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

GEF ID:	**9400**		
Country/Region:	**Tanzania**		
Project Title:	**Safeguarding Zanzibar's Forest and Coastal Habitats for Multiple Benefits**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5670 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3; CCM-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$106,000**	Project Grant:	**$5,181,671**
Co-financing:	**$23,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$28,181,671**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Paul Harrison**

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]	3-8-16 The project is mostly about the conservation of forests in Protected Areas, and Community Managed Forest Areas (COFMAs). This project fits well with BD-1 Program 1 and CC-2 Program 4, and much less with LD-2. This needs to be fixed or LD funding removed from the project. There is no reference to the	

[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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		appropriate Aichi targets. 6-2-16 In Table F. there is reference to 86,000 ha. as project target. In the results framework, there are various figures. Please explain what accounts for the 83,600 ha. Thanks. 9-1-16 Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	3-8-16 Please clearly identify the links between the GEF programs mentioned in the project with the corresponding NBSAP, NAMA and NAP (Note: the GEF did not find references of Zanzibar in the NAP priority areas). 6-2-16 The project is making use of GEF CCM $1.2M. Is this project aligned with the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs)? 9-1-16 Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	3-8-16 The drivers of environmental	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	degradation are detailed mainly for biodiversity and forests. However, the identification of drivers of land degradation for agriculture or agroforestry is not very clear. Please address the financial and ecological sustainability of the network of Protected Areas, wildlife reserves and COFMAs being targeted by the project. What Government institution will be responsible to cover the recurrent cost of the investments in these areas? In relation to the COFMAs, what are the actual activities that would allow local communities to sustain themselves? (NTFPs and Ecotourism will provide marginal income at best). Please elaborate on the financial revenues obtained by local communities thank to the intervention of the HIMA project with a total budget of $23 million. What is the experience so far with the expansion of the COFMAs model to 45 sites across Zanzibar? 6-2-16 Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	3-11-16 Please clearly state the baseline projects for the two main interventions on the ground: The Network of Protected Areas and	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		COFMAs. Once these are listed, please elaborate on how the GEF project will be used incrementally to deliver Global Environment Benefits. 6-2-16 Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	3-8-16 Component 1. i) Is there effective landscape planning and an inter-ministerial planning platform worth the investments listed under output 1.1.1.?ii) It is not clear why the project wants to use STAR resources for the development and implementation of a Zanzibar-BSAP. Isn't Zanzibar included in Tanzania's NBSAP? iii) Output 1.1.3 should be part of component 2.,iv) The GEF does not support national terrestrial inventories, v) Outputs 1.1.5 and 6 are very vague making difficult to visualize the tangible and measurable results on the ground, vi) It is not clear why output 1.1.4 is not part of Tanzania's IWT program. This Component should relate to the network of PAs and COFMAs, rather than the entire spectrum of investments in the realm of policies, laws and institutions. Component 2. i) The budget is	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		insufficient to cover the expenses associated with improving management effectiveness of the network of PAs, wildlife reserves and COFMAs. It is necessary to increase the budget (using $ resources from Component 1?) or reduce the number of target sites. ii) The GEF does not support BD surveys. Proposed surveys should be carried out with co-financing (U. California listed as stakeholder but not as a co-financier). Iii) Clearly state the operational definition of "restoration" of forests and wetlands. iii) Please provide a map with the location of the target areas, iv.) What is the land tenure situation of these COFMAs? Please clarify the capacity of COFMAs to conserve forests in perpetuity. Please provide the reference of a seminal article/publication on COFMAs to better understand their pros and cons. v) Output 2.1.7 is vague and appears to be an afterthought. This output in itself would consume a significant fraction of the resources allocated to the component. Component 3. i) The component is a real mix bag of activities without a clear geographic or thematic focus. There is reference to afforestation (not funded by the GEF), restoration	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		and rehabilitation (difference?), establishment of woodlots, charcoal production, climate smart agriculture, NTFPs and ecotourism. The Agency should consider concentrating activities on PAs under Component 1 and on COFMAs under component 2. This would facilitate the justification for the use of CCM resources, including the estimates of carbon benefits. The clearing of forests for the production of fuel wood and charcoal appears to be the main threat to the forests of Zanzibar. Nevertheless, solutions to this threat are only mentioned tangentially under component 3 when making reference to "afforestation" (not paid by the GEF) and "wood-fuel trading and sustainable charcoal production". Please elaborate on how this project will address this imminent threat. Risks. The PIF needs to better elaborate on the risks associated with investments in PAs and COFMAs, as there are clear risks associated with for instance encroachment, land tenure, the capacity to enforce the law, mountain pressures for the conversion of forests to fuel wood, and charcoal	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		6-2-16 In Table B. please disaggregate the $ investment in Component 2 for outcomes 2.1 and 2.2 9-1-16 Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	3-11-16 The main beneficiaries of this project are the communities making use of the COFMAs. Cleared	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	3-8-16 As of today, Tanzania has sufficient STAR resources to cover this $7.8M project. Nevertheless, Tanzania has reached the SFM ceiling stipulated in the GEF 6 strategy, so it cannot access the $2.69M requested for this project. The Agency may want to resubmit the PIF as a MFA project without the SFM incentive. As this is mostly about forests, the Agency may want to consider a BD-CCM project only. Co-financing: Are the co-financiers	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		listed on Table C aware that they are listed in this PIF with an associated amount in cash or Grants? 6-2-16 Cleared	
	• 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?	3-11-16 No. Please address issues listed under 1,2,3,4,5, and 7. Thanks. 6-2-16 No. Please address issues under 1,2 and 5. Thanks. 9-4-16 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
Review Date	Review	March 11, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 02, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 04, 2016	

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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[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.