

Final Report Audit Trail

Author	No.	Conclusion, Recommendation or Paragraph	Comment	Reply and actions taken
Ekingo Magembe	1		See document attached to email: Numerous spelling corrections and a few formatting suggestions	All changes accepted
Dr. Bakari S. Asseid (QAP)	1		Nevertheless, there are minor typos which need some corrections. For instances, there are missing pages number 8 and 9.	This does not seem to be the case in the version that we have.
	2		In page 20 in the rust para the word Republic is misspelled and in page 52, first line there is word Eritrea out of context.	Eritrea changed to Tanzania. Spelling of republic corrected.
	3		As the draft final report is meant to cover a period between 1992 and 2012 there is an inconsistency which need some consideration. For instance, page 44 para 137 reflects up to end of 2013.	Most cases where 2013 is used do not significantly affect the coherence/consistency of the report. However page 44 needs to be addressed.
	4		If the final draft report considers up to the end of 2013 many data need to change. For example, the Small Grants Programme has provided a financial support totaling 7.93 for 285 projects by the end of 2013. It is advisable therefore, to review para 137 and stick for up to the end of 2012 to avoid many changes at stage of the report.	The report covers the period until the end of FY12 for the FSP/MSP/EA portfolio. The SGP information is more up to date and available from UNDP so it is included.
Nyangi Chacha	1		This is to inform you that I have gone through the entire (with the exception of the Annexes) Draft Final CPE Report you circulated to us for comments. From my reading, I found the document comprehensive and well presented. However, I have few minor comments particularly with respect to the statistics (numerals). In some cases, there appears to be contradictions between the numbers in the figures and those reported in the texts (please see the attachment for details).	Checked and corrected
	2		For example, on page 8 (paragraph 5), the funding for multifocal area (MFA) based on Figure 1.1 is \$12.6 or 16% of	Checked and corrected

			GEF grant (\$78.8m), but the reported statistics in the text is \$18.9 or 24% of GEF grant.	
	3		On the same page, item 6, the overall funding (GEF+co-financing) for MFA based on the statistics in Figure 1.1 is \$12.9 (GEF) +\$66.5 (co-financing)=\$79.4, but the reported statistics in the text for the two components is \$103.7m.	Checked and corrected
	4		On page 10 (paragraph 8), it is written: "The total reported investment including co-financing was \$2,66.5m; with GEF funding being US\$ 438.5m or 16.5 percent of the total" A thorough check revealed that total reported investment is \$2,663.5m not \$2,66.5m.	Checked and corrected
	5		Others are just typographical error, for example, "Rorest" instead of Forest (page 14, paragraph 32), "Kilmobero" instead of Kilombero (page 17, paragraph 48), "over-reliance" instead of over-reliance (page 18, paragraph 50), etc.	All typographical, spelling and formatting mistakes and suggestions have been accepted and incorporated.
		Paragraph	From track changes in document attached to email:	
	1	3	A bit too long, I think it can be split into 2 to make it easy for the reader to comprehend the message	Rephrased
	2	1	Not very clear	Rephrased
	3	multiple	In reference to the language in Tanzania, Swahili should be changed to Kiswahili	Swahili changed to Kiswahili
	4	multiple	Spelling mistakes, typographical errors, and minor formatting suggestions	All changes accepted
	5	multiple	Incorrect figures provided for multi focal area projects and funding	Checked and corrected
	6	Multiple (e.g. 8)	Regional cofinancing figures	Checked and corrected
	7	88	Tanzania allocations to focal areas did not add up to total	Checked and corrected, \$3.6m for SGP
		146 & 147	Totals did not add up	Checked and corrected
		152	Incorrect percentage for funds for 74 projects	Checked and corrected
Gratian Bamwenda	1		I have read the document. I do not have any additional comments. Only someone may ask how come that the issues discussed in the CPE touch and address critical policy issues that are in policies that have come out/about to just recently like the Agricultural Policy 2013 and Innovation Policy. (that was a good job of Triangulation and ROT!).	We trust that involvement by the Quality Assurance Panel and senior experts such as Dr. Bamwenda, can help to ensure that the utility of the CPE is increased by highlighting conclusions and findings to the bodies developing new policies such as the Agriculture Policy. As reported at the AfrEA conference, by Dr. Bamwenda,

				the Tanzania CPE has found its way to contribute also to the Tanzania Climate Change Strategy, the 5 year development plan – 2015-2020 and some legal reforms to the ESIA laws
Ulrich Apel	1		My only comment is that in section 1: Summary of conclusions. A paragraph on Land Degradation seems to be missing. LD is consistently mentioned in subheading throughout the text but not in the summary chapter.	A paragraph has been added for LD and more information about LD portfolio results.
Franck Jesus	1		1. The chapter Main Conclusions and Recommendations seems to rely very strongly on one PV projects for CCM issues when a total of 10 CCM projects where identified. Why is that so? What is the assessment and what where the lessons learned for the other projects?	More information on the evolution of the entire CC portfolio has been added.
	2		2. Conclusions related to MFA and cross-cutting projects: can the evaluation provide assessments on the added efficiency or trade-offs among focal areas of projects dealing with several focal areas in one go? Were the potential leakages in mitigation impacts assessed for projects targeting conservation of biodiversity to increase the carbon dioxide sink potential?	Unfortunately, this type of comparative analysis was not part of the Terms of Reference so an assessment of trade-offs cannot be made.
	3		3. Conclusion 10 points at the time-consuming GEF project processes: is the issue more related to GEF agencies processes than to GEF secretariat processes?	Because national institutions do not have direct dialogue/access to the Secretariat their perception of complexity and opaqueness of GEF is associated with Agencies which work in country with national institutions to develop the projects..
	4		4. Recommendation 2 may need some refinements. How does the report proposes to link SGP and FSPs/MSPs in practice? Would this be done in sequence? How about the risk of seeing the GEF funding twice the same thing? How are potential overlapping avoided? The report does not mention these elements? Is this a recommendation for the SGP process only or also for the FSP/MSP process? Isn't there a risk of rendering the GEF process more complex and time-consuming?	The recommendation has been reformulated. Many of the questions posed would need to be looked into more by the SGP program and the Secretariat. The CPE/ACPER are bringing to light that this is already taking place effectively in some cases, and there are efficiencies to be gained from further exploration.
	5		5. Recommendation 4 targets language issues in knowledge management but does not consider the issues related to	Addressed in revised formulation of the recommendation

			the limited means projects propose and use for information diffusion/sharing.	
	6		6. Figure 1.2 page 9: A different scale for GEF funding and Co-financing would be better.	Revised Figure
Dustin Schinn	1		I am pleased to herewith forward comments from the CC Team on the Evaluation Office's draft report on the Tanzania Country Portfolio Evaluation. Special thanks also to Chiz and Fareeha for their particularly constructive thoughts. As an overarching comment, the draft report is well written and yields valuable and sound conclusions. Summarizing the CC Team's perspective, this is a neat and welcomed product. However, there are a few suggestions that have come up, which I am summarizing as follows: It seems reasonable to start addressing the sustainable development issues of Tanzania pertaining to GEF support by engaging OFP in M&E; strengthening community level support through SGP; enhancing synergy to OFP; and distributing communications in Swahili. However, it may be of interest to also add some other recommendations, including for instance regarding how to sustain and enhance results.	-
				There are recommendations pertaining to need for more frequent and strategic meetings of the national GEF stakeholders as a mechanism to enhance results and sustainability and yield greater synergies.
	3		It may be useful to employ separate analyses of climate change mitigation and adaptation given that these are financed from different sources.	The adaptation portfolio is too small to warrant a separate analysis – 2 projects.
	4		Corresponding to the latter bullet point, it may be advantageous to add a short comprehensive sub-section on adaptation, discussing the country's vulnerability to climate change (e.g. as mentioned in para. 97) and pulling in information from paras. 141 and 183.	Added
	5		Paragraph 219 (page 70) states the following: "A number of respondents also perceived that difficulties in generating co-financing have, on occasions, led Government to take loans (e.g., from the World Bank) to meet GEF conditions, which pose a possible threat to the 'grant' nature of GEF funding." We would encourage clarification of this statement, given that the type of cofinancing, whether it is	Cannot attribute the sentence. It has been removed.

			<p>loan, grant, or co-financing, does not influence the GEF grant financing. Furthermore, only a small number of national projects were in collaboration with the World Bank. Of the six national projects with the World Bank (out of 30 national projects in total), two were MSPs - meaning only 4 out of the 30 projects were full sized projects with significant co-financing. Therefore we would like to suggest to explain how and under what conditions the Government would be compelled to take loans from the World Bank to meet GEF conditions, and which GEF projects were developed as a result. Given that the Country Assistance Strategy for the country (in which loans are identified) is developed between the World Bank the national government in a process that is separate from the GEF project development, we experience difficulties in understanding how, or to what degree, the GEF conditions would influence the Government's decision to take out loans.</p>	
	6		<p>You may wish to revise Figure 7.3 (page 71) on the duration of project stages by project type. The legend shows enabling activities and full size projects (two categories), while the graphs includes four parameters that seem not to match the legend.</p>	Addressed
Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	1		<p>Thanks for sharing the Tanzania portfolio evaluation. I will not repeat the points already raised by my colleagues. If I think it is a good work – I notably appreciated the efforts of analysis about the complementarity between different GEF supports (enabling activities, MSP/FSP, and SGP) and the points related to scaling up and replication - I however feel that there are some missed opportunities in this evaluation, notably the following ones: A missed opportunity to trigger the SFM incentive program: At the time of the evaluation, there were three GEF5 NR projects related to forest conservation and catchment area management without using the GEF5 SFM/REDD+ incentive program (1) Enhancing the Forest Nature Reserves Network for Biodiversity Conservation in Tanzania, 2) Kihansi Catchment</p>	-
	2			<p>Agreed this was a missed opportunity to look deeper into how these projects are working without the SFM incentive and speaks to need to engage better/deeper with Secretariat on evaluation issues that should be probed further in CPEs.</p>

		Conservation and Management, 3) Securing Watershed Services Through SLM in the Ruvu and Zigi Catchments Eastern Arc Region). With STAR allocations exceeding 27 million of US\$ and knowing the environmental challenges around forest issues, it sounds as a big missed opportunity. There are potentially lessons for us as GEFSEC, but also for GEF agencies, GEF OFP, and GEF partners.	
3		The country portfolio analysis and the interviews with national and local partners should have been an excellent opportunity to learn more about the role of a country like Tanzania in sub-regional initiatives: for instance, the GEF has spent more than \$50 million in half a dozen of projects related to the West Indian Ocean's Large Marine Ecosystem. The report is almost silent on this initiative, while there are definitely success stories and lessons to share in this IW and MFA portfolio.	Regional initiatives unless PMU or large geographic focus in Tanzania were outside the scope of the evaluation.
4		Several projects were developed in Tanzania to address Integrated Coastal area management issues: from an IW perspective, but also from a BD point of view and more recently from a LDCF point of view. Some deeper analysis would have been welcome to have a better idea about the synergy and the coherence between approaches. More and more the LDCF portfolio is becoming an important player in GEF countries, but I do not see any mechanism of dialogue when both GEF and LDCF projects are addressing common issues (coastal area management, water, agriculture, for instance).	Tanzania only had 1 LDCF project which was recently closed. Again more comment on the ToR earlier in the evaluation and more engagement on IEO part with Secretariat would have allowed better propping.
5		The terms of reference do not include the analysis of global and regional projects, but there are more than 50 of them! (the evaluation focuses on 29 projects) It seems that Tanzania took part in various analytical projects dealing with methods and best practices. It is always difficult to evaluate the outcomes of these projects, but it could have been helpful to see if these projects or some of them were helpful to the country, if the methods were applied, if the best practices were disseminated, etc.	Outside scope of the evaluation.

	6		Only one LD project is considered in the portfolio – it is maybe the reason why there is no mention of LD in the summary of conclusions. However, they could have crossed the information with regional projects where LD was an important issue, especially the Kagera river basin project, but there are others (#2139, #2052, #905,). LD issues are also addressed in BD and MFA projects (#3000, #1170, for instance). The message might be to use or consider LD issues through MFA and SFM. cf item 1.	The evaluation makes the point that although there is only 1 LD project, land degradation issues were clearly addressed through other projects but going forward a more overt strategy for this important issue in Tanzania would be important.
	7		Para 154: the mention of Eritrea seems a mistake.	Corrected.
Jaime Cavelier	1		I had the change to go over the BD projects (and MFA with BD funding) with particular emphasis on Results and GEBs:	No action needed.
	2		1. The report makes reference, at least once, to all GEF BD and MFA (with BD) funded projects.	
	3		2. The report is mostly about cataloging projects (Completed as well as Under-implementation) according to different evaluation criteria.	
	4		3. There is in-depth information for only the projects that have been completed (780 Development of Mnazi Bay Marine Park; 1170 Conservation and Management of the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests, 1743 The Development and Management of the Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor) except for 2151 (Novel Forms of Livestock & Wildlife Integration Adjacent to Protected Areas in Africa).	
	5		4. The report provides positive reviews for all projects and relate them to actual or potential GEBs. One of the main conclusions is that these GEF projects have delivered results on the ground and in the enabling environment.	
	6		5. There is a positive review of the Conservation Endowment Fund created under the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests (started supported four sites (2009) and it is now supporting nine (2012). At least three areas were upgraded to Forest Nature Reserves.	
	7		6. In some projects, while co-financing was not readily mobilized during project execution, financial resources were identified and put in place after project closure (Mnazi Bay Marine Park and Eastern Arc Mountain Forests)	

	8		
	9		7. The project in Selous-Niassa Wildlife Corridor is mentioned as a good example of "adaptive management" (i.e. making use of the recommendations of the MTR). The opposite was reported for the Mnazi Bay Marine Park. 8. BD Tracking Tools in the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests suggest improve BD management and threat reduction.