



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

GEF ID:	5695		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Ecosystem-Based Adaptation for Rural Resilience		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$7,571,233
Co-financing:	\$21,550,000	Total Project Cost:	\$29,221,233
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	YES. Tanzania is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated January 23, 2014, has been attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of	YES. The proposed grant is available	

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access	from the LDCF is accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project seems broadly aligned with Tanzania's Climate Change Strategy, the National Strategy for Poverty Reduction and Economic Growth, the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and the Water Sector Development Strategy and Policy.</p> <p>Still, the PIF provides for a very broad range of possible adaptation measures in different climatic and agro-ecological contexts and it is difficult to assess at this stage to what extent these measures are in line with Tanzania's NAPA. Moreover, the PIF refers to the activities listed by theme in Section 6.2 of the NAPA, rather than the most urgent priorities listed in Section 6.3.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please refer also to sections 6 and 8 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please clarify, in Section B.1 of the PIF, how the proposed project would address the most urgent and immediate priorities identified in Section 6.3 of Tanzania's NAPA.</p> <p>07/01/2014 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies how the proposed project would contribute towards the implementation of Tanzania's NAPA and the National Climate Change Strategy.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Agricultural Sector Development Program (ASDP) and the Water Sector Development Program (WSDP) appear to be relevant baseline programs within which adaptation should be integrated. However, the baseline programs are described very broadly at the national level, rather than in terms of the activities they have carried out or would carry out in the areas that would likely be targeted by the proposed LDCF project. As a result, it is also difficult to understand how the indicative co-financing figures, which represent specific shares of the baseline programs, have been determined.</p> <p>Moreover, the regions that are identified as ones of particular concern -- namely Morogoro, Manyara, Dodoma, Ruvuma and Shinyanga, as well as certain agricultural areas of Zanzibar -- span a</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>very large area with more than 7 million inhabitants. These regions encompass a diversity of climatic and agro-ecological contexts, with very diverse baseline scenarios.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon further considering and clarifying the potential target areas of the proposed project and the criteria for selecting intervention sites and beneficiaries, (i) please describe the baseline scenario in these potential target areas; (ii) clarify how the two baseline programs would engage in these target areas.</p> <p>07/01/2014 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies the baseline scenario for the targeted districts and specifies the investments planned in these districts through the two baseline programs.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 8 and 17.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 8 and 17, please revise the project framework as needed.</p> <p>07/01/2014 -- YES. The project framework is clear, sound and appropriately detailed.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>In absence of further clarity regarding the areas and beneficiaries potentially targeted by the proposed project, and the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>baseline scenario specifically as it relates to these areas and beneficiaries, the additional reasoning and adaptation benefits cannot be adequately assessed at this stage. The potential range of adaptation approaches, measures and outcomes is simply too broad.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please revise the additional reasoning and specify the expected adaptation benefits based on a clearer understanding of the areas, beneficiaries and climate change risks that would likely be targeted through the proposed project.</p> <p>07/01/2014 -- YES. The additional reasoning and adaptation benefits have been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please clarify further the targeting principles for the proposed project. Whereas Component 2 would aim to reduce vulnerability in four rural districts in the central plateau and Zanzibar, Section A.1.2 of the PIF describes a baseline scenario for six districts and Zanzibar.</p> <p>Moreover, Component 1 introduces many activities that are relevant for Tanzania's NAP process. By CEO Endorsement, the project's contributions towards the preparation of the NAP process could be discussed explicitly.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>YES. The role of public participation, including CSOs is adequately addressed for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>YES. Risks and relevant mitigation measures have been adequately addressed for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>YES. The PIF adequately identifies relevant initiatives with which coordination and coherence will be sought.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for</li> </ul>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 5, 6 and 8 above. The innovative aspects and potential for sustainability and scaling up cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 5, 6 and 8, please clarify the innovative aspects as well as the potential for sustainability and scaling up the proposed project.</p> <p>07/01/2014 -- YES. To ensure sustainable</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	scaling up the project's intervention.	outcomes and to secure viable pathways to scaling up successful approaches and practices, the proposed project would adopt a multi-pronged approach to reduce vulnerability in rural districts in Tanzania's central plateau and Zanzibar. The project would strengthen technical and institutional capacities at the national and local levels; review policies and plans in vulnerable sectors; and implement carefully targeted ecosystem-based adaptation measures as well as diversified livelihood strategies. The project would adapt cutting edge methodologies for vulnerability assessment at the local level; and introduce adaptation strategies that address in a comprehensive manner the linkages between agricultural, water and ecosystems. The project would be fully integrated within two major investment programs in agricultural development and water resources management.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 8 and 17.  RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	and outputs?	<p>addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, as needed.</p> <p>07/01/2014 -- YES. The proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component are adequate and appropriate.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 6 above.</p> <p>In addition, it is not clear how the indicative co-financing amounts provided by UNEP and VPO relate to the two baseline programs identified. The in-kind co-financing that UNEP would indicatively provide would seem in fact to be parallel financing rather than financing associated with a baseline initiative.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, (i) please adjust the indicative co-financing figures accordingly, as needed; and (ii) ensure that all indicative sources and amounts of co-financing are relevant for and clearly reflected in the baseline scenario.</p> <p>07/01/2014 -- YES. The indicative sources and amounts of co-financing are adequate.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	YES. At \$355,848 or some 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>YES. A PPG of \$100,000 is requested, in line with the norm for projects of up to and including \$10 million.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<p>Secretariat Recommendation</p>			
<p>Recommendation at PIF Stage</p>	<p>24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 17.</p> <p>07/01/2014 -- YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to Section 8 above.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	February 15, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	July 01, 2014	
	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.**