

## TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	10299
Project Name:	Kazakhstan Resilient Agroforestry and Rangeland Management Project
Countr(ies):	Kazakhstan
Implementing Agency:	World Bank

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. OVERVIEW .....3**

**A. Description .....3**

**B. Key Dates .....3**

**C. Disbursements .....3**

**II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES .....4**

**A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings .....4**

**B. Stakeholder Engagement .....4**

**C. Gender Equality .....4**

**D. Knowledge Management .....4**

**III. CORE INDICATORS .....5**

**IV: CO FINANCING .....7**

**V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS .....8**

**VI. ANNEX .....8**

## I. Overview

### A. Description

Project name

Kazakhstan Resilient Agroforestry and Rangeland Management Project

Country

Kazakhstan

GEF ID

10299

Implementing Agency

World Bank

Executing Entity

Ministry of Ecology, Geology and Natural Resources, Forestry  
Wildlife Committee; Ministry of Agriculture, FAO

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

Objective: Restore land productivity in targeted degraded landscapes in the Republic of Kazakhstan This project is divided into 2 pillars with the following respective pillar objectives: Pillar 1-WB: aims to pilot agroforestry practices using a community-centered approach and to build government capacity for landscape management and restoration. Pillar 2-FAO: focuses on expanding the use of sustainable pasture management practices and technologies in targeted areas.

### B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

4/13/2021

Agency Approval

6/14/2021

Implementation Start

6/14/2021

First Disbursement

8/27/2021

Expected MTR

10/20/2023

MTR Submission

4/30/2026

Actual MTR

11/10/2023

Expected Completion

9/30/2025

Actual Completion

9/30/2025

Actual TE

9/30/2025

TE Submission

4/30/2026

Final Disbursement

### C. Disbursements

Project Financing  
6,850,000.00

Cumulative Disbursement  
4,344,036.00

## II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

### A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

The project largely succeeded in achieving the two intended outcomes embedded in the PDO - piloting agroforestry practices using a community-centered approach and building government capacity for landscape management and restoration. The Project's overall outcome rating is therefore rated as Satisfactory. This is based on the High rating for Relevance, and Substantial ratings for Efficiency and Efficacy. The PDO remained well aligned with national priorities and World Bank objectives, and most intended outcomes were achieved. The Project generates substantial economic benefits, was closed on time, was fully disbursed, incurred no cost overruns, and benefited from purposeful reallocation of resources to higher-impact activities. Together these elements support an overall Outcome rating of Satisfactory.

### B. Stakeholder Engagement

Supervision missions did not record any significant E&S non-compliance issues. A number of activities including stakeholder consultations were regularly conducted upon the project launch and during implementation, meetings with beneficiaries and local authorities were conducted in accordance with SEP and reported in the project completion reports. The project took into account all recommendations made by the Bank during MTR to strengthen reporting of the the E&S risk management of the project and ensure well functioning of the Grievance Mechanism. No complaints from stakeholders were reported during implementation.

### C. Gender Equality

The project made an effort to engage with female farmers, foresters, and beneficiaries. While pay parity was established, there are some challenges for women's labor force participation in the forestry sector. Most women do not take up field work as it is strenuous, given foresters would need to live in harsh windy conditions and camp for weeks, hence end up taking administrative positions. Since MTR the PIU included progress under the gender action plan as per PAD including women in the stakeholder engagement plan, labor management plan and has assigned responsibility to monitor and report progress on gender to the E&S specialist. Relevant project activities were reported in the project final completion report.

### D. Knowledge Management

The clients regularly attended the RESILAND program conference, which held annually and presented their progress to other countries in the region who are also implementing similar resilient landscape projects. Kazakhstan has been the first mover in the region, and is looked upto in terms of best practice, with lots to learn from. Project results were featured in the Bank results' story videos that were published on web. Project outcomes were taken into account during preparation of the PROGREEN Resilient Landscapes Restoration project that also included component on community participation in agro-forestry activities.

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/video/2026/03/18/transforming-kazakhstans-degraded-lands-from-dust-to-orchards>

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/video/2026/03/18/protecting-kyzylorda-building-a-living-barrier-against-dust-wind-anderosion>

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/video/2026/03/18/reviving-the-aral-seabed-millions-of-seedlings-for-a-sustainablefuture>

### III. Core Indicators

#### Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	7135	3085	3270

#### Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
		4,000.00		
Rangeland and pasture			15.00	15.00
Rangeland and pasture			120.00	120.00

#### Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	3,135.00	2,950.00	3,135.00

#### Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

#### Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

#### Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	926815	2950	10839

#### Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	110,815.00	0.00	0.00

#### Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

### Type/Name of Third Party Certification

#### Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	816,000.00	2,950.00	10,839.00

#### Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

#### Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
Inventory of the nrecorded forests				100,000.00	173,915.00

#### Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

#### Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>		2500887		122571.4
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>				1229382

#### Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>		2,500,887		122,571.4
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>				1,229,382
<b>Anticipated start year of accounting</b>		2021		
<b>Duration of accounting</b>		20		

#### Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>				
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>				
<b>Anticipated start year of accounting</b>				
<b>Duration of accounting</b>				

**Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)**

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
<b>Target Energy Saved (MJ)</b>				

**Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)**

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)

**Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments**

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
<b>Female</b>		46,000	20,769	21,096
<b>Male</b>		48,000	23,539	24,224
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>94,000</b>	<b>44,308</b>	<b>45,320</b>

**IV: Co Financing**

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)	Materialized at TE(\$)
GEF Agency	World Bank	Loans	Investment mobilized	190,000,000.00		
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,854,424.00		
Private Sector	AkTep	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000.00		
<b>Total Co-financing</b>				<b>191,954,424.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Comments

Unfortunately, World Bank North Aral Sea Rehabilitation project phase 2 (planned amount of US\$190 million) didn't materialize because of difficulties with approval of technical design and feasibility study of the project. Initial technical design did not pass technical and environmental expertise and currently is under revision. The project is still in pipeline and may be implemented in the next five years.

## V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

### Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
	Medium/Moderate	Medium/Moderate Medium/Moderate	Medium/Moderate

#### Measures to address identified risks and impacts

The Environmental and Social (E&S) risk rating for the Project was Moderate. E&S performance has consistently been Satisfactory throughout implementation, with all subprojects implementing the Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) in an adequate manner. Oversight of E&S systems implementation was provided by the Environmental and Social Specialist of the PMU who ensured classification of subprojects proportionate to their E&S risk levels in accordance with the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). Through implementation, no environmental, social, health, or safety (ESHS) non-compliance issues were recorded, and no outstanding environmental concerns were identified post-completion.

## VI. ANNEX

#### Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Terminal Evaluation (TE)	10299-P171577-2026-ICR-TE-WB-Kazakhstan
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	ESRS-P171577-WB-KZ Landscape GEF-Appraisal-Submitted-Eng
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	ESMF-P171577 - WB-KZ Landscape GEF - English rev