



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

GEF ID:	5463		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Securing Watershed Services Through SLM in the Ruvu and Zigi Catchments Eastern Arc Region		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5077 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3; LD-3; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,648,858
Co-financing:	\$15,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,748,858
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Veronica Muthui

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	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, Dr. Julius Ningu, Tanzania OFP, sent a letter of endorsement as of June 14, 2013. The information is matching with the PIF: project title, agency, and focal area amount.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes. At the time this review is prepared, Tanzania has programmed \$20.6 million.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. 1) The project and the PPG reach an	

		<p>UNDP may check with the OFP if that makes sense to increase the project amount with the resources that are still available for LD.</p> <p>2) Many elements of the project are SFM related. Did you discuss with the OFP the opportunity to trigger the SFM incentive? With contributions from at least another focal area, CCM or BD, it would be possible to develop a more ambitious project by adding resources from the SFM/REDD+ incentive.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 OK</p>	
	<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? 	NA	
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 project fits with two LD objectives and five outcomes. It might be too much, highlighting a problem of reasoning and lack of focus of the project. Please, justify or revise. See also cell. 6 and 7 about the reasoning and the result framework.</p> <p>- Table A: Please provide a GEF and cofinancing amount in front of each outcome (one line per outcome).</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant</p>	<p>It is mentioned that the project is aligned with the UNCCD's NAP, the country's Growth and Development Strategy (agriculture), the National Water Sector</p>	

	NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	<p>Development Strategy. This last point might be a source of concern (see Cell. 6). Depending on the responses that will be given, more information on the country's national strategies on agriculture and land use planning might be necessary. All in all, a deeper analysis of national strategies and plans will be needed to well anchor the project in the national decision system, and to better understand what will be financed by the cofinancing and what the incremental role of the GEF grant will be.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Addressed. Thanks.</p>	
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 baseline project is mainly provided by the Investment Plans of the Dar es Salaam Water and Sanitation Agency (DAWASA) and the Tanga Urban Water and Sanitation Supply Agency (Tanga UWASA). Among their investment plans of \$50 million for the period 2011-2015, \$6.5 million are considered as cofinancing.</p> <p>1) We are worried that most of the \$50 million will go towards the construction of the Kiduda dam on the Ruvu river. Plans are also in place for a second dam by 2025. We would need more information on the dams (size, upstream and downstream impact). It is not sure to build a GEF project on the top of such investment is acceptable. First, because there are reputation risks to be associated to such investment; second, because there is a risk to use GEF resources for baseline activities (studies, environment assessments, etc.), and third because the Global Environment Benefits (GEB) are</p>	

protect the life expectancy of dams. We understand it is a benefit for the country, but it is not a GEB - and then not GEF eligible per se. We recommend removing the linkages with the dam construction.

2) Moreover, some baseline problems are going beyond the LD scope (lack of implementation of regulations for buildings and mining for instance). This problem of reasoning is leading to a project that is too broad. This aspect may explain the lack of focus of the result framework (see comment cell. 4).

3) However, some problems - deforestation, land degradation, biodiversity loss, degradation of watershed services, as consequences of overgrazing, expansion of agriculture in forests, forest fires, and excessive fuel wood gathering by local communities- can be relevant to build the GEF reasoning. In the current document, the list of problems the project wants to address is too long and unrealistic (part II. 1, sections 3-9). You need to make a strategic choice to focus on a reasonable number of issues in addition to baseline activities.

4) The baseline scenario can be provided partially from the IWRM context (without dam related investments), the National Land Use Planning Commission, WWF, and UNDP.

5) The two barriers (absence of collaborative framework for land use management and lack of demonstrated experiences in NRM at the landscape

		<p>to focus the two technical components on these barriers, remove the outcomes and activities that are out of the scope of the revised project, and better link the two components together.</p> <p>6) With these modifications, the PIF should be more focused, with a better reasoning leading to GEF eligible activities on the top of the baseline activities. The result framework should be more concise, with a reduced number of outcomes and outputs. The table A and B will then be simplified.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Addressed. Thanks.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>1) There is confusion between outcomes and outputs. Many outputs sound as outcomes: reduction in land management crimes; secure additional financed, connectivity established. These outputs need to be rewritten and simplified. All the activities of training under "reduction in land management crimes" need to be justified from a GEF perspective.</p> <p>2) The budget for the component 1 - mainly related to capacity building- is too high from a GEF perspective.</p> <p>3) Moreover we do not see the linkage between the component 1 (capacity building) and the component 2 (SLM activities on the ground).</p> <p>4) The formulation of outputs should be short, concrete, tangible, reflecting activities, and if possible quantified. Please, shorten the text included in the</p>	

		<p>the outputs - it will facilitate the reading and the monitoring of activities.</p> <p>5) The lack of analysis of the national strategies and the current programs do not permit to understand what is financed by the cofinancing and how the GEF is used for additionnal activities. Many "outputs" sound as baseline activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It certainly the case for the Strategic Environmental Assessment related to the Ruvi and Zigi catchments. The GEF should not finance such "output" that is clearly a baseline activity and should be covered by the cofinancing. - About the spatially based digital decision making system and the multi-stakeholder national committee, we need a better reasoning to justify these "outputs" and additional elements to figure out how these elements are going to last once the project will have closed (sustainability). - Component 2: "ecological connectivity established" and "increase water quality" are not outputs. Please, reformulate the outputs to reflect the expected results that will achieve the outcomes. <p>August 20, 2013 Addressed. see cell. 25 for the points that will be checked at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 200,000 ha under SLM, improved soil productivity, x ha of protected forests are potential GEB that are acceptable. - However, a careful assessment of tradeoffs within the two catchment areas is needed to demonstrate the value of incremental benefits in terms of both GEBs and socio-economic benefits. - The dam projects will go ahead with or 	

		<p>dams are going to affect the GEBs. Please, make specific reference to the tradeoffs to underscore the incremental benefits in this project. A more detailed assessment of tradeoffs will be requested during PPG.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 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>Section A.2. Yes. Please develop a participatory approach during the PPG to reinforce the engagement of CSO.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 This point will be checked at CEO endorsement.</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, but please reinforce this aspect during the PPG to develop a comprehensive and focused risk analysis.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 This point will be checked at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Some projects are mentioned. We welcome the implementation of a CSIF. Even at PIF stage, please provide more information on projects addressing similar issues or working in the same area. Indicate you will develop synergies and coordination during the PPG phase (and avoid duplication, of course). We do not see how this project will be</p>	

		<p>notably those financed by bilateral partners. Please, revise section A.4.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 This point will be checked at CEO endorsement.</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>- Sustainability: Some aspects of sustainability are included in the PES that was developed by WWF. In relation to the comments in cell 8 about the need to assess tradeoffs to demonstrate incremental benefits, please explain the sustainability of the project. Explain also the sustainability of the GEBs and socio-economic benefits, with due consideration to the optimization of GEBs to avoid the burden of long term costs associated with any of them.</p> <p>- Innovation and scaling up: Please explain the innovative aspects of the project and the potential for scaling up.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	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 and outputs?	<p>See comments above (cell. 7). The table B needs to be simplified and updated. The linkage between the components 1 and 2 should be demonstrated. The budget also needs to be revised and give</p>	

		<p>August 20, 2013 Addressed at PIF level. Please, confirm at CEO endorsement.</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>- We do not understand what the cofinancing is financing. And as said above, the amount of each component needs to be revised.</p> <p>- UNDP is bringing \$2 million through a program focusing on land rehabilitation and restoration in support of the agriculture-led economic development. However, the role of this cofinancing as a baseline activity is not clear. Please, develop the role of this contribution in the baseline.</p> <p>- WWF is bringing \$1.5 million to set up a Payment for Watershed Services Scheme in the Zigi Basin. This cofinancing will have a key-role at community level and in view of the sustainability of the approach.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes. Under five percent, and with a high cofinancing ratio of 1:5.75</p>	
	<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 amount of \$100,000 is ok for a \$3.6 million GEF project.</p> <p>- Please use the latest template (as of February 2013), available on the following link: http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1708</p> <p>August 20, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of</p>	<p>NA</p>	

Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>August 20, 2013 All points have been addressed. Please remind the points to consider at CEO endorsement. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include a comprehensive risk analysis; - During the PPG, include a participatory plan to well identify and involve all stakeholders, including CSO/NGO; - Include a gender issue in the project; - Confirm the cofinancing; - Develop a coherent Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, including the measurement of GEB. - Explain the mechanisms of synergy that will be developed on the field with other donors/partners. - Develop the consistency and the logical reasoning between the capacity building components and the work on the ground. - Provide a detailed assessment of the 	

Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	June 27, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 20, 2013	
	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.