

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

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10388

Countries

Regional (Africa, 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

10/11/2019

Review completed by PM

4/8/2020

Program Manager

Astrid Hillers

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

The project is overall aligned with the respective focal area priorities.

Please though take account of comments in Part 2, section 4.

(3/9/2020) see Part 2/qu. 4 comment below " (3/9/2020) Please note that there remain inconsistencies across the numbers for each focal area in tables A, B, and D. Please make sure all focal area resources across tables are consistent and align with the LOEs. "

(4-07-2020) Summing up the sub-amounts for IW, BD, and LD in table A leads to sums that do not math the totals across LOEs for BD, LD and IW. The amounts in red below differ from table D. Please revise table A and align with table D.

A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements					
Programming ID	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)		
BD-1-1	GET	1,049,535	11,150,980		
BD-2-7	GET	3,148,601	15,709,021	4,198,136	BD
LD-1-1	GET	1,925,569	1,858,696		
LD-1-4	GET	1,283,712	1,466,545	3,209,281	LD
IW-3-6	GET	5,034,166	21,272,377		
IW-3-7	GET	2,157,500	9,314,960	7,191,666	IW
Total Project Cost (\$)		14,599,083	60,772,579	14,599,083	

(4-8-2020) Table A has been revised. Comment addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Tables A, B, D and E have been revised, also to reflect the increase in STAR allocation from the DRC.

07/04/2020

Table A has been aligned with FA totals in table D in the portal and a revised PIF word file has been uploaded. Thank you for highlighting the issue.

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

- Please revise the PDO which currently does not speak to any improvement of the lake and cooperation of countries to achieve this (e.g. via implementing specific SAP priority actions). As the IW resources are leading resources in this project and this is second SAP implementation project stress reduction to the lake would be expected among the project goals.
- The project context/description recognizes that the long-term solution to achieving sustainable management of the lake is SAP implementation, yet this is not obvious in the project design. Links to the SAP are too general while the SAP is quite specific on actions (both on regional and national levels). E.g. two on the components of the present project simply copy the SAP overview tables with priorities from urban drainage to protected areas management. Please review the SAP and note for each component the SAP strategic component and per country and prioritization.

Protected areas:

1. The project aims at enhancing the conservation status and management effectiveness of three protected areas - one National Park (Burundi), one Natural Reserve (DRC), and one Game Reserve (Tanzania) – covering a total area of 1,183,838 ha. This should generate significant GEBs and worth the investment of BD resources. There is also reference to Zambia's Ntsumbu National Park and the Tondwa and Kaputa Game Management Areas, but appears to be dislocated from the rest of the project. Information on Zambia's threats, barriers and investments need to be placed along the other three PAs (pages 14-16). Zambia is not mentioned in the Components or Outputs.
2. The threats and barriers are numerous and overwhelming,. The proposed activities aim at addressing these threats and barriers. It is clear that the funding allocated by the three countries, with the possible exception of Tanzania, will **NOT** be sufficient to deliver the proposed outcomes. Suggest requesting refining the proposed investments, even if they have to leave out activities that are needed. Serious prioritization for the investment of GEF resources is badly needed.

Otherwise, the project runs the risk of spreading the funds so thin, that even short term results may not be achieved. Some of this refinement must take place at PIF stage. Otherwise the project is likely to bog down in prioritization during project preparation and even during the initial stages of implementation.

3. Of the propose interventions, there are some that require serious thinking including: i) supplementing wildlife populations in heavily poached areas; ii) the planning (revising and updating local land use plans to better align with the core conservation zones; revising and updating individual protected area plans and zoning maps to incorporate the updated core conservation zones. How much planning is really needed and how much will be invested? Iii) public-private-community partnerships in nature-based tourism, recreational and hunting enterprises in the targeted protected areas and their buffer zones (Are these partnerships and enterprises really viable and have a chance to make a difference at this time?); (iv) information-sharing and awareness-raising, among others.

4. Overlap and alignment with ongoing projects and/or those under preparation: there is not a clear enough analysis of ongoing projects, or projects under preparation, to justify the strategic choices of activities and to avoid duplication. e.g.: For DRC (the only country in the Congo IP and the current draft PIF), it is mentioned that a GEF project is under preparation for the Kabobo-Luama landscape. However, the draft PIF stays silent on the Kivu+ landscape included in the Congo IP. This landscape was identified by the WB, including the Itwombe reserve, the Maiko NP, and the Kahuzi-Biega NP. We therefore cannot fund a second investment on the same protected area (Itwombe) in GEF 7 – it will be complicated in terms of indicators, risks of double counting, etc. The WB project was recently transferred to UNEP, so UNEP will be in good position to confirm the selected landscapes.

With regard to IW:

6. One would expect that this project that this second SAP implementation project would be more ambitious in terms of stress reduction to the lake and focus on IW eligible actions and sets appropriate targets in this regard.

7. (Component 1) A number of pollution sources have been detailed in the SAP (strategic component F). Priorities in that regard are spelled out in quite detail in the SAP e.g. including water quality (incl. pollution from mining, agriculture, industry, harbor and marine traffic, and petroleum and sedimentation). Why is the project mainly focusing on municipal/household waste water also given that this is already being addressed by another regional project with similar focus? Please note that GEF only rarely funds national level investments in sanitation/wastewater treatment. It only does so for highly innovative and/or beyond basic (stage 1 and 2) treatment. The project here wants to show ‘cost effectiveness’ of small scale sanitation investments. This in itself has been shown already elsewhere and is not innovative itself – numbers on costs, and cost-effectiveness can be deducted from case studies across the globe. Please also note that GEF **IW does not** fund waste collection and disposal.

8. Also, with regard to the wastewater treatment pilots (component 1): a target of 10% coliform reduction does not really make a difference in terms of making the water safer for human health. Second, we note that the issue of invasive species appears to me of medium priority in the SAP. Can you elaborate why this is therefore chosen among issues addressed by the project ?

9. Data and information exchange and regional information system (LTRIEMP): the note in a later section (on innovation, sustainability and scaleup) of basic system with focus on what data and information that countries already collect is noted. Are there any parallel or co-finance resources that do support the improvement of capacities on national level for sample taking and analysis, plus enhancement of policies and regulations for pollution control and enforcement ? Without a hand-in - hand of physical investments and strengthening of regulatory and enforcement capacity any greater change in water quality in the lake cannot be expected. Also, the previous project funded some successful pilots for sedimentation control. Would it make sense to scale these up and link them to the planned interventions on improved land management?

10. SAP update: Is there a reason to not update the SAP during the project implementation. It would seem important with change in developments and priorities on the ground and very much improved information on likely CC impacts to update the SAP at least in 10 year intervals - including resilience to increasing climate variability and change. Please take note of the IW-guidance/methodology for the TDA update (and SAP/NAP updates).

11. Please show what outputs under component 2/outcome 3 (with 912 K IW funds) are intended to be funded via IW funds. As written alignment with the IW strategy is not clear and none of the indicators aim at tracking impacts on the state of the Lake.

12. Ditto for component 4 and please link to SAP.

13. Component 5: Please note that at least 1% of the entirety of the IW grant (not only component 1 IW grant) should be allocated to IW-Learn related (incl. e.g. at least two experience notes, setting up a project website, participation in the biannual global IW Conference and in IW-Learn regional/thematic meetings). Additional funds may need to be allocated to knowledge management and certainly to communication and awareness raising within the project.

14. Note: just a structural/editorial comment: Kindly please add the component titles/headers *ahead* of each component. In the moment the components seem to blend into each other in the way this is entered into the portal.

(3/9/2020)

Overall comment: The project remains overall too ambitious especially with what is proposed in and around the PAs - the targeted areas are huge, the barriers and challenges to address described are vast, and the type of activities are too diverse to be able to be tackled in one project. There needs to be some sense of focus and clarity on what the project aims to tackle for us to be able to assess that the project is feasible and does not spreading resources too thinly across activities and actors (please see more detailed comments below).

- PDO and project title: Please define the PDO to align with the revised project design more clearly. The PDO (and title) does not mention sustainable fisheries management (majority of IW resources) or transboundary cooperation/SAP implementation. Also, the final outcome (in the PDO and the Theory of Change(TOC)) of

"more resilient socio-ecological systems in Lake Tanganyika" is hard to measure/verify i.e. it is too general to be meaningful for the project. Please also consider what would be a PDO level indicator (?)

Comments on protected areas (components 2 and 3):

1. The clarification that Zambia is not addressed by the STAR resources and PA activities is noted and so are the description and maps of the targeted areas in Burundi, DR Congo and Tanzania. The total areas remain large (PA and buffer zones) and are too ambitious (~1.5 million ha in total). While the investment per unit area is not bad (\$30/ha in Burundi; \$3.4/ha in DRC and \$4.8 in Tanzania), these investments don't consider those to be carried out in the buffer zones. The relatively low level of investments inside the PA + buffer zones, is compounded by the number of proposed activities as noted below.
2. Furthermore, the breadth/lack of focus of suggested interventions seem impossible to underpin by an effective delivery mechanism and in the time and with the available resources. While it is noted that some suggested interventions have been eliminated from the text and we note the team's response that not all measures will be envisioned in all areas, the previous comment remains: threats and barriers to be addressed by the project are too numerous and so are stakeholders and issues (for example - to illustrate - these include: Indigenous people access to resources and IPLC managed areas in over 300,000 has; regular rangers patrol in 80 % of the area (visit once per week? how much area with only 200 community rangers? in these huge PAs of over 1 million ha) ; sustainable agriculture and livestock management and land practices in > 0.5 million ha; beekeeping; sustainable charcoal; improved mining management; wetlands and river bank restoration in >40.000 Has; change in agricultural practices by 20 % of small scale farmers; six commercial hunting/tourism concessionaires providing regular income streams of IPLCs, etc.). All of this reads like a menu for integrated management for which no filter and focus to envision realistic implementation modalities has been applied yet. The GEF strongly suggests continuing narrowing down the number of activities in each of the PAs, so the project has an opportunity to deliver something concrete and tangible.

In order to facilitate narrowing down the activities, the GEF suggests using the table below, and instead of Priority (for all sites), insert a column for each of the three PA and indicate with a tick what actions are priority for the area. May need to add Strategic Actions, but not too many as that would defeat the purpose of prioritizing. Select a maximum of 3 Strategic/sub-strategic actions per PAs.

Strategic Component	Strategic Actions	Priority
C. Sustainable Land Management	Promote widescale reforestation (and afforestation), particularly in erosion-sensitive sub-catchment areas	Very high
D. Critical Habitat Protection, Restoration and Management	Enhance capacity for monitoring and law enforcement in protected areas	High
	Enhance institutional capacity for adequate parks management	
	Improve demarcation of protected areas	
	Increase community involvement in critical habitat protection to promote benefit sharing and improve livelihoods	
E. Control and Prevention of Biological Invasions	Promote appropriate physical, chemical and biological eradication and/or control methods	Medium
	Promote community participation in control of invasive species	

To aid in focus, please refine the Theory of Change (graphic and narrative) and accompany with a narrative on what the project can achieve and how it aims to do so and with whom and support this with a focused thematic and geographical set of component interventions to achieve this. The variety of interventions suggested right now is daunting in considering the variety of scale and sectors it would involve and any effective way to deliver project activities. As suggested at the last review, additional focus is needed at PIF Stage and cannot be all deferred to start at PPG stage.

3. Please elaborate on the proposed interventions related to “hunting enterprises”. While this item was there before, the GEFSEC has concerns about the auctioning of blocks in MGR, “*for use on a leasing concessionary basis to tourist hunting companies for exclusive use by their clients*”. Leasing concessions for tourism hunting in Tanzania has turned difficult and controversial.

In connection with Point No. 1 above, the following activities could be turn into Strategic or Sub-strategic Actions and then select where these activities are priorities for the target Pas. No more than 3 per PA.

(i) strengthening the patrolling and enforcement capabilities (staffing, equipment, skills, training and infrastructure) of the responsible management authority (see also Output 3.1 above) to monitor and control illegal activities (hunting, logging, poaching, grazing, mining, etc.) and land encroachment (settlements, mining, agriculture, etc.) occurring in the core conservation zone; (ii) developing and implementing an integrated (chemical, biological and mechanical) invasive alien species control program in the core conservation zone (e.g. managing the spread of Lantana camara along river courses); (iii) developing and implementing a basic wildfire rapid response capability (staffing, equipment, skills, training) for the core conservation zone; and (iv) mitigating human-wildlife conflicts (HWCs) (e.g. hippos in the Rusizi floodplain and delta) in the core conservation zone.

4. The clarification on the Itwombe area is noted. In connection with DRC, it is prudent to add specific language on Social and Environmental Safeguards to be used if investments in law enforcement were to be made.

Comments on International Waters (component 1, parts of 2 and 3; and parts of comp4):

The activities requested to be funded by the IW Focal Area have been revised and comments pertain to the new design (and the numbering of comments below, therefore, does not align with the last review):

5. The aim for greater impact appears to have shifted the focus from working on water quality to a main focus of the interventions on fisheries management with an emphasis on local co-management schemes and building on previous experiences of other projects in Lake Tanganyika. Please comment on how the project envisions to coordinate with specific initiatives mentioned e.g. EcoFish (EU support; fisheries), LATAWAMA (EU Support; water quality) and build on the previous TNC funded Tuungane project in Tanzania and ongoing work in partnership with the Zoological Society in Zambia, as well as the GEF-AfDB project incl. fisheries management in Zambia. There seems to be overlap in the sites in Zambia between the TNC finance (close to Nsumbu National Park) and what is proposed in the component 1. How is cooperation or even co-location of staff and /or PMU location among these closely related project envisioned?

6. What are the main fish species targeted for interventions? Is the carrying capacity for these known and have sustainable catch limits been defined among the countries sharing the Lake?

7. The project could not only benefit (in design and later in implementation) from the fish refugia effort in SCS, but also exchanges with the Lake Edward/Albert fisheries project (LEAF; managed by NELSAP; GEF and AfDB funded) and the experiences of the beach management units in Lake Victoria. Please consider to mention in Component 4/KM & exchanges.

8. Are there any efforts in the project to strengthen national and harmonize regionally policies, strategies and guidelines as well as enforcement efforts to curb illegal fishing as well as prevent overfishing? The text of the component description seems to indicate detailed efforts (outputs 1.1/1/2 and 1.3/1.4 – page 21 of the word version of the PIF) but that seems weakly reflected in the project framework/table B. Clarification and alignment of table B to the text would be helpful.

9. Could you please share with us the *Lake Tanganyika Framework Fisheries Management Plan* for transboundary resources (FFMP) which was revised by FAO, AfDB and the African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) and approved in February 2020 with support from the European Union through Lake Tanganyika Water Management Project? This could be useful to answer some of the questions raised above. Also, please refer in the PIF to this document and where the PIF may directly aim to implement the FFMP 2020.

10. As per the previous comments (comments 11 and 12), please indicate what (what sub-component?) the IW funds under components 2 and component 3 are intended to fund and how these would be IW eligible given that there seems to be marginal benefits to the shared lake (as the PAs being quite distant to the lake).

11. A state of the Lake report is shown as indicator under outcome 4, but missing to be shown as an output. This is a distinct activity and should be listed as an output to assure attention and proper budgeting.

12. Component 4 indicator mentions that the "LTA score for the GEF IW institutional effectiveness tracking tool increases by at least 20 %". What score are you referring to ? Please also note that the GEF tracking tools have been replaced by the *GEF core indicators* and GEF tracking tools are no longer required or used.

13. Previous comment on SAP update: note that a SAP update would be just that : "an update" to maintain its relevance to the current needs and priorities of the countries. It would not need to be an entirely new document. We still would like to point to consideration of having such strategies/action plans reviewed and updated at some regular time intervals and would like to ask UNEP if an interval of every 10 years does seem reasonable and useful?

(4-07-2020)

Comments above and the agency responses have been discussed before resubmission of the PIF. The revised PIF addresses the previous comments. **Cleared.**

•

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Overall response: the level of ambition has been revised, in particular concerning the proposed interventions in and around the PAs - target areas have been reduced considerably to prioritize core conservation areas and selected areas in nearby villages (TBD at PPG), the barriers and challenges, and the type of activities narrowed down to those prioritized in consultation with the riparian countries, LTA and key partners.

- PDO and project title: the PDO is now aligned with the revised project design and the TOC reflects those changes.

Responses on protected areas (components 2 and 3):

1. The total areas have been reduced considerably to 553,775 ha in the three PAs (out of the original total area of 1,183,838 ha), similarly the area in the buffer zones has been reduced to 21,000 ha - the related level of investments inside the PA and buffer zones therefore increased.

2. The suggestion to include columns indicating the priority activities per PA and buffer zones under components 2 and 3 is agreed. We have narrowed those down to the most critical, with the highest potential to address key threats and barriers as identified in consultation with the executing agencies. Please refer to table B and the alternative scenario description for detail. The Theory of Change graphic has been revised accordingly and accompanied with a narrative reflected in the revised set of components descriptions.

3. Interventions related to "hunting enterprises" have been deleted in the absence of sufficient stakeholder consultations to address concerns about the feasibility of this approach through the proposed project.

4. The Environment and Socio-Economic Review Note has been uploaded and related language on Social and Environmental Safeguards added in the risk Section 5, Part II in connection with potential investments in law enforcement in DRC. Please note that in line with the overall rating of moderate risk, UNEP proposes to apply a precautionary approach to safeguards and to carefully assess in detail each of the potential safeguards to be triggered by this project during PPG.

Responses on protected areas (components 2 and 3):

5. The description on how this project will work with ECOFISH, LATAWANA and Tuungane projects has been included under Part II, Section 6.
6. The information on the focus fish species under Component 1 is now included in Component 1 description (Part II, 1a, 3). The carry capacity related issues are addressed Part II Section 1a in relation to the lack of proper fish stock assessment.
7. The targeted exchange of experiences with the mentioned projects is included under Component 4 description (Part II, 1a, 3) as well as Part II, Section 6.
8. Table B has been modified to reflect the alignment of the national fisheries policies incorporating co-management institutions.
9. Description of the LFFMP has been updated under Part II, Section 1a and linkage of this Plan with Component 1 is clearly established under Part II, Section 1a, 3). The Plan itself (English and French) will be shared in an email with GEF Secretariat responsible officers.
10. The IW funding under Components 2 and 3 will be used to promote and monitor sediment control in the PAs and the surrounding target areas. The description of these Components is now revised to clarify this point.
11. The state of lake report will be produced to demonstrate actual impacts of the SAP implementation prior to and during the project. It will not be a full-fledged state of the lake report, but information gathered during the project preparation and implementation will contribute to this report as a tool of M&E. The Table B and Component 4 (Output 4.3) has been modified to this effect.
12. The indicator mentioned in Table B has been deleted to avoid confusion.
13. Output 4.2 has been created to update the SAP and NAPs.

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

The indicative co-financing is outlined and recurrent expenditures and investment mobilized separated.

Please note that by endorsement stage the co-finance and specifically the 'investment mobilized'/cash co-finance needs to be explained in terms of what it is comprised off and how the co-finance aligns with which specific component/s and how the co-finance contributes to the PDO and implementation of the project (as per the GEF co-financing policy). A table/text explaining this alignment of co-finance with the components will be needed.

The co-financing is: Recurrent Expenditure = \$77.8 Million; Investment Mobilized = \$13.2 million.

Please clarify who the project aims at delivering the proposed outcomes in all the components marked with the Finance Type "Technical Assistance".

Please provide reassurance that the Recurrent Expenditure in the amount of \$77.8 million will be effectively become available for implementation. Without this co-financing the project will under-deliver.

(3/10/2020)

Please keep comment above in mind that the co-finance needs to be trackable and at endorsement and at MTR & TER. Co-finance needs to be shown in how (what part of which co-finance) aligns with specific components. While co-finance at PIF stage is indicative, we just want to alert to this. Also, there are some items we especially want you to look at even now: e.g. private sector in Congo with 3.5 million of **cash**/investment mobilized (it is realistic given apparently so far little discussions with private sector entities at the current/PIF stage); 5.4 million in in-kind contribution from local communities in Burundi ? Is that realistic and why are these community labeled as "government" ?; WB grant in Burundi of 6 million: grants should not be labeled recurring expenditure and is that WB project support to Burundi (all of the USD 6 million) aligned with the project objective?.

Overall the complexity of the co-finance and tracking this at later stage seems extremely complex. We would caution to this approach. Also, have there even been discussions with all these entities to assume an indicative co-finance commitment across all of these actors? While there have been some revisions since the last PIF submission, the comment remains.

- > See also the the previous comment (last submission) to provide reassurance that the co-finance (recurrent and grant) is actually likely to materialize as the project as described is very large in scope (esp with respect to components 2 and 3) and would hinge on availability of more than only the GEF grant.

(4-07-2020) Previous comments on being realistic/conservative on co-finance amounts from communities and the private sector have been addressed. The co-finance remains complex and will need to be firmed up/confirmed and adjusted during PPG.

Please again note that "grants" are not be counted as "Recurrent expenditures" - see e.g. the EU and World Bank co-finance. Please check for all entries noted as "grants" On the other hand all in-kind should be recurrent expenditures. **Please address.**

(4-8-2020) Table revised. **Comments addressed. Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

The co-financing amounts have been further revised: although based on preliminary discussions with local private sector in DR Congo, the advice provided is well noted and consequently, the remaining 3.5 million of investment mobilized has been deleted for the moment in absence of any written confirmation; the in-kind contribution from local communities in Burundi has been reduced and changed to “beneficiaries” in line with discussions held by the local partners; the total amount indicated for the WB funded “Regional Great Lakes Integrated Agriculture Development Project” portion for Burundi continues to be aligned with the project objective, target areas and the type of co-financing corrected to “in-kind”. The most recent monitoring reports confirm that the project remains significantly behind schedule despite progress made since its launch in 2018 and hence an extension of its duration is the indicative amount of co-financing remains in line with the project objective.

07/04/2020

Many thanks for pointing out the oversight on the portal. The labels had been revised in the word file and some slipped on the portal. They have all been revised for consistency.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) Yes

(3/9/2020) Please note that there remain inconsistencies across the \$\$ numbers for each focal area in tables A, B, and D. Please make sure all focal area resources across tables are consistent and align with the LOEs.

(4-07-2020) Please see earlier comment with regard to table A and needing to align focal area totals in table A with the amount in the LOEs.

(4-8-2020) Comment addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Tables A, B, D and revised as mentioned.

07/04/2020

The figures in table A have been corrected to align with focal area totals in table D in line with LOEs.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) Yes.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

- See earlier comment with regard to the Itombwe reserve which is already addressed in the Kivu landscapes project.
- While the GEF only *tracks* (and does not have targets) on direct beneficiaries, 15000 direct beneficiaries appears low for this size project. Also the project design would need to assure that indeed the majority of beneficiaries is comprised of women (as indicated).

(3/9/2020) comments above cleared.

Note though earlier comment to assure realism in the areas the project can address (see question 2 above).

(4-07-2020) Comment addressed (areas reduced) and agency comment on beneficiaries noted. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Noted. The minimum number of direct beneficiaries kept despite reduced ambition and expected to increase during PPG.

Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

Please review that IW tags are used. Otherwise comprehensive tags provided.

(3/9/2020)

1. TDA and SAP preparation is tagged as well as SAP implementation. Does that imply that there will be a SAP update?
2. Please consider tagging one of the RIO markers for adaptation.

(4-07-2020) Comments addressed. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

1. SAP updating has been clearly indicated now under Component 4.
2. Climate Change Adaptation 1 has been selected for this project in the portal.

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

- The project should provide some concrete lessons learned from the previous IW and BD funded projects for Lake Tanganyika. For example , the regional database and monitoring system (LTRIEMP) was supposed to materialize under the last GEF IW SAP implementation project (UNDP implemented). Why did it not come about and how will this project tackle this differently and make it likely to have a sustainable outcome. National capacities to monitor e.g. water quality are still weak and unless co-finance or the project enhances that capacity the regional monitoring will add little value.
- The background and choice and description of the projects could be much more firmly anchored in the TDA and SAP analysis and link the investments into direct improvement and cooperation on Lake water quality and the PA and land management investments, incl e.g. links of these interventions to both more sustainable agricultural production, livelihoods but also decrease sediment loads to the lake. Selecting project activities that relate to and reinforce each other would aid the project focus and impact.
- The project has the potential of delivering significant GEBs but needs focus (prioritization) because the funds allocated to the project will simply not be sufficient to tackle all the threats and address all the barriers listed in the project. Narrowing down the project must start at PIF stage.

(3/10/2020)

1. Please summarize main lessons learned from the previous regional GEF Tanganyika support project that is informing this investment. (see first comment above)
2. Annex F is noted but please address earlier comments on project design (address under Part I/question 2).
3. As noted earlier (question 2) the previous comment remains a considerable concern (see earlier comment above: "The project has the potential of delivering significant GEBs but needs focus (prioritization) because the funds allocated to the project will simply not be sufficient to tackle all the threats and address all the barriers listed in the project. Narrowing down the project must start at PIF stage. ")

(4-07-2020) The previous comments esp. with regard to greater focus in the PA related efforts have been discussed with the UNEP team and comments have been addressed in the revised PIF. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

1. The main lessons have been referred in relation to relevant sections. E.g.
 - a. Component 1 on fisheries co-management from the TNC Tuungane and UNEP fish refugia projects,
 - b. From the UNDP/GEF Lake Tanganyika project related to avoiding reliance on other projects as prerequisite – co-financing has been reduced and project activities scaled down accordingly, while the proposed strategy is to further replicate good practices as co-financing opportunities are identified.
 - c. Recommendations following several lessons from the same project have been integrated on strengthening the LTA to play its coordinating role in monitoring, reporting and harmonization of co-management of fisheries (component 1) and applied research on the effectiveness of various farming techniques and various land use practices to reduce sedimentation (component 4)
 - d. Promotion of research and analysis and active monitoring of land use activities to avoid further increase in erosion and subsequent sedimentation (components 2 and 3)
 - e. Component 3 includes lessons from the region to inform the design of sustainable agriculture interventions
 - f. The coordination section includes reference to lesson learning from GEF/AfDB Lake Edward/Albert fisheries project and the experiences of the beach management units generated for Lake Victoria, among others.
2. Components 2 and 3 activities have been further clarified in response to the queries of IW funding use under these components.
3. There has been a revision of threats and further prioritization of the activities to better target the delivery of GEBs.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

Baseline interventions and project history is described on regional level. There needs to be more effort to capture country/national level projects (GEF and non-GEF) that are addressing similar issues and to perform a gap analysis to narrow the key interventions that this project should tackle.

(10/3/2019)

The baseline description has been substantially amended and details on relevant national level projects provided in all countries. Especially on the side of fisheries (IW) please add a clearer *gap analysis* to explain what this project does in addition. Please clarify e.g. if one main aim is to upscale experiences in Tanzania on local fisheries management.

(4-07-2020) Comment addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

06/04/2020

An analysis of the current gap in the implementation of the fisheries related section of the SAP has been added to the baseline scenario in Part II, section 1a.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) See earlier comments under question 2 /part I.

(3/10/2020) See earlier comments under question 2 /part I.

(4-07-2020) Comments addressed (as noted earlier under qu. 2/part I). **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Addressed as mentioned under question 2 / part I.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

- Overall yes, but please strengthen the alignment with the IW strategy in terms of SAP implementation and institutional reform and investments under all three sub-objectives.

- Also, the end of the first para in that section mentions an early warning system (on what?) that now is not part of the PIF anymore. Please update.

- It also mentions the capacity strengthening of the LTA - which is appreciated and should be more clearly anchored in the project outputs and activities during project design.

(3/10/2020)

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.
3. LTA strengthening - needs to be addressed further and shown in table B among outcome/outputs.

(4-07-2020) The agency response is noted. *During PPG* the overall management capacity needs to be assessed not only from a technical point, but also - see agency response - to assure that LTA has solid capacity to handle projects in terms of e.g. financial management and procurement capacity. The project should include training for LTA staff to address any critical gaps. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

LTA strengthening has been further addressed in Table B and related component description and in the Coordination section, concerning LTA institutional coordination capacity building on fisheries and future project and financial management capacity.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) Overall yes, but please revisit and adjust once the other comments have been addressed.

(3/10/2020) see above especially for needed refocus of components 2 and 3.

(4-07-2020) Comments addressed. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Components 2 and 3 refined as indicated in response to question 2 / part I.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

- Please see also earlier comments on the indicators.

- See earlier comment: The project has the potential of delivering significant GEBs but needs focus (prioritization) because the funds allocated to the project will simply not be sufficient to tackle all the threats and address all the barriers listed in the project. Narrowing down the project must start at PIF stage.

(3/10/2020)

Both comments remain to be addressed.

(4-07-2020) Comments addressed. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

As indicated earlier, threats, barriers, table B, core indicators and component descriptions revised to tighten delivery of GEBs in line with funds allocated.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

Yes, there is potential for all of this, but it needs to be more clearly articulated e.g.

On Sustainability;

- Greater project focus will aid as well as later a design of on the ground interventions around PAs that utilize and strengthen country systems.

- Clearer vision - even at PIF stage on measures to assure sustainability of environmental and water quality monitoring on national levels and sustainability of information systems on regional levels. If monitoring capacities and reliability of data provided from national levels is low then regional harmonization and exchange is not going to improve lake monitoring unless there are efforts made to increase capacity on national levels.

(3/10/2020) the section is overambitious, e.g. with regards of the impact of the project on the land rights of indigenous people and local communities as the project design is sufficiently focused to address land rights comprehensively, among other.

(4-07-2020) The section has been revised and aligned with the scope of the project. **Cleared.**

-

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Please note that the section has been revised in the context of the reduced level of ambition. The interventions remain focused on developing the capacities of local communities to effectively conserve and manage the natural resources under their stewardship.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) Yes, maps have been provided.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

Yes, a table outlining the envisioned role of key stakeholders considered so far is included in Annex D.

Please explain why TNC is not listed as an executing partner (in Part 1 of the PIF) but in Annex D is listed as being "responsible for project monitoring and evaluation", and will "participate in planning and execution of the project interventions and facilitating collaboration with other partners."

TNC has long been working with the LTA and other partners in the Great Lakes but as of early September apparently has not been aware of the present PIF.

(3/10/2020) - Yes, a long table is provided and reflects an overall complex design of the project aiming to engage actors ranging across local indigenous groups, small scale farmers, fishing communities, mining companies, bee keepers, various government sectors etc. etc.

- For TNC (previous comment): the agency response is noted and is fine. Please delete than the role of TNC (in the table) as being responsible for monitoring and evaluation.

(4-07-2020) Comment addressed. It is also noted that the complete Annexes are filed within a word version of the PIF in the 'documents' section of the portal while the Portal PIF only includes Annex A. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Done. The potential role of IUCN to support LTA in project execution has been added as discussed with LTA.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

The outline in the gender is somewhat generic - while sufficient at PIF stage and assuring that there will be a gender analysis during project design. The direct beneficiaries estimated appear to be in majority women (as per table F) but the outline of the components and outputs do not seem to yet make a sufficient case for this to be achieved.

(3/10/2020) O.k. at PIF stage but please assure that gender considerations are not only outlined in the RSA and a gender action plan (GEF required at endorsement) but part of the component design. The teams' response is well noted. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

There is a strong pitch on how the project will be engaging private sector partners and a rather incredibly diverse group of sectors around the PAs, yet the component outline/descriptions do not quite align with that ambition.

(3/10/2020) Agency response noted but please add focus to interventions even a PIF stage. For example, the PIF states that the project will actively work - among other - with a whole range of different mining companies without reflecting this in the component activities. Please focus the project to be realistic in what it can deliver (and do not promise what it cannot).

(4-07-2020) Comments with regard to not directing GEF resources directly to any private sector entities incl. hunting, plantation, mining etc. other than regulatory and enforcement have been addressed. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Noted. Reference to the role of the mining companies has been deleted in the PIF and will be confirmed during PPG as relevant.

Risks

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) A number of key risks are listed with regard to political stability and civil conflict, capacity of local institutions, and commitment of the countries and the LTA as well as climate risks. Beyond that the PIF lists numerous other risks and barriers with regard to PA management which should be reflected here.

(3/10/2020) Sufficient at PIF stage. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(3/10/2020)

1. The indicative institutional arrangements with regards to the fisheries activities is described. Please clarify the mandate of the LTA in terms of fisheries (add footnote).
2. Components 2 and 3 are less clear on scope (too wide/large) and therefore also what would be the envisioned institutional arrangements - see comments under Part I/question 2.
3. Coordination - see comments under Part I/question 2 e.g. with regard to ECOFISH and other.

(4-07-2020) Comments addressed. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

1. The mandates of the LTA in terms of fisheries have been described under 'key institutions' heading of Part II, section 1a.
2. While different stakeholders will be responsible for the delivery of certain outputs and activities, it is not envisaged to have separate institutional arrangements for different project components. The reference to the National Coordination Unit has been revised to reflect this point.
3. The 'Coordination' section 6 has been updated to further clarify the coordination with the ongoing and planned projects.

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) yes.

Cleared.

Agency Response**Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) Please see earlier comment with regard to component 5.

(3/10/2020) Yes, cleared.

Agency Response**Part III – Country Endorsements**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019)

The respective OFPs have signed the LOEs. Please obtain a revised LOE from DR Congo as the Congo LOE missed to endorse the IW grant.

(3/10/2020) Revised LOEs have been provided.

(4-07-2020) The revised LOE for Tanzania to address a typo in the BD allocation has been noted. **Cleared.**

Agency Response

06/04/2020

Noted. DRC has provided a revised LOE dated 25 March, reflecting an increase in their total STAR allocation, totalling 3.5 million. There was an error in the Tanzania LOE where the project amount for the BD focal area read \$2,688,088 instead of the correct amount, which is \$2,688,008. The OFP has corrected the error and the revised letter has been uploaded.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

04/15/2020 (Agency response to the GEFSEC comments under following RECOMMENDATION section from 04/15/2020)

On the comment re. stakeholder consultations leading to the PIF:

- Noted.
- The boxes for consultations with the private sector, civil society and communities/indigenous people have been 'unticked' and their reference removed from the text at this stage.
- Table D has been included in the main text on the portal to avoid confusion.

04/15/2020 (Agency response to the GEFSEC comments under following RECOMMENDATION section from 04/14/2020)

1. Table C/Co-financing: "GEF Agency" replaced by "Donor Agency" in the co-financing table in reference to IUCN.
2. On Stakeholder Engagement: a short summary of the stakeholder consultations held leading to the finalization of the PIF and distinct headings to separate the paragraphs describing the stakeholder process for the PIF and during PPG have been added respectively.

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(10/21/2019) Please address the comments provided. As there are a number of comments across FAs, it may be useful to discuss the comments and questions via a call between the UNEP team and GEFSEC.

(3/10/2020) Not yet.

- Please address comments provided. Specifically please address the need for greater focus and realistic scope of work in and around the PAs.
- We also note that no safeguards screening/preliminary rating document has been attached yet. Please do so. Please make sure it addresses Indigenous Peoples and local communities as IPLCs are mentioned throughout and living inside and outside of the PAs.

(4-07-2020) Please address comments:

- Please revise Table A to align focal area totals with table D.
- Co-finance: please label grants as investment mobilized, not recurring expenditures; most recurrent expenditures will be in-kind. Please check all entries in table C and revise as applicable.

(4-8-2020) Comments have been addressed. The project is recommended for technical clearance and inclusion in a future work program.

(4-14-2020) Please address two additional items:

1. Table C/Co-financing: Where co-financing is provided by a GEF Agency that is not the implementing Agency of the project (e.g. not UNEP, but is the World Bank or IUCN), please use "Donor Agency" rather than "GEF Agency" in the co-financing table. For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines.
2. On Stakeholder Engagement: Please note that the stakeholder section in the PIF refers to and asks for a short summary of the stakeholder consultations (who and how) that lead to the PIF i.e. in the project *identification* phase. Please add a short description/summary on who was consulted how and when and adjust the “tick” marks on (i) indigenous people and local communities; (ii) CSOs; (iii) private sector entities; and (iv) private sector. Again, this refers to the lead up time to the PIF, not the project preparation/PPG stage. Please add a distinct heading to separate the paras where you start describing the stakeholder process that WILL take place during PPG.

Please address and resubmit.

(4-15-2020)

On the comment re. stakeholder consultations leading to the PIF:

- Thanks for including the description on the consultations
- You need to “untick” the ticks for consultations with the private sector, civil society and communities/indigenous people if they have not happened yet at this stage or provide a short description with whom you consulted and how/when. From the outline given this is not clear (see text excerpt below). Also, if happened were these discussion with *local communities* or truly “*indigenous people*”? (if so, please list which indigenous groups; this is important if there are specific, recognized indigenous groups which will need specific attention in project design)
- Annex D is not attached.

Please address and resubmit.

(4-15-2020) Comments have been addressed. Recommended.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Comments for endorsement are provided throughout the review sheet.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Background. Lake Tanganyika lies at an elevation of about 772 m above sea level in the Western part of the Great Rift Valley. It is, after Lake Victoria, Africa’s second largest lake and the world’s second deepest (1,471m), after Lake Baikal. Two main rivers flow into the lake: the Ruzizi River which enters the north of the lake from Lake Kivu, and the Malagarasi River which enters the east side of the lake. There is one major outflow, the Lukuga River, which empties into the Congo River drainage basin. The lake is shared by four countries: Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) (45%), Tanzania (41%), Burundi (8%) and Zambia (6%). The lake

is a permanent source of clean water for domestic use and industrial and agricultural development and hosts one of the largest freshwater fisheries in Africa, particularly through its pelagic fish stocks. Both commercial and artisanal fisheries yield 165,000-200,000 tons of fish per year, employ about 100,000 people in fisheries-related activities, and provide 25-40 percent of the protein needs to one million people living around the lake. Hosting at least 1,500 aquatic species, of which approximately 600 are currently considered endemic, the lake is a recognised global hotspot of biodiversity. The lake basin contains several forest reserves and national parks and Ramsar sites. The proposed project builds on previous investments of the GEF in Lake Tanganyika which lead to the development of a Strategic Action Program (SAP), endorsed by the countries in 2000 and updated in 2012.

The project aims to support the implementation of SAP actions through enhancing sustainable fisheries management, biodiversity conservation and restoration of degraded landscapes in selected key biodiversity areas. At the *regional scale* the project will support building a network of community-based *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 Lake Tanganyika Management Authority (LTA), government fisheries institutions and the local fishing communities in order to minimize resource use conflict, improve good governance and encourage proactive leadership on the conservation and management of fisheries resources. At the *local scale* of the selected Protected Areas (PAs), and their buffer zones the project envisages the participative, community driven 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, increase household productivity and incomes from these natural resources and increase incentives for communities to continue to invest in the long-term stewardship of these protected areas beyond the term of the project.

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.