



REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in Tanzania			
Country(ies):	Tanzania	GEF Project ID: ¹	5691
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	01207
Other Executing Partner(s):	Vice President's Office (VPO), Ministry of Agriculture	Resubmission Date:	May 10, 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation	Project Duration(Months)	36 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	123,403
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 		

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
(select) LD-1	1.2: Improved agricultural management	1.2 Types of Innovative SL/WM practices introduced at field level	GEF TF	207,000	1,335,000
	1.3: Sustained flow of services in agroecosystems	1.3 Suitable SL/WM interventions to increase vegetative cover in agroecosystems	GEF TF	207,000	1,335,000
(select) LD-3	3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management	3.1 Integrated land management plans developed and implemented	GEF TF	442,490	890,000
	3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities	3.2 INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested	(select)	442,490	890,000
Total project costs				1,298,980	4,450,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To improve natural resources management and livelihoods of communities in Lake Nyasa catchment through sustainable land management systems						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1 Strengthening	TA	Outcome 1.1: Catchment capacity	Output 1.1.1: Conduct baseline mapping and	GEF TF	514,000	1,760,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

capacities at catchment level for SLM		to provide ecosystem services enhanced Outcome 1.2. Enhanced capacity of local and national stakeholders, including communities and institutions, to sustainably manage natural resources and to resolve land use conflicts	assessment of land use activities in targeted districts Output 1.1.2 Catchment and Village Land Use plans developed Output 1.2.1: Capacity needs assessment of farmer groups and other key stakeholder undertaken Output 1.2.2: Awareness programme on sustainable land management practices developed and communities mobilized Output 1.2.3. District Councils trained on participatory land use planning and catchment management			
Component 2. Integrated Catchment management through SLM systems	TA	Outcome 2.1: Improved land productivity and community living standards	Output 2.1.1 Land rehabilitation/ conservation/ protection measures implemented on cultivated land Output 2.1.2 Degraded lake catchment areas and water sources rehabilitated/ conserved Output 2.1.3. Techniques on conservation agriculture implemented on arable land Output 2.1.4 Alternative income generating activities identified and implemented	GEF TF	510,600	1,750,000

		2.2.Reduced land degradation, improved soil health and increased productivity of agroecosystems	<p>Output 2.1.5. Degraded Mined land rehabilitated through reforestation</p> <p>Output 2.2.1. Best practice guidelines for SLM for small scale agriculture developed and demonstrated</p> <p>Output 2.2.2. Adoption of SLM practices and conservation of indigenous food crop varieties increased</p> <p>Output 2.2.3. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation system for SLM developed</p>			
Component 3 Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework	TA	Outcome 3.1 Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework for SLM established	<p>Output 3.1.1 Policy and development analysis in Lake Nyasa basin undertaken</p> <p>Output 3.1.2. Local government authorities are enabled to enforce by-laws for catchment management</p> <p>Output 3.1.3. Inter-ministerial committee on Lake Nyasa established</p>	GEF TF	204,380	700,000
Project Mangement	TA			GEF TF		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal					1,228,980	4,210,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEF TF	70,000	240,000

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Total project costs	1,298,980	4,450,000
----------------------------	-----------	-----------

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Office of the Vice President	In-kind	2,900,000
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	UNDP/UNEP-PEI	In-kind	1,200,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	In-kind	350,000
(select)		(select)	
		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			4,450,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Tanzania	1,298,980	123,403	1,422,383
	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				1,298,980	123,403	1,422,383

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	0	0	0
National/Local Consultants	31,000	215,000	246,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

- A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. N/A
- A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. N/A
- A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: N/A
- A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: An additional component on Policy and Institutional Framework was added by the stakeholders during the validation workshop in recognition that a robust SLM strategy would require a multidisciplinary approach. The drivers and impacts of land degradation cuts across sectors (lands, water, agriculture, irrigation, mining, energy, fisheries and tourism). While all these sectors are key stakeholders in Lake Nyasa basin, they have been implementing development programmes through parallel interventions and using different approaches which at times are antagonistic. This has not only resulted in duplication of efforts but has also confused and disoriented stakeholders at the grassroots. Under this component, the project will support establishment of an inter-ministerial committee on Lake Nyasa to harmonize and promote sustainable development of Lake Nyasa basin specifically addressing the challenges of land and ecosystem degradation
- A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project: N/A
- A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: N/A
- A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives N/A

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation. The project implementation will adopt a participatory approach, engaging various stakeholders whose participation is central to the successful delivery of the project. Under the project implementation arrangements agreed by stakeholders, key partners will be engaged in direct execution of some specific project outputs through sub-contacts and letters of Agreement. The identification of the implementing partners will be based their statutory mandate, technical and operational capacity.

Clear mechanisms for participation, partnership building and effective communication will be essential and will be considered at the outset of Project implementation to ensure full inclusion of all relevant stakeholders. It is essential that the project management arrangements provide space to enable partners to work together effectively and that all stakeholders are kept fully informed of project progress.

The main beneficiaries of this project will be the local government authorities and community groups. Women and will be the priority target of interventions through grants for agricultural base small enterprises. The expected outco

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

stakeholder engagement is to establish a multi-sectoral platform that would coordinate sustainable development of the basin.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project will generate socio-economic benefits to the local communities in a way that will lead to behavioral change and more support for sustainable land and ecosystem management. Some of the socio-economic benefits include:

- a) Improved farm production for household food security and higher incomes as SLM practices yield benefits for soil fertility and crop productivity.
- b) Improved nutrition and incomes through and expanded legume and cereals inter-cropping. In addition, legumes are a source of high quality protein while cereals are sources of carbohydrates and fats and will contribute significantly to household nutrition;
- c) The promotion of traditional farming systems will enhance conservation of agrobiodiversity and the plant genetic resources that have been neglected and yet could offer the solution to food security and adaptation to climate change.
- d) Women and youths who are the majority in the target area will benefit from increased awareness, knowledge and skills in enterprise management
- e) Putting more land under sustainable land and ecosystem management will increase flow of ecosystem goods and services to cope with the increasing demand from an expanding population. I
- f) The project will facilitate Private-Public-Partnerships (PPPs) through capacity building of producer groups in agribusiness and bio-enterprise development in order to ensure that SLM practices are market driven and sustainable.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project will adopt cost saving strategies in the execution of the project implementation. The aim is to reduce operational costs so as to release more funds to the actual implementation of activities that would directly benefit the target groups. The strategies to be employed include:

Use of existing institutions and structures – The project will not create new structures nor employ new extension staff but as much as possible use the existing structures at the district level. The project will work closely with the District Agricultural Office and will use their extension staff in training and dissemination of project activities. At the community level, the project will work with existing community institutions already established and will not directly support establishment of new CBOs for the sake of the project. This approach will reduce administrative costs.

In dissemination of new technologies and responding to farmers constraints, the project will engage Sokoine Agricultural University to provide radio and mobilised based extension service which is cost effective compared with sending experts on the ground.

Targeted support – The project will build the capacity of stakeholders based on capacity needs assessment. The project resources will thus be based on targeted support and will avoid duplication with on-going support from other development partners but rather complimenting and building synergies.

Community Based Approach – The communities are the key target for the project and the project will use the existing community groups as entry points for the project. This approach will reduce costs on

community mobilisation and thus more funds will be used for training and capacity building. The strengthening of community groups will also ensure sustainability of the project activities at the end of the project.

Strategic partnership with on-going SLM related programmes – There are a number of on-going SLM related programmes in the focal counties which the project could benefit through linkages and synergies. These include UNDP/UNEP Poverty and Environment Initiative, WWF programme on conservation of Lake Nyasa and others

Multi-sectoral platform - the project will support the establishment of a multi-sectoral platform to coordinate efforts in sustainable management of Lake Nyasa basin which thus avoiding duplication of efforts but creating synergies for more impact

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The budgeted M&E plan is summarized in Appendix 7 (in the prodoc). The means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators is provided in the summary. Other M&E related costs are also presented in the Costed M&E Plan and are fully integrated in the overall project budget. The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are summarized in Appendix 8 (in the prodoc). The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework presented in Appendix 4 (in the prodoc) includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in Appendix 6 (in the prodoc) will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Indicators and their means of verification may also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the project management team but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators. It is the responsibility of the Project Manager to inform UNEP of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion.


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Dr Julius K. Ningu	GEF Operational Focal Point	VICE PRESIDENT OFFICE	4 FEBRUARY 2014

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan Van Dyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP		May 10, 2016	Ersin Esen Task Manager	+254 20 762 4731	Ersin.Esen@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please see the separately attached Annex A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Please see the separately attached Annex B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 80,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
PPG Lead Consultant including travel	20,000	20,000	
National Consultant	10,000	10,000	
Meetings and Workshops	35,000	35,000	
Logistics and Reporting	5,000	4,700	
	0		
Total	70,000	69,700	0

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

ANNEX E: ALIGNMENT OF THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF

Please see the separately attached Annex E: ALIGNMENT OF THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF