



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

GEF ID:	4991		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Tanzania to Support Climate Resilient Development		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5096 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,000,000
Co-financing:	\$19,790,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,790,000
PIF Approval:	May 23, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mark Tadross

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?	YES. Tanzania is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated April 20, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. UNDP has a comparative advantage in institutional capacity building, as well as technical and policy support in the area of climate change adaptation.	
	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	YES. UNDP has a considerable portfolio of relevant projects, as well as	

		UNDP's programming in the areas of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management is well described in the PIF.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant (\$4.4 million, including Agency fee) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is fully aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-2 and CCA-3 and, specifically, CCA-2.2 on strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks of climate change-induced economic losses; and CCA-3.1 on the successful demonstration, deployment and transfer of relevant adaptation technology. More than 70 per cent of the proposed LDCF grant would support CCA-3.1.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	YES. The proposed project is well aligned with Tanzania's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and it contributes towards the implementation	

	NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	agriculture, water resources management, public health, and coastal zone management.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>YES. The project combines physical investments in hydro-meteorological monitoring and early-warning infrastructure with capacity building for national hydro-meteorological services and other key stakeholders. The project includes a sub-component focusing on long-term public and private financing arrangements to ensure the sustainable management of the systems developed.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of the risks associated with the lack of sustainable financing, institutional support and political commitment, along with appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	
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?	<p>YES. The proposed project would build on and contribute towards the following baseline initiatives: (i) Mainstreaming CCA in the National sectoral policies of Tanzania; (ii) the SADC Regional Meteorology Project (SAMPRO); (iii) activities associated with crisis prevention and recovery in the UNDP country program; (iv) the Food for Assets component of the WFP country program; and (v) the Emergency Preparedness and Response component of UNICEF's country program.</p> <p>The baseline initiatives are all relevant and adequately described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, upon a more detailed understanding of the specific</p>	

		of the proposed project, please discuss the gaps and needs associated with the baseline initiatives to allow for a complete and thorough assessment of the additional reasoning.	
	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/ additional reasoning?	<p>NOT CLEAR. While, for the most part, the additional cost reasoning is well described for each component and output, it is not clear what activities would in fact be carried out under Component 3 and how such activities relate to the technical assistance activities carried out under outputs 1.6, 2.1 and 2.3. Moreover, the description of outcome 3.2 on page 18 appears to be inconsistent with that of the Project Framework (Table B).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide a more clear and coherent description of the added value of Component vis-à-vis the project as a whole, and, if appropriate, consider integrating the component into outputs 1.6, 2.1 and 2.3.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, upon a more comprehensive assessment of baseline initiatives, as well as associated gaps and needs, please describe in greater detail the activities proposed for LDCF financing, their associated cost, and the additional reasoning on which these activities are based.</p>	

		05/21/2012 -- YES. The activities previously proposed under Component 3 have been clarified and folded into outputs 1.6, 2.1 and 2.3.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above with respect to Component 3. Moreover, it is not clear why output 2.3 has been identified as an investment as opposed to technical assistance.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendation under Section 13 above, please revise the Project Framework accordingly; and kindly revise or classify output 2.3 as TA.</p> <p>05/21/2012 -- YES. The project framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	YES. The adaptation benefits associated with the activities proposed for LDCF financing are clearly described, based on sound and appropriate assumptions and methodology.	
	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>YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are well described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information as to how the proposed project would reach the most vulnerable communities and groups, particularly women.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>YES. Public participation is adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, kindly provide further information regarding the local-</p>	

		project.	
	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>YES. The risk assessment is adequate for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of risks and relevant mitigation measures, considering in particular the sustainability of the systems established and the capacities developed (see also Section 10 above).</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>YES. The PIF identifies relevant initiatives and processes in Tanzania as well as in the wider region.</p> <p>BY CEO Endorsement, in addition to listing other relevant initiatives, please describe in greater detail how the proposed project will be coordinated with such initiatives.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please identify other executing partners in the Project Identification section of the PIF (page 1), considering in particular that the project will primarily be nationally executed, as stated on page 5.</p> <p>05/21/2012 -- YES. The revised PIF identifies the following executing partners: Tanzania Meteorological Agency, Prime Minister's Office - Disaster Management Department, and the Ministry of Water. Further information about implementation and execution arrangements will be provided by CEO Endorsement.</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?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$190,000, the funding level for project management costs is below 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under Section 13 above, please revise the grant and co-financing amounts accordingly.</p> <p>05/21/2012 -- YES. The grant and co-financing amounts have been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>The indicative co-financing is appropriate, at \$19.79 million, placing the co-financing ratio at 1:4.95. It is not clear, however, why the co-financing associated with the WFP and UNICEF country programs has been labeled as in-kind, as opposed to grant co-financing.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the co-financing type indicated in Table C is consistent with the nature of the baseline initiatives described in Section II.B.1 of the PIF.</p>	

		associated with the WFP and UNICEF country programs has been re-labeled as grant rather than in-kind.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>NOT CLEAR. While Table C and page 11 of the PIF indicate that UNDP would be bringing \$2.75 million in indicative co-financing, Section C.2 maintains that total UNDP co-financing would amount to \$12 million.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that UNDP co-financing is consistently described across the document.</p> <p>05/21/2012 -- YES. UNDP co-financing is consistently described in the re-submission.</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:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 13, 14, 20, 24, 25 and 26.</p> <p>05/21/2012 -- YES.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 11, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 19.	

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*	May 10, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 21, 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?	Yes, the proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes, the itemized budget is justified.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes, PPG approval is being recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 06, 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.