



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

GEF ID:	5691		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in Tanzania		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$70,000	Project Grant:	\$1,298,980
Co-financing:	\$5,250,000	Total Project Cost:	\$6,618,980
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Mohamed F. Sessay

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 ?	United Republic of Tanzania signed the UNCCD on October 14, 1994 and ratified it on June 19 1997. The Convention was effective on September 17 1997.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. There is a letter dated July 23, 2013 signed by Dr. Julius Ningu, endorsing \$1,600,000 for a Project proposal "sustainable land management for Lake Nyasa catchment in Tanzania". March 6, 2014 A new letter has been submitted dated February 4, 2014. The total GEF resources requested are \$1,505,000 including the project grant, the PPG, and the fees. The marginal adjustment is	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>applied.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
<p>Resource Availability</p>	<p>3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>- The remaining STAR resources for LD are: \$505,001;</p> <p>- Tanzania can trigger the marginal adjustment. They have initial STAR resources of \$27 million and can thus transfer up to \$1 million either from BD or LD. Their current remaining allocations are: CC \$1,118,402; BD \$1,000,300 and LD \$505,001.</p> <p>- The country support for the project is shown with the letter of endorsement. We will check with BD and CC colleagues from the GEF Secretariat whether there are other PIFs under preparation.</p> <p>- However, in any case, the maximum amount can be \$1,505,001 (project, fees and PPG included). Another option would be to develop a SFM project merging the \$2.6 million STAR allocations in BD and LD and trigger the SFM incentive (up to \$1.2 million) depending of course of the country priorities. Please check with the country which option they prefer. Please, keep in mind that there will be a tight deadline if there is a willingness to develop a MFA/SFM FSP for inclusion in the May Work Program.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 The project is now a \$1,298,980 LD</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		project (\$1,505,000 with the PPG and the fees). Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	No set aside are used (as there is no SFM). Please, confirm. March 6, 2014 Cleared.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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>The PIF is referring to the LD1 and LD 3 objective, and more specifically the outcomes 1.2 (improved agriculture management), 1.3 (sustained flow of services in agro-ecosystems), and 3.2 (integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities).</p> <p>If these outcomes are confirmed, please revise the project focusing on outputs and activities that fit into these lines. Outputs 1.3 and 2.5. should be better justified or reduced (awareness, alternatives).</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE,</p>	<p>Yes. The project is in line with the UNCCD NAP and the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty. The project was identified in the NPFE (2012).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?		
Project Design	6. 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>The project aims to reduce the environmental stresses from the lake catchment through the implementation of a SLM approach. The main problem in the lake catchment is land degradation caused by cultivation on sloping lands, shifting cultivation, burning, wildfire, and deforestation, as well as mining activities.</p> <p>Some baseline projects are tackling these issues. The project is proposing an alternative.</p> <p>However, while mining is mentioned, we did not find how this problem will be addressed within the project or by other partners. Please, clarify.</p> <p>During the PPG, please provide a map of main biomes and provide data to better quantify the problems.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>The table B provides a simple and focused project framework.</p> <p>We suggest to focus the first component on the reinforcement of capacities at the catchment level in addition to baseline investments: catchment and district land use plans are welcome, outreach and training too (1.3, but please reformulate, 1.5).</p> <p>- The output 1.1.1. "catchment and district land use plans developed and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>implemented" is welcome, but needs to be better tailored to the corresponding outcome 1.1 "Catchment capacity to provide ecosystem services enhanced".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The rehabilitation of 50,000 ha (1.3) does not seem in the right component (we recommend to focus the first component on capacity development and keep all field interventions in the second component.) - The enforcement of by-laws (1.4) can be acceptable if you can prove it is an additional output. Please, explain what the baseline and cofinancing activities are on this issue. - We appreciate that the larger part of the project, roughly the two-third are used for field interventions. The outputs 2.1 and 2.2 are welcome. - For the output 2.3: please confirm the focus of these alternative activities. In the text, tourism and honey production are mentioned. We need a better rationale to understand how these alternative income generating activities will help to fight land degradation and tackle the problem that are identified (deforestation, burning, inadapted agriculture practices...). <p>March 6, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The GEB are described in the section A.1.5. Many of them are BD oriented. However, reducing land degradation in 50,000 ha with SLM, reducing competing land uses, and restoring agro-ecosystem services in the catchment area are fully</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>welcome.</p> <p>We would like the agency to clarify that the project is focusing on land as catchment area that surrounds lake Nyasa more than the lake itself. The project will deliver GEB by addressing global environment problems, root causes and barriers that affect lands. Benefits that accrue to the lake are spill over effects of the interventions on land, rather having them as the primary focus of the project.</p> <p>During the PPG, please improve the description of baseline projects that target forests, agricultural and social sectors.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>9. 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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>CSO organisations will be associated (cf A.2). At CEO endorsement, please provide a stakeholder analysis and confirm that operational partnerships will be developed on the ground.</p> <p>In the PIF, please fill in the cell about the "other executing partners", part I, p1.</p> <p>March 6, 2014</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Addressed.	
	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>A list of risks is provided. At CEO endorsement, please provide a comprehensive risk analysis.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Some other projects are mentioned. During the PPG, please develop the way and arrangements to coordinate this project with other related initiatives.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>We do not want to lower the expectations for this project, but it can only be a piece of what is needed to solve all the problems in the Lake Nyasa catchment. The project has definitely a potential for replication in the catchment area and beyond in the Lakes Rukwa and Manyara.</p> <p>Please, improve the rationale on sustainability and innovation.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>We made some comments about the project design (cf cell. 7). That said, we welcome the breakdown between the component 1, 2, and the management costs. We appreciate that almost 2/3 of the project grant is used for the component 2 for activities on the field that will benefit to local communities.</p> <p>If possible, improve the cofinancing for the component 2. It is surprising that the cofinancing amounts between the components 1 and 2 are in the same range.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Addressed.</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>The cofinancing ratio is 1:3.8. It is acceptable. Please at CEO endorsement, confirm the cofinancing and if possible, try to improve it.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>The management costs reach 5.38 percent of the project sub-total. At CEO endorsement, please justify the amount.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	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>The PPG is reaching the maximum possible. Please, check that the amounts for the project grant, the PPG, and the fees are in the range of the remaining LD allocations (with the application of the marginal adjustments).</p> <p>March 6, 2014 Noted.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>NA</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
Agency Responses	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended for clearance yet. Please address the points above.</p> <p>March 6, 2014 All points have been addressed at PIF level. Some items will be clarified at CEO endorsement. The PIF clearance is</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	recommended. During the PPG and in view of the CEO endorsement, please address the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a map of main biomes and provide data to better quantify the Land Degradation problems. - Provide an analysis of other projects that affect the catchment area, especially on agriculture, forests, and social issues. - Include a comprehensive risk analysis. - Confirm cofinancing. - Include a Monitoring and Evaluation Program. - Provide the baseline for the Monitoring program. - Confirm the implementation arrangements and the partnerships on the ground (CSO, NGO, universities, etc.). - Include gender issues in the project design. - Develop the arrangements with related initiatives. 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	February 04, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 06, 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.