



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9132		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Food-IAP: Reversing Land Degradation Trends and Increasing Food Security in Degraded Ecosystems of Semi-arid Areas of Central Tanzania		
GEF Agency:	IFAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$183,486	Project Grant:	\$7,155,963
Co-financing:	\$52,961,800	Total Project Cost:	\$60,301,249
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Stephen Twomlow

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental		

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
Availability of Resources	7. 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		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
• Focal area set-aside?			
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	<p>January 6, 2017</p> <p>This is a child project under the Food Security IAP program, for which the PIF stage was not required. The project has been designed in line with the Program Framework Document, which identified all relevant GEF strategic objectives for alignment. Please note that LD1 "Program 2" in Table A of CEO endorsement was not included in the PFD. Therefore it should be removed.</p> <p>March 30, 2017</p> <p>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>January 6, 2017</p> <p>The overall project structure / design is appropriate, but there are inconsistencies that raise concern about how the expected outcomes and outputs could be achieved. In this regard, the following needs to be addressed:</p> <p>1) The theory of change as described</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>and illustrated is not adequately supported by the project components and expected outcomes / outputs, including basis for defining the environmental and development benefits. For example, Figure 2 in the Prodoc includes for environmental outcomes (reduced deforestation, carbon emissions, and land degradation, and increased wildlife biodiversity). Yet how they are mapped to the project results framework and estimates of GEBs is not clear. Please provide a more detailed description of the ToC to clarify how the GEBs are mapped.</p> <p>2) While the geographical context is clear with respect to spatial scale, socio-economic and biophysical conditions, the agro-ecological characterization of the six target sites is inadequate. As a result, it is hard to rationalize the potential for GEBs, even with the reasoning provided for GEF incremental financing. Please clarify for each district a) typology of production systems and estimated coverage of each, and b) proportion of the area targeted to put into context the 9,000 hectares (for conservation & climate-smart farming) and 500 hectares (for restoration). These should be especially elaborated in the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>appendix 2, which is almost entirely focused on social and gender aspects, and appropriately referenced in the CEO endorsement and ProDoc.</p> <p>3) The baseline description (and rationale in ProDoc) is very thorough, but it is not clear how the GEF alternative will leverage such a wide range of investment opportunities to achieve the kind of transformational shift envisioned for the semi-arid areas of Tanzania. Please provide a clear explanation of how the different baseline initiatives will be harnessed to enhance potential for synergies, especially given the emphasis on "landscape approach" and "scaling-up". How will the proposed implementation arrangement for the project accommodate this potential?</p> <p>4) Alignment with conventions is very well articulated in the ProDoc, including reference to the country's INDC. Please clarify what targets are being proposed for mitigation in the INDCs, and how the proposed LDFS project will specifically contribute to those targets.</p> <p>March 30, 2017</p> <p>The ToC is now clear, and</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>geographical context more appropriately described. In addition, potential for alignment with baseline has been clarified, and links to INDC highlighted.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>January 6, 2017</p> <p>The financing is adequate and cost-effectiveness is demonstrated based on the proposed GEF alternative. However, there a number of inconsistencies in the breakdown of financing provided that need to be addressed.</p> <p>1) Para 118 of the ProDoc indicates \$7.89 million as "total combined LDFS investment and incremental recurrent costs". Please clarify how this amount is derived given that it is different from the total GEF grant. What about the co-financing, even if it is all in-kind?</p> <p>2) Para 119 suggests a total of \$7.68 million, including \$0.37 million as PMC. Please clarify why these amounts are not consistent with those in Table B of the CEO endorsement. Note also that the PMC must not exceed 5% of the grant, and must be part of the total amount in the OFP</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>endorsement letter.</p> <p>3) The amounts provided in Tables A and B of the CEO endorsement must add-up to the same totals, and GEF grant must be in line with amount in the OFP endorsement letter. Please correct the tables to ensure totals are exact amounts.</p> <p>4) The agency fee needs to be corrected, and the correct amount provided in space in PART 1 of the CEO endorsement template.</p> <p>5) As indicated in cell #1, adding "LD-1 Program 2" in Table A creates a mis-match with the PFD. Please correct.</p> <p>March 30, 2017</p> <p>All inconsistencies have been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>January 6, 2017</p> <p>Yes, all major risks have been identified and mitigation measures sufficiently described.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>January 6, 2017</p> <p>The co-financing amounts are all confirmed, but not adequately accounted for in the CEO endorsement document. Please address the following:</p> <p>1) Please provide a clear explanation for how the "in-kind" co-financing will be leveraged to deliver each of the components, given the breakdowns and relevant links to other projects and entities provided in each of the supporting letters. How will the other projects and institutions be engaged? Where is the evidence that entities identified in the letters have been involved in the design process?</p> <p>2) Either include the IFAD co-financing (\$8 million grant + \$35 million from others) in Table C of the CEO endorsement, or clarify why this cannot be done. Who are "the other partners" identified in the support letter? To what extent were they involved in the project design?</p> <p>3) Ensure consistency between amount in the confirmed letters and those presented in Table C of the CEO endorsement, and provided a correct total.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>4) Ensure that breakdown in amounts confirmed are consistent with totals in Table A and breakdown by component in Table B of the CEO endorsement.</p> <p>March 30, 2017</p> <p>Co-financing arrangements have been clarified and breakdown now consistent.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?</p>	<p>January 6, 2017</p> <p>The Tracking Tool was completed, and the use of ExACT to generate estimate of mitigation benefits is noted. The TT how shows a number of inconsistencies with the overall project design that need to be addressed.</p> <p>1) The agroecological context is characterized as covering a total 18,000 hectares of production systems, with only 500 hectares considered as "degraded". These figures are not in line with description provided in both the CEO endorsement and the ProDoc. Please clarify.</p> <p>2) Baseline data for SLM benefits are lacking, despite case being made for investment in practices to arrest and</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>reverse land degradation. Assuming that not all of the production systems are degraded (i.e. 100 percent degradation), please provide estimate of the baseline or clarify.</p> <p>3) Please ensure consistency between Table E in the CEO endorsement, logical framework in ProDoc, descriptive text in both documents, and the TT for all estimates of GEBs.</p> <p>4) Ensure consistency between the logical framework in main text of ProDoc and Attachment 1 of Appendix 1 of the same document. Clarify why the logical framework is showing delivery of total GHG benefits at project mid-term with no change at project end; and ensure that biodiversity benefits highlighted in the TT are consistent in both versions of the logical framework (under output 2.2).</p> <p>March 30, 2017</p> <p>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/a	
	8. Is the project coordinated with	January 6, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>Coordination with other initiatives is highlighted, especially in relation to the base context. However, it is not clear how such coordination will maximize the potential for transformational change in the semi-arid areas of Tanzania. Please clarify how this project will strengthen coordination to influence such change, especially given the emphasis on FFS and other innovative approaches for scaling-up.</p> <p>March 30, 2017</p> <p>Coordination is now clarified, especially in relation to existing and planned initiatives.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>January 6, 2017</p> <p>Yes, a budgeted M&E plan is included.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>January 6, 2017</p> <p>Yes, the KM plan is clearly articulated, including links to the cross-cutting regional "hub" project.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	January 6, 2017 Please check and confirm that there no specific comments for Tanzania at PFD stage.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	January 6, 2017 Please check and confirm that there no specific comments for Tanzania at PFD stage.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	January 6, 2017 Please check and confirm that there no specific comments for Tanzania at PFD stage.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	January 6, 2017 No, the project is not yet recommended. Please address all comments and issues raised in this review. May 30, 2017 All GEF Secretariat comments on the initial submission have been addressed. However, the re-submitted project document also received	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		comments from one Council member during the 4-week notification period, which has now been addressed by the agency. The project is now technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	January 09, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 30, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 30, 2017	