

Food System, Land Use and Restoration Impact Program in Uzbekistan

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10601

Countries

Uzbekistan

Project Name

Food System, Land Use and Restoration Impact Program in Uzbekistan

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/2/2021

Review completed by PM

2/11/2022

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF □

CEO Endorsement □

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes. However,

- In table A, please only include the IP FOLU line with the total amount including all FA objectives (as the total draws from the PFD amount approved under the IP). Table D is okay, the focal area contributions can remain in Table D.

- In part I: the expected implementation start is) 01/01/2022, which may not be realistic and will have to be adjusted in the subsequent re-submissions.

- in part I: the "other executing partners": it appears that FAO has considerable execution function. Please clarify. If that is the case, an exception request from the OFP is necessary. The reviewer could not locate an exception request.

02/04/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

No response required

24 Jan 2022

- Table A was updated

- Starting date has been moved tentatively to 1 Jun 2022

- Exception Request Letter from the OFP has been uploaded into the portal. Both FAO and the State Committee for Ecology and Environmental Protection have been included as executors in Part I.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes. However,

- The presentation of the components is somewhat confusing as component 1 is listed several times for each outcome, and also comes after component 3 one more time. Please revise for better readability.

- The ratio of PMC co-financing is far from being proportional. Please bring in line with overall co-financing rate.

- The request for 5.7% of PMC is not considered justified in view of the low PMC co-financing rate and of budget details (see comments on the budget below under cost-efficiency).

02/04/2022: Addressed.

However, as the PMC is now below 5%, the justification provided under Table B needs to be removed accordingly. Please delete justification for PMC increase.

02/11/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

Justification removed

24 Jan 2022

- Presentation has been revised

-Ratio of PMC to cofinancing is now proportional

-PMC is now under 5%

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

24 Jan 2022

No response required

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

02/09/2022: We were unable to locate the Co-financing documents ? kindly let us know in which Annex they are located for a detailed review and/or upload these documents as a separate file.

02/11/2022: Have been uploaded as a separate document.

Cleared

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

Three Cofinancing letters have been uploaded as separate documents into the portal

24 Jan 2022

No response required

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Not fully.

Table D is adequate. However, the budget is not considered cost-effective and requires revisions. The reviewer has several comments and clarification questions as follows:

- the request for vehicles from GEF grant requires justification for the reviewers consideration; In this context: GEF will not cover the driver and the vehicles. Drivers would need to be covered by co-financing in case GEF agrees to vehicle purchase.
- The budget indicates substantial amount of FAO execution support. However, (i) no OFP exception request has been made, (ii) it is not mentioned in the coordination section, and (iii) FAO is not listed as executing partner in Part I. If indeed FAO partly executes the project, an exception request has to be discussed with the reviewer and officially requested in line with GEF guidelines.
- The General Operation Expenses of \$115,000 are considered high, further they belong to PMC (and may need to be covered by co-financing).
- Publication costs of \$84,000 and KM products of \$80,000 are considered high. What is covered under these budget lines? Why is only \$40,000 of KM products managed by the national executing partners?
- Please clarify what is covered exactly under PPPP support materials?
- Please clarify what is covered under "Renewable Energy Support for VC support" of \$554,000. Why is this expense so high and how does it contribute to the achievement of the project's objective?
- Why are 2 CTAs and 2 project assistants needed? Please provide justification.
- The "project coordinator / senior technical advisor" is fully charged to PMC, which causes the PMC to exceed 5%. Please consider, based on a description of the technical tasks of the position by the ToR, a cost sharing arrangement between project components and PMC to bring the PMC to the level of 5%
- The budget does not seem to include any line items that would allow the project to actively participate in the global FOLUR partnership and link up with the global coordination activities. Please clarify.

02/04/2022: Addressed.

Further, the Program Manager (PM) approves the exception request of the OFP for FAO to provide execution services as specified in the request and the budget accordingly. PM recommends Managers clearance of this arrangement.

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

No response required

30 Jan 2022

-The vehicles/drivers have been removed from the budget and instead rentals will be used when travelling to the field. Funding has been set aside for travel costs.

-FAO execution support letter added to portal. The Coordination Section has been updated to reflect FAO's role as execution support. FAO has been listed as executing partner in part I

-GOE expenses have been removed. GoU will support operation expenses for the field offices.

Publications and KM products have been reduced to half the originally proposed budget. The balance has been transferred to Ecosystem Restoration works and participation in the global FOLUR platform.

Activities for Private Public Producer Partnerships (PPPP) are described in Section 1.5.2 under Output 1.2.3. They envision materials and labour costs and include multiplication of plant materials, showcasing of innovative machinery, infrastructure, techniques (laser-leveling) for demonstration sites or training activities, biodiversity conservation or ecosystem restoration, habitat development and value chain instruments or technologies. They can therefore include fertilisers, seed, grafting or nursery materials, soil amendments and their application (Lime, Gypsum, rock Phosphate), materials for water-saving techniques and irrigation equipment, use of specialized planting, tilling or soil fertilization machinery, small-scale earthworks for water-harvesting, fencing or other enclosure materials, nest building or habitat creation materials or works. They will act as a means of supporting the modeling, demonstration and provide economic data in order to scale SLM and biodiversity options.

-Support would include purchase of materials and energy generation systems to participant wheat clusters, industries, communities, producers and groups formed through project activities to showcase and demonstrate cost-savings, resource efficiency and use of renewable energies within the project selected value chains (Section 1.4.4). The project takes a holistic approach to meeting the FOLUR objectives and energy generation is an important step to meet the project goals. The high estimated cost is related to the costs of purchase, transport and installation of the systems. They are a minor percentage compared to the potential costs needed for energy transition as provided in the Renewable Energies report (Annex Q) and therefore the design team deemed it necessary to provide an adequate demonstration of these technologies that meet the scale and ambition of the FOLUR and project core indicator objectives.

- There are two national institutions involved in project execution, namely the Ministry of Agriculture and the State Committee for Ecology. While each institution will provide a focal point from within the Ministry, specialized support is required within each of them. Rather than CTAs, the project will hire a Wheat Production Specialist within the MoA and a BD Conservation Specialist within the SCEEP.

-Point taken. The project coordinator will carry out activities within component 1. This is also reflected in the Implementation Arrangements

-In addition to the global coordination activities, Component 4 includes a set of coordinated outputs, activities and knowledge product development that will contribute to cross-border partnerships with the Kazakhstan FOLUR and consistently provide information, reports and studies for the global FOLUR knowledge platform. Nonetheless, a budget of \$39,400 has been set aside to support participation of government staff in the global FOLUR platform.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

However, Table F does not include the PPG totals, please check. Can this be fixed on your end or does it need to be fixed by IT from the GEF back-end?

02/04/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

No response required

24 Jan 2022

While this is not something we can fix on our side, the table now shows the totals.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Clarification questions:

- the targets do not include BD related targets, despite the project being aligned with the BD mainstreaming objective. The CEO endorsement request also lists PAs in Kashkadarya, Khorezm, and Karakalpakstan of in total 179,000 ha. Will these areas benefit from mainstreaming BD? If so, please include the area in indicator 4.1, 4.2., or 4.4 as appropriate.

- Further, under "1.c child project" the project mentions restoration area that benefits BD in Ramsar sites. Where is this reflected in the targets?

- The number of 5,000 beneficiaries appears small compared to the 350,000 ha of SLM targeted. Please explain how the number of beneficiaries has been estimated.

02/04/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

No response required

24 Jan 2022

-BD target 4.1 has been incorporated into the ProDoc. PAs will benefit from BD mainstreaming, principally the buffer zone and ecosystem restoration works outlined under Component 3 and specifically Output 3.4, ILM planning, LDN mapping and monitoring and value chain activities.

-While not located within the project districts or provinces, the Dengizkul Lake (Ramsar Site) will benefit from improved resource use efficiency achieved through Component 2 in addition to the ecosystem restoration and habitat conservation activities and targets described within Component 3.

- Numbers of estimated direct beneficiaries per output is provided in the explanation following Table E. in Part 1 of the document. Specific outputs and activities within the land planning and policy work is expected to impact a large section of the population working in the sector and using natural resources for their livelihoods, and therefore, have indirect benefits for these communities. This has been added to the beneficiary table under Table E in Part 1.

This said, the direct beneficiary number of 5,000 is considered as the most adequate target given the fact that under the Uzbekistan law, individual Commercial farmers have control over large areas (set to increase under Wheat Cluster model), value chains are often under state-controlled systems, teaching and other professional staff accredited in agriculture and SLM practices exist in low numbers and a network of FFS or similar agricultural or ecological outreach groups do not currently exist. Greater investment per direct beneficiary is therefore sought and provided for by the project, though indirect impacts and benefits are foreseen.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Not fully.

The link of this child project with the FOLUR program needs to be elaborated on (in section 1.c. "Child project"). Further, the linkages need to be reflected in the budget as appropriate.

02/04/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

No response required

24 Jan 22

Section 1.c has been updated to reflect the links with the FOLUR programme
Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Not fully.

As above mentioned, the project appears to be partly executed by FAO. However, this is not reflected in this section. An OFP exception request is also missing.

02/04/2022: Addressed.

Further, the Program Manager (PM) approves the exception request of the OFP for FAO to provide execution services as specified in the request and the budget accordingly. PM recommends Managers clearance of this arrangement.

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

No response required

24 Jan 22

This section has been updated to reflect FAO support. An OFP Exception Letter is uploaded in the portal

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

However, please check text and table 25 for consistency. The text refers to a M&E budget of \$139,380 vs. 175,380 in the table.

02/04/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

No response required

30 Jan 2022

-Budget and M&E costs in the PRODOC are now consistent

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Yes.

02/04/2022: Please make sure that there is ONE document uploaded and tagged as "Agency Project Document" that contains all necessary information for circulation to Council. Currently, there are apparently 3 parts of the agency document and it is not clear, which one should be circulated and whether it contains all necessary annexes.

02/11/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

PRODOC has been consolidated into a single document, including annexes

Document Title	Category	Prefix	Classification	Last Modified Date
State Committee for Ecology and Env. Protection - Cofinancing	Project Supporting Document	Co-financing letter	Official Use Only	2/11/2022 6:00 AM
Ministry of Agriculture - cofinancing	Project Supporting Document	Co-financing letter	Official Use Only	2/11/2022 5:59 AM
FAO Cofinancing	Project Supporting Document	Co-financing letter	Official Use Only	2/11/2022 5:58 AM
10601_Uzbekistan_FOL	Project	Agency project doc	GEF Secretariat	2/10/2022
UR_10February2022_	Document	ument	Use Only	10:31 AM

24 Jan 22

No response required

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Has been provided in project document.

02/04/2022: Annex A Project, Results Framework table: please include targets for the Core Indicator 11 ?Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender?.

02/11/2022: The reviewer notes the explanations in the response box, however the numbers don't match. The Project results framework under Output 1.3.2, reads ?Number of potential direct and indirect beneficiaries of plans (disaggregated by sex)? but there is no actual target (5,000 people with 2,000 women). Could you please ask the Agency include the target?

02/23/2022: Addressed and corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

February 22, 2022.

Thank you for the comment. There was confusion with the indicator under Output 1.3.2. This output does not have direct beneficiaries as an indicator. This has been corrected and deleted from output 1.3.2. However, the target and the number of direct beneficiaries as mentioned before remain. This project aims to target 5,160 direct beneficiaries through the activities of Outputs 1.1.3, 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.1.3. We have now corrected the results framework to mention explicitly that the targets under these outputs contribute to GEF Core Indicator 11.

The CEO Endorsement request in the Agency Project Document and GEF Portal has now been adjusted throughout to include the number of 5,160 (50% women) of direct beneficiaries that correspond to the sum of the direct beneficiaries under each output.

11 Feb 2022

Targets for Core Indicator 11 labeled in the log frame. Please note the direct beneficiaries are distributed as follows across the outcomes/outputs:

OUTPUT	NUMBER OF DIRECT BENEFICIARIES	NUMBER OF INDIRECT BENEFICIARIES	TYPE OF ACTIVITY
Output 1.1.3	300	2,000	Capacity development program initiated for stakeholders involved in wheat and wheat landscape value chains, including use and implementation of the toolbox for ILM
Output 2.1.1	60	500	Capacity building of existing or created producer organizations and Wheat Clusters to implement sustainable wheat production and diversification at farm and landscape levels (including Farmer Field Schools, FFS and Training of Trainers ToT) to implement improved farming management practices and landscape management
Output 2.1.3	3,800	10,000	Capacity building of Producers in Improve management to increase crop production (conservation agriculture, integrated soil nutrient management, improved wheat cultivation, subsurface drip irrigation system, integrated pest management, etc.)
Output 3.1.1	300	5,000	Capacity building and resource mobilization carried out for implementation of ILM plan (Output 1.3.2) through local producer government and other stakeholders -- including the private sector
Output 3.1.2	300	1,000	Benefit sharing programme that uses results from ILM to financially supports communities and other stakeholders in conservation and restoration of habitats/ecosystems in production landscapes
Output 3.1.3	400	2,000	Alternative livelihoods demonstrated for community women and men involved in activities that threaten global environmental values for conservation and restoration of habitats/ecosystems in production landscapes
Total Beneficiaries	5160	20,500	

24 Jan 22

No response required

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC comments at EOI stage have been addressed.

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request No specific comments received at PFD stage. Council may comment during the 4-weeks circulation period of this child project.

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Has been provided in Annex C.

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: Please include in Annex D. Maps have been provided in several places throughout the document - please insert them here for easy reference.

02/04/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

11 Feb 2022

No response required

24 Jan 22

Maps have been consolidated in Annex D

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

24 Jan 22

No response required

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/17/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

02/04/2022: No. Please address outstanding comments made in this review.

02/11/2022: No. Please address outstanding comment on project logframe.

02/23/2022: Yes. Program manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/17/2021	

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/4/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/11/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/22/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The Uzbekistan The Food Systems, Land-Use and Restoration Child Project has been designed under the Global IP to address its land management and policy issues. Uzbekistan's agriculture sector is undergoing a transition to a more liberal market, with the aim of transitioning wheat value chains to meet changing demands. At the same time, there is recognition by the Government that this needs to happen in a sustainable, inclusive, responsible way, to protect the environment and improve livelihoods, and ensure the long-term resilience of production systems. The project aims to trigger wide-scale adoption of efficient land management technologies and conservation approaches and promote green value chains to change the trajectory from ecosystem degradation to sustainable management for multiple benefits. As a result, the project plans to sequester 1M t of CO₂eq, ecologically restore 50,000 ha, place 50,000 under improved biodiversity management and aid the transition of 300,000 ha under improved land management practices within the wheat-dominant landscapes of the project regions of the country. There are important opportunities for cooperation with the Kazakhstan FOLUR project, which could trigger change in neighbouring countries and similar transitioning economies towards sustainable production and green value chains.

Uzbekistan proposes to transform the management of critical and highly degraded landscapes where globally important biodiversity coexists with production systems, under threat from overexploitation and agriculture intensification. Uzbekistan's participation presents a strategic opportunity for this IP to harness the Government's interest to transform the agricultural commodity systems, given the country's changing State order-driven system towards a market-oriented system for wheat value chains, together with the strategic engagement with the Kazakhstan FOLUR project. Wheat is one of the eight agricultural commodities targeted by the GEF FOLUR project, and the project takes a

broad, holistic approach to FOLUR objectives within wheat-dominant landscapes, and aims to work closely with neighbouring Kazakhstan whose FOLUR IP project also focuses on wheat.

The project document have adequately analyzed risks and opportunities of COVID-19 pandemic and adaptive management measures are in place to mitigate risks and take avail of opportunities, in line with government framework and regulations to address the pandemic.