



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

GEF ID:	9524		
Country/Region:	Tanzania		
Project Title:	Supporting the implementation of integrated ecosystem management approach for landscape restoration and biodiversity conservation in Tanzania		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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):	BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$190,000	Project Grant:	\$11,205,872
Co-financing:	\$64,283,501	Total Project Cost:	\$75,679,373
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Asha Bobb-Semple	Agency Contact Person:	Marieta Sakalian,

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)?				
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>July 1, 2016 UA:</p> <p>The PPG is within the allowed limits and it recommended for CEO approval.</p> <p>The parent PFD was approved by Council June 8, 2016.</p>		
	Review Date	Review		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	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>1/23/2018 ABS:</p> <p>Changes in GEB target (specifically a reduction of the BD target) and Focal Area allocations have been identified in the CEO Endorsement Request (compared to the Program Framework Document of the PFD). Please adjust the focal area allocations, to what was approved under the Program Framework Document and include the justification for the change in the GEB for biodiversity.</p> <p>Please also provide a breakdown of the Focal Area allocations in Table D.</p> <p>5/14/2018 ABS:</p>	<p>5/4/2018:</p> <p>We apologize for not clarifying this well. The respective sections have been rephrased. As result of proposed project 110,000 ha will benefit from supporting natural regeneration using biodiversity reach options. Tables B and E of the CEO endorsement document and the Results Framework have been revised accordingly. Table D includes now a breakdown of the Focal Area allocations</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>1/23/2018 ABS:</p> <p>The focal area objectives, project structure and design are aligned to the overall TRI PFD. However please address the questions below re specific outcomes and outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With such a significant BD investment, please include related indicators and targets for BD-4, Program 9 within Table B and the Program Results Framework. -Please clarify the difference between the baseline maps/activities outlined in Output 1.3.1 and 2.1.1? There have also been a number of baseline projects outlined in the Project Document. Have any of these provided information upon which this project can build? -As written/described, Outputs 1.3.2 and 1.3.3 can merged as Output 1.3.2 is largely an activity that will guide the results of Output 1.3.3 - Table B, Outcome 2.1- Please outline the target hectares for all interventions as well as the target 	<p>5/4/2018:</p> <p>The indicators and targets have been included in the Results Framework under Output 2.1.1:</p> <p>Indicator: ROAM and DATAR assessments undertaken and # of feasible mosaic and wide scale SLR options (including diversity based options to enhance productivity) identified for the three ecosystems and % increase in agrobiodiversity as measured by richness and evenness Target for BD 4: 25% increase in agricultural biodiversity</p> <p>Output 1.3.1 refers to generating estimated areas with restoration potential at national level and to provide relevant information to the government in view of facilitating national commitment to restoration as part of the Bonn Challenge, whereas Output 2.1.1 is about restoration options for selected sites in the targeted ecosystems. We have now rephrased Output 1.3.1. to better reflect this difference.</p> <p>Output 1.3.1. Restoration potential map for Tanzania produced using ROAM and experiences gained from project sites This change has been made in the Project Document, CEO endorsement document and all related appendices.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>sites. If possible please refer to the specific outputs.</p> <p>-What is the tangible result of Output 2.1.4? This effort should be infused across all the outputs that involve engagement with national and local level partners.</p> <p>- Table B, Output 2.2.1 and 2.2.4- please include an target/indicator to reflect the number of beneficiaries (people and households)</p> <p>-Table B, Outcome 2- does not reflect the livelihood, income generating and diversification activities briefly mentioned in the Project description of the Project Document and also outlined in the Sustainability section. Please include, as well as a indicator (s) and/targets for improvements in income.</p> <p>-Project Document, Outcome 2.2- the description is missing. Please include/submit.</p> <p>-Please clarify how Output 2.2.2 and Output 3.2.2 are different and what are the different results that are expected?</p> <p>-Outputs 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 are can be</p>	<p>Output 1.3.1. Restoration potential map for Tanzania produced using ROAM and experiences gained from project sites This change has been made in the Project Document, CEO endorsement document and all related appendices.</p> <p>Baseline projects outlined in the project have been reviewed and relevant information gathered. An overview of ongoing relevant baseline projects and their incremental value to the proposed project is provided in Annex 6. The National Tree Planting and Management Strategy (VPO, 2017-2030), was used as a major stepping stone in developing the proposal as it is the major national framework document for restoration initiatives in Tanzania.</p> <p>We had considered 1.3.2. (as technical output the project plans to accomplish) and 1.3.3 (an output dependent on government decision to determine the area of land to be put under restoration). As per the suggestion of the reviewers, we have now merged the two outputs into one. And output 1.3.2. is rephrased as:</p> <p>Output 1.3.2. At least 1 million ha is proposed to be included in Tanzania's commitment to the Bonn Challenge</p> <p>This change has been made in the Project document, CEO Endorsement Document and</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>merged to produce one result, as Output 3.3.1 as written is an activity. Please clarify what is meant by-knowledge base and support mechanisms for financing SLR initiatives-? Will the guidance and tools that will be produced under Output 3.3.1 contribute to the Knowledge base?</p> <p>-Table B-Output 3.3.3, please provide an indicator for the business cases. What is the target number? What is the plan for approaching the private sector in order to secure potential investment and or partnership? Will project proposals/bankable projects also be prepared?</p> <p>- Gender disaggregated data/assessment is mentioned as a budgeted item, but is not clearly reflected in the project description. Please include.</p> <p>-In the Program Results Framework, please include targets (where possible, estimates if necessary) for Outputs 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.3.2, 1.3.3 as well as for Outcome 3.</p> <p>5/14/2018 ABS: Cleared</p>	<p>all related appendices.</p> <p>A suggested, the target hectares have been listed in Table B under 2.1. In the ProDoc Table 2 (page 39) and also in the log frame we have indicated that a total of 110,00 ha will be put under SLR transition, of which 5,000 ha will put under afforestation and reforestation activities, 7,755 ha of forestlands will see significant reduction in deforestation, 5,000 ha will put under sustainable land management and climate smart agriculture while the remaining 87,245 ha will be put under complementary improved resource management practices (e.g. assisted natural regeneration, regulated grazing, fire control). As the project will be implemented in 11 districts, it will be difficult to provide detailed figures for each of the project sites in advance as this will be determined by the restoration opportunities assessment to be undertaken in each pilot site.</p> <p>We thank the reviewers for the suggestion. Now Output 2.1.4 has been removed and output 2.1.3. has been rephrased as follows:</p> <p>Output 2.1.3. Using gender balanced approach, communities receive technical assistance required to adopt SLR practices, and extension workers supported to train women.</p> <p>The revision has been made in the relevant sections of the ProDoc. and all related</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>appendices.</p> <p>The format of Table B of CEO Endorsement document does not make provisions for detailed listing of all targets. Please kindly refer to the project logframe. Under output 2.2.1, it is planned that at least 500 government experts, and 1100 community members and 110 local administrators and community leader in 11 districts will be trained in SLR practices. The targets for 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 are organizing respectively 48 events, and a minimum of 16 cross site visits. Concerning the comment on Output 2.2.3 please kindly note that as indicated in the Table B of the CEO Endorsement Document and the logframe only 3 outputs are envisaged under Outcome 2.</p> <p>The target set by the project (Output 2.1.3) is to engage in various activities of the project and benefit 100,000 households. This is indicated in the Results framework. But the specific targets in certain level of increase in income were not set as the specific restoration options that are economical and best fit to the location at project site level are yet to be defined. We cannot at this stage indicate the specific number of beneficiaries that will be involved in income generating activities and by how much their income would increase. This would happen after the first year when we have detailed baseline data on household income level at project sites levels.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>With apologies, descriptions of Outcome 2.2 and the planned outputs under this outcome are now included in the ProDoc, please see paragraphs 278-282.</p> <p>Output 2.2.2. is about outreach and awareness raising work at project sites/community level whereas Output 3.2.2 is designed for tailoring SLR information to national and external audiences. The two outputs differ in their scope, target audiences, messages and means of reaching out. Please kindly refer to the description of the outcome in the Project Document and specific targets in the Results Framework.</p> <p>Based on the reviewers' comments, we have now rephrased output 3.3.1 and merged 3.3.2 and 3.3.3. The rephrased outputs are:</p> <p>3.3.1. Guidance and tools produced to strengthen existing public and private financing structures to support SLR initiatives</p> <p>3.3.2. Based on knowledge gained from assessing existing financing structures, Three business cases developed to mobilise support for SLR initiatives in the three ecosystems</p> <p>The knowledge base refers to the findings of the assessment on existing public and private financing systems to fund SLR initiative in Tanzania. Support mechanism is used to indicate existing structures (funding system in Tanzania) to finance SLR initiatives in the</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>country. Comment well received. At least three business cases and bankable proposals (one each for the three ecosystems) by involving and targeting the private sector at least those active in the project areas.</p> <p>The comment is again well received. We have further developed the section that describes the gender aspects. Please see para 351 of Project Document and Table 6 where gender mainstreaming activities and targets are described</p> <p>For Output 1.1.2, there will be one national and 11 district level planning platforms (a total of 12) established and made operational.</p> <p>For Output 1.1.3, we plan to produce at least two policy briefs, one on gaps and one on options.</p> <p>Output 1.3.2. and 1.3.3. have been merged into one. Targets for these outputs have now been included in the Results Framework</p>
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>1/23/2018 ABS: Not fully. -Please justify the need for the project vehicle if the project will also provide 11 motor cycles?</p>	<p>5/4/2018: UN Environment has consulted with the reviewer on this matter and the documentation has been amended accordingly, please see budget notes in Appendix 1. The national and district project managers who</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- Please confirm whether or not all Project Managers (National and District) and technical experts will be newly recruited local staff/consultants for the duration of the project only?</p> <p>-Note that motor vehicle costs and government staff costs are not eligible Project Management costs. Please adjust the budget accordingly. Please refer to Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy- GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01.</p> <p>5/14/2018 ABS:</p> <p>The budget has been amended and only a portion of the costs to cover motorcycle purchase remains under project management costs. Following upstream discussion with the Agency, this has been justified and accepted in order not to further burden the budget available for project implementation of the project components.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>will spend full time in this project will be recruited for the project for the period of the project duration. Please refer to Appendix 11 Terms of Reference were tasks and respective skills for each staff and consultant to be hired are described. The project will be also supported by the local district offices that are mandated to work on landscape restoration. Regarding the vehicle costs, please refer to Appendix 1 "Reconciliation between GEF Activity Based Budget and UN Environment Budget Line (GEF Funds Only US\$) – Consolidated" where a footnote has been added referring to the comment. No government staff time will be charged to the project. As indicated project Director and Accountant will be covered by co-financing.</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</p>	<p>1/23/2018 ABS:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>5/14/2018 ABS:</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>1/23/2018 ABS:</p> <p>Yes, however please address the following:</p> <p>-Letters have been provided for the districts of Mpimbwe and Wanging'ombe however these contributions have not been captured in Table C. Please include</p> <p>-Please also correct the co-financing letter from the District of Kibindo as the total amount differs from that indicated in Table C.</p> <p>5/14/2018 ABS: Cleared</p>	<p>5/4/2018:</p> <p>The Letter provided by Wanging'ombe District Council, Njombe Region was listed in Table C of CEO endorsement document as provided by Njombe District Council. Also the letter provided by Mpimbwe District Council, Mpanda-Katavi was listed as provided by Mpanda-Katavi District Council. These inconsistencies have been corrected now. The correct total amount for Kibondo District letter is \$4,000,000 as per committed amounts per component. By mistake total figure was listed as \$5,000,000. In addition, we have noticed that the letter from Wanging'ombe commits TShs 4,000,000(\$1,768 as co-financing not \$4,000,000. The co-financing amounts have been revised accordingly in the Project Document and CEO Endorsement document to reflect this.</p>
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>1/23/2018 ABS:</p> <p>-CCM and SFM TT- please ensure the emissions avoided figures are the same for direct and indirect.</p> <p>-LD GEBs and Social Benefits- please provide estimates where possible for the missing information. These can be confirmed at a later stage.</p>	<p>5/14/2018:</p> <p>This has been done accordingly.</p> <p>We cannot at this stage indicate the specific number of beneficiaries that will be involved in income generating activities and by how much their income would increase. This would happen after the first year when we have detailed baseline data on household income level at project sites levels.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		5/14/2018 ABS: Cleared	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	1/23/2018 ABS: N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	1/23/2018 ABS: We note the alignment with Tanzania's national plans and initiatives as we all as international commitments. Please indicate how the project will contribute to the LDN target setting process as Tanzania has volunteered to set LDN targets. 5/14/2018 ABS: Cleared	Tanzania is working to address the challenges of land degradation. The project will provide actual and field based data to inform what can be achieved in this regard. Statements describing how the project would contribute to setting targets and executing activities to achieve LDN targets are now included in papa 242.
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	1/23/2018 ABS: Yes	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	1/23/2018 ABS: Yes Component 3 addresses knowledge and learning and additional information has been outlined under the relevant section in the CEO ER.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		

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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEFSEC 	1/23/2018 ABS: No specific comments for Tanzania.	5/14/2018: Response to comments are now included in the CEO Endorsement package.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAP 	1/23/2018 ABS: Please address the PFD level comments (GEF ID#9264) submitted by STAP, which are relevant to the project. 5/16/2018 ABS: Cleared.	5/14/2018: Response to comments included in the CEO Endorsement package.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEF Council 	1/23/2018 ABS: Please address the PFD level comments (GEF ID#9264) submitted by the GEF Council which are relevant to the project. 5/16/2018 ABS: Cleared	5/14/2018: Response to comments included in the CEO Endorsement package. 5/16/2018 ABS: Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convention Secretariat 	N/A	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	1/23/2018 ABS: Not at this time. Please address the comments above. In addition the OFP Endorsement Letter submitted is dated July 29, 2015. Is there a more recent version available?	5/14/2018: Please refer to responses above. The endorsement letter was signed at the PFD submission stage. As per the GEF policy re-endorsement of the CEO Endorsement document is not a requirement.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		5/14/2018 ABS: Noted. All comments have been addressed. The project is recommended for clearance and circulation to the Council.	
Review Date	Review	January 23, 2018	May 04, 2018
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 16, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		