



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5034		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Enhancing the Forest Nature Reserves Network for Biodiversity Conservation in Tanzania		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5106 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$130,000	Project Grant:	\$4,100,000
Co-financing:	\$19,600,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,830,000
PIF Approval:	October 03, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 15, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Nik Sekhran

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	7-23-12 Yes. Tanzania is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	7-23-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$4,719,000 including project, PPG and Agency fee. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	7-23-12 Yes. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	6-22-14 Yes Cleared

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	7-23-12 Yes. Page 14 of PIF. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	7-23-12 Tanzania has BD \$13.95 Million and the balance is sufficient to carry-out this project. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?	7-23-12 Tanzania has BD \$13.95 Million and the balance is sufficient to carry-out this project. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	7-23-12 Yes. See details page p.3 of PIF. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	7-23-12 BD-1 Cleared	NA
	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?	7-23-12 Yes. See details page p.3 of PIF. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	7-23-12 Staff training in Headquarters and FNR (see component 1). Cleared	6-22-14 Yes 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?	7-23-12 Component 2. Enhancing the financial sustainability of the FNR PA System is relying on a number of activities, each one supported by key assumptions: 1. A national FNR System Financing Plan (based on business plans for all 11 FNRs). 2. An economic case is made for increased investment in FNRs (tourism and other use and non-use values, as well as the climate change risk management benefits [including maintaining critical stream base flows, avoided emissions and carbon sequestration]). 3. Tourism product for FNR network and Commercial investment in tourism engineered through private sector community partnerships. Questions: 1. While "business plans" have become standard in PA management, do "business plans" really enhance the financial sustainability of the FNRs? Is	6-22-14 Yes Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>there domestic evidence in support of this assumption? What activities could be planned and executed as part of this project above and beyond the preparation of the business plans to ensure their implementation? If follow-up activities are planned and budgeted for, what is the risk that these "business plans" become outdated after the completion of the project?</p> <p>2. What makes the Government and the GEF Agency believe that tourism can effectively increased the financial sustainability of the FNRs, when most of the wildlife is concentrated in National Parks and Game Reserves? Do FNRs, designed to conserve forests (including endemic and threaten species), really have the biodiversity assets to attract tourism in sufficient numbers to make a difference in the financial sustainability of the areas?</p> <p>3. Is it realistic to think that "maintaining critical stream base flows, avoided emissions and carbon sequestration" can assist in the financial sustainability of the FNRs? What is the domestic experience on this matters and why FNRs would be in better position to deliver these goods than other forested areas in the country?</p> <p>For these questions, please provide insights emerging from the development and implementation of the previous</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>GEF funded projects in support of FNR</p> <p>8-13-12 Properly addressed in revised PIF and Responses to Project Reviews. Cleared</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		<p>6-22-14 Yes Cleared</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>7-23-12 Yes. Activities for the consolidation (creation and management) and for the financial sustainability of the FNR are based on incremental reasoning. Cleared</p>	<p>6-22-14 Yes Cleared</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>7-23-12</p> <p>Component 2.</p> <p>Enhancing the financial sustainability of the FNR PA System is relying on a number of activities, each one supported by ket assumptions:</p> <p>1. A national FNR System Financing Plan (based on business plans for all 11 FNRs).</p> <p>2. An economic case is made for increased investment in FNRs (tourism and other use and non-use values, as well as the climate change risk management benefits [including maintaining critical stream base flows,</p>	<p>6-22-14 Yes Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>avoided emissions and carbon sequestration].</p> <p>3. Tourism product for FNR network and Commercial investment in tourism engineered through private sector community partnerships.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>1. While "business plans" have become standard in PA management, do "business plans" really enhance the financial sustainability of the FNRs? Is there domestic evidence in support of this assumption? What activities could be planned and executed as part of this project above and beyond the preparation of the business plans to ensure their implementation? If follow-up activities are planned and budgeted for, what is the risk that these "business plans" become outdated after the completion of the project?</p> <p>2. What makes the the Government and the GEF Agency believe that tourism can effectively increased the financial sustainability of the FNRs, when most of the wildlife is concentrated in National Parks and Game Reserves? Do FNRs, designed to conserve forests (including endemic and threaten species), really have the biodiversity assests to atrack tourism in sufficente numbers to make a difference in the financial sustainability of the areas?</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>3. Is it realistic to think that "maintaining critical stream base flows, avoided emissions and carbon sequestration" can assist in the financial sustainability of the FNRs? What is the domestic experience on this matters and why FNRs would be in better position to delivered these goods than other forested areas in the country?</p> <p>For these questions, please provide insights emerging from the development and implementation of the previous GEF funded projects in support of FNR.</p> <p>8-13-12 Properly addressed in revised PIF and Responses to Project Reviews. Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>7-23-12 Yes. Table on p.10 makes easy to understand the status of the FNRs and the proposed interventions. Clearer</p>	<p>6-22-14 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>7-23-12 Locally, communities will be able to and benefit from new tourism development opportunities and for those with community forest areas bordering FNR, sustainable use of NTFP" (p.11-12).</p> <p>Question: Do local communities really benefit from tourism development or are the</p>	<p>6-22-14 Yes Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>benefits kept by tour operators and lodges.</p> <p>8-13-12 Properly addressed in revised PIF and Responses to Project Reviews. Cleared</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>7-23-12 Yes. See p.10. Cleared</p>	<p>6-22-14 Yes Cleared</p>
	<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>	<p>7-23-12</p> <p>1, Risk 1 and 2 appear to be the same with different rankings (H & M). Can these risks be presented around the individual threats imposed from the outside?</p> <p>2. Climate change. In the map, some FNRs appear to be isolated, while other appears to be adjacent to larger PAs. What of the 11 FNRs are more at risk because of small size and isolation?</p> <p>3. Tourism. The risk appears to be a combination of a global financial downtown and the capacity of the FNRs to attract tourism (see comment on item 14). Please adjust as appropriate.</p> <p>8-13-12 Properly addressed in revised PIF and Responses to Project Reviews. Cleared</p>	<p>6-22-14 Yes Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	7-23-12 Yes. Please see last paragraph of comment in item 14. 8-13-12 Properly addressed in revised PIF and Responses to Peoject Reviews. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	7-23-12 Yes. The project will be executed by the Tanzania Forest Services (TFS), recently established under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT) in 2009 to enhance forest management capacity. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	7-23-12 Project management is 5% of the project cost. Co-financing for project management is also 5%. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	7-23-12 Yes, assuming all the co-financing becomes effective. Issue to be reviewed at CEO Endorsement. Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if	7-23-12 1. Is the \$15M contribution from	6-22-14 Yes. All LoC included. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	confirmed co-financing is provided.	Government, the expected investment in the 11 FNRs over the next 5 years (duration of the project) or the total investment in the FNR network? 2. There is an indicative co-financing of \$1M from NGOs. Have all these NGOs (WCS, WWF TCO, WCST, TFCG) already committed to provide funding (cash) in support of this project? 8-13-12 To be confirmed at CEO Endorsement. Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	7-23-12 UNDP is contributing \$1M (cash) Cleared	6-22-14 Yes Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		6-22-14 Yes Cleared
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	7-23-12 No. Please address issues under items 11,14,16,18,19 and 25. Provide responses and review the PIF	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>accordingly. Please highlight the paragraphs in the PIF that were modified in the revised PIF. Thanks.</p> <p>8-13-12 Yes. This PIF has been technically cleared and maybe included in an upcoming work program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		6-22-14 Yes Cleared
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		6-22-14 Yes. This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement. Cleared
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 23, 2012	June 22, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 13, 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?	<p>8-13-12 Yes. The proposed activities are:</p> <p>1) Policy Framework and Institutional Capacity Review of Tanzania Forest</p>

		Services 2) Conservation Needs Assessment and FNR Consolidation Planning 3) Assessment of baseline FNR together with revenue-generating and forest PA alignment opportunities 4) Local stakeholder and gender assessment 5) Feasibility Analysis and Budget Cleared
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	8-13-12 Yes. Cleared
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	8-13-12 Yes. This PPG is recommended. Cleared
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 13, 2012
	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.