



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4855		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Kihansi Catchment Conservation and Management Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	126361 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,980,554
Co-financing:	\$18,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,280,554
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Paola Agostini

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	3-27-12 Yes. Tanzania is eligible for funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	3-27-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP dated March 12, 2012 for \$6,578,598. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	3-27-12 Yes. The design of this Project builds substantially on the knowledge and experience gained under the previous World Bank supported Lower Kihansi Environmental Management Project (LKEMP) which closed on June 30, 2011. Cleared	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	

	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	3-27-12 The World Bank Country office has three staff (Senior Environmental Specialists) based in Dar es Salaam and a Senior Water Resources Specialist (with extensive international and Tanzanian experience on environmental flow assessment) based in Washington, DC. Cleared	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3-27-12 Tanzania has BD STAR of \$13.95 Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	3-27-12 Tanzania has BD STAR of \$13.95 Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	3-27-12 Yes. Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	3-27-12 Yes. As stated in the PIF, "Biodiversity Outcome 2.1 " increase in sustainability in managed landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation - by enhancing biodiversity conservation in the Kihansi catchment of which 48	

		production". Cleared	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	3-27-12 Yes. This project is aligned with the National Environmental Policy (1997), the National Wildlife Policy (2007), the Environmental Management Act Cap 191 of 2004, the National Water Policy (2002), and the National Water Resources Management Act (2009). The project was identified by Tanzania as a priority in the NPFE. Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	3-27-12 See outcome 1.1. and output iii. Cleared	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	3-27-12 Yes. Component 1 of the Water Sector Development Project (WSDP) is comprised of three sub-components, of which the following two sub-components provide synergistic and complimentary support to the proposed GEF financed activities: i) Sub-Component 1A: Basin Level Water Resources Management, ii) Sub Component 1B: Integrated Water Resources Development and Management Plans. Cleared	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/	3-27-12 The incremental GEF- Biodiversity-funded activities would provide for	

		<p>1) The management of globally critical habitat and highly endemic and endangered species to be fully mainstreamed within the Water Sector Development Project (WSDP).</p> <p>2) Catchment management plans to be supported by the proposed GEF project will also be piloting a world leading initiative to amphibian conservation through the control of amphibian diseases such as chytrid fungus.</p> <p>3) The development of an expanded program of conservation and management for the other highly endemic and critically endangered plant and animal species including coffee and butterflies found in the Kihansi Gorge.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>3-27-12</p> <p>Please address the following questions:</p> <p>1) Is the target of components 1, the Kihansi catchment or the Rufiji basin (19% of the country)?</p> <p>2) What are the Protected Area in the Kihansi catchment where the in-situ conservation plans for critical habitats and endangered species will be developed and implemented (including pilot investments and provision of small infrastructure, patrolling & monitoring equipments)?</p> <p>3) Grant Type for Component 2 is mainly TA, not INV.</p>	

		<p>4) What institution(s) will be using the Sustainable Financing Plans for the conservation of the Kihansi catchments ecosystems?</p> <p>5) There is significant funding for Technical Assistance (resulting in various Plans and guidelines) but little to make these documents operational and have an impact on the ground. What activities will take on the implementation of these plans and who is going to pay for them? By having mainly plans as outputs, there is a significant risk of not obtaining the GEBs described in the Incremental Reasoning.</p> <p>3-30-12 Issued addressed in Responses to GEF Comments. Some items would need additional consideration at CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>3-27-12 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>3-27-12 See pages 6-8 in PIF. Cleared</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>3-27-12 Output 3 under Component 1. Cleared</p>	

	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>3-27-12 Please address the risks associated when trying to "mainstream" biodiversity conservation measures in different sectors, including making operational plans and guidelines where Biodiversity objectives are being pursued.</p> <p>3-30-12 Issued addressed in Responses to GEF Comments. Some items would need additional consideration at CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>3-27-12 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>3-27-12 As stated in the PIF, "the project will be coordinated by the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) under the Vice President's Office (VPO) - Environment. In addition to the VPO, other key sectors that would be involved in the implementation of the proposed project will include the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Ministry of Water, and Ministry of Agriculture". Cleared</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project	3-27-12	

Project Financing		Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>3-27-12 Are the figures for co-financing going to effectively co-finance (co-pay) the GEF activities and associated outputs and outcomes? In other words, is the total cost of Component 1 \$6,595,766 (GEF = \$1.5 million and Co-financing = \$5 million) and \$16,100,000 for Component 2 (GEF = \$4.1 million and cofinancing = \$12 million)?</p> <p>3-30-12 Issued addressed in Responses to GEF Comments. Some items would need additional consideration at CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>3-27-12 WB soft loan (\$14.6 million) and Government (\$3.6 in-kind). As in item 24, is the Loan co-financing the GEF supported activities? Cleared</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>3-27-12 The WB is bringing a soft loan for \$14,675,200. Cleared</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>3-28-12 No. Please address the issues under items 14, 18, and 24. Thanks.</p> <p>3-30-12 Yes. This PIF is recommended.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>3-30-12</p> <p>The CEO Endorsement documentation should include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The names of the Protected Areas where in-situ conservation activities will take place. In the detailed budget of the project, the GEF expects to see the allocation for the proposed investments in infrastructure, patrolling and monitoring equipments for each of the PAs. 2. In the detailed budget, the GEF expects to see a clear separation of funding for Technical Assistance and Investment. 3. The commitment and allocation of financial resources from the corresponding Government institutions to implement the action plans that mainstream biodiversity conservation in the Kihansi catchment. 4. Description of the items that will constitute the Sustainable Financing Plan and the commitment of NEMC to 	

		5. Details on Implementation arrangement, particularly when dealing with activities at the scale of the Rufiji basin, and Kihansi catchment.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 28, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 30, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.