



---

## Building resilience through sustainable land management and climate change adaptation in Dodoma

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10418

**Countries**

Tanzania

**Project Title**

Building resilience through sustainable land management and climate change adaptation in Dodoma

**GEF Agency(ies)**

AfDB

**Agency ID**

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**

Aloke Barnwal

## PIF

## Part I – Project Informatic

### Focal area elements

#### 1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project is aligned with LDCF programming strategy and will directly contribute to CCA Objective 1 and CCA Objective 2. The project is also aligned with Land Degradation focal area and will contribute to sustainable land management in Tanzania.

The multi-trust fund of LD focal area and LDCF complements in a very meaningful way to improve resilience and avoid land degradation of rapidly expanding Dodoma city. The project will be unique to combine resilience and land degradation issues in an urban environment.

##### Agency Response

#### Indicative project/program description summary

#### 2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project components are interconnected and complementary to achieve the objectives of this multi-trust fund project. It adopts an integrated and comprehensive approach to improve resilience and land management of Dodoma Metropolitan Area including surrounding rural areas. It focuses on strengthening the city Master Plan, build institutional capacity on sustainable land management in the target landscape and implement resilience and land management solutions. The activities seem appropriate to contribute to targeted core indicators.

Nov 8: The outcome statement in the table is inconsistent with the outcome statement in the text in the alternate scenario section. Please revised. The one in alternate scenario section reads better.

**Agency Response** AfDB, 8 November 2019: The outcome statement in the table has been harmonized with the outcome statement in the alternate scenario section.

## Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Ver 1.0- The co-financing is adequately documented and relevant for the project. It is in line with GEF co-financing policy and guidelines.

Ver 2.0- The co-financing is on a very higher side nearly 1:40. The agency is requested to review the co-financing number and include only relevant co-financing with this project.

Nov 8: No more comments

### Agency Response

**AfDB, 8 November 2019:** The co-financing number was reviewed and it was found that it would be difficult to reduce this number. A sizeable portion of the AfDB investment will cover Component 1 related activities (construction works for the ring-road) for a total amount of 165 million USD while a lesser amount will cover Component 2 (Development of related urban/rural roads leading to key social services, markets, Road-Side Stops; Community Water Sources, Strengthening of health Centers, Provide Enterprise Development Assistance to women and youth), Component 3 (Institutional Support and Capacity Building for 8.2 million USD) and Component 4 (Project Management for 3 million USD). All these components will benefit from the GEF co-financed activities. This number will be refined during the PPG phase.

## GEF Resource Availability

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The LDCF fund is in line with the resources available.

The LD focal area fund is used based on the marginal adjustment allowed for Tanzania.

### Agency Response

## The STAR allocation?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

LD STAR fund is proposed for this project using the marginal adjustment.

### Agency Response

## The focal area allocation?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please see above

### **Agency Response**

#### **The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

##### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The budget is in line with LDCF funds available for Tanzania.

### **Agency Response**

#### **The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

##### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

### **Agency Response**

#### **Focal area set-aside?**

##### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Ver 1.0 The proposed PIF includes funding from Land Degradation focal area. It appears that the country has already used its Land Degradation STAR allocated. The agency is requested to consult the OFP and verify if there is STAR available for this MTF project using the marginal adjustment. If using the marginal adjustment, please specify the focal area.

Ver 2.0 No more comments.

**Agency Response** AfDB, 6 November 2019: Upon consultation with the OFP from Tanzania, the AfDB can confirm that there are STAR resources available for this MTF for land degradation activities.

### **Impact Program Incentive?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

### **Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes

## Agency Response

### Core indicators

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Ver 2.0 - The agency needs to clarify if the land related targets are mutually exclusive for LD and for LDCF resources. It seems there is double counting of the hectares of land management under this project.

Nov 8: No more comments

## Agency Response

### Project/Program taxonomy

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

## Agency Response

## art II – Project Justification

### 1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Comments on Ver 1.0:** It is not clear why the PIF emphasizes on waste and emissions as the core problem instead of climate vulnerability of urban population and land degradation in the city. The section 1 needs to make a much stronger case for climate resilience given that it intends to use LDCF fund. This description is not consistent with the project components which very well focuses on climate risks and vulnerabilities of Dodoma metro areas. The section should outline what are the climate related risks in the metro area related to flooding, increased temperature, depleting water tables, land degradation, informal settlement's vulnerability, urban sprawl, drainage, etc.

The barriers section is very vague not aligned well. Given that this project itself is about climate resilience, it doesn't make sense to have specific climate barriers. Climate barriers are written for general investments but this project is specifically addressing the issue and the barrier section should define why the climate issues are not being tackled effectively in the region.

The section 1 on problems, root cause and barriers need to be revised significantly to justify the LDCF and LD money and also to link with the project components. It should clearly define what specific climate risks the project will tackle.

**Comments on ver 2.0-** The above comments have been addressed. However, the agency is requested to focus on the environmental problems and adaptation challenges under one section and relevant to the project scope linking it with wider regional/national issue. The root cause section needs to elaborate more on systemic drivers of land degradation and climate vulnerability e.g. informal excavation or mining; unsustainable agriculture practices around the region; limited conservation focus; climate variability and extremes; limited alternative livelihood options; lack of sustainability policy focus and integrated approach in the urban area and surrounding landscapes. The barriers section is fine.

Nov 8: The table related to climate profile and impact is too generic and refers to villages. Please summarize it for the DMA region.

#### Agency Response

**AfDB, 05/11/2019:** Additional information has been provided on root causes and adaptation challenges to strengthen the climate rationale with a focus on aspects that are relevant for this particular project which include a description of extreme rainfall patterns and their impacts on the urban water supply (notably the Makutapora well-field which is the sole source of water for the city of Dodoma), households,



livelihoods, infrastructure. Other contributing factors such as urbanization and the construction of building with the integration of climate-related considerations.

Regarding the barriers section, three additional barriers were added that are specific to the implementation of this project. These include the following:

1. Inability to adequately predict future climate risk events:
2. Weak dissemination channels for warnings:
3. Lack of climate, environmental and vulnerability (including adaptive capacity) databases for historical analysis of risks associated with climate variability and change:

In addition, climate barriers have deleted from this section given that the project's objective seeks to address climate resilience in the city of Dodoma.

**AfDB, 8 November 2019:** The global environmental problems, root causes and adaptation challenges section has been revised to include systemic drivers of land degradation and linkages with climate change adaptation. Given its location in a semi-arid agro-ecological zone, Dodoma region (including the capital city of Dodoma) exhibits clear symptoms of land degradation due to a number of biophysical and socioeconomic factors. Explanations were inserted to show how the drivers identified significantly affect the social-environmental connections behind the provision of adequate ecosystem services to support communities' livelihoods and, by extension, the country's economy. Systemic drivers cause changes that may end up negatively and/or positively pressure the balance by the environment and society. A table was also added which lists the various direct and indirect drivers of land degradation identified as part of the as part of the Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting Programme exercise which took place in 2018.

AfDB, 8 November 2019: The table related to climate profile and impact with reference to villages has been deleted. More in depth information on this can be found in the global environmental problems, root causes/systemic drivers and adaptation challenges section of the document.

## 2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Comment on ver 1.0 - The baseline section needs to be more structured and linked with project components and barriers. The first paragraph in the section looks very disconnected with the project strategy. The elaboration on why Dodoma is a strategic city is good. The rapid urban expansion and sprawl due to unplanned urbanization in light of becoming the new capital is also fine. Could be rephrased to remove sole focus on deployment of government employees as the main problem. The 5.5.% growth in the city is very high and above the average urban population growth. Please highlight this important aspect in relation to urban growth in Africa and globally. The systemic pressures do not elaborate on the link with climate change. This is critical to highlight. Seismic activity is important but not much relevant in this project context. It also reads very generic. Same for other pressures listed. They read very generic and not linked with Dodoma city or the surrounding landscape. Climate profile section talks about productive agriculture activity in Dodoma. The context is not clear. There is further reference to crop production in the climate table which is not aligned with the project focus. The evidence from survey of 398 households is not looking strong as the sample size is very small. Was this done as part of the AfDB project? If yes, please refer to that. The reference link provided is not opening as the link is tied to the personal folder of the person who has submitted the PIF. In the baseline- please also describe sustainability related initiatives taken by Dodoma city and sustainability leadership of the Mayor if possible. The AfDB baseline project description should describe clearly how it will complement the GEF investment to strengthen resilience of the city. It reads very standalone currently. Will the GEF project contribute to strengthening the resilience of the ring road and related infrastructure?

Comment on ver 2.0- The above comments have been addressed well. No more comments.

### Agency Response

**AfDB, 05/11/2019:** It was found that the baseline scenario has some incomplete elements that should rather fit under the “root causes and adaptation challenges” section A.1 of the PIF. The baseline scenario was revised with some restructuring of paragraphs and additional information more specific to the project’s scope. The systemic pressures linked to climate change have been further developed in the “root causes, adaptation challenges” section A.1 of the PIF. Additional information was also provided to show how the GEF-LDCF financing will complement the AfDB ring-road baseline project.

For instance, the ring-road project will contribute to the economic and social resilience of millions of beneficiaries, especially women and vulnerable groups, for many decades. The tree-planting component of the GEF-LDCF proposal will further contribute to climate change adaptation as well as the greening of the urban environment. In particular, the list of climate change and green growth-related activities have been included as a sub-component under the Urban Development component of the ring-road project and is expected to be supported with GEF-LDCF funding.

Furthermore, information about relevant ongoing interventions in the country was inserted to show how the GEF-LDCF financing will complement these projects and not duplicate certain activities.

### 3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Ver 1.0:

##### Output 1.1.

It is not clear what is meant by Environmental Assets of the city? Will the project support resilience of environmental assets only and not other built infrastructure such as buildings, roads, etc. The components talk about building standards and drainage systems also and therefore it seems the project's focus is beyond environmental assets. It would be good to assess the vulnerability in a more holistic and integrated perspective covering the entire city by mapping flood plains, settlements, green spaces, water bodies, etc. We suggest to do geo-spatial mapping of the city based on which vulnerability could be assessed and which can inform zoning policies and climate resilience investments as needed.

##### Output 1.2

Support to strengthen the Master Plan is good. However, the proposed sectoral plans seem to take a sectoral and fragmented approach contrary to integration approach promoted under sustainable cities program and also under LDCF. Will these sectoral plans be linked with each other to address climate risks and other systemic challenges more systemically? Also, under component 3, the project proposed development of Water Management Action plan. Will the project support similar plans for other sectors also e.g. transport, waste, energy, etc..

##### Output 1.3

Please elaborate a bit more on what are the specific capacity building areas e.g. institutional coordination, technical capacity to assess climate risks, decision making processes, municipal financing, etc. Currently it reads very shallow.

#### Component 2:

Output 2.1.- The urban-rural interface and land mapping is quite relevant for a city which is expanding fast. It is not clear from the output if the project will support developing a land development and management plan also or will it be limited to land use mapping only.

Output 2.2- Please provide some examples of measures to address the groundwater contamination issue.

Output 2.3. This seems to refer to nature based solutions to improve resilience through plantation, restoration of land and water bodies, conservation of biodiversity. Please elaborate how this is linked to advance gender based equality in the DMA.

Output 2.4 Bee-keeping is totally out of place in this project without links with any other activity. Similarly outputs 2.5 and 2.6 are not clear on their link with this component.

Output 3.1- The focus on building codes and making resilient buildings is good. It would be good to highlight vulnerability of buildings in the problems and barriers section. Given that poorly designed housing makes informal settlement households more vulnerable, this link will also be useful to provide in this output. In the output, it would be good to specify building DESIGN standards and codes that factors in climate risks.

3.2 and 3.3.- Flood management and water management plans seem effective.

3.4- Is there infrastructure already in the city for early warning? It is not clear what exact support will be provided e.g. setting up AWS, early warning models for communication, access to early warning information by urban planners/engineers/people, etc. Please make it a bit more specific.

Finally, Table B indicates this component as investment. However, it seems most of the activities seems to be technical assistance only.

#### **Ver 2.0:**

The alternate livelihood options is fine. However, the agency is requested to keep it more broad rather than focusing only on a specific pilot on bee-keeping.

The output related groundwater contamination is not very clear on how it will contribute to LD related GEBs. Will the activity involve improved land management or will it focus on waste management within cities. e.g. the PIF says hazardous waste collection from households. Will this be supported by LD fund?

Please elaborate on the mining aspect and its nature. Also as a key driver for LD in the region. The output 2.4 in this regard mentions that 70,000 hectares land management will be just achieved through rehabilitating these brownfields. Please elaborate on rehabilitation measures and also how other outputs are relevant to achieve this land management target.

Finally, in the alternate scenario, please describe how the multi-trust fund using LDCF and LD funds will complement each other to produce impacts which could not be achieved through individual siloed efforts. Such description is also important in the additionality/incrementality section.

Nov 8: The agency is requested to make the output 3.5 more consistent with the project component. Green spaces and plantation are proven climate resilience measures for urban resilience. The role of community based enterprises in implementing these solutions is great but that's the delivery model. We suggest to revise it along the following lines:

Output 3.5- Demonstrate nature based solutions for improved urban resilience and alternative livelihood creation through community based enterprises.

In the text- please mention the direct resilience benefit also in addition to alternative livelihoods generation.

## Agency Response

### AfDB, 05/11/2019: Component 1

Output 1.1. has been revised to the following:

#### Output 1.1. Climate Risk and vulnerability mapping for Dodoma City and recommendations for re-zoning, where necessary

- A holistic climate risk and vulnerability mapping for the city will be undertaken in the very early stages of project implementation. The vulnerability mapping will include flood plains, settlements, green spaces, water bodies, etc.).
- The results from the mapping will help to identify the vulnerabilities to critical infrastructure, environmental and urban assets of the city and produce an integrated perspective for identifying urban development policies and areas for future investments to strengthen the sustainability and climate resilience of the DMA. As per the recommendations of the GEF, the project will undertake a geo-spatial mapping of the city using GIS or drones (the selection of technology will be determined during the PPG), upon which the vulnerabilities will be assessed and information used to inform zoning policies and climate resilient investments.
- This output will identify areas that are not suitable for development such as flood plain, seismic fault lines and other vulnerable locations. If there are already informal settlements in such locations, then it would enable to integrate those locations into the master plan. This would enable the DMA to rezone where needed.

Output 1.2 has been revised to the following:

#### Output 1.2: Strengthen the implementation of the new Dodoma City Master Plan by developing integrated sectors plans

- Within the context of the new Dodoma City Master Plan the project will tackle the systemic challenges facing Dodoma. It will support the development of integrated sector plans for urban mobility, water, sanitation, drainage, waste management, energy and communication.
- The development of integrated sector plans will be adjusted to the already experienced and predicted impacts from climate change, for water, sanitation (including waste), drainage, electricity, roads, public transport, housing (including planning of unplanned and informal settlements), green spaces and biodiversity conservation (through integrating biodiversity and ecosystem values into urban planning). This output will guide future planning and enable the prioritization of investments in the DMA.

•The project will develop integrated plans and strategies to tackle rapid urbanization and the corresponding socio-economic and environmental problems in the DMA. Taking into account the rapidly changing demographics of the DMA, the project will promote inclusive and sustainable urban development, through activities such as development of strategies and action plans for water management, affordable housing, green space restoration, public transport management, waste management, energy efficient building construction, street lighting, and sustainable industrial development among others. The plans will aim to strengthen economic growth, promote entrepreneurship, job creation and community development; rehabilitation of the physical environment including construction of climate resilient infrastructure, restoration of degraded land, support design of energy efficient buildings, brownfield redevelopment, preservation and development of natural and cultural heritage, and improved provision of services to the residents of the DMA.

Output 1.3 has been revised to the following:

Output 1.3 Institutional capacity developed to adequately address climate vulnerabilities in communities of the DMA

•The project will aim to strengthen the city's capacity to become more competitive in order to attract new investments including FDI. The project will build the city's capacity for effective institutional coordination with the key stakeholders – particularly with the relevant government ministries and departments (water, natural resources and tourism, works, transport, TANROADS, education, health, housing, University of Dodoma and other academic institutions, NGOs, and various development partners, etc.). It will promote skills development for effective climate risk assessment, urban planning, land management, financial management and reporting, procurement, and improved decision-making processes. In collaboration with regional partners such as the United Cities and Local Governments of Africa (UCLGA) the project will promote innovative methods to improve Dodoma municipal financing. This will benefit not only Dodoma but all other cities and towns across Tanzania and Zanzibar.

•This output will address key barriers to the government's ability to integrate climate-related issues into national and sectoral policies, and to design, implement and enforce policies. This will also strengthen the ability of government institutions to systematically address climate change and land degradation within Tanzania's elaborate institutional policy framework.

**Component 2:** Output 2.1.- The section has been revised to clarify that the output will undertake a land mapping exercise as well as produce a land development and management plan

Output 2.2- This section has been revised to among other include the following:

- Examples of activities that the project and the DMA can engage in to minimize groundwater contamination and pollution could include: i) ensuring that land use plans and regulations protect important water supply aquifers and well fields; ii) support protection legislation and programs; iii) inform and educate residents and businesses about groundwater; iv) consider important aquifers when acquiring open space; v) monitor and inspect important well fields and recharge areas; vi) conduct household hazardous waste collections, and vii) ensure that town facilities practice good pollution prevention. These activities will further be defined during the PPG phase

Output 2.3. – Output 2.5 have been revised. The former outputs have been merged under one output, entitled ‘Output 2.4 Demonstration of alternative income generating activities to alleviate pressures on land and adding to the climate resilience of communities the DMA, through community-based entrepreneurship’. Communities of the DMA have been relying on the forest and land for income generating activities. However, as the project is based around efforts to reduce, and where possible eliminate, the drivers of land degradation, communities need to be provided with alternative income generating opportunities, if the results of the project and the global environmental benefits are to be sustained. Community consultations undertaken during the AfDB baseline project preparation have noted that communities require support to establish alternative income generating activities.

Particularly woman and youths will be encouraged to engaged in these community led initiatives for greening the DMA. Efforts will be undertaken by the project to support the commercialization of these initiatives in the form of community-led enterprises to offer the communities sustainable and alternative income-generating opportunities. These opportunities for created for the communities will cover the full life cycle for greening spaces (e.g. seedlings, nurseries, managing and maintaining green spaces).

### **Component 3:**

The exposure and vulnerability of buildings (including housing) was highlighted and explained in the “root causes and adaptation challenges” section of the PIF. In addition, additional clarification and information was included to further show the relevance of the component’s outputs in relation to certain climate-related challenges. This includes the updating of building standards and codes, improving drainage systems, techniques to increase and preserve the supply of water in the face of climate change and other non-climate contributing factors such as demographic growth. Lastly, additional explanation was provided regarding the relevance of early warning systems as part of this project. There is already some kind of EWS in place however it needs to be improved and operational for effective use.

**AfDB, 08/11/2019:**

Output 2.3 has been revised to more broadly capture the possible activities that could take place under this output. Community consultations will be undertaken during the PPG and possible business opportunities assessed to determine the most suitable activities for community-based enterprise to engage in activities that will support the objectives of the LD targets of the project. Similarly, community-based entrepreneurship activities to support the climate resilience of communities in the DMA to be undertaken under component 3 (output 3.5) will also be more closely assessed during the PPG.

The output on groundwater contamination is not meant to be part of Component 2, but rather contribute to Component 3 'Urban Resilience to Climate Change'. The DMA is solely depended on its groundwater resources (which is described in the PIF) and therefore, as part of the DMA's climate resilience response, needs to ensure that these water resources are protected from contamination and pollution.

It is estimated that 30% of the degraded land in the DMA is from artisanal small-scale mining for building and construction material. As the city is expanding rapidly and the demand for building and construction material high, communities, particularly women and youths, are engaging in these small-scale mining activities as a source of livelihood. These practices are ongoing and will continue until those involved in the practice are provided with alternative income generating opportunities. The impacts of these mining activities are evident and have also been witnessed by the project formulation team. During the PPG the project will be able to assess the full footprint of these activities on the land in the DMA. This assessment will also strengthen the target estimates on GEBs.

Brownfields will be regarded as being an integral part of the overall landscape and as such, the ecological and social functions of the land will be valued and improved to complement parks and natural reserves. The mapping exercise from Output 2.1 will identify the right brownfield sites to be rehabilitated for their potential to also support natural fauna and flora and/or for alternative uses. The activities envisaged can include site cleanup, planting of some sparse vegetation in a way that contributes also to decreasing the risk of flooding and other climate-related risks.

Regarding the rationale behind the multi-trust fund resources for this project, additional information was inserted in the proposed alternative scenario section to show the added value of an integrated approach through this project by using multi-trust fund resources from LDCF and the LD focal area. This clearly shows the holistic advantage of such an approach over activities that are solely land degradation and climate change adaptation challenges in isolation. Given the interdependency between land degradation dynamics and its connection with natural resources management, it will have affect the vulnerability of urban dwellers, their livelihoods, infrastructure and food production systems at large in the face climate change related risks.

The activities around *Green spaces, tree growing and planting on hill ranges, around the city of Dodoma*, have been moved to component 3.

AfDB, 8 November 2019: Output 3.5 was made more consistent with the project component. We have adopted the suggested revision. The direct resilience benefit linked to the generation of alternative livelihoods is linked to the fact that the diversification of sources of income will diminish climate related risks to households' financial, physical and natural capital by spreading it over a wider range of sources of



livelihood. This activity will therefore lessen the possible impacts from climate change and increase the capacity of households to rebound. All in all, it will increase their adaptive capacity and decrease their vulnerability to climate risks.

#### 4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the project is aligned with LDCF and LD focal area.

**Agency Response AfDB, 05/11/2019:** Additional information was provided to show that the project aligns with CCA 1. The project aligns with CCA Objective 1 through the implementation of nature based solutions to improve the drainage capacity of the ring-road thus reducing the risk of flooding, strengthening the early warning system. It will contribute to increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas, strengthen adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses, successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas and enhanced enabling environment to support adaptation related technology transfer.

#### 5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Ver 1.0

The table is useful, especially the column on baseline and gaps which provides the incremental cost reasoning well. Few comments:

- Please see the if the adaptation cost column is consistent with the components budget in table B.

The last row, under baseline, it says the ring road project will not look into the resilience results of LDCF project. It is not clear what is meant here. Need to provide here what the baseline or co-finance project will do. Given that resilience is core to AfDB's strategy, it reads quite contrary that the baseline project will not focus on adaptation related knowledge. I suggest rephrasing it in a way which is more positive and complementary.

Ver 2.0

Please provide a rationale for the multi-trust fund for this project linking the LD and adaptation benefits and link it with the additionality argument.

Nov 8: No more comments

## Agency Response

**AfDB, 05/11/2019:** The adaptation cost column has been revised to be consistent with Table B.

Component 4. Effectiveness of the outputs assessed, experience documented, and knowledge management, for the baseline, has been revised to the following:

There is substantial lack of coordination and communication between sectoral ministries and agencies for adequate knowledge generation and management.

TANROADS will be responsible for the overall implementation, administration, and enforcement of the recommendations of the ESIA. An assessment of their capacity revealed that most safeguard staff have considerable exposure to the Bank Group's Safeguard Requirements. However, for the daily monitoring aspects, the project design has allowed for training and capacity enhancement for staff in Dodoma to ensure that: (a) effective coordinating and implementation of the ESMP is done; and (b) ensure that performance of environmental controls and proposed mitigation measures are implemented.

At national level, the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) is the main agency responsible for oversight and ensuring that development projects carried out in Tanzania adequately address environmental and social issues during the lifetime of the project. TANROADS will continue to engage with NEMC to ensure that there will be an independent evaluator to carry out compliance monitoring to

address any claims raised by members of the community, Community Based Organizations, or Non-Governmental Organizations on the negative aspects of the project.

The monitoring and evaluation framework of the Dodoma ring-road project will monitor and evaluate among other, the socio-economic impact of the project. However, it does not include a tailored and effective M&E system to adequately monitor and evaluate achieved sustainable land, climate change adaptation and resilience benefits by the project, as well as, negative impacts as a result of the influx in populations expected, due to better and more integrated national and regional road networks. The existing M&E framework of the baseline investment would also not sufficiently monitor, evaluate and report on progress and achievements from the GEF-LDCF Project. In addition, the baseline project, does not include, knowledge generation and sharing for better coordination of sustainability initiatives.

**AfDB, 8 November 2019:** Thank you for the comment. A rationale for the multi-trust fund approach for this project linking LD and adaptation benefits has been provided as part of the incremental and additionality argument. The GEF financing will complement the AfDB baseline project by supporting the city of Dodoma with the restoration of degraded urban land, sustainable land management that is climate sensitive. This will include reforestation of the Dodoma city hill ranges, along the City Outer Ring Road, and other city roads, avenues and major highways, strengthening the capacity of the City to develop alternative or sustainable income generating activities for artisanal miners, developing an integrated water supply and sanitation master plan, and undertaking drainage system improvements to control rain water runoff and soil erosion all the while taking into account the potential climate risks that might affect urban dwellers, their livelihoods, infrastructure and productive landscapes.

## **6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Ver 1.0- The LD targets are very small and it would be good to have a more detailed cost estimated of costs per hectare. (refer to Ulrich's comments)

Ver 2.0- Yes. the revised targets are reasonable and achievable. The agency is requested to review the consistency of the land management related targets in the project.

Nov 8: No more comments

### Agency Response

**AfDB, 05/11/2019:** Based on preliminary discussion with national stakeholders, the targets for LD have been revised. The project will now restore 70,000 ha of agricultural land under the project. Further GEBs and co-benefits are detailed in the relevant section of the PIF.

AfDB, 08/11/2019: The LD related targets of the projects have been revised to avoid the possibility of double-counting. While the project activities will made contributions to the restoration of degraded land agricultural land (indicator 3.1) , it makes a stronger contribution to 'area of land under sustainable land management (indicator 4.3). Section 6 of the PIF has been updated accordingly.

## 7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Ver 1.0- The section does not really respond to the question regarding innovation, sustainability and scalability of the project. Need to rewrite this section.

Ver 2.0- The revised version is fine. No more comments.

**Agency Response AfDB, 05/11/2019:** The section has been revised. Kindly see the relevant section of the PIF

## Project/Program Map and Coordinates

### Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

yes

## Agency Response

### Stakeholders

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Stakeholder engagement is adequately documented.

## Agency Response

### Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Ver 1.0 The proposed activities do not link with the components proposed in the PIF e.g. reduction in energy demand and renewable energy; low emissions zone, green mobility, etc. No reference of these in the PIF. Need to improve the section. Also need to elaborate how? Just intent will not be sufficient in the PIF.

Ver 2.0 Women as beneficiary is elaborate better now. Please also add if women will benefit from integrated land use planning and nature based solutions that the project will focus on. Also, will women be involved in decision making and planning and any other capacity building activities of the project. Please add a bit more details on these lines.

Nov 8: No more comments

### Agency Response

**AfDB, 05/11/2019:** The majority of those involved in the informal mining activities in Dodoma are woman and youths, but mainly woman. These informal mining activities are ongoing this will not be stopped until these groups have alternative income generating opportunities. By addressing these problems, we are also helping these women. The project will support the establishment of community-based enterprises as a strategy to minimize land degradation, restore degraded land and contribution to strengthening the resilience of the land.

**AfDB, 08/11/2019:** The project interventions will be designed to promote gender equality throughout the scope of the project. Woman and youth will be promoted to strongly benefit from integrated land use planning and the nature based solutions promoted by this project. This includes the involvement of woman in decision-making and planning, as well as, any other capacity building activities of the project. During the PPG a detailed gender assessment will be carried out to determine how best the project can promote gender equality. The full project document will contain a comprehensive action plan to promote gender equality within integrated land-use planning and the identified opportunities for nature-based solutions to strengthen the DMA's sustainability and resilience to climate change.

Equal opportunity to participate in project activities (including as members of the National Project Coordination) and decision-making at all levels will be ensured. For project based recruitments, the project will also encourage female applicants.

The gender element of the project will be very significant since several associations and other community-based enterprises in the field often include women. For the PPG, women's groups and associations will be consulted in order to gather their opinions and take into account their concerns in the preparation of the full project proposal. During the implementation, programmes to strengthen capacities and mechanisms for support to community-based enterprises will particularly target women.

### Private Sector Engagement

## Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Ver 1.0: Private sector engagement vis-à-vis the project components is not clear. It's very vague and doesn't look very relevant to the program's focus on climate resilience currently.

Ver 2.0: The revised version is better. However it is not clear what is meant by "...create the opportunity for low-carbon and to develop an overarching investment framework that overcomes the barriers to investment". What is the low ca-carbon element here? How will the project engage with the private sector for resilience and sustainable land management in the city and surrounding region. The project has a distinct focus on building standards which will largely be complied by the private sector. It is important to engage private sector effectively in this regard in terms of their capacity building and to seek their views regarding the standards. Similarly, the project could explore PPP models for sustainable and resilient infrastructure development under the project. Please consider these suggestions in the project design to add value.

Nov 8: No more comments

### Agency Response

**AfDB, 05/11/2019:** The project is mainly going to work with community-based enterprises to alternative livelihood activities that alleviate pressures on land and increase climate vulnerability. Successful ventures will be documented and publicized to the communities of Dodoma and Tabora. Access to finance is a major barrier to private sector investment in greener practices, which is why this project will support national stakeholders, particularly SMEs and community-led enterprises in their efforts to make the business case and create the opportunity for low-carbon and to develop an overarching investment framework that overcomes the barriers to investment in initiatives that support the sustainable development objectives of the DMA.

Groundwater is the only source of water in the city and it is not enough to accommodate the expected influx of people in the coming years. The project is going to work with communities, government and the private sector to protect groundwater aquifers from land contamination sources.

During the PPG the project will assess the impacts of industries and SMEs on land degradation and increasing vulnerabilities to climate change. Should the impact be significant then the project will engage the private sector, as relevant.

**AfDB, 08/11/2019:**

This section of the PIF has been revised to more accurately reflect the components and scope of the project. Apart from engaging with the community-based enterprises and SME's, the most relevant private sector in regard to this project is the building and construction sector. The artisanal small-scale mining activities that are contributing to the degradation of the agricultural land in the DMA are responding to the growing city's demand for building and construction material (e.g. aggregates, sand, clay, etc). Furthermore, the project focuses on building standards, which is relevant to the building and construction sector. There are numerous projects underway to expand the DMA's road network and infrastructure assets. During the PPG the project will undertake a detailed stakeholder analysis to determine the relevant stakeholders, including, private sector entities in relation to the objectives and scope of the project. The project will seek to engage all relevant private sector entities to leverage existing resources and support the impact potential, sustainability and scale-up potential of the project

**Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Ver 1.0- Very few risks were identified. Please add more.

Ver 2.0- The revised risks look fine.

**Agency Response AfDB, 05/11/2019:** Additional risks were also added such as delays during the implementation of the project due to the occurrence of climate-related events such as floods and/or droughts which could activate emergencies that might delay certain activities. Another risk added is the lack of engagement of sub-national stakeholders in the project activities. Mitigation measures were also proposed for these two risks. Political willingness and lack of national ownership were also added to the risk table. Kindly see the relevant revised section.

**Coordination**



**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?  
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Ver 1.0 Given the focus of the project is more on integrated urban planning and other core city related interventions, it is not clear if TANROADS will have the capacity to execute the project. It seems the Dodoma City Council will be a better executing agency.

Ver 2.0: The revised arrangement is clear and ensures engagement of the city council well. The agency will be required to provide a more detailed institutional arrangement at the CEO endorsement stage.

**Agency Response AfDB, 05/11/2019:** The implementation of this project over a 48 month-period will require the set-up of an effective multi-sectoral approach in close collaboration and coordination with relevant sectoral government ministries and departments both at national and sub-national levels. In addition, interventions and actions will be coordinated in cooperation between government and development partners, the private sector and civil society organizations (CSOs). It is expected that this coordination will be led by the Vice President's Office as the entity which could co-execute the GEF-LDCF project in close collaboration with the Tanzania Roads Authority (TANROADS) as the executing agency for the AfDB ring-road baseline project with close support from the City Council of Dodoma.

#### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The project is consistent with national priorities and sustainable urban development ambitions of the Dodoma city council.

## Agency Response

### Knowledge Management

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Ver 1.0: The outcome statement needs to be revised.. The first sentence on SC-IP is not necessary. Just mention that the project will participate in the global platform created under GEF Sustainable Cities IP and utilize the platform to learn best practices and share experiences with other peer cities.

Ver 2.0: The revised version is fine. The agency is requested to provide a detailed knowledge management strategy during the endorsement stage.

#### Agency Response

**AfDB, 05/11/2019:** The section has been revised and the reference to the SC-IP has been removed.

### art III – Country Endorsements

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Ver 1.0 : The Letter of Endorsement by the Operational Focal Point is not attached along with the PIF. The agency is requested to provide the letter.

Ver 2.0- The letter of endorsement is fine.

**Agency Response** AfDB, 6 November 2019: The Letter of Endorsement signed by the Operational Focal Point of Tanzania has been attached along with the PIF.

### **Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**EFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Ver 1.0 The agency is requested to address the comments related to LD STAR utilization and OFP letter of endorsement. The GEF Secretariat will provide detailed feedback once these are addressed.

Ver 2.0 The agency is requested to address the final set of comments and resubmit for GEF consideration.

Ver 3.0- Please address a few additional comments.

Ver 4.0- All comments are addressed. The PIF is recommended.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**/iew Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	11/6/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	11/8/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>