See earlier comment. This must be a technical/formatting problem with the portal. Please reach out to the support team as needed.

(3/3/2023) The PPG utilization is shown in Annex C. Please provide some more detail on the use of funds by eligible expenditure categories included in Guidelines. The current format does not allow review of the eligibility of expenditures.

(4/25/2023) See earlier comment. Please address there. No need to repeat here.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. The annex C table has been updated to current levels of PPG utilization and pasted into the portal.

(3/3/2022)

This has been pasted in the portal.

Annex C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) (If requesting for PPG reimbursement, please provide details in the table below):

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$300,000

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent to Date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Local and International consultants	152,000	150,000	2,000
Travel	20,000	1,243	18,757
Transfers and Grants to Implementing Partners	88,000	71,404	16,596
Meetings/Conferences	40,000	28,689	11,311
TOTAL	300,000	251,336	48,664

Response to (3/3/2023)

The PPG utilization is shown in Annex C. Please provide some more detail on the use of funds by eligible expenditure categories included in Guidelines. The current format does not allow review of the eligibility of expenditures.

As mentioned above, the table below was created and pasted into the CEO endorsement package. The final audit for the PPG operations is yet to be completed at the time of this review and a budget of US\$10,632 has been set aside for this activity. UNEP will close the PPG in its internal system as soon as the audit report is produced and validated.

Response to (4/25/2023)

See earlier comment. Please address there. No need to repeat here.

Answer:

Answer to (5/1/2023) and (5/4/2023)

The term "UNEP International Consultants" in the table is indeed misleading as this does NOT refer to UNEP staff but to an international expert hired and directly reporting to UNEP during the PPG. It refers to **ONE International Consultant** in charge of leading the PPG roadmap, with clear TOR targeting the PPG phase and the development and finalization of the full-sized project document, in close cooperation with the executing agency and the national experts. No PPG funds were used for day-to-day support to UNEP.

The misleading word "UNEP" has now been deleted from the table in Annex C of the CEO endorsement document and replaced with: **International Consultant (PPG regional coordinator)**. Noted.

<u>UNEP Budget Line</u>	<u>Total budget (USD)</u>	<u>Cumulative expenditure (USD)</u>	<u>Unspent as of 15th April 2023(USD)</u>
<u>Staff & Personnel</u>	<u>79,015</u>	<u>79,015</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Consultants</u>	<u>51,948</u>	<u>51,948</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Audit</u>	<u>10,632</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10,632</u>
<u>Transfers & Grants to Implementing Partners (TNC, WWF, and National technical working groups)</u>	<u>77,704</u>	<u>77,704</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Travels (PPG Inception, validation, and coordination meetings)</u>	<u>30,701</u>	<u>30,701</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>International Consultant</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Grand Total</u>	<u>300,000</u>	<u>289,368</u>	<u>10,632</u>

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(12/20/2021) Yes, maps/locations are included.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Noted.

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

(12/20/2021) No , the project is not yet recommended for endorsement. Please address the comments provided and get in touch if you have any questions on the comments as provided in the review sheet.

(3/3/2022) No, the project cannot yet be recommended for endorsement. We would like to encourage a dialogue across GEFSEC review and the UNEP team to discuss some of the key remaining issues.

(3/3/2023) There are still a number of comments to be addressed. Please contact GEFSEC for any clarifications as needed. Please also keep in mind that the project requires 4 week circulation to Council and addressing possible Council comments before endorsement.

(4/25/2023) Please address the issues identified as not fully addressed from the last review. To save time I am returning the ER within 24 hours after the technical review step and so that in the next revision it can be cleared.

(5/1/2023) and (5/4/2023) The majority of comments are sufficiently addressed at this stage, yet there are a few remaining issues with regard to co-finance and one on the PPG reporting that need further revision/clarification. **Please feel free to contact us for any questions on these remaining few comments.**

Please note the cancellation deadline early June and requirement for circulation to Council and therefore extremely tight timeline for processing.

Please also take note of comments pertaining to implementation stage, including by MTR.

(5/8/2023) Please address the comments on co-finance.

(5/8/23) ER revised according to comments. The project has been technically cleared and is recommended for endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2022	2/14/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/8/2023	3/3/2023

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2023	4/25/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/1/2023	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Background. Lake Tanganyika and its basin are internationally recognized as a global hotspot of biodiversity - representing some of the most diverse aquatic ecosystems in the world - and is renowned for its terrestrial biodiversity and scenic beauty. Already a lifeline asset to millions of people living in the catchment area, Lake Tanganyika holds significant potential of creating additional benefits, provided it is managed prudently, consistently, and equitably. The *Convention on the Sustainable Management of Lake Tanganyika* (the "Convention") was adopted in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania on 12 June 2003. The Contracting States of the Convention are Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (the "DRC"), Tanzania, and Zambia. The Contracting States have established the Lake Tanganyika Authority (LTA), with international legal personality and the legal capacity necessary to perform its functions and mission under the Convention.

The project is designed to strengthen the collaborative partnerships between the LTA and the contracting states which, over the long-term would realise the countries' Shared Vision for , *A Lake Tanganyika where the ecosystems and biodiversity prosper from resource management that empowers communities to more effectively manage and conserve the natural environment, secures sustainable and resilient livelihoods, and provides nutritional sources of food?*

The project is founded on the implementation of three complementary strategic approaches which will collectively contribute to improving the ecological condition of Lake Tanganyika and its basin, and to assuring the more sustained delivery of ecosystem services to the contracting states.

The first strategy (Component 1) seeks to encourage improved fishing practices in the littoral zone of the lake by directing project support to the establishment, operationalisation and capacity strengthening of fisheries co-management institutions (CMIs). The project will also help to identify, map, and protect areas important for fish species diversity and reproduction in collaboration with local communities, with emphasis on the use of participatory tools to ensure inclusivity and gender equality (men, women and youth), and develop the technical capacity of CMIs to monitor these areas for illicit fishing activities. The project will further support regional agencies and riparian governments to partner with, and actively support the functioning of, these CMIs across Lake Tanganyika.

The second strategy (components 2 and 3) seeks to reduce upstream erosion and discharge of sediment load into nearshore lake habitats by containing land degradation, reducing soil loss, rehabilitating degraded habitats and strengthening the protection of intact biodiverse natural habitats, in the lake catchment areas. The project will enhance the capacities of protected area agencies in the riparian countries to more effectively control illegal activities and land encroachment in the core conservation zones of protected areas across the lake basin, and to rehabilitate and restore degraded natural habitats in these core conservation zones. It will also encourage and support the adoption of more sustainable natural resource use and good agricultural practices by communities living in the multiple use and buffer zones of these protected areas, and to rehabilitate and restore degraded natural habitats in these multiple use and buffer zones. The project outputs and activities that have been developed to operationalise this strategy are captured under **Component 2** (*Protection of core conservation zones in three protected areas*) and **Component 3** (*Sustainable natural resource use in three protected areas and their buffer zones*) of the project.

The third strategy seeks to ensure more coordinated and harmonised implementation across the lake and its basin of the high priority strategic actions (notably those being supported by this project) identified in the Lake Tanganyika Strategic Action Plan (SAP). The project will contribute to addressing some of the key transboundary governance capacity constraints by strengthening the: (i) enabling institutional framework for transboundary cooperation; (ii) participation of regional and national stakeholders in trans-boundary governance; (iii) management instruments for transboundary cooperation; and (iv) financial sustainability of the LTA. It will further facilitate the regular monitoring, reporting and evaluation of progress in implementing the SAP for Lake Tanganyika.

This MFA project's GEBs as measured by the GEF core indicators are the improved management of 569 968 ha of terrestrial areas for conservation and sustainable use, 6250 ha of landscapes restored, and 173 898 ha under improved management in addressing the sustainable management of Lake Tanganyika which is shared by four countries.

Benefits, sustainability and scale-up. The project is improving fisheries management and LTA capacities for the coordinated management of the transboundary lake and improving the management of over half a million ha of protected areas and adjacent buffer zones. The project will seek to ensure the sustainability and replicability of the already tested fisheries co-management approaches in areas in Tanzania. The fisheries co-management areas experience and lessons learnt in Tanzania will be replicated and scaled up in the riparian countries. By supporting and guiding this scaling up of community-based co-managed fisheries area, the LTA can facilitate the collation of information and sharing of knowledge in support of other fisheries co-management areas in the region. With a *focus on community benefits and livelihoods*, the project will also seek to deliver innovative approaches for improved land and protected area management that: (i) enable local communities to acquire rights to, or meaningfully participate in, the control, management and use of natural resources in and around the three targeted protected areas of the lake basin and the nearshore zones of the lake; (ii) develop the capacities of these communal rights holders to effectively conserve and manage the natural resources

under their stewardship; (iii) develop the capacities of these communal rights holders to improve income and improve their welfare from the sustainable management of natural resources; and (iv) build resilience of these communal rights holders to the effects of climate change, civil conflict and in-migration.