



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

GEF ID:	8021		
Country/Region:	Zambia		
Project Title:	Zambia Lake Tanganyika Basin Sustainable Development Project		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$7,813,698
Co-financing:	\$26,562,630	Total Project Cost:	\$34,576,328
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Siham Mohamed Ahmed

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	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 March 11, 2015 A new letter of endorsement is available with the revised amounts. Addressed.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes. However, please remember that resources from only two focal areas are	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		necessary to trigger the SFM program incentive. You have to measure the complexity to develop a MFA project responding to BD, LD, CCM, and SFM strategies. You may either use only STAR resources from two focal areas or use the adjustment mechanism (up to \$2 million). February 27, 2015 Your choice. Addressed.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	The project is triggering \$1.5 million from the SFM program. Please, be aware that this project may trigger up to \$2.925 million from the SFM program (two dollars from STAR for one dollar of SFM). Please explain if you discuss this point with Zambia. Is there any reason to do without this extra leverage \$1.425 million? February 27, 2015 Point taken. The point will be considered as addressed, only when a letter of endorsement will have been submitted. March 11, 2015 A new letter of endorsement is available with the revised amounts. Addressed.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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>No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, refer to the GEF6 strategy and the expected outcomes for the BD4 Program 9 on mainstreaming. In the table B, the proposed outcome 1.2 "improvement management of existing protected areas" fits with a different BD program. - The activities related to Climate Change Mitigation are too vague. Please refer to the GEF6 CC Strategy. The CC2 Program 4 aims to promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks in forest, and other land-use, and support climate smart agriculture. Depending on the baseline activities, you may focus the resources on mitigation actions targeting forest depletion drivers, to provide carbon benefits and other social and environmental benefits, or to focus on agricultural practices that respond to land degradation issues, enhance soil quality, and reduce agro-based GHG emissions. <p>March 4, 2015 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>The main elements of the development and agriculture agenda are mentioned, as well as the UNCCD NAP, UNCBD NBSAP, and NAPA. Please, complete with the UNFCCC documents and strategies (NC and NAMA).</p> <p>March 4, 2015 Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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>No. Please, revise and shorten the information in the pages 5-9. Please include a more systemic analysis of the problems, barriers, and obstacles, and how the baseline project is addressing them. Identify the drivers the project is targetting, and explain the reasoning. It will be a way to focus on a smaller number of outcomes and outputs and propose a more focused project.</p> <p>A rapid appraisal of existing literature and projects in the area may help to develop better evidence based solutions for climate smart agriculture, sustainable forest management, and land restoration.</p> <p>March 4, 2015 Addressed. During project development, please look at Kalaba et al. (2013) in Forest Ecology and Management, Kalaba et al in (2013) in Population and Environment; Kalaba et al. (2010) in Environmental Science and Engineering.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>No.</p> <p>There is no project objective in the table B. This missing information may reflect a deeper issue of project reasoning. We have actually difficulties to capture the logical reasoning from the problem analysis to the result framework. There is a (too) long list of outcomes and outputs without a robust justification.</p> <p>Each outcome should be related to a series of outputs. It is not the case with</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>11 outcomes and 16 outputs. Please, revise the reasoning and provide a more focused result framework where each outcome is clearly related to one or several outputs. Each component should include a limited number of outcome.</p> <p>Revise the formulation of outcomes and outputs. See the GEF guidelines. The outcomes should reflect the effects, the consequences of outputs.</p> <p>Most of the outputs are not correctly formulated or quantified. The outputs should reflect the products, capital goods and services which result from an intervention. They should reflect tangible and quantifiable results (including the number of hectares, or the number of plans, or documents, or training sessions, etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Outcome 1.2 (improved management of existing protected areas) seems out of the context. - 1.4: Please justify how the GEF can be involved in plantations of exotic species. Describe the safeguards deployed to avoid any invasive risk. - Component 2: output 2.1: We did not find the rationale or a minimum of information for this output (feasibility, costs, sustainability, partners, etc). - Component 3: if this component includes progress reports, mid-term and 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>final evaluation, monitoring activities, etc. Can you explain what the project management costs will include? Please, confirm there is no cofinancing for project management costs. Please, explain the role of the cofinancing (\$2.785 million) and the use of the GEF resources (\$1.26 million) for this outreach and monitoring component. It seems high.</p> <p>March 4, 2015 Thanks for the pruning and reformulation. Please, clarify the nature of activities behind the outputs 2.2.3., 3.1.1.</p> <p>March 11, 2015 Cleared.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>No. It is one point to claim the principle of multiple environmental benefits, but a minimum of information is needed to describe and quantify them. Please, note that a map with the coverage of main natural and productive landscapes will be useful.</p> <p>- The number of ha of productive landscape under SLM is an acceptable proxy under the LD strategy. However, the number of ha of forests under protection or sustainable management is needed, as well as an estimation of carbon benefits. A rough estimation is acceptable at PIF level. You will have to provide more accurate values at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>- From a CCM perspective, you have to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>estimate the carbon stocks that will be protected and/or enhanced in forests, as well the reduced agro-based GHG emissions.</p> <p>- Additional benefits are welcome (Tanganyika Lake water quality, fish populations), but they cannot be the main targets of this SFM project.</p> <p>March 4, 2015 Addressed.</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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	In the PPG, please include a stakeholder analysis.	
	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>Not enough.</p> <p>Risk analysis is a key step of project management cycle. A minimum of identified risks is expected at PIF level and a comprehensive risk assessment is expected at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Please, revise. We suggest to include a table to identify the risks, rate them, and propose measures.</p> <p>March 4, 2015 Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>A list of initiatives and projects is included. However, the complementarities of these initiatives and projects, as well as the way to coordinate are not addressed. Please, be more specific, notably with the on-going GEF IW projects.</p> <p>There is a long experience of Farmer Field School approach in Eastern and Southern Africa. Please explain how this project will collaborate with existing FFS initiatives.</p> <p>March 4, 2015 Addressed. During PPG, please develop coordination mechanisms.</p>	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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>The project has to be completely revised to respond to these criteria.</p> <p>March 4, 2015 Addressed.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>No.</p> <p>It should be part of the project reasoning: explain the role of cofinancing in each component and use this information to justify the added value of the GEF for the proposed outcomes and outputs. A better formulation of outcomes and outputs will help to better understand the cost for value.</p> <p>February 27, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please check the coherence of numbers in the different tables (A, B, C, and D): based on the table D, the project grant is \$8,013,698. If you confirm this value, please correct the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the fee calculation in the "Part I-Project information" (9.5% of the project grant); - the total and the breakdown of resources per focal area in the table A; - the total project costs in the table B (and then, the breakdown); - Please check the table A, the total should reflect the breakdown of resources used in the project (table B). The fees should not be included. <p>March 4, 2015 Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	\$26.3 million is provided in cofinancing with a loan, meaning a cofinancing ratio of 1:3.6. It is relatively low in regards to the challenges. Could it be possible to include cofinancing from the government, the beneficiaries, and other partners? March 4, 2015 Co-financing has been better explained. During PPG, please identify sources of parallel financing that will help to achieve the project objectives.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	under 5%, but please refer to the item 7. March 4, 2015 Addressed.	
	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?	Please, revise: - a PPG of \$200,000 is in the norm of a GEF project financing under \$10 million. - The amount of \$350,000 is mentioned in the first line; - The PPG Agency fee cannot be \$707,535 (see first lines); - We may wonder why \$50,000 from LD and CC and \$100,000 from SFM (while no resources from BD are used). \$50,000 from each focal area and the SFM program may be more relevant. - The Agency fee calculation is wrong for the three lines, as well as the sub-totals and final total. March 4, 2015 Addressed.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	reflows included?		
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>No, the PIF cannot be recommended for clearance. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>March 4, 2015 The PIF cannot be recommended yet. However, thanks for the revised package, the project has considerably improved. Minor issues are still pending (see 7). Other issues will be considered at CEO endorsement (6, 17). Please also provide a revised letter of endorsement (cell 3).</p> <p>March 11, 2015 All points have been addressed. The PIF is technically cleared.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	At CEO endorsement, please include the following elements:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include science based evidences to justify the nature of interventions (see the references provided in the cell 7, especially from Kabala). - Include a stakeholder analysis before defining the project implementation arrangements. - Develop the coordination mechanisms with other initiatives and projects. - Include a comprehensive risk analysis. - Confirm the cofinancing. Identify other sources of parallel financing. - Develop a Monitoring and Assessment Plan to measure the Global Environment Benefits. - Confirm the carbon value. - Confirm the area under SLM and SFM. - Provide mapped information. 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	January 30, 2015	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 04, 2015	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 11, 2015	

* **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.**