

Terms of Reference

GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Tanzania (1992-2012)

Approved by GEF Evaluation Office Director on March 26, 2013

Background and Introduction

1. Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) are one of the main evaluation streams of work of the GEF Evaluation Office.¹ By capturing aggregate portfolio results and performance of the GEF at the country level they provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries. CPEs relevance and utility will increase in GEF-5 with the increased emphasis on country ownership and country driven portfolio development.
2. GEF eligible countries are chosen for portfolio evaluations, based on a selection process and a set of criteria including the size, diversity and maturity of their portfolio of projects.² Among several considerations, Tanzania was selected based on its diverse portfolio in almost all GEF focal areas (biodiversity, climate change, persistent organic pollutants, land degradation and multifocal area) and because it has many completed/closed projects with significant emphasis on biodiversity and climate change, giving broader scope for review of sustainability and progress to impact. Furthermore, Tanzania includes several ongoing projects as well as those that are on the verge of implementation.
3. The Republic of Tanzania was formed in 1964 through the merger of Tanganyika and the archipelago of Zanzibar, made up of two main islands and several smaller ones. Centrally placed in East Africa, Tanzania, has eight neighboring countries and 1400 kilometers of Indian Ocean coastline. It is a member of the East African Community (EAC) and Southern African Development Community (SADC). As a semi-autonomous part of Tanzania, Zanzibar has its own government, known as the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar, with a President, First Vice President, Second Vice President and cabinet.
4. Tanzania is divided into thirty regions: five on the semi-autonomous islands of Zanzibar and twenty-five on the mainland, the former Tanganyika. The population of the country is 44.9 million (2012 national census). Out of these, approximately 43 million reside in mainland Tanzania and 1.3 million in Zanzibar.
5. The Human Development Index (HDI) is 0.466 giving the country a rank of 152 out of 187 countries, which, although below the World's average, is above the regional average³. Over the past two decades, economic reforms have improved the economic status of the country. The economic growth rate in 2011 has been estimated to be 6.4% in real terms, higher than the target of 6.0%, but lower than the 7.0% recorded in 2010. According to a World Bank study the living

¹ A complete list of countries having undergone CPEs can be found on the Office's website (www.gefeo.org).

² http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/CPE_final_country_selection_note-0910_0.pdf, Website access: 7th November, 2012.

³ <http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/TZA.html>, Website access: 16th November, 2012.

conditions in rural areas of Tanzania have not improved because many households have not been included in the economic growth patterns.⁴

6. The economy is based primarily on agriculture, which accounts for more than half of the GDP (\$23.71 billion in 2011) provides 75% (approximately) of exports, and employs approximately 75% of the workforce. Tourism accounts for around 16% of the GDP and nearly 25% of total export earnings. Topography and climate, though, limit cultivated crops to only 4% of the land area. The nation has many resources including minerals, natural gas, and tourism.

7. The country's landscape spans from east coast shores to a mountainous northeast, which is dominated by Africa's highest peak, Mount Kilimanjaro. Tanzania borders with Lake Victoria in the north and Lake Tanganyika to the west. The center of the country consists of a large plateau with plains and some arable land. About a third of Tanzania is covered by forests and woodland, on the plains, populations of African wildlife thrive in well-known areas, such as the Serengeti, which remain mostly unspoilt. In the marine realm, the country's mangrove forests have several ecosystem functions including as nursery areas for fish and prawns. There are also extensive sea grass areas, an important food and habitat. Coral reefs are located along about two thirds of Tanzania's coastline⁵.

8. The six major environmental threats identified by its Government are land degradation; lack of accessible, good quality water for both urban and rural inhabitants; environmental pollution; loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity; deterioration of aquatic systems and deforestation.⁶ This results in reduction of soil productivity, lack of availability of good quality water for washing, cooking, drinking and bathing and threats to national heritage and tourism. All these factors have also been associated with increase in poverty in the country. The reasons for the above have been identified as inadequate land and water management at various management levels, inadequate financial and human resources, the inequitable terms of international trade, vulnerable nature of some local environment, rapid growth of rural and urban population and inadequate institutional coordination. Apart from these, other factors include inadequate monitoring and information systems, inadequate capacity to implement programs, inadequate involvement of major stakeholders (local communities, non-governmental organizations and the private sector) and inadequate integration of conservation measures in planning and development of programs.⁷

9. GEF has been active in Tanzania since 1992 with 29 national projects. The portfolio⁸ includes 11 climate change projects, 12 projects in biodiversity, 3 multi focal area projects, 2 in POPs and 1 in land degradation (Table 1). The total GEF grant is approximately \$79 million with \$366 million of co-financing. The Tanzania projects are evenly spread within the GEF project cycle with 14 projects completed, 9 projects under implementation and 6 pending (these include CEO, Council and Agency approved).

10. The portfolio in Tanzania is split as follows: UNDP has been a main channel for support with 13 projects totaling over \$29 million in GEF budget; World Bank has implemented \$36 million in GEF support through 6 projects; UNIDO has 5 projects with a total GEF budget of \$9.3 million and UNEP also with 5 projects having GEF budget of \$4.7 million. Respective co-financing amounts by focal area are indicated in Table 1.

⁴ http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSPContentServer/WDSP/IB/2012/10/24/000386194_20121024053815/Rendere d/PDF/733460WP0P133400Box371944B00PUBLIC0.pdf, Website access: 4th December 2012

⁵ http://www.panda.org/who_we_are/wwf_offices/tanzania/about_tanzania/, Website access: Dec 12, 2012

⁶ <http://www.tzonline.org/pdf/nationalenvironmentalpolicy.pdf>, Website access: 15th November, 2012.

⁷ <http://www.tzonline.org/pdf/nationalenvironmentalpolicy.pdf>, Website access: 15th November, 2012.

⁸ Portfolio analysis will be finalized in the preparatory stages of the evaluation in consultation with Agencies.

Table 1: GEF Support to National Projects by Focal Area and GEF Agency

Focal Area	Agency	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-financing Amount (\$)	Total Amount (\$)	Number of Projects
Climate Change	UNIDO	8,627,000	36,233,500	44,860,500	3
	UNDP	7,250,000	26,098,946	33,348,946	3
	UNEP	3,910,300	67,878,498	71,788,798	4
	World Bank	6,500,000	53,100,000	59,600,000	1
	Subtotal	26,287,300	183,310,944	209,598,244	11
Biodiversity	UNDP	16,222,874	40,583,017	56,805,891	7
	UNEP	777,300	614,300	1,391,600	1
	World Bank/UNDP	12,000,000	33,300,000	45,300,000	1
	World Bank	7,310,554	19,966,000	27,276,554	3
	Subtotal	36,310,728	94,463,317	130,774,045	12
Multi Focal Area	UNDP	2,945,000	13,786,266	16,731,266	2
	World Bank	10,000,000	52,750,000	62,750,000	1
	Subtotal	18,926,805	84,836,266	103,763,071	3
POPs	UNIDO	708,000	210,000	918,000	2
	Subtotal	708,000	210,000	918,000	2
Land Degradation	UNDP	2,630,000	21,646,000	24,276,000	1
	Subtotal	2,630,000	21,646,000	24,276,000	1
	TOTAL	78,881,028	366,166,527	445,045,555	29

Objectives of the evaluation

11. The purpose of the Tanzania CPEs is to provide the GEF Council with an assessment of results and performance of the GEF supported activities in the country, and of how the GEF supported activities fit into the national strategies and priorities as well as within the global environmental mandate of the GEF. Based on this overall purpose, the Tanzania CPE will have the following specific objectives:

- Evaluate the **effectiveness and results** of GEF support in a country, with attention to the **sustainability** of achievements at the project level and **progress toward impact** on global environmental benefits.⁹
- Evaluate the **relevance and efficiency**¹⁰ of GEF support in Tanzania from several points of view: national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes, the GEF mandate of achieving of global environmental benefits, and GEF policies and procedures.

⁹ From the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2010: **Effectiveness**: the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; **Results**: in GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and progress toward longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects; **Sustainability**: the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion; projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

¹⁰ **Relevance**: the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national environmental priorities and policies and to global environmental benefits to which the GEF is dedicated; **Efficiency**: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.

- Provide **feedback** and **knowledge** sharing to (1) the GEF Council in its decision making process, (2) Tanzania on its collaboration/participation in the GEF, and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF support.

12. The Tanzania CPE will also be used to provide information and evidence to other evaluations being conducted by the Office; for example the Biodiversity Impact Evaluation, Mid-Term Review of the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise and overall the second report of the Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS5) to the GEF Replenishment Committee.

13. The Tanzania CPE will analyze the performance of individual projects as part of the overall GEF portfolio, but without rating such projects. CPEs are conducted to bring to the attention of Council different experiences and lessons on how the GEF is implemented at the national level from a wide variety of countries. CPEs do not aim at evaluating the performance of GEF agencies, national entities (agencies/departments, national governments or involved civil society organizations), or individual projects.

Key Evaluation Questions

14. GEF CPEs are guided by a set of key questions that should be answered based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the evaluative information and perceptions collected during the evaluation exercise. The Tanzania CPE will be guided by the following key questions:

Effectiveness, results and sustainability

- a) Is GEF support effective in producing results at the project level, aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area, and at the country level; and are project level results sustainable?
- b) Is the GEF support to Tanzania effective in creating individual capacity and strengthening institutions at national, regional and local levels?
- c) Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners, and if so, how are such lessons shared in-country?
- d) Has GEF support led to progress toward impact over an extended period of time after completion?
- e) Is GEF support effective in replicating/up-scaling the successful results it has demonstrated in its projects?
- f) Is the GEF support effective in linking environmental conservation measures with compatible sustainable livelihood and development activities for achieving global environmental benefits?
- g) Has the GEF support to Tanzania facilitated the channeling of additional resources for preventing land degradation efforts for achieving global environmental benefits?

Relevance

- a) Is GEF support relevant to the Tanzania sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities, to the country's development needs and challenges, and to national GEF focal area action plans?
- b) Is GEF support relevant to the objectives linked to the different global environmental benefits in the climate change, biodiversity, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?

- c) Are GEF and its Agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process in Tanzania, and if so, how has this evolved over time?
- d) To what extent have GEF- supported activities also received support from the country and/or from other donors?
- e) Are there tradeoffs between the relevance of GEF support to Tanzania's national priorities versus the relevance to global environmental benefits?

Efficiency

- a) How much time, effort and financial resources (including co-financing) does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality?
- b) What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among different stakeholders in project implementation?
- c) Are there synergies among GEF agencies, Tanzania national institutions and other donors in support of GEF programming and implementation?
- d) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in project adaptive management and overall efficiency? Are results based on defined tracking tools and monitoring and evaluation data?
- e) Is the necessary capacity available, created and remaining within national institutions to more independently receive GEF support?
- f) How do the national budget procedures affect GEF project proposals preparation and funding?

15. Each of these questions is complemented by indicators, potential sources of information and methods in an evaluation matrix, which is presented in Annex 1.

Scope and Limitations

16. The Tanzania CPEs will cover all types of GEF supported activities in the country at all stages of the project cycle (pipeline, on-going and completed) and implemented by all active GEF Agencies in all active focal areas, including applicable GEF corporate activities such as the Small Grants Programme (SGP) and a selection of regional and global programs that are of special relevance to these countries. However, the main focus of the evaluation will be the projects implemented within the country boundaries, i.e. the national projects, be these full-size, medium-size or enabling activities. ¹¹The stage of the project will determine the expected CPE focus (see Table 2).

Table 2. Focus of evaluation according to stage of project

Project Status	Focus		On a exploratory basis	
	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Effectiveness</i>	<i>Results/Benefits</i>
Completed	Full	Full	Full	Full
On-going	Full	Partially	Likelihood	Likelihood
Pipeline	Expected	Processes	Not applicable	Not applicable

¹¹ The review of selected regional projects will feed in the aggregate assessment of the national GEF portfolio described above.

17. The GEF does not establish country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets. However, since 2010 the GEF has started supporting countries in undertaking national portfolio formulation exercises on a voluntary basis. These exercises serve as a priority setting tool for countries and as a guide for GEF Agencies as they assist recipient countries. These country programming efforts are rather recent, which limits their usefulness in country portfolio evaluations that look back up to the start of GEF operations, i.e. sometimes 20 years back. This is why generally CPEs entail some degree of retrofitting of frameworks to be able to judge the relevance of the aggregated results of a diverse portfolio of projects. Accordingly, the CPE evaluation framework described here will be adapted along with the other relevant national and GEF Agencies' strategies, country programs and/or planning frameworks as a basis for assessing the aggregate results, efficiency and relevance of the GEF portfolio in Tanzania.

18. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions operating at many levels, from local to national and international level. It is therefore challenging to consider GEF support separately. The Tanzania CPE will not attempt to provide a direct attribution of development results to the GEF, but address the contribution of the GEF support to the overall achievements, i.e. to establish a credible link between what GEF supported activities and its implications. The evaluation will address how GEF support has contributed to overall achievements in partnership with others, through analysis on roles and coordination, synergies and complementarities and knowledge sharing.

19. The assessment of results will be focused, where possible, at the level of outcomes and impacts rather than outputs. Project-level results will be measured against the overall expected impact and outcomes from each project. Special attention will be paid to the identification of factors affecting the level of outcome achievements and progress to impact, as well as to the risks that may prevent further progress to long term impacts. Outcomes at the focal area level will be primarily assessed in relation to catalytic and replication effects, institutional sustainability and capacity building, and awareness.

20. Progress towards impact of a representative sample of mature enough projects¹² (i.e. completed at least since 2 years) will be looked at through field Reviews of Outcome to Impact (ROtI) studies. Expected impacts at the focal area level will be assessed in the context of GEF objectives and indicators of global environmental benefits.

21. The inclusion of regional and global projects increases the complexity of this type of evaluations since these projects are developed and approved under different context (i.e. regional or global policies and strategies) than national countries. However, a representative number of regional and global projects will be included based on criteria such as the relevance of the regional project for the country, the implementation unit being located in the country, among others.

22. Within the national portfolio, 14 projects are completed (3 full-size projects, 5 medium-size projects and 6 enabling activities); 9 projects are under implementation (8 are full-size projects and 1 medium size) and 7 pending (includes CEO, Council and Agency approved – 6 full-size and 1 enabling activity). The context in which these projects were developed, approved and are being implemented constitutes another focus of the evaluation. This includes a historic assessment of the national sustainable development and environmental policies, strategies and priorities, legal environment in which these policies are implemented and enforced, GEF

¹² It is expected that at least 3 ROtI would be conducted. Opportunities to conduct more will be sought in consort with other evaluations taking place in the Evaluation Office.

Agencies country strategies and programs and the GEF policies, principles, programs and strategies.

Methodology

23. The Tanzania country portfolio evaluation will be conducted by staff of the GEF Evaluation Office and staff and consultants from the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF). The team includes technical expertise on the national environmental and sustainable development strategies, evaluation methodologies, and GEF.

24. ESRF staff qualifies under the GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines, and have signed a declaration of interest to indicate no recent (last 3-5 years) relationship with GEF support in the country. The Operational Focal Point in the country will act as resource person in facilitating the CPE process by identifying interviewees and source documents, organizing interviews, meetings and field visits.

25. The methodology includes a series of components using a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and tools. The expected sources of information include:

- Project level: project documents, project implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, reports from monitoring visits, and any other technical documents produced by projects;
- Country level: national sustainable development agendas, environmental priorities and strategies, GEF-wide, focal area strategies and action plans, global and national environmental indicators;
- Agency levels: country assistance strategies and frameworks and their evaluations and reviews;
- Evaluative evidence at country level from other evaluations implemented either by the Office, by the independent evaluation offices of GEF Agencies, or by other national or international evaluation departments;
- Interviews with GEF stakeholders, including the GEF Operational Focal Point and all other relevant government departments, bilateral and multilateral donors, civil society organizations and academia (including both local and international NGOs with a presence in the country), GEF Agencies, SGP and the national UN conventions' Focal Points;
- Interviews with GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities;
- Surveys with GEF stakeholders in the country;
- Field visits to selected project sites, using methods and tools developed by the Office such as the or the Review of Outcomes to Impact (ROtI) Handbook;
- Information from national consultation workshops.

26. The quantitative analysis will use indicators to assess the relevance and efficiency of GEF support using projects as the unit of analysis (that is, linkages with national priorities, time and cost of preparing and implementing projects, etc.) and to measure GEF results (that is, progress towards achieving global environmental impacts) and performance of projects (such as implementation and completion ratings). Available statistics and scientific sources, especially for national environmental indicators, will also be used.

27. The Evaluation Team will use standard tools and protocols for the CPEs and adapt these to the national and regional context. These tools include a project review protocol to conduct the desk and field reviews of GEF projects and interview guides to conduct interviews with different stakeholders.

28. The Tanzania CPE will include visits to project sites. The criteria for selecting the sites will be finalized during the implementation of the evaluation, with emphasis placed on both ongoing and completed projects. The evaluation team will decide on specific sites to visit based on the initial review of documentation and balancing needs of representation as well as cost-effectiveness of conducting the field visits.

29. Quality assurance will be performed at key stages of the process by a Quality Assurance Panel composed by three independent national experts¹³. The expertise provided covers the relevant scientific and technical aspects of the peer review function related to the GEF focal areas as well as to evaluation.

30. The Evaluation Team will also present a separate analysis of the Zanzibar GEF portfolio, i.e. those GEF supported projects implemented in Zanzibar. While these projects will remain within the broader Tanzania portfolio for analysis; the separate analysis will benefit from, and benefit, the GEF Evaluation Office's experience with evaluation of GEF programming in small island development states such as those recently undertaken in the Caribbean, Cuba, East Timor and the ongoing Vanuatu and SPREP Portfolio Evaluation. The Zanzibar analysis will present the portfolio distribution and discussion of its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and results.

Process and Outputs

31. These country-specific TOR have been prepared based on two GEF Evaluation Office visits to Tanzania in September and November 2012. The first mission was conducted with the purpose of assessing institutional and human capacity for joint management, quality assurance and national conduct of the evaluation. The 2nd mission was for scoping the evaluation and identifying key issues to be included in the analysis. The scoping mission was also an opportunity to officially launch the evaluation and introduce the selected consultants to GEF national stakeholders. These TOR conclude the preparatory phase, and set the scene for the evaluation phase, during which the Evaluation Team will collect information and review literature to extract existing reliable evaluative evidence and prepare specific inputs to the CPE, including:

- the **GEF Portfolio Database** which describes all GEF support activities within the country, basic information (GEF Agency, focal area, implementation status), their implementation status, project cycle information, GEF and co-financing financial information, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project, etc.
- **Country Environmental Legal Framework** which provides an historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented in Tanzania. This document will be based on information on national environmental legislation, environmental policies of the government administration (plans, strategies and similar), and the international agreements signed by The Tanzania presented and analyzed through time so to be able to connect with particular GEF support.

¹³ The following individuals comprise the Quality Assurance Panel: Prof Amos Enock Majule, Director - Institute for Resource Assessment, University of Dar-es-Salaam; Dr. Bakari Asseid - Deputy Principal Secretary (Natural Resources) – Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Zanzibar and Technical Advisor to the Society for Natural Resources and; Mr. Ekingo Magembe, Head of the Poverty Monitoring Office in Ministry of Finance, unit responsible for implementation of MKUKUTA (Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan) Monitoring Master Plan.

- **Global Environmental Benefits Assessment** which provides an assessment of the country's contribution to the GEF mandate and its focal areas based on appropriate indicators, such as those used in the System for the Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (biodiversity, climate change and land degradation) and others used in projects documents.
- **Review of Outcomes to Impact (RotI)** Field studies of three projects completed since at least 2 years, selected in consultation with the Evaluation Office staff, which will contribute to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on results.
- The Evaluation Team will also **conduct additional field visits** of other (3-5) ongoing and/or completed national and regional projects, including those from the Small Grants Programme (SGP) Portfolio of projects¹⁴, selected in consultation with the Evaluation Office staff, which will contribute to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on results.
- Conduct the **evaluation analysis and triangulation** of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. This will be done during a mission to Tanzania by the Office's Task Manager working with the ESRF team. The aim will be to consolidate evidence gathered thus far, identify missing information and analysis gaps and arrive at preliminary findings. These will be summarized in a concise **Aide Mémoire**, which will be distributed to stakeholders one week prior to the final consultation workshop.¹⁵ During this mission, additional analysis, meetings, document reviews and/or field work might be undertaken as needed.
- Conduct a **Stakeholder Consultation Workshop** for the Government and national stakeholders, including project staff, donors and GEF Agencies, to present and gather stakeholders' feedback on the GEF Tanzania CPE key preliminary findings, contained in the Aide-Mémoire and circulated prior to the workshop. The workshop will be an opportunity to verify eventual errors of facts or analysis in case these are supported by adequate additional evidence brought to the attention of the Evaluation Team. The workshop will also aim at identifying potential areas of recommendations and verify their concreteness and feasibility;
- Prepare a **Draft GEF Tanzania CPE Report**, which incorporates comments received at the final consultation workshop. The draft report will be sent out for factual error checking as well as errors of analysis to stakeholders;
- Consider the eventual incorporation of comments received to the draft report and prepare the **Final Tanzania CPE Report**. The GEF Evaluation Office will bear full responsibility for the content of the report.

Evaluation Key Milestones

32. The evaluation will be conducted between December 2012 and August 2013. The key milestones of the evaluation are presented here below:

Preparaton	Status
Preparatory work, preliminary data gathering	Completed in September - October 2012
Pre-evaluation mission	Completed in November 2012
Evaluation Workplan	Completed in January 2013

¹⁴ Field visits to SGP projects will be undertake when opportunistic in relation to other field work.

¹⁵ The Aide Mémoire will be circulated to GEF stakeholders with an invitation to the final consultation workshop.

Evaluation matrix	Completed in January 2013
Quality control/peer review, finalization and disclosure of Tanzania-specific CPE TOR	March 2013
Milestone	Deadline
Launching evaluation phase, literature review, data gathering	February 1, 2013
Country Environmental Legal Framework	March 8, 2013
Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	March 8, 2013
Data collection/interviews, GEF portfolio database and project review protocols	March 15, 2013
Finalization of the GEF country portfolio database	March 15, 2013
Three ROtI field studies	April 26, 2013
Consolidation and triangulation of evaluative evidence, additional analysis/gap-filling	Week of May 6, 2013
Preparation of a Aid Mémoire (Report of Preliminary Findings)	May 31, 2013
Presentation of Preliminary Findings in a Consultation workshop	Week of June 3, 2013
Draft CPE report for circulation	July 5, 2013
Delivery of final CPE report	August 9, 2013

Tanzania CPE Report Outline

33. The CPE report will be a concise, stand-alone document organized along the following general table of contents:

CHAPTER 1. Main Conclusions and Recommendations

Background

Objectives, Scope and Methodology

Conclusions

- Results and effectiveness
- Relevance
- Efficiency

Lessons

Recommendations

CHAPTER 2. Evaluation Framework

Background

Objectives and Scope

Methodology

Limitations

CHAPTER 3. Context

The under analysis: General description

The Global Environmental Facility: General description

Environmental resources in key GEF support areas

The environmental legal framework in Tanzania

The environmental policy framework in Tanzania

CHAPTER 4. The GEF portfolio in Tanzania

Defining the GEF Portfolio

Activities in the GEF Portfolio

Evolution of GEF Support by Focal Area and by GEF Agency

Corporate, Regional and Global Programs

Roles and Responsibilities among Different Stakeholders in Project Implementation
The GEF Focal Point Mechanism in Tanzania

- CHAPTER 5. Results of GEF support to the Tanzania
Global Environmental Benefits/Impacts
Catalytic and Replication Effects
Institutional Sustainability and Capacity Building
Results by Focal Area
Knowledge Generation and Learning
- CHAPTER 6. Relevance of the GEF support in The Republic of Tanzania
Relevance of GEF Support to the Country's Sustainable Development Agenda and Environmental Priorities
Relevance of GEF Support to Country's Development Priorities and Challenges
Relevance of GEF Support to National Action Plans within GEF Focal Areas
Relevance of GEF Support to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits
Relevance of the GEF Portfolio to Other Global and National Institutions
- CHAPTER 5. Efficiency of GEF supported activities in The Republic of Tanzania
Time, Effort, and Financial Resources Required for Project formulation
Coordination and synergies
Monitoring and Evaluation for Project Adaptive Management

ANNEXES

- A. Country Response
- B. Quality Assurance statement
- B. Country-specific Terms of Reference
- C. Evaluation Matrix
- D. Interviewees
- E. Sites Visited
- F. Workshop Participants
- G. GEF Portfolio in Tanzania
- H. Bibliography

TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS

- 1. Country Environmental Legal Framework
- 2. Global Environmental Benefits Assessment
- 3. ROTI Field Studies

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX GEF CPE TANZANIA 1992-2012

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
Effectiveness, results and sustainability			
a) Is GEF support effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) at the project level, aggregate (portfolio and program) level and country level? Are these results (project level) sustainable?	Overall project outcomes and impacts of GEF support	Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOs	Focus groups and individual interviews
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
	Existing ratings for project outcomes (self-ratings and independent ratings)	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	Desk review, project review protocols
	Changes in global benefit indexes and other global environmental indicators	Evaluative evidence from projects and donors, global environmental benefits assessment	Literature review, meta analysis of evaluation reports, national and global state of environment reports
	Overall project outcomes and impacts of GEF support	Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOs	Focus groups and individual interviews
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
	Sustainability ratings for projects that are still under implementation re likelihood that objectives will be achieved	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	GEF Portfolio aggregate analysis
	Catalytic and replication effect on national and regional programs	Data from overall projects and other donors, , including evaluation studies by other donors	Desk review
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
		Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Focus groups and individual interviews
	Use of tracking tools and monitoring and evaluation data?	Data from overall projects and other donors, including evaluation studies by other donors	Desk review
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
		Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOs	Focus groups and individual interviews
	Existing ratings for project outcomes (self-ratings and independent ratings)	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	Desk review, project review protocols
b) Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners? If so, how are such lessons shared in-country?	Existing ratings for project outcomes (self-ratings and independent ratings)	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	Desk review, project review protocols
	Dissemination of positive impacts of GEF projects and best practices into national development plans and other channels to	project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives civil society staffs (NGOs and academia),	Focus groups and individual interviews

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	mainstream lessons from GEF projects		
	Lessons learned are shared nationally and regionally and models/interventions are in use	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, and so on), ROTI studies, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government Representatives, NGOs and academia	Desk review, ROTI methodology, GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis
c) Has GEF support led to progress toward impact over an extended period of time after completion?	Continued existence of the intended change/activity beyond the GEF support	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.); Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; ROTI studies	Desk review, focus groups and individual interviews, project review protocols, ROTI methodology, GEF portfolio analysis
	Availability of financial and technical resources to carry out the interventions beyond GEF funding		
	Ownership of projects by local institutions or by beneficiary groups who continue to engage with the interventions		
d*) Is the GEF support effective in creating individual capacity at national, regional and local levels?	Evidence of individual capacity improvement by credentials and performance	Project related reviews; project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; NGOs and academia, ROTI studies, evaluation studies by other donors	Project Review Protocols, focus groups and individual interviews, ROTI methodology
e*) Is the GEF support effective in strengthening institutional capacity at national, regional and local levels?	Evidence of institutional capacity strengthening by institutional creation, performance measures, staffing or budget	Project related reviews; project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; ROTI studies, NGO reps	Project Review Protocols, focus groups and individual interviews, ROTI methodology
f) Is the GEF support effective in linking environmental conservation measures with compatible sustainable livelihood and development activities for achieving global environmental benefits?	Incorporation of livelihood needs into project design	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations (TE), TE reviews, etc.);project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOs, academia	Desk Project Review Protocols, stakeholder consultations (focus groups and individual interviews)
	Evidence of environmental stress reduction; status improvement Evidence of livelihood improvements among communities who are dependent	Project-related reviews, ROTI studies, project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives and civil society representatives (NGO and academia),	Project Review Protocols, ROTI methodology, GEF portfolio analysis, stakeholder consultation

* For the purposes of analysis, the review of the key question concerning individual capacity and institutional strengthening has been split.

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	on natural resources	evaluation studies by other donors	
	% allocated for livelihood support from the total support?	Project related reviews; project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOs and academia	Project review protocols, focus groups and individual interviews
g) Is GEF support effective in replicating/up-scaling the successful results it has demonstrated in its projects?	Institutions continue the projects or use lessons to provide services and interventions Evidence of an increase in the use of similar interventions. Catalytic up-scaling & replication effects	Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations (TE), TE reviews, etc.); Data from overall projects and other donors; ROTI studies	Desk review; Project Review Protocols, Meta-analysis, ROTI methodology, Focus groups and individual interviews
h) Has GEF support facilitated the channelling of additional resources for preventing land degradation as a means to achieve global environmental benefits?	Evidence of land degradation prevention projects/activities as supported by the Govt/other donors National/regional policies (agriculture, forestry, envmt, etc) to slow the rates of land degradation Active monitoring of land degradation by government/non-government entities	Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations (TE), TE reviews, etc.); Data from overall projects and other donors, including evaluation studies; ROTI studies	Desk Review, Project Review Protocols, individual interviews, RotI, Meta-evaluation
Relevance			
a) Is the GEF support relevant to the national sustainability development agenda and environmental priorities, the national development needs and challenges and national GEF focal area action plans?	GEF support for environmental protection is within Tanzania's development vision and national strategies, including strategies for progress towards the Millennium Development Goals?	Tanzanian relevant sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans Project-related documentation (project document and log frame, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases, evaluation studies by other donors	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality, and project status (National), selected key person interviews Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	Level of GEF support compared to other development partners in activities prioritized in national sustainable development and environmental policies and legislations	Available databases (international as WB etc., and national, i.e. GET focal point and its agencies, government authorities and others)	(national)
	GEF support has country ownership and is Tanzania based (i.e. project origin, design and implementation)	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
		Country Legal Environmental Framework	Literature review, timelines, etc.
			Meta-evaluation
	GEF supports development needs (i.e., income generating, capacity building) and reduces challenges	Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)
	The GEF's various types of modalities, projects and instruments are in coherence with country's needs and challenges	Project-related documentation (project document and log frame, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluations reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
		Country Legal Environmental Framework	Literature review, timelines etc.
	GEF support linked to the national environmental action plan (NEAP); national communications to UNFCCC; national POPs; National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA); adaptation to climate change (NAPA), etc.	GEF-supported enabling activities and products (NCSA, NEAP, NAPA, national communications to UN Conventions, etc.)	Desk review
		Small Grant Programme country strategy	
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
b) Are GEF and its Agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process in Tanzania? And if so, how has this evolved over time?	Level of GEF funding compared to other development assistance in the environmental sector and development activities	Available databases (global such as World Bank, ADB, etc, and national, such as Ministry of Finance. planning and economy ,Ministries responsible for Environment etc)	Desk reviews and meta-analysis for evaluating financing information to assess contributions of government, donors, private and civil society organizations
	Co-financing rate (from Government, private sector and/or civil society)		

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	GEF support has Tanzanian ownership and is country based (i.e. project design and implementation by in-country national institutions)	Project design and implementation documents, evaluation studies from other donors, Government officials, agencies' staff, donors, and civil society representatives	Desk review, stakeholder consultation (focus group discussions, individual interviews)
	Relevant national policies and strategic documents include set of priorities that reflect the results and outcomes of relevant GEF support	STAR/RAF documents, Project-related documentation	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
		Country environmental legal framework	
c) Is the GEF support in Tanzania relevant to the objectives linked to the different Global Environmental Benefits in the climate change, biodiversity, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?	GEF Project outcomes and impacts are in line with the Global Benefit Index (for biodiversity and climate change) and with other global indicators for greenhouse gases, POPs, land degradation, and international waters	National Conventions action plans and reference/links in the RAF, STAR documents.	Desk review, project field visits, project review protocols
		Global environmental benefits Assessment	Literature review
	GEF support linked to meeting national commitments to conventions	Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, and so on), PMIS, Agencies' project databases,	GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality, and project status (national)
		Government officials, Agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives (including NGOs and academia)	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
		Global environmental benefits Assessment	Literature review
d) To what extent have GEF-supported activities also received support from the country and/or from other donors?	GEF activities, country commitment and project counterparts support GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies (catalytic and replication, etc.)	GEF Instrument, Council decisions, focal area programs and strategies,	Desk review; GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality, and project status (national) Meta evaluation
	Co-financing amounts National and regional budgets for environmental protection activities Donor support to non-GEF supported environmental activities	Project-related documentation (project document and log frame, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases, evaluation studies from other donors	
		GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies	Individual interviews

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
		Global environmental benefits assessment	Literature review
		Country environmental legal framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
	Level of funding from Tanzanian Government for GEF projects and its trajectory over time	National allocations for related projects (Ministry of Finance and economy, Ministry responsible for environment)	Government documents and interviews with officials
e) Are there tradeoffs between the relevance of GEF support to Tanzania's national priorities versus the relevance to Global Environmental Benefits?	Alignment of Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) to national sustainable development priorities (i.e. encouraging economic development/poverty reduction in a sustainable manner)	Comparison of country context/national development strategies and GEB (through country context and GEB assessment)	Desk review
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews, national workshop)
	Contribution of GEF projects to support or integrate environment objectives into the larger development agendas.	Project-related documentation, STAR/RAF strategy documents	GEF portfolio analysis
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews, national workshop)
		Country Environmental Legal Framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
	Alignment of international projects to meeting local/regional sustainable development priorities and needs	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews, national workshop)
Efficiency			
a) How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality in Tanzania?	Process indicators: processing timing (according to project cycle steps), preparation and implementation cost by type of modalities etc. Financial spending timeline intact with plans Plans are adapted as necessary Financial allocations are used as scheduled	Project-related documentation (project documents and log frames, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS and Agencies project databases.	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis, timelines

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	Projects drop-outs from PDF and cancellations	GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff and government officials, GEF focal point	Individual interviews, field visits, project review protocols
	GEF vs co-financing	National and local government officials, donors, NGOs, beneficiaries	
b) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in project adaptive management and overall efficiency? Are results based on defined tracking tools and monitoring and evaluation data?	Use of M&E inputs to guide the project towards achieving results Consideration of lessons learned? Tracking tools used, correctly filled in	Project-related documentation especially progress reports, terminals and terminal evaluation reviews.	Desk reviews, GEF portfolio analysis, interviews with GEF agencies, focal point
	Project learning provides information for decisions for future projects, programs, policies and portfolios.	Project termination reports, policy makers/government officials, GEF secretariat and agencies staff, project reports	Desk review, interviews with GEF agencies, focal point.
c) What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among different stakeholders in project implementation?	Types of actors involved and levels of participation Working relationships between partners/ stakeholders	Project-related documentation (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	Meta evaluation (review of other donor reports) Desk review and Portfolio Analysis, stakeholder analysis
	Roles and responsibilities of GEF actors defined Capacity gaps defined	Project-related documentation (implementation/progress reports) Project staff, government officials, beneficiaries	
	Coordination and exchange of information/knowledge/lessons between GEF projects		
	Existence of a national coordination mechanism for GEF support	GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies, and GEF operational focal point staff	Interviews, field visits, institutional analysis
d) Are there synergies for GEF project programming and implementation among: GEF Agencies, national institutions,	Acknowledgments among GEF agencies and institutions of each other's projects	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), evaluations from other donors	Desk review, interviews, and field visits

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
GEF projects, and other donor-supported projects and activities?	Effective communication and technical support between GEF project agencies and organizations and between national institutions	GEF Agency staff, national executing agencies (NGOs, other) Project staff, national and local government officials, beneficiaries	
e) How do the national budget procedures affect GEF project proposals preparation and funding?	Timing of Project cycles (national budget, and GEF project cycles)	Government documents, Government officials, Project proponents	Document review, Interviews
	Budget allocations and alignment of GEF projects to carry out these activities	Government documents and data and information from officials.	Document review, Interviews
f) Is the necessary capacity available, created and remaining within national institutions to more independently receive GEF support?	Availability of skilled manpower capable of writing and implementing GEF projects	Government documents, Government officials, Project proponents, Evaluation studies from other donors	Meta-evaluation Desk review, Interviews
	Effective communication and technical support between GEF project agencies and organizations and between national institutions	GEF Agency staff, national executing agencies (NGOs, other) Project staff, national and local government officials, beneficiaries	