

Support to Chu-Talas Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12280
Countries
Regional (Kyrgyz Republic, Kazakhstan)
Project Name
Support to Chu-Talas Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation
Agencies
UNDP
Date received by PM
2/16/2026
Review completed by PM
4/22/2026
Program Manager
Taylor Henshaw
Focal Area
International Waters
Project Type
FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

16th of February 2026 (thenshaw):

Please use GEF ID 12225 (UNDP) and ID 11999 (UNDP) for guidance on presentation and the level of detail required for this PIF. Please ensure all sections are formatted properly. Please remove bullets and present narrative in full paragraphs. Please also number paragraphs.

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

(i) The two LOEs list the executing entity as "to be determined". Therefore, please remove UNECE from the Executing Partner field. UNECE can be added during PPG.

It is concerning that national level execution and the Chu Talas Commission is not contemplated. Please reconsider to ensure this investment is building basin institution capacity to sustain the project interventions.

(ii) Much of the indicative co-financing listed precedes project implementation. And a lack of identified co-financiers across co-financing source types points to a lack of partnership mobilization in this project. This investment cannot proceed without a much more robust presentation of indicative co-financing at PIF stage.

(iii) Please remove "Mixed & Others" from Project Sector field. This is for CCM projects only.

(iv) Please upload an English translation of the Chu-Talas Strategic Action Programme to the Documents tab in the GEF Portal.

(v) Please carry out an extensive proofread of phrasing/sentence structure throughout the document. The formatting also needs attention, as several lines throughout the document, which are meant to be part of lists, are numbered as paragraphs.

(vi) In general, the PIF storyline is not clear and largely needs to be recast with crisp language that shows change pathways under each output and includes tangible outputs and outcomes that are tied to SAP implementation and can be properly measured.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

Document has substantially improved. Some Portal formatting still needed (i.e. spacing issues, unnecessary indentation, font differences, which make for a very distracting read). Please use "Chu" instead of "Chui" throughout, to avoid reader confusion.

(i) Not addressed. The two LOEs list the executing entity as "to be determined". If the countries are requesting UNECE as the executing entity, this must be stated in the LOE. New LOEs are thus required. If LOEs cannot be secured, please remove UNECE from the Executing Partner field. UNECE can be added during PPG.

It is important that this project builds the capacity of stakeholder institutions. Therefore, please include "Regional/national execution arrangements to be determined in PPG" to signal this SAP sustainability element.

(ii) See co-financing comments below.

(iii) Not addressed. "Mixed & Others" is still indicated.

(iv) Addressed

(v) Partly. Formatting still problematic in sections. Please see comments below on movement of TOC and descriptions.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

(i) Still not addressed. UNECE is not indicated in the two LOEs and therefore must be removed from the project executing partner field. Please input language directly from the offline document "Regional/national execution arrangements to be determined in PPG"

(ii) See co-financing comments below.

(iii) Still not addressed. "Mixed & Others" is still indicated. Please remove "Mixed & Others" from Project Sector field. This is for CCM projects only.

(v) Addressed

13th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

10th of April 2026: Addressed.

Section	GEF Reviewer comments ? 5 th April 2026	UNDP Response
General Project Information / Eligibility	Document has substantially improved. Some Portal formatting still needed (i.e. spacing issues, unnecessary indentation, font differences, which make for a very distracting read). Please use "Chu" instead of "Chui" throughout, to avoid reader confusion.	Formatting issues ha Thanks for pointing
General Project Information / Eligibility	(i) Not addressed. The two LOEs list the executing entity as "to be determined". If the countries are requesting UNECE as the executing entity, this must be stated in the LOE. New LOEs are thus required. If LOEs cannot be secured, please remove UNECE from the Executing Partner field. UNECE can be added during PPG. It is important that this project builds the capacity of stakeholder institutions. Therefore, please include "Regional/national execution arrangements to be determined in PPG" to signal this SAP sustainability element.	UNECE as an EA/II stakeholder or indica Suggested sentence
General Project Information / Eligibility	(iii) Not addressed. "Mixed & Others" is still indicated. Please remove "Mixed & Others" from Project Sector field. This is for CCM projects only.	
General Project Information / Eligibility	6th March (v) : Please carry out an extensive proofread of phrasing/sentence structure throughout the document. The formatting also needs attention, as several lines throughout the document, which are meant to be part of lists, are numbered as paragraphs. 5th April (v) : Partly. Formatting still problematic in sections. Please see comments below on movement of TOC and descriptions.	The formatting issue sections.

GEF Reviewer comments	UNDP Response
Please use GEF ID 12225 (UNDP) and ID 11999 (UNDP) for guidance on presentation and the level of detail required for this PIF. Please ensure all sections are formatted properly. Please remove bullets and present narrative in full paragraphs. Please also number paragraphs.	The PIF has been comprehensively reformatted and meets the presentation standard. The revised version uses the current substantially stronger narrative structure, fuller paragraphs, sections, and a clearer articulation of results pathways.
The two LOEs list the executing entity as 'to be determined'. Therefore, please remove UNECE from the Executing Partner field. UNECE can be added during PPG.	The current PIF continues to tentatively identify UNDP as the executing/implementation support partner in order to facilitate its facilitation role in the Chu-Talas Basin and its continuing transboundary cooperation processes. At the same time, the PIF will be anchored in the CTWC and relevant national level execution arrangements, and coordination modalities.
It is concerning that national level execution and the Chu Talas Commission is not contemplated. Please reconsider to ensure this investment is building basin institution capacity to sustain the project interventions.	This concern has been addressed. The revised PIF now places national institutions at the center of implementation and sustains national Outputs 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4, and further clarifies the multiple stakeholder roles of the CTWC, national ministries and other stakeholder sections.
Much of the indicative co-financing listed precedes project implementation. And a lack of identified co-financiers across co-financing source types points to a lack of partnership mobilization in this project. This investment cannot proceed without a much more robust presentation of indicative co-financing at PIF stage.	Identified co-financers
Please remove "Mixed & Others" from Project Sector field. This is for CCM projects only	Done
Please upload an English translation of the Chu-Talas Strategic Action Programme to the Documents tab in the GEF Portal.	Uploaded
Please carry out an extensive proofread of phrasing/sentence structure throughout the document. The formatting also needs attention, as several lines throughout the document, which are meant to be part of lists, are numbered as paragraphs.	Thank you. We have improved the quality of the text and resolved formatting issues including list structures, and numbering as requested.
In general, the PIF storyline is not clear and largely needs to be recast with crisp language that shows change pathways under each output and includes tangible outputs and outcomes that are tied to SAP implementation and can be properly measured.	Addressed. The revised PIF has been substantially reworked to show more tangible, measurable outputs and outcomes linked to the Project Summary, Indicative Project Overview and the SAP. This is now reflected across project Outputs, which include demonstration, investment-preparation, and KM/M&M.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

(i) Please recast the summary storyline to cover the following points: (1) the importance of the Chu-Talas basins to the two countries; (2) that earlier GEF support (including dates) led to the development of a TDA and SAP (through a participatory process); (3) the identified environmental

problems and barriers that need to be overcome, as identified in the TDA; (4) Based on the TDA, the countries then developed a Strategic Action Program to address the key basin issues (include the major priority actions); (5) the countries endorsed the SAP and this project is designed to support the countries with SAP implementation (include project objective statement); (6) explain what each major component of the project will do (a few sentences for each component); (7) explain how this project will lead to GEBs and include the Core Indicator targets.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

The included summary does not respond to the above comments. Please address.

Please remove "The proposed UNDP/GEF project" and just say "The project".

The GEBs (Core Indicator targets) are still far too low. Please adjust and ensure new targets are accurately reflected in the summary.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Following still not addressed

The included summary does not respond to the above comments. Please address.

The new summary is improved but not does include all elements of the request (purple items need to be added):

(i) Please recast the summary storyline to cover the following points: (1) the importance of the Chu-Talas basins to the two countries; (2) that earlier GEF support (including dates) led to the development of a TDA and SAP (through a participatory process); (3) the identified environmental problems and barriers that need to be overcome, as identified in the TDA; (4) Based on the TDA, the countries then developed a Strategic Action Program to address the key basin issues (include the major priority actions); (5) the countries endorsed the SAP and this project is designed to support the countries with SAP implementation (include project objective statement); (6) explain what each major component of the project will do (a few sentences for each component); (7) explain how this project will lead to GEBs and include the Core Indicator targets.

Please remove "The proposed UNDP/GEF project" and just say "The project".

For the brief description on C3, please include "C 3, through a stakeholder dialogue process, will prepare and mobilize bankable follow-on investment packages for irrigation modernization, canal efficiency, wastewater treatment, and pollution reduction beyond the GEF grant."

For the brief description on C2, Please include "C 2 will implement a small number of practical hotspot demonstrations to reduce irrigation water losses and restore and protect riparian ecosystems to scale across the basins"

For the expected results description, please include "Expected results include: an operational CTWC-led SAP coordination and reporting mechanism; one targeted basin diagnostic update endorsed and used for implementation decisions; harmonized monitoring and joint basin reporting arrangements for water quantity, water quality, and ecosystem indicators; updated bilateral instruments and procedures aligned with the new Water Codes; two shared water ecosystems under improved cooperative management; 2,500 ha of land and ecosystems under restoration; 80,000 ha of landscapes under improved practices; an estimated 200,000 tCO₂e in greenhouse gas emissions mitigated; preparation and mobilization of bankable follow-on investment packages for irrigation modernization, canal efficiency, wastewater treatment, and pollution reduction; and direct benefits for 50,000 people, including women empowerment, supported by participatory, gender-responsive monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge management."

13th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency's Comments

10th of April 2026

<p>The included summary does not respond to the above comments. Please address. The new summary is improved but not does include all elements of the request (purple items need to be added): (i) Please recast the summary storyline to cover the following points: (1) the importance of the Chu-Talas basins to the two countries; (2) that earlier GEF support (including dates) led to the development of a TDA and SAP (through a participatory process); (3) the identified environmental problems and barriers that need to be overcome, as identified in the TDA; (4) Based on the TDA, the countries then developed a Strategic Action Program to address the key basin issues (include the major priority actions); (5) the countries endorsed the SAP and this project is designed to support the countries with SAP implementation (include project objective statement); (6) explain what each major component of the project will do (a few sentences for each component); (7) explain how this project will lead to GEBs and include the Core Indicator targets.</p>	Summary revised
<p>Please remove "The proposed UNDP/GEF project" and just say "The project".</p>	Done
<p>For the brief description on C3, please include "C 3, through a stakeholder dialogue process, will prepare and mobilize bankable follow-on investment packages for irrigation modernization, canal efficiency, wastewater treatment, and pollution reduction beyond the GEF grant."</p>	Included
<p>For the brief description on C2, Please include "C 2 will implement a small number of practical hotspot demonstrations to reduce irrigation water losses and restore and protect riparian ecosystems to scale across the basins"</p>	Included

Thank you. Done according to your suggestions

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) No, the objective is truncated. Perhaps it is meant to read as proposed in the summary: "To enhance water use efficiency, ecosystem resilience, and water security in the Chu and Talas River Basins through implementation of the jointly agreed Strategic Action Programme. "?

(b) ****Please adjust output title phrasing to reflect comments below (project description). Please ensure outputs are phrased as proper outputs, with tangible deliverables.

(i) Please include only one Component 1, one Component 2 and one Component 3. In other words, nest all outcomes and outputs for Component 1 under one Component 1 heading only.

(ii) See next section comments regarding gender, km and M&E.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) No. The new stated objective is not included. The objective still reads "Enhancing Water Use Efficiency in the Chu and Talas River Basins through Strategic Action Programme Implementation".

(b) *** Please see comments in project description.

(i) Addressed.

(ii) Not addressed. There is now no M&E component and M&E has been merged with KM, which is not permitted. And Component 4 is not labeled. Please revise to include a Component 4 on KM and Comms and the separate M&E line. Gender aspects are still not properly reflected in the project output phrasing. Please revise.

As noted in offline comments, "please remove indicators from project outcomes column and include them elsewhere". Please include Outcomes only in the Outcome column.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) Still not addressed. The objective reads "Enhancing Water Use Efficiency in the Chu and Talas River Basins through Strategic Action Programme Implementation." Please change
to To strengthen transboundary water security and climate resilience in the Chu and Talas River Basins through coordinated implementation of the jointly endorsed Strategic Action Programme

(b) (ii) Indicators comment addressed.

For M&E, please include M&E outputs:

i.e.,

"Output 5.1. A gender-responsive project Monitoring and Evaluation System designed and operational."

"Output 5.2. Annual binational review and grievance mechanism developed & implemented. PIRs completed and independent project evaluations conducted."

***PLEASE ENSURE THESE OUTPUTS 5.1 and 5.2 ARE INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SECTION OF PIF (chapeau and detail and TOC diagram).

For "1.4. Legal/procedural proposals (bilateral instruments and protocols) are prepared and proposed for approval to strengthen the CTWC mandate and align bilateral cooperation with the new Water Codes in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan." suggested change to "1.4. Legal/procedural proposals (bilateral instruments and protocols) are prepared and proposed for approval and uptake to strengthen the CTWC mandate and align bilateral cooperation with the new Water Codes in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan."

3.3. Financing engagement packages are prepared and used to mobilize follow-on public, IFI, and other financing for priority basin investments, demonstrating their environmental, water-security, gender, and climate-resilience benefits and channel finance to agreed basin priorities

For 3.3. Please state "3.3. Financing engagement packages, utilizing outputs 3.1 and 3.2, are prepared and used to mobilize follow-on public, IFI and other financing....."

***PLEASE ENSURE THESE OUTPUT LANGUAGE CHANGES ARE INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SECTION OF PIF (chapeau and detail and TOC diagram).

13th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

10th of April 2026

Indicative Project Overview (3.1)	(a) Still not addressed. The objective reads "Enhancing Water Use Efficiency..." Please change to "To strengthen transboundary water security and climate resilience in the Chu and Talas River Basins through coordinated implementation of the jointly endorsed Strategic Action Programme".	Ad
Indicative Project Overview (3.1)	(b)(ii) For M&E, please include M&E outputs: i.e., "Output 5.1. A gender-responsive project Monitoring and Evaluation System designed and operational." "Output 5.2. Annual binational review and grievance mechanism developed & implemented. PIRs completed and independent project evaluations conducted. ***PLEASE ENSURE THESE OUTPUTS 5.1 and 5.2 ARE INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SECTION OF PIF (chapeau and detail and TOC diagram).	Inc
Indicative Project Overview (3.1)	(b) For "1.4. Legal/procedural proposals (bilateral instruments and protocols) are prepared and proposed for approval to strengthen the CTWC mandate and align bilateral cooperation with the new Water Codes in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan." suggested change to "1.4. Legal/procedural proposals (bilateral instruments and protocols) are prepared and proposed for approval and uptake to strengthen the CTWC mandate and align bilateral cooperation with the new Water Codes in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan."	Inc
Indicative Project Overview (3.1)	For 3.3. Please state "3.3. Financing engagement packages, utilizing outputs 3.1 and 3.2, are prepared and used to mobilize follow-on public, IFI and other financing....." ***PLEASE ENSURE THESE OUTPUT LANGUAGE CHANGES ARE INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SECTION OF PIF (chapeau and detail and TOC diagram).	Rev

<p>6th March (a) No, the objective is truncated. Perhaps it is meant to read as proposed in the summary: "To enhance water use efficiency, ecosystem resilience, and water security in the Chu and Talas River Basins through implementation of the jointly agreed Strategic Action Programme. "?</p> <p>5th April (a) No. The new stated objective is not included. The objective still reads "Enhancing Water Use Efficiency in the Chu and Talas River Basins through Strategic Action Programme Implementation".</p>	<p>The project objective was changed to enhance water use efficiency, ecosystem resilience, and water security in the Chu and Talas River Basins through implementation of the jointly agreed Strategic Action Programme?.</p>
<p>(ii) Not addressed. There is now no M&E component and M&E has been merged with KM, which is not permitted. And Component 4 is not labeled. Please revise to include a Component 4 on KM and Comms and the separate M&E line. Gender aspects are still not properly reflected in the project output phrasing. Please revise.</p>	<p>M&E Component is separated from KM and updated in log frame and narrative action plan.</p> <p>Gender aspects have been incorporated into the project narrative, as well as output descriptions.</p>
<p>As noted in offline comments, "please remove indicators from project outcomes column and include them elsewhere". Please include Outcomes only in the Outcome column.</p>	<p>The indicators are removed from Project Outcomes and included in the Project Description, namely at <i>Incremental Outcomes</i>.</p>

6th March 2026:

GEF Reviewer comments	UNDP Response
-----------------------	---------------

(a) No, the objective is truncated. Perhaps it is meant to read as proposed in the summary: "To enhance water use efficiency, ecosystem resilience, and water security in the Chu and Talas River Basins through implementation of the jointly agreed Strategic Action Programme. "?	Addressed. The project objective is now clearly stated and consistently reflected in the Project Summary and <i>security and climate resilience in the Chu and Talas implementation.</i> ?
(b) ****Please adjust output title phrasing to reflect comments below (project description). Please ensure outputs are phrased as proper outputs, with tangible deliverables.	Addressed. The output titles and descriptions have been updated.
(i) Please include only one Component 1, one Component 2 and one Component 3. In other words, nest all outcomes and outputs for Component 1 under one Component 1 heading only.	Done

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): No, please address the following:

Gender: No gender equality and empowerment outputs are included in the project architecture. Please include, taking guidance from the UNDP MSPs that are cited in the first section of the review sheet. Gender elements must be included explicitly across components to effectively see mainstreaming. The project could be further strengthened by explicitly addressing women's active participation and leadership, including strengthening women's capacities in natural resource management and ecosystem services. This could include promoting gender-responsive policies, ensuring women's meaningful participation in decision-making spaces, and ensuring that project investments and capacity-building activities effectively reach women, women's organizations, and women-led businesses, including through improved access to financial resources. These actions could be further refined and operationalized during the PPG stage, informed by the forthcoming Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan, to better target the intended beneficiaries and address context-specific gender gaps.

Knowledge Management: No KM outcomes and outputs are included in the project architecture. Please include, taking guidance from the UNDP MSPs that are cited in the first section of the review sheet.

M&E: No M&E outcome and outputs are included in the project architecture. Please include, taking guidance from the UNDP MSPs that are cited in the first section of the review sheet.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

Gender: Not addressed. Outputs must reflect gender equality and empowerment aspects. Please revise.

KM: Not addressed. KM must be its own component and not merged with M&E. Please break "4.1. Basin-wide knowledge management, learning, and knowledge-sharing system established to capture, package, and disseminate lessons, data, good practices, and policy-relevant knowledge on transboundary water cooperation, climate resilience, ecosystem restoration, and basin management" into several tangible outputs rather than a "system". Please include an output that includes contributions to IW:LEARN activities.

M&E: Not addressed. M&E must be its own line in the project architecture. "4.2. Participatory and gender-inclusive M&E and KM system is established and implemented" is not adequate as an output.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

Gender: Addressed

KM: Addressed

M&E. See comment in above section of review sheet regarding adequate outputs and suggested phrasing.

The M&E 3% threshold is exceptionally exceeded for this project because the ES risk is rated "substantial". Importantly, the project will use these additional M&E allocated resources to ensure a rigorous risk mitigation program is carried out during the project period through monitoring and evaluating the stakeholder consultation and validation process, ensure a robust grievance redress mechanism is functioning well, and to be equipped to monitor the substantial ES risk on a rolling basis and adapt accordingly.

13th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

10th of April 2026

M&E: See comment in above section of review sheet regarding adequate outputs and suggested phrasing.	Addressed as re
--	-----------------

5th April 2026: Revised and added as per response to comment #6

Gender 3.2:

Thank you for the comment. Please see below how we addressed:

? added a dedicated gender section,

- added a 50% women participation target,
- committed to a Gender Analysis + GAP + budget during PPG,
- added sex-disaggregated monitoring and reporting,
- added gender-responsive grievance/consultation measures, and
- mainstreamed gender language across Outputs 1.1?4.2, instead of leaving gender outside the results architecture.

The current PIF uses cross-component mainstreaming plus Component 4?s gender-inclusive M&E/KM framework

KM:

Addressed. The revised PIF now includes a dedicated Component 4 on KM and M&E with dedicated outputs.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

- (a) No, there is no allocation for M&E. Please include and revise all components accordingly.
- (b) While there is proportionality, the co-financing amounts are not accurate. See co-financing section below and revise proportionality accordingly.
- (c) Yes

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

- (a) Not addressed. Please do not merge M&E and KM. M&E must have its own budget line. Please ensure there is adequate budget for KM.
- (b) See co-financing comments below.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th April 2026:

KM and M&E are now separate

4.1 is break into three outputs:

4.1. Knowledge products, communication materials, and learning packages are developed, updated, and disseminated for basin institutions, local stakeholders, practitioners, and financing partners, based on project results on governance, monitoring, demonstrations, ecosystem-supporting measures, gender, and investment preparation.

4.2 Two-way basin learning and stakeholder feedback mechanism is operationalized through exchanges, field learning events, technical dialogues, and communication channels that both disseminate project lessons and feed stakeholder experience and feedback back into project implementation.

4.3 IW:LEARN level and wider transboundary knowledge exchange contributions are delivered, including participation in IW:LEARN activities

M&E and KM are separated, and included as different components with own outcomes and outputs

M&E and KM are separated, and included as different components with own outcomes and outputs. Budget revised.

6th March 2026:

- a) Addressed. The revised PIF now includes a dedicated Component 4 on KM and M&E with dedicated outputs and budget
- b) We have now updated the co-financing figures completely.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) (i) For current situation, please detail the importance of the Chu-Talas Basins to the countries and why addressing the environmental problems is critical.

(ii) Please ensure environmental problem claims are back up by scientific evidence. Please use footnotes and citations "(____, 2025)".

The TDA notes that a Cause and Effect Relationship Analysis was prepared to inform the TDA. Please include a summary of this causal chain analysis for each problem in the situational analysis section of the PIF to present each problem's direct, underlying and root causes and their consequences. Please also include a detailed summary of the stakeholder analysis that was prepared

(iii) Please enlarge map as it is currently not viewable.

(iv) Please present the TDA recommendations in table format, rather than paragraphs. The current presentation is difficult to follow.

(v) Beginning at paragraph 39, please include how the SAP was developed, including which stakeholders were involved and process.

(vi) Paragraph 40 states that "six objectives were formulated", then the Vision is presented followed by long term goals. Please proofread/revise

Please utilize a table to present the full snapshot of the SAP, including the six major objectives and all priority actions under each. Any other visual aids in the SAP or otherwise prepared to help explain the SAP would be welcomed in this section.

(vii) Please include "Figure 2. SAP objectives and overcoming TDA challenges within the project" in the PIF document. It does not appear in the Documents tab, as the PIF notes.

(vii) Please include information about the Joint Statement on approval of the SAP and how the SAP is endorsed and approved for implementation within the two governments.

(b) (i) The root causes section is a set of lists and not paragraphs, yet they are numbered, which is very difficult to follow. Please reformat and explain the root causes and barriers to be addressed in full paragraphs/or bulleted lists.

(ii) Please include a brief summary in this section of each national Water Code and preliminary analysis of the implications of these legal reforms on SAP implementation and this project.

(iii) Please include a detailed box in this section on the history of the Chu-Talas Commission, concluding the its assessed strengths and weaknesses.

(iv) Figure 2 in paragraph 81 is missing. Please include and provide an associated description for the reader.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

*There are still several stats in this section that are not backed by citation. Again, please use (source, date) "...(World Bank, 2024)" rather than solely footnote links. Please address.

(a) (i) Addressed

(ii) Partly addressed. Several of the footnoted links take the reader to webpages that are not dated. Please provide source and date throughout the narrative rather than just links in footnotes at the end of paragraphs. Please re-read comment. Further, some pages redirect to figures on Amu Darya and Syr Darya. Please correct.

Is there a diagram from the cause and effect analysis (mentioned in the SAP in explaining the TDA) that can be included to support the root causes aspect?

(iii) The map no longer appears in this section. Please address.

(iv) Addressed

(v) PIF states "The nominated experts from water, environment, hydromet, emergency, agriculture, energy, foreign, local and other relevant ministries and agencies as well as academia, experts and civil society organisations from both countries were elaborating SAP within the Working Group on Adaptation to Climate Change and Long-term Action Programmes under the CTWC in 2017-2021", The Agency notes in the review sheet (in ESS section) that smallhold farmers were involved in the SAP development, yet this does not appear to be true based on the quoted statement. Further, the table of stakeholders in the SAP does not seem to include smallhold farmers. Please explain.

(vi) Not sufficiently addressed. The reader would benefit from a detailed snapshot of what is in the SAP. Please include.

(vii) Para 16: "The SAP was approved on December 22, 2023 by the two countries through a signed joint statement." Please provide more detail here. Include highlights of what does the joint statement says directly in this section. As well as who signed the statement.

(b) (i) Addressed

(ii) Addressed

(iii) Para 18: Please put the text in a box. It currently reads "Text Box.....". The narrative between paras 17 and 19 needs to be broken up with a text box. In this text box, please elaborate on the sentence "However, decision making has been limited in these areas and needs and needs to be strengthened for the implementation of the SAP". Please explain why.

(iv) Addressed

New:

Para 17: " According to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), the SAP is intended to support cooperation benefiting about 3 million people in the basin and is complemented by national action plans for each country." Why according to UNECE? This should be an established fact.

Please fix this sentence: "The nominated experts from water, environment, hydromet, emergency, agriculture, energy, foreign, local and other relevant ministries and agencies as well as academia, experts and civil society organisations from both countries were elaborating SAP within the Working Group on Adaptation to Climate Change and Long-term Action Programmes under the CTWC in 2017-2021."

"The SAP is divided into Joint Action Programme and two national action plans ". Please state clearly that the SAP document uniquely includes both the joint programme and national action plans.

Regarding the national actions plans, what is the evidence for "In the Kyrgyz Republic, the action plan approved in October 2022" and "In Kazakhstan, the plan approved June 2021"? These approvals came before the joint approval of the SAP?

Regarding the sentence "Kazakhstan's new Water Code entered into force in 2025, introducing concepts such as water security and ecological flow, while Kyrgyzstan's new Water Code was adopted in 2025 and is expected to enter into force in 2026.". Does the Kyrgyz Water Code also introduce water security and ecological flow concepts? Is it incongruent? Please specify in the text, as the sentence reads incomplete.

Please confirm that the Barriers identified are from the SAP process and include at as a intro under the Barrier heading.

Remove first person " I assign this the lowest probability not because it is unrealistic, but because it requires sustained finance, political commitment, and institutional follow-through well beyond what is typically achieved under current regional constraints."

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Mostly addressed.

Minor fixes:

Figure 1: Project area and suggested project sites (Zo? Environment Network, 2011). Please remove this map title, as it does not include "suggested project sites". Please just label "Geography of the Chu and Talas Basins".

At paragraph 10 "10. Based on the analysis of situation in the transboundary Chu-Talas Basin the following four simple future scenarios were considered for this GEF project **GEF design guidance** (STAP, 2023)[7]1:" please place "GEF design guidance in the bracketed citation), as the current placement sparks some confusion.

At paragraph 21 "The CTWC held its 35th and 36th meetings in Astana and Bishkek in April and September 2025 accordingly, where it reviewed rehabilitated infrastructure and adopted updated water-allocation protocols and acknowledged the importance of the monitoring of SAP implementation, showing that the bilateral mechanism is active and still central to basin governance", please clarify text, as "bilateral mechanism" could be interpreted to mean the CTWC. Suggested change to "showing that the bilateral SAP is active and central to basin governance".

Please remove paragraph 22 box, which is redundant (already at para 17).

Agency's Comments

10th of April 2026

Situation Analysis (4.1) ? minor fixes	Figure 1: Project area and suggested project sites (Zo? Environment Network, 2011). Please remove this map title, as it does not include "suggested project sites". Please just label "Geography of the Chu and Talas Basins".	Ad
Situation Analysis (4.1) ? minor fixes	Paragraph 10: "10. Based on the analysis of situation in the transboundary Chu-Talas Basin the following four simple future scenarios were considered for this GEF project GEF design guidance (STAP, 2023)[7]1:" please place "GEF design guidance in the bracketed citation), as the current placement sparks some confusion.	Co
Situation Analysis (4.1) ? minor fixes	At paragraph 21: "The CTWC held its 35th and 36th meetings in Astana and Bishkek in April and September 2025 accordingly, where it reviewed rehabilitated infrastructure and adopted updated water-allocation protocols and acknowledged the importance of the monitoring of SAP implementation, showing that the bilateral mechanism is active and still central to basin governance", please clarify text, as "bilateral mechanism" could be interpreted to mean the CTWC. Suggested change to "showing that the bilateral SAP is active and central to basin governance".	Tha The ben The Ast 202 reh upa ack SA imp and gov
Situation Analysis (4.1) ? minor fixes	Please remove paragraph 22 box , which is redundant (already at para 17).	Re

5th April 2026:

Situation Analysis	There are still several stats in this section that are not backed by citation. Again, please use (source, date) "...(World Bank, 2024)" rather than solely footnote links. Please address.	Citations are now
--------------------	--	-------------------

<p>Situation Analysis</p>	<p>6th March (ii) : Please ensure environmental problem claims are back up by scientific evidence. Please use footnotes and citations "(____, 2025)". The TDA notes that a Cause and Effect Relationship Analysis was prepared to inform the TDA. Please include a summary of this causal chain analysis for each problem in the situational analysis section of the PIF to present each problem's direct, underlying and root causes and their consequences. Please also include a detailed summary of the stakeholder analysis that was prepared</p> <p>5th April (ii) : Partly addressed. Several of the footnoted links take the reader to webpages that are not dated. Please provide source and date throughout the narrative rather than just links in footnotes at the end of paragraphs. Please re-read comment. Further, some pages redirect to figures on Amu Darya and Syr Darya. Please correct.</p> <p>Is there a diagram from the cause and effect analysis (mentioned in the SAP in explaining the TDA) that can be included to support the root causes aspect?</p>	<p>Footnotes checked</p> <p>Relevant Figures n respect</p>
<p>Situation Analysis</p>	<p>(iii) The map no longer appears in this section. Please address.</p>	<p>The map is now F</p>
<p>Situation Analysis</p>	<p>(v) PIF states "The nominated experts from water, environment, hydromet, emergency, agriculture, energy, foreign, local and other relevant ministries and agencies as well as academia, experts and civil society organisations from both countries were elaborating SAP within the Working Group on Adaptation to Climate Change and Long-term Action Programmes under the CTWC in 2017-2021", The Agency notes in the review sheet (in ESS section) that smallhold farmers were involved in the SAP development, yet this does not appear to be true based on the quoted statement. Further, the table of stakeholders in the SAP does not seem to include smallhold farmers. Please explain.</p>	<p>Corrected. Small f development, nam authorities and wa important stakehol farmers and were i development.</p>

<p>Situation Analysis</p>	<p>6th March (vi) Paragraph 40 states that "six objectives were formulated", then the Vision is presented followed by long term goals. Please proofread/revise</p> <p>Please utilize a table to present the full snapshot of the SAP, including the six major objectives and all priority actions under each. Any other visual aids in the SAP or otherwise prepared to help explain the SAP would be welcomed in this section.</p> <p>5th April (vi) Not sufficiently addressed. The reader would benefit from a detailed snapshot of what is in the SAP. Please include.</p>	<p>Please see Figures description under 1</p>
<p>Situation Analysis</p>	<p>(vii) Para 16: "The SAP was approved on December 22, 2023 by the two countries through a signed joint statement." Please provide more detail here. Include highlights of what does the joint statement says directly in this section. As well as who signed the statement.</p>	<p>Please see Figures description under 1</p>
<p>Situation Analysis</p>	<p>(iii) Para 18: Please put the text in a box. It currently reads "Text Box.....". The narrative between paras 17 and 19 needs to be broken up with a text box. In this text box, please elaborate on the sentence "However, decision making has been limited in these areas and needs and needs to be strengthened for the implementation of the SAP". Please explain why.</p>	<p>Added as follows: <i>remains limited and implementation of integrated, cross-sector beyond infrastructure coordinated management climate risks at the</i></p> <p>Please note paras a Box 10 p.18</p>
<p>Situation Analysis (new comment)</p>	<p>(v) Para 17: " According to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), the SAP is intended to support cooperation benefiting about 3 million people in the basin and is complemented by national action plans for each country." Why according to UNECE? This should be an established fact.</p>	<p>In the Project Rati that the ?SAP is in about 3 million pe</p>
<p>Situation Analysis (new comment)</p>	<p>Please fix this sentence: " The nominated experts from water, environment, hydromet, emergency, agriculture, energy, foreign, local and other relevant ministries and agencies as well as academia, experts and civil society organisations from both countries were elaborating SAP within the Working Group on Adaptation to Climate Change and Long-term Action Programmes under the CTWC in 2017-2021."</p>	<p>Corrected.</p>
<p>Situation Analysis (new comment)</p>	<p>"The SAP is divided into Joint Action Programme and two national action plans ". Please state clearly that the SAP document uniquely includes both the joint programme and national action plans.</p>	<p>Included in the ad endorsing the SAP</p>

Situation Analysis (new comment)	Regarding the national actions plans, what is the evidence for "In the Kyrgyz Republic, the action plan approved in October 2022" and "In Kazakhstan, the plan approved June 2021"? These approvals came before the joint approval of the SAP?	The relevant information
Situation Analysis (new comment)	Regarding the sentence "Kazakhstan's new Water Code entered into force in 2025, introducing concepts such as water security and ecological flow, while Kyrgyzstan's new Water Code was adopted in 2025 and is expected to enter into force in 2026.". Does the Kyrgyz Water Code also introduce water security and ecological flow concepts? Is it incongruent? Please specify in the text, as the sentence reads incomplete.	We added as follows: "Kazakhstan's new Water Code entered into force in 2025, introducing concepts such as water security and ecological flow, while Kyrgyzstan's new Water Code was adopted in 2025 and is expected to enter into force in 2026.". Does the Kyrgyz Water Code also introduce water security and ecological flow concepts? Is it incongruent? Please specify in the text, as the sentence reads incomplete.
Situation Analysis (new comment)	Please confirm that the Barriers identified are from the SAP process and include at as a intro under the Barrier heading.	Confirmed and added. The barriers have been added under the heading. The barriers are derived from the underlying TDA-basins and are outlined through the CTWC. The CTWC summarizes the main findings and implementation in the PIF.
Situation Analysis (new comment)	Remove first person " I assign this the lowest probability not because it is unrealistic, but because it requires sustained finance, political commitment, and institutional follow-through well beyond what is typically achieved under current regional constraints."	Thank you for pointing out the error in PIF para 15

6th March 2026:

GEF Reviewer comments	UNDP Response
(i) For current situation, please detail the importance of the Chu-Talas Basins to the countries and why addressing the environmental problems is critical.	This is now addressed in the project rationale
(ii) Please ensure environmental problem claims are back up by scientific evidence. Please use footnotes and citations "(, 2025)".	Done
The TDA notes that a Cause and Effect Relationship Analysis was prepared to inform the TDA. Please include a summary of this causal chain analysis for each problem in the situational analysis section of the PIF to present each problem's direct, underlying and root causes and their consequences. Please also include a detailed summary of the stakeholder analysis that was prepared	The revised Project Rationale now presents a strong analysis of the environmental problems, threats, future scenarios, baseline context, and how the project reflects the causal logic linking direct pressures, underlying weaknesses, and resulting transboundary consequences.
(iii) Please enlarge map as it is currently not viewable.	Done
(iv) Please present the TDA recommendations in table format, rather than paragraphs. The current presentation is difficult to follow	The revised PIF now reflects the key TDA recommendations on suggested project sites and the linked project results. Description
(v) Beginning at paragraph 39, please include how the SAP was developed, including which stakeholders were involved and process.	The revised PIF now explains more clearly that the SAP was developed through a formal process / UNDP / GEF-supported basin cooperation process, formally endorsed by the CTWC, with subsequent monitoring of the importance of monitoring SAP implementation, as outlined in the <i>Baseline programs in transboundary Chu-Talas basins and threats</i> .
(vi) Paragraph 40 states that "six objectives were formulated", then the Vision is presented followed by long term goals. Please proofread/revise	The SAP-related narrative has been revised in the project rationale to include a clear formulation on objectives / vision / long-term goals.

Please utilize a table to present the full snapshot of the SAP, including the six major objectives and all priority actions under each. Any other visual aids in the SAP or otherwise prepared to help explain the SAP would be welcomed in this section.	The revised PIF now presents the SAP and the related narrative form in the Project Rationale and links to relevant project Outputs
(vii) Please include "Figure 2. SAP objectives and overcoming TDA challenges within the project" in the PIF document. It does not appear in the Documents tab, as the PIF notes.	Figure 2, titled "SAP objectives and overcoming TDA challenges within the project" removed from the current PIF as we updated TOC
(vii) Please include information about the Joint Statement on approval of the SAP and how the SAP is endorsed and approved for implementation within the two governments.	SAP endorsement through the Joint Statement is done
(b) (i) The root causes section is a set of lists and not paragraphs, yet they are numbered, which is very difficult to follow. Please reformat and explain the root causes and barriers to be addressed in full paragraphs/or bulleted lists.	The three main barriers are now explained in the paragraphs
(ii) Please include a brief summary in this section of each national Water Code and preliminary analysis of the implications of these legal reforms on SAP implementation and this project.	Paragraph on Kazakh and Kyrgyz Water Codes is included. This informs now outputs 1.1 and 1.3 on CTWC-related proposals.
(iii) Please include a detailed box in this section on the history of the Chu-Talas Commission, concluding the its assessed strengths and weaknesses.	A box on the history of the Chu-Talas Commission on its strengths and weaknesses has been included as para 19 in part A.
(iv) Figure 2 in paragraph 81 is missing. Please include and provide an associated description for the reader.	Figure 2, titled "SAP objectives and overcoming TDA challenges within the project" removed from the document.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

- (a) Yes, this is a SAP implementation project.
- (b) To be determined on resubmission.
- (c) Paragraph 80 notes that the project will cover most of the tasks and activities approved in the Joint Action Plan and the two National Actions Plans of the Chu Talas SAP. What is the Joint Action Plan? Are the National Action Plans developed? Please provide a summary of all three plans directly in this section and upload the documents (in English) to the Documents tab.
- (d) (iv) Paragraph 73. Please elaborate on the extent of Local Communities. Does this mainly focus on farmers and households?

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

- (b) Addressed.

(c) Not addressed. As stated above, please provide details on what these plans actually set out to do. In the next section, please map each of the outputs to the plans (by action #) to evidence that this project will fulfill its mandate of supporting SAP implementation.

(d) Addressed

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th April 2026: (c):

Information on the Joint Action Programme and National Action Plans was added to the Project Rationale namely in the *Baseline programs in transboundary Chu-Talas Basin to address environmental and climate threats*.

Addressed. The PIF now provides more specific information on what the SAP-associated national action plans set out to do, including quantified measures, responsible institutions, and implementation focus areas. In the Project Outputs section, each output is now explicitly mapped to the relevant SAP Goals, Tasks, and actions, thereby showing how the project supports implementation of the Joint Action Programme and the associated national action plans.

For KM and M&E Components the following sentences were included as there are no specific activities in SAP:

Since component 4 involves knowledge generation and collection of lessons learned related to Outcomes 1?3, the actions for implementing the SAP described above for the outputs in components 1-3 align with this component.

Since component 5 involves participatory and gender-inclusive M&E related to Outcomes 1?3, the actions for implementing the SAP described above for the outputs in components 1-3 align with this component.

6th March 2026:

c) The main purpose and the brief explanations of the content of the Joint Action Program and National Action Plans are provided in the Project Rationale including approval of these documents.

d) The Project Description namely the section on Key Stakeholders details that at user and community level the project will engage Water User Associations/Municipal Water Departments, farmers, agribusinesses, pasture users, and rural households as the primary local actors in water demand management and ecosystem supporting measures.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) (i) The Figure 3 Theory of Change diagram is presented too small and is not legible. Please revise so a full review of the ToC can be carried out.

(ii) Please include a more robust set of assumptions in the TOC diagram and description.

(iii) Please include a change pathway description to accompany the TOC diagram, using the recent Bolivia/Chile UNDP MSP as template:

"The Theory of Change is based on the premise that if Bolivia and Chile jointly generate a shared scientific and socio-institutional understanding of transboundary water, ecosystem, and climate risks through a TDA; and if this evidence base is translated into a jointly agreed SAP supported by a strengthened, inclusive binational mechanism (building on the existing Chile/Bolivia Binational Round Table on Transboundary Water Resources); and if early, demonstrative stress-reduction actions and a validated investment portfolio are developed to show tangible benefits of cooperation; then durable transboundary governance will be established, enabling coordinated, climate-resilient management of shared high-Andean water and wetland systems and the delivery of sustained Global Environmental Benefits."

(iv) The TOC "goal" is stated as a pathway change, not a goal. Please include the project objective here instead and present a more detailed change pathway in the description.

(vi) Please ensure TOC is rephrased to reflect comments throughout this review sheet.

(b) Please address below comments on the project description:

Component 1

Outcome 1.1

The overview description for Outcome 1 is missing in this section. Please include.

(i) Output 1.1.1: If the CTWC Joint Working Group is the "platform for the joint and national coordination of the SAP implementation" then why does it need to be "established" (as reflected in the Output 1.1.1)? For paragraph 86, please describe what the WG SAP is and why it needs to be "...harmonized and supported". What are the activities of the WG SAP? Please explain how the project will support the activities of the WG SAP?

(ii) Output 1.1.2: "Chu-Talas TDA is updated to review existing and assess emerging issues in basins" is confusing. Please rephrase. Please also explain what new literature and data is available to include since the TDA was developed, prompting its necessary update. Is it necessary to update the TDA to conduct an "in-depth assessment of the needs and proposing solutions for improvement of the institutional and legal basis of the CTWC and bilateral transboundary cooperation"? Could this not just be a new assessment? Will this assessment be done through a participatory process? If so, with which stakeholders? Please share the TDA and highlight which sections need updating. What happens once the TDA is updated/institutional assessment is completed? What does it feed into? How will it be used to deliver on this project? Even if said elsewhere, please include these points under Output 1.1.2 so reader can better understand the pathway of change.

(iii) Output 1.1.3: Please explain why amending the bilateral agreement is necessary to enable IWRM. What are the shortfalls? It is not clear what this output is achieving. The recommendations for legal and institutional arrangements developed under Output 1.1.2 are shared with the CTWC Secretariat? Is this to be done in a dialogue process that leads to some

outcome? What is the tangible deliverable of this output? Are the new recommendations taken up through this output? Is the bilateral agreement amended through this output? What happens next?

Outcome 1.2

Please rework this outcome description to better explain the shortfalls of the current monitoring system and why strengthened technical capacities will lead to better functioning monitoring systems and long-term SAP implementation and basin decision making.

(iv) Output 1.2.1

Please recast this output description in its entirety. Please present clearly and simply what the project is going to do, with tangible deliverables. What does "The GEF SAP implementation will increment all above baseline programmes and projects....".

Outcome 1.3

It is not clear what "Governments and Commission are enabled to integrate environmental considerations to the decision making and development programmes". Please revise. In addition to not being clear, "enabled" is vague and it is not clear how this "outcome" can be measured.

What does it mean "The IW:LEARN, UNECE Water Convention....AQAUSTAT... are to be incremented"?

(v) Output 1.3.1: This output description is confusing and needs to be rewritten so reader can understand what exactly is being proposed. It appears the sole deliverable is an economic assessment and climate change impact analysis. What are the purposes of such studies and what are they going to feed into to advance SAP implementation? The storyline for this output is difficult to follow.

(vi) Output 1.3.2: Please explain what "training facilities" are. Please explain why facilities and toolkits need to be "tested" and not fully implemented? Are these facilities being built through co-financing? Considering Output 1.3.2, doesn't the outcome change to include all stakeholders ("school, college, university educators ad students, water operators and users, businesses, farmers, community leaders, and household owners"..., not just 'governments and commission" benefitting? Are these two facilities going to be used as research and monitoring facilities as well?

Component 2

Please fix Component 2 title phrasing "Investing ecosystems' restoration and water resilience...".

*****Please substantively improve the quality of the storyline for the demonstration/pilots*****

Outcome 2.1

(vii) Output 2.1.1: Please describe what "demonstrated" means. Will these be pilots? Who is the target stakeholder audience? Will these demonstrations be led by local communities? What is the outcome of these demonstrations for SAP implementation?

(viii) Output 2.1.2: Please describe what "demonstrated" means. Will these be pilots? Please describe the buffer zone in detail. Will these demonstrations be led by local communities? What is the outcome of these demonstrations for SAP implementation?

Outcome 2.2

"Promoted water resilience enable water efficient end use and water resilient livelihood" is not a tangible outcome. Please revise.

(ix) Output 2.2.1: Please describe what "demonstrated" means. Will these be pilots? Will these demonstrations be led by local communities? What is the outcome of these demonstrations for SAP implementation? Please better describe what is meant by "the investment of a model comprehensive.... for at minimum two selected geographical locations in two basins will also be done?"

(x) Output 2.2.2: Please describe what "demonstrated" means. Will these be pilots? Will these demonstrations be led by local communities? What is the outcome of these demonstrations for SAP implementation?

(xi) Output 2.2.3: What does "established" mean? Please better describe this output and how it relates to SAP implementation.

Output is truncated in project overview table "**Output 2.2.3.** Concessional funding facilities to promote sustainable water end-use in agriculture, businesses and livelihood are "

What GEB targets will be achieved through these demonstration/pilots? Which SAP priority actions do the above demonstrations/pilots relate to?

Component 3

Outcome 3.1

(xii) Output 3.1.1: What are the planned tangible deliverables for the in depth assessment(s) and what happens after they are prepared/What do they feed into?

(xiii) Output 3.1.2: It is not clear what is meant by model reconstruction piloted. This description should be recast for clarity

(xiv) Output 3.1.3: It is not clear what is meant by the technical assistance rendered. This description should be recast for clarity

Outcome 3.2

This outcome description is not clear. Please recast for clarity.

(xv) Output 3.2.1: The description is not clear. Please recast for clarity. What happens after the assessment is completed?

(xvi) Output 3.2.2: The description is not clear. Please recast for clarity. How does this advance SAP implementation?

(xvii) Output 3.2.3: "Ensured" is not a tangible output. Please revise description accordingly.

(xviii) There is no mention of gender elements in the project description. There must be specific outputs dedicated toward gender equality and empowerment. Please revise.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

Please avoid numbering individual sentences as paragraphs:

(i.e.)

3. The Project Objective will be achieved through three mutually reinforcing project strategies (Components) designed to address the key barriers to effective transboundary water security and climate resilience management in the Chu and Talas River Basins and to deliver the intended outcomes in a systematic and catalytic manner. The proposed approach builds on the priorities identified in the TDA, SAP, and national action plans of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyz Republic, as well as on lessons from earlier GEF, UNECE, UNDP, and other partner-supported cooperation in the basin, to ensure that the project responds to the most critical institutional, technical, and investment gaps that still remain. The four components are designed to work in synergy:

4. *Component 1:* Strengthening transboundary governance and monitoring for SAP implementation;
5. *Component 2:* Demonstrating priority measures to reduce irrigation losses and support ecosystem resilience;
6. *Component 3:* Preparing follow-on investments for irrigation efficiency and wastewater pollution reduction;
7. *Component 4:* Knowledge Management (KM), Monitoring and Evaluation

(a) (i) The Theory of Change diagram should be placed in paragraph 1, rather than much later at para 35. Please revise. The TOC at its current resolution is readable, however, it will need updating based on comments below and above.

Please update GEB Core Indicator targets in the TOC with new targets that are commensurate with a \$6.5M investment.

(ii) Addressed.

(iii) Addressed.

However, "3. The Project Objective will be achieved through three mutually reinforcing project strategies (Components) designed to address the key barriers to effective transboundary water security and climate resilience management in the Chu and Talas River Basins and to deliver the intended outcomes in a systematic and catalytic manner." is incorrect. There is a fourth component on knowledge management and communications that should be included here.

The fourth component should be a properly phrased component on knowledge management (not "Knowledge Management"). KM is an important component of a SAP implementation project and should be in the mutually reinforcing connection, not as more of a supporting element.

Please move all six key lessons up to paragraph 3, which states that the project builds on lessons from earlier work. Then please combine the Component summaries (paragraphs 8 - 28) and the detailed description (paragraphs 52 - 83) respectively (to avoid repetition).

Please move suggested project sites (paras 36-41) into a box and nested at the end of the consolidated project description.

Please move paragraph 29 to the beginning of the section after the TOC introduction.

The map at paragraph 41 does not include appear to include a depiction of project sites. Please explain.

The GEBs starting at paragraph 45 are incorrect and are, regardless, too low for a \$6.5M investment. Please revise.

(iv) Addressed

(b)

Component 1

Output 1.1

Para 55: Italicize all of "the *Working Group on Climate Change Adaptation and Long-Term Action Programmes* under the CTWC Secretariat, establish a *subgroup for monitoring*

implementation progress, and ensure regular joint and national coordination meetings," to avoid reader confusion.

" The Commission will also benefit from the capacity building activities of the Water Convention through the project support." Please describe how (i.e., through UNECE).

Output 1.3

"The Commission will also benefit from technical guidance and relevant thematic capacity building under the Water Convention through the project support" . Please describe how (i.e., through UNECE).

****Please strongly consider adding a CTWC capacity building twinning activity here with the support of the IW:LEARN program: <https://iwlearn.net/twinning> where the CTWC participates in a twinning exercise with another and more advanced Commission in another basin on certain aspects.

Component 2

Output 2.1: This sentence still does not make sense: "This output will identify and technically design a small number of priority hotspot sites where practical demonstrations can show how reducing irrigation water losses contributes directly to improved basin water security, downstream availability, and ecosystem resilience. " The output will design hotspot sites? Shouldn't it be "identify priority hotspot sites and technically design practical demonstrations that show how reducing irrigation water losses contributes directly to improved basin water security..."?"

Please then state in the PIF under Output 2.1 that "the pilots are then carried forward under Output 2.2, where they are implemented and monitored to generate practical lessons and replication value for SAP implementation."

To satisfy the gender comment, please include in the Output "Priority hotspot sites are selected and designed for demonstration of irrigation conveyance and/or on-farm water-loss reduction, and women empowerment, based on transboundary relevance, feasibility, and replication potential Please then follow up in the description with " Gender will be mainstreamed under this output by ensuring that hotspot selection, baseline assessment, and technical design include women empowerment aspects, consider women's and men's different roles in irrigated agriculture, access to water, decision-making, labor burdens, and expected benefits, and that consultations with water users and local stakeholders include equitable participation of women and men in identifying feasible and replicable demonstration options.

Please include the indicative stakeholders for activity execution under this Output. Based on the ESS response below, smallhold farmers will participate?

Output 2.2

Please include the women empowerment aspects noted above in the Output phrasing and description.

Please include the indicative stakeholders for activity execution under this Output . Based on the ESS response below, smallhold farmers will participate?

Output 2.3.

Please include the women empowerment aspects noted above in the Output phrasing and description.

Please include the indicative stakeholders for activity execution under this Output . Based on the ESS response below, smallhold farmers will participate?

**** Please target higher Core Indicator 3 and 4 through these Component 2 outputs.

****The short description notes that Component 2 is mapped to GEF lever stakeholder dialogue, yet such a mechanism for dialogue does not appear to exist across the three outputs. Please include, including who will be invited to the planning dialogue.

Component 3

Output 3.1

Remove "Prefeasibility" in this output and include "technical" instead. Update the output language throughout document.

Output 3.1 must have a robust stakeholder consultation mechanism built in to the identification and design. Please include, including an indicative design of this mechanism. Please note under the Output 3.1 description that Output 3.1 then feeds into Output 3.3.

Output 3.2 must have a robust stakeholder consultation mechanism built in to the identification and design. Please include, including an indicative design of this mechanism. Please note under the Output 3.2 description that Output 3.2 then feeds into Output 3.3.

Output 3.3.

Please explain what "structured engagement with public investment programs, IFIs, and other partners" means. Will these be investment roundtables? The output needs to be much more tangible here to justify an \$860,000 component investment.

It is expected that at least one or more financing engagement package should be advanced by project end so that there is some on the ground environmental benefits (Core Indicator contributions) realized under Component 3. Please incorporate this into the narrative of the Output 3.3.

Please include a women empowerment narrative for at least one investment package.

Include the indicators in this Component "*=at least 4 bankable investment packages (US\$100 mln total) are prepared and endorsed for follow-on financing,;*

->=at least US\$40 million in follow-on financing mobilized (formally advanced, committed, or under active consideration)" ->= 2 priority wastewater and pollution reduction investment projects formally initiated through government, IFI, or partner financing processes

and how these are likely going to be realized.

Component 4:

This needs to be a standalone KM and comms component. Please include adequate budget (it is suggested \$500,000) and a robust set of outputs on KM and comms, including contribution to IW:LEARN activities (1% of total GEF budget). And please ensure there is two-way KM (project ---> stakeholder and stakeholder ---> project) mechanism in place.

"4.1. Basin-wide knowledge management, learning, and knowledge-sharing system established to capture, package, and disseminate lessons, data, good practices, and policy-relevant knowledge on transboundary water cooperation, climate resilience, ecosystem restoration, and basin management" needs to be unpacked into several outputs that are tangible.

Please move paragraphs 85 to 105 to this new Component 4 narrative.

Please elaborate on how "The project will benefit from the knowledge, capacity building and technical guidances of the Water Convention."

M&E

Include a separate M&E description.

"4.2. Participatory and gender-inclusive M&E and KM system is established and implemented" is not a satisfactory output" f

See Titicaca SAP implementation PIF for guidance.

Please budget at least \$200-250k for M&E purposes.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Mostly addressed

For the TOC explanation, please include "3. The Theory of Change is based on the premise that if the Governments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan apply and strengthen a shared scientific, technical, and socio-institutional understanding of transboundary water, ecosystem, and climate risks in the Chu?Talas basin through a targeted implementation-oriented diagnostic update and coordinated implementation of the jointly endorsed Strategic Action Programme (SAP) , supported by a strengthened, inclusive and functional institutional framework (building on and strengthening the existing Chu?Talas Water Commission); and if early, demonstrative stress-reduction measures are showcased for basin-wide replication, and a prioritized, bankable investment portfolio is developed and mobilized to showcase tangible benefits of cooperation; then durable transboundary water governance will be reinforced, enabling coordinated, climate-resilient and sustainable management of shared water and associated ecosystems in the Chu?Talas basin, and ensuring the delivery of sustained Global Environmental Benefits."

For paragraph 10 of project description, the Component 2 Outputs are the old phrasing. Please update.

For paragraph 15, please update M&E Outputs based on suggestions above.

Please update TOC diagram to reflect suggested revisions to a few Outputs.

Does Assumption 4 now relate to Component 4? It seems largely focused on M&E, yet is partially mapped to KM. Please consider.

13th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

10th of April 2026

Theory of Change (5.1)	For the TOC explanation, please include "3. The Theory of Change is based on the premise that if the Governments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan apply and strengthen a shared scientific, technical, and socio-institutional understanding of transboundary water, ecosystem, and climate risks in the Chu?Talas basin through a targeted implementation-oriented diagnostic update and coordinated implementation of the jointly endorsed Strategic Action Programme (SAP) , supported by a strengthened, inclusive and functional institutional framework (building on and strengthening the existing Chu?Talas Water Commission); and if early, demonstrative stressreduction measures are showcased for basin-wide replication, and a prioritized, bankable investment portfolio is developed and mobilized to showcase tangible benefits of cooperation; then durable transboundary water governance will be reinforced, enabling coordinated, climateresilient and sustainable management of shared water and associated ecosystems in the Chu?Talas basin, and ensuring the delivery of sustained Global Environmental Benefits."	Inco
Theory of Change (5.1)	For paragraph 10 of project description, the Component 2 Outputs are the old phrasing. Please update.	Rev
Theory of Change (5.1)	For paragraph 15 , please update M&E Outputs based on suggestions above.	Ad
Theory of Change (5.1)	Please update TOC diagram to reflect suggested revisions to a few Outputs.	Ad
Theory of Change (5.1)	Does Assumption 4 now relate to Component 4 ? It seems largely focused on M&E, yet is partially mapped to KM. Please consider.	Co to M

5th April 2026:

Project Description	Please avoid numbering individual sentences as paragraphs: (i.e.)	Thanks and noted. document has inc
Theory of Change	(a) (i) The Theory of Change diagram should be placed in paragraph 1, rather than much later at para 35. Please revise. The TOC at its current resolution is readable, however, it will need updating based on comments below and above. Please update GEB Core Indicator targets in the TOC with new targets that are commensurate with a \$6.5M investment.	Updated TOC now GEB Core Indicat
Theory of Change	(iii) Addressed. However, "3. The Project Objective will be achieved through three mutually reinforcing project strategies (Components) designed to address the key barriers to effective transboundary water security and climate resilience management in the Chu and Talas River Basins and to deliver the intended outcomes in a systematic and catalytic manner." is incorrect. There is a fourth component on knowledge management and communications that should be included here.	Corrected and incl separated: The Pr three mutually rei supportive compon barriers to effectiv resilience managem to deliver the inter manner
Theory of Change	(iii) The fourth component should be a properly phrased component on knowledge management (not "Knowledge Management"). KM is an important component of a SAP implementation project and should be in the mutually reinforcing connection, not as more of a supporting element.	Component 4 supp expected to achiev adaptive project m lessons learning th
Theory of Change	(iii) Please move all six key lessons up to paragraph 3, which states that the project builds on lessons from earlier work. Then please combine the Component summaries (paragraphs 8 - 28) and the detailed description (paragraphs 52 - 83) respectively (to avoid repetition).	Addressed
Theory of Change	(iii) Please move suggested project sites (paras 36-41) into a box and nested at the end of the consolidated project description.	Addressed but in s
Theory of Change	(iii) Please move paragraph 29 to the beginning of the section after the TOC introduction.	Respective para w
Theory of Change	(iii) The map at paragraph 41 does not include appear to include a depiction of project sites. Please explain.	At the PIF stage, p because they have provides a descrip TDA, SAP, and na hotspots in the mic transboundary ripa and selected upper referencing, and m carried out during assessments, stake
Theory of Change	(iii) The GEBs starting at paragraph 45 are incorrect and are, regardless, too low for a \$6.5M investment. Please revise.	GEBs corrected an

Output 1.1	<p>Para 55: <i>Italicize all of "the Working Group on Climate Change Adaptation and Long-Term Action Programmes under the CTWC Secretariat, establish a subgroup for monitoring implementation progress, and ensure regular joint and national coordination meetings," to avoid reader confusion.</i></p> <p>" The Commission will also benefit from the capacity building activities of the Water Convention through the project support." Please describe how (i.e., through UNECE).</p>	Addressed
Output 1.3	<p>"The Commission will also benefit from technical guidance and relevant thematic capacity building under the Water Convention through the project support" . Please describe how (i.e., through UNECE).</p> <p>****Please strongly consider adding a CTWC capacity building twinning activity here with the support of the IW:LEARN program: https://iwlearn.net/twinning where the CTWC participates in a twinning exercise with another and more advanced Commission in another basin on certain aspects.</p>	Addressed. Twinning

<p>Output 2.1</p>	<p>This sentence still does not make sense: "This output will identify and technically design a small number of priority hotspot sites where practical demonstrations can show how reducing irrigation water losses contributes directly to improved basin water security, downstream availability, and ecosystem resilience. " The output will design hotspot sites? Shouldn't it be "identify priority hotspot sites and technically design practical demonstrations that show how reducing irrigation water losses contributes directly to improved basin water security...?"</p> <p>Please then state in the PIF under Output 2.1 that "the pilots are then carried forward under Output 2.2, where they are implemented and monitored to generate practical lessons and replication value for SAP implementation."</p> <p>To satisfy the gender comment, please include in the Output "Priority hotspot sites are selected and designed for demonstration of irrigation conveyance and/or on-farm water-loss reduction, and women empowerment, based on transboundary relevance, feasibility, and replication potential Please then follow up in the description with " Gender will be mainstreamed under this output by ensuring that hotspot selection, baseline assessment, and technical design include women empowerment aspects, consider women's and men's different roles in irrigated agriculture, access to water, decision-making, labor burdens, and expected benefits, and that consultations with water users and local stakeholders include equitable participation of women and men in identifying feasible and replicable demonstration options.</p> <p>Please include the indicative stakeholders for activity execution under this Output. Based on the ESS response below, smallhold farmers will participate?</p>	<p>The sentence has b</p> <p>The recommended place.</p> <p>Women empowerment into the text</p> <p>Indicative stakeho</p>
<p>Output 2.2</p>	<p>Please include the women empowerment aspects noted above in the Output phrasing and description.</p> <p>Please include the indicative stakeholders for activity execution under this Output . Based on the</p> <p>ESS response below, smallhold farmers will participate?</p>	<p>Women empowerment into the text and o</p> <p>Indicative stakeho</p>

<p>Output 2.3</p>	<p>Please include the women empowerment aspects noted above in the Output phrasing and description. Please include the indicative stakeholders for activity execution under this Output . Based on the ESS response below, smallhold farmers will participate?</p> <p>**** Please target higher Core Indicator 3 and 4 through these Component 2 outputs.</p> <p>*****The short description notes that Component 2 is mapped to GEF lever stakeholder dialogue, yet such a mechanism for dialogue does not appear to exist across the three outputs.</p> <p>Please include, including who will be invited to the planning dialogue.</p>	<p>Women?s empow integrated into the</p> <p>Indicative stakeho</p> <p>CIs 3 and 4 are no</p> <p>The updated narra mechanisms.</p> <p>Indicative stakeho</p>
<p>Output 3.1</p>	<p>Remove "Prefeasibility" in this output and include "technical" instead. Update the output language throughout document.</p> <p>Output 3.1 must have a robust stakeholder consultation mechanism built in to the identification and design. Please include, including a indicative design of this mechanism.</p> <p>Please note under the Output 3.1 description that Output 3.1 then feeds into Output 3.3.</p>	<p>The sentences hav</p> <p>Stakeholder consu</p> <p>The sentence has b</p>
<p>Output 3.2</p>	<p>Output 3.2 must have a robust stakeholder consultation mechanism built in to the identification and design. Please include, including a indicative design of this mechanism.</p> <p>Please note under the Output 3.2 description that Output 3.2 then feeds into Output 3.3.</p>	<p>Stakeholder consu</p> <p>The sentence has b</p>

<p>Output 3.3</p>	<p>Please explain what "structured engagement with public investment programs, IFIs, and other partners" means. Will these be investment roundtables? The output needs to be much more tangible here to justify an \$860,000 component investment.</p> <p>It is expected that at least one or more financing engagement package should be advanced by project end so that there is some on the ground environmental benefits (Core Indicator contributions) realized under Component 3. Please incorporate this into the narrative of the Output 3.3.</p> <p>Please include a women empowerment narrative for at least one investment package.</p> <p>Include the indicators in this Component "->=at least 4 bankable investment packages (US\$100 mln total) are prepared and endorsed for follow-on financing,;</p> <p>->=at least US\$40 million in follow-on financing mobilized (formally advanced, committed, or under active consideration)" - >= 2 priority wastewater and pollution reduction investment projects formally initiated through government, IFI, or partner financing processes and how these are likely going to be realized.</p>	<p>Structured engage technical working and 3) support to g investments into n country programs,</p> <p>Indicative output t</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Added</p>
-------------------	--	--

Component 4	<p>This needs to be a standalone KM and comms component. Please include adequate budget (it is suggested \$500,000) and a robust set of outputs on KM and comms, including contribution to IW:LEARN activities (1% of total GEF budget). And please ensure there is two-way KM (project ---> stakeholder and stakeholder ---> project) mechanism in place.</p> <p>"4.1. Basin-wide knowledge management, learning, and knowledge-sharing system established to capture, package, and disseminate lessons, data, good practices, and policy-relevant knowledge on transboundary water cooperation, climate resilience, ecosystem restoration, and basin management" needs to be unpacked into several outputs that are tangible.</p> <p>Please move paragraphs 85 to 105 to this new Component 4 narrative.</p> <p>Please elaborate on how "The project will benefit from the knowledge, capacity building and technical guidances of the Water Convention."</p>	<p>1) KM and M&E \$500,000</p> <p>2) KM now included</p> <p>4.1. Knowledge learning packages for basin institutions, financing partners, monitoring, demonstration, gender, and investment</p> <p>4.2 Two-way basin mechanism is of learning events, channels that boost stakeholder experience implementation.</p> <p>4.3 IW:LEARN knowledge exchange contribution in IW:LEARN activities</p> <p>3) moved paragraphs to narrative.</p> <p>4) Included in Output</p>
Component 4	<p>M&E : Include a separate M&E description.</p> <p>"4.2. Participatory and gender-inclusive M&E and KM system is established and implemented" is not a satisfactory output"</p> <p>See Titicaca SAP implementation PIF for guidance.</p> <p>Please budget at least \$200-250k for M&E purposes.</p>	<p>Included separately</p> <p>Budgeted 250,000</p>

6th March 2026:

Section	GEF Reviewer comments	UNDP Response
Theory of Change	(a) (i) The Figure 3 Theory of Change diagram is presented too small and is not legible. Please revise so a full review of the ToC can be carried out.	The ToC is revised and enlarged (see attached)
Theory of Change	(ii) Please include a more robust set of assumptions in the TOC diagram and description.	The robust assumptions included in the TOC diagram and description.

Theory of Change	<p>(iii) Please include a change pathway description to accompany the TOC diagram, using the recent Bolivia/Chile UNDP MSP as template:</p> <p>"The Theory of Change is based on the premise that if Bolivia and Chile jointly generate a shared scientific and socio-institutional understanding of transboundary water, ecosystem, and climate risks through a TDA; and if this evidence base is translated into a jointly agreed SAP supported by a strengthened, inclusive binational mechanism (building on the existing Chile/Bolivia Binational Round Table on Transboundary Water Resources); and if early, demonstrative stress-reduction actions and a validated investment portfolio are developed to show tangible benefits of cooperation; then durable transboundary governance will be established, enabling coordinated, climate-resilient management of shared high-Andean water and wetland systems and the delivery of sustained Global Environmental Benefits."</p>	The change pathway included: para
Theory of Change	(iv) The TOC "goal" is stated as a pathway change, not a goal. Please include the project objective here instead and present a more detailed change pathway in the description.	The project objective changed to ?P transboundary water security and cl Basins through coordinated SAP im Project Description
Theory of Change	(vi) Please ensure TOC is rephrased to reflect comments throughout this review sheet.	ToC changed taking into account co
Outcome 1.1	The overview description for Outcome 1 is missing in this section. Please include.	The Project Description part namely
Outcome 1.1	(i) Output 1.1.1: If the CTWC Joint Working Group is the "platform for the joint and national coordination of the SAP implementation" then why does it need to be "established" (as reflected in the Output 1.1.1)? For paragraph 86, please describe what the WG SAP is and why it needs to be "...harmonized and supported". What are the activities of the WG SAP? Please explain how the project will support the activities of the WG SAP?	The Indicative Project Overview (C establishment of a new mechanism, Group on Climate Change Adaptati Programmes which is the Working Description in the section on Project mentioned Working Group will be s example, by expanding its work thr implementation progress and renew
Outcome 1.1	ii) Output 1.1.2: "Chu-Talas TDA is updated to review existing and assess emerging issues in basins" is confusing. Please rephrase. Please also explain what new literature and data is available to include since the TDA was developed, prompting its necessary update. Is it necessary to update the TDA to conduct an "in-depth assessment of the needs and proposing solutions for improvement of the institutional and legal basis of the CTWC and bilateral transboundary cooperation"? Could this not just be a new assessment? Will this assessment be done through a participatory process? If so, with which stakeholders? Please share the TDA and highlight which sections need updating. What happens once the TDA is updated/institutional assessment is completed? What does it feed into? How will it be used to deliver on this project? Even if said elsewhere, please include these points under Output 1.1.2 so reader can better understand the pathway of change.	Description of the Output 1.1.2 in th updated providing required informa which will focus on five priority are decision-support tool for prioritizin basin whereas the main purpose of t baseline assessment of basin condit

Outcome 1.1	(iii) Output 1.1.3: Please explain why amending the bilateral agreement is necessary to enable IWRM. What are the shortfalls? It is not clear what this output is achieving. The recommendations for legal and institutional arrangements developed under Output 1.1.2 are shared with the CTWC Secretariat? Is this to be done in a dialogue process that leads to some outcome? What is the tangible deliverable of this output? Are the new recommendations taken up through this output? Is the bilateral agreement amended through this output? What happens next?	While new Output 1.2 identifies the 1.4 in the supports the two countries and preparing a focused package of procedures that broaden the CTWC annual water allocation and infrastructure SAP implementation and overall climate basin.
Outcome 1.2	Please rework this outcome description to better explain the shortfalls of the current monitoring system and why strengthened technical capacities will lead to better functioning monitoring systems and long-term SAP implementation and basin decision making.	Monitoring became part of Outcome Description/Project Outputs describing system on the basin level, building
Outcome 1.2	(iv) Output 1.2.1 Please recast this output description in its entirety. Please present clearly and simply what the project is going to do, with tangible deliverables. What does "The GEF SAP implementation will increment all above baseline programmes and projects....".	Done in the description of output 1.
Outcome 1.3	It is not clear what "Governments and Commission are enabled to integrate environmental considerations to the decision making and development programmes". Please revise. In addition to not being clear, "enabled" is vague and it is not clear how this "outcome" can be measured. What does it mean "The IW:LEARN, UNECE Water Convention....AQAUSTAT... are to be incremented"?	Description of output 1.3 in Project both countries and the Commission monitoring and reporting.
Outcome 1.3	(v) Output 1.3.1: This output description is confusing and needs to be rewritten so reader can understand what exactly is being proposed. It appears the sole deliverable is an economic assessment and climate change impact analysis. What are the purposes of such studies and what are they going to feed into to advance SAP implementation? The storyline for this output is difficult to follow.	Outputs in Outcome 1 were rewritten the activities proposed by PIF. The now captured more clearly under O and linked directly to Outputs 1.3 a legal/procedural proposals, so that t prioritization, CTWC decision-mak
Outcome 1.3	(vi) Output 1.3.2: Please explain what "training facilities" are. Please explain why facilities and toolkits need to be "tested" and not fully implemented? Are these facilities being built through co-financing? Considering Output 1.3.2, doesn't the outcome change to include all stakeholders ("school, college, university educators ad students, water operators and users, businesses, farmers, community leaders, and household owners"..., not just 'governments and commission" benefitting? Are these two facilities going to be used as research and monitoring facilities as well?	This output was removed from Con basin-wide knowledge management Specific knowledge products and se Knowledge in Project Description.
Component 2	Please fix Component 2 title phrasing "Investing ecosystems' restoration and water resilience...".	Component 2 rephrased as ?Demon losses and support ecosystem resilie

Outcome 2.1	(vii) Output 2.1.1: Please describe what "demonstrated" means. Will these be pilots? Who is the target stakeholder audience? Will these demonstrations be led by local communities? What is the outcome of these demonstrations for SAP implementation?	Component 2 has been revised, and new ?Output 2.1: Priority hotspot site demonstration of irrigation conveyance based on transboundary relevance, to respond to the last leg of your comment. Output 2.2, where they are implemented lessons and replication value for SA
Outcome 2.1	(viii) Output 2.1.2: Please describe what "demonstrated" means. Will these be pilots? Please describe the buffer zone in detail. Will these demonstrations be led by local communities? What is the outcome of these demonstrations for SAP implementation?	Component 2 has been revised, and renamed as ?Output 2.3. Targeted e implemented in a few selected riparian directly contribute to sediment reduction and further refined in line with GEF
Outcome 2.2	"Promoted water resilience enable water efficient end use and water resilient livelihood" is not a tangible outcome. Please revise.	Component 2 has been revised and show practical, replicable ways to r riparian ecosystems in the basins?
Outcome 2.2	(ix) Output 2.2.1: Please describe what "demonstrated" means. Will these be pilots? Will these demonstrations be led by local communities? What is the outcome of these demonstrations for SAP implementation? Please better describe what is meant by "the investment of a model comprehensive.... for at minimum two selected geographical locations in two basins will also be done?"	Component 2 has been revised and renamed as ?Output 2.2. Pilot meas and improve water-use efficiency, v implications for availability and env with GEF recommendations.
Outcome 2.2	x) Output 2.2.2: Please describe what "demonstrated" means. Will these be pilots? Will these demonstrations be led by local communities? What is the outcome of these demonstrations for SAP implementation?	Output 2.2.2 has been removed from demonstration. Instead, these activi Priority wastewater and pollution re through technical and economic ana pollution hotspot?.
Outcome 2.2	(xi) Output 2.2.3: What does "established" mean? Please better describe this output and how it relates to SAP implementation. Output is truncated in project overview table "Output 2.2.3. Concessional funding facilities to promote sustainable water end-use in agriculture, businesses and livelihood are " What GEB targets will be achieved through these demonstration/pilots? Which SAP priority actions do the above demonstrations/pilots relate to?	Output 2.2.3 removed from Compon Component 3.
Outcome 3.1	(xii) Output 3.1.1: What are the planned tangible deliverables for the in depth assessment(s) and what happens after they are prepared/What do they feed into?	The Component 3 revised and has c partners have bankable investment, efficiency and wastewater and pollu grant? it excluded the pilot activities follows:
Outcome 3.1	(xiii) Output 3.1.2: It is not clear what is meant by model reconstruction piloted. This description should be recast for clarity	Output 3.1. Priority irrigation mode are screened, prepared through pref basin hotspots
Outcome 3.1	(xiv) Output 3.1.3: It is not clear what is meant by the technical assistance rendered. This description should be recast for clarity	Output 3.2. Priority wastewater and screened, prepared through technica municipal or other major pollution l
Outcome 3.2	This outcome description is not clear. Please recast for clarity.	
Outcome 3.2	(xv) Output 3.2.1: The description is not clear. Please recast for clarity. What happens after the assessment is completed?	

Outcome 3.2	(xvi) Output 3.2.2: The description is not clear. Please recast for clarity. How does this advance SAP implementation?	Output 3.3. Financing engagement, follow-on public, IFI, and other financing demonstrating their environmental, benefits and channel finance to agriculture
Outcome 3.2	(xvii) Output 3.2.3: "Ensured" is not a tangible output. Please revise description accordingly.	The linkages with SAP advancement
All components	(xviii) There is no mention of gender elements in the project description. There must be specific outputs dedicated toward gender equality and empowerment. Please revise.	The current PIF uses cross-components 4's gender-inclusive M&E/KM framework mainstreamed across Outputs 1.1-4. Gender Analysis + GAP + budget+ gender-responsive and socially inclusive Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): To be assessed on resubmission.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Partly. The GEBs (Core Indicator Targets) must be higher to meet a good incremental cost threshold. Please address.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments GEBs Core Indicator Target revised upwards

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) No. Please explain why the executing entities have not been determined at PIF stage, given the length of time that has passed since the 2023 joint statement and this project was first broached. It is important that national level execution is included to ensure sustainability of the investment.

(b) The Agency has checked "Yes" for "Does the GEF Agency expect to play an execution role on this project". Yet, the description then states that UNDP will not play an executing role. Please explain/revise accordingly.

(c) Partly. Please be more specific in what several of the initiatives listed in the coordination table are (i.e., FAO and EBRD programs). Please include the GEF-FAO Central Asia Water Land Nexus Program, which will be developing two SAPs in the region.

Please indicate that consultations with each of these projects and initiatives will take place during PPG and a more detailed indication of potential coordination and cooperation will be presented in the CEO document.

(d) No. See comments above.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) Please see comment in the first section on UNECE not mentioned in the LOEs and the need for some national/regional level execution. Please speak with GEF Sec to clarify.

If this can be resolved with new LOEs, please explain in detail the value add of UNECE to project execution, including the organization's history working in the basins, and in the context of the Water Convention.

(b) Addressed

(c) "FAO programmes in Central Asia". "EBRD programmes on municipal and environmental infrastructure". ADB Strategy 2030 and Environmental Initiatives (including water investments). Energy-Water-Land Use Nexus in Central Asia project implemented by OECD, UNECE, EBRD, and SIC ICWC. Please be specific.

(d) Please see comments above on KM and comms.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Mostly Addressed.

Please state here that the project is expected to be executed by both regional and national entities, which will be confirmed in PPG.

For the CAWLN acronym, please call it Central Asia Water Land Nexus Program rather than "Integrated Natural Resource Management in Central Asia: Water?Land Nexus Programme."

Please use correct title for "UNDP?UNESCO?GEF project ?Mountain Cryosphere Sustainability in Central Asia?"

Islamic Development Bank loan? Should this be documented here?

13th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

10th of April 2026

Implementation Framework (5.3)	Please state here that the project is expected to be executed by both regional and national entities, which will be confirmed in PPG.	Ad
Implementation Framework (5.3)	For the CAWLN acronym, please call it Central Asia Water Land Nexus Program rather than "Integrated Natural Resource Management in Central Asia: Water?Land Nexus Programme."	Co
Implementation Framework (5.3)	Please use correct title for "UNDP?UNESCO?GEF project ?Mountain Cryosphere Sustainability in Central Asia?"	Ful
Implementation Framework (5.3)	Islamic Development Bank loan? Should this be documented here?	Incl

5th April 2026:

Implementation Framework	(a) Please see comment in the first section on UNECE not mentioned in the LOEs and the need for some national/regional level execution. Please speak with GEF Sec to clarify. If this can be resolved with new LOEs, please explain in detail the value add of UNECE to project execution, including the organization's history working in the basins, and in the context of the Water Convention.	(a) UNECE refer will be revisited d
Implementation Framework	(c) "FAO programmes in Central Asia". "EBRD programmes on municipal and environmental infrastructure". ADB Strategy 2030 and Environmental Initiatives (including water investments). Energy-Water-Land Use Nexus in Central Asia project implemented by OECD, UNECE, EBRD, and SIC ICWC. Please be specific.	Addressed

6th March 2026:

a) According to the previous assessment UNECE was identified as Executing Agency for this project since it has a strong regional knowledge and experience for supporting transboundary cooperation in Central Asia including in the Chu-Talas basin. Since engaging the national/basin entities for project realization is crucial UNECE will execute the project in close cooperation with the Chu-Talas Water Commission and the relevant national authorities based on previous experience work with Chu-Talas Water Commission incl. its Secretariat. With regards to the national institutions, water and environment authorities will be actively engaged in each country. Their role as well as the role of the other relevant national authorities and stakeholders incl. civil society organizations will be identified at the PPG stage due to the recent changes in water management in Kyrgyzstan (please see the information below).

The national Executing Entities have not been formally confirmed at the PIF stage due to the ongoing institutional and regulatory transition in the water sector, driven by the adoption of the new Water Code (2025), which entered into force in 2026 in Kyrgyzstan. This reform introduces significant changes in water governance, including the restructuring of water management institutions, clarification of mandates between national and basin-level authorities, and revisions to water use and allocation mechanisms. As a result, the roles and responsibilities of potential executing entities?particularly those related to basin-level coordination and infrastructure management?are currently being redefined.

Given this evolving context, premature designation of executing entities at the PIF stage could risk misalignment with the new legal framework and institutional setup. Instead, the project design intentionally maintains flexibility to ensure full consistency with the reformed governance structure and to support long-term sustainability of investments through nationally endorsed arrangements.

During the PPG phase, a detailed institutional analysis and stakeholder consultations will be conducted to identify and confirm the most appropriate national executing entities, ensuring alignment with the new Water Code provisions, strengthened national ownership, and effective implementation capacity. This process will also clarify coordination mechanisms between national, basin, and local levels, and ensure that execution arrangements are fully embedded within the reformed water governance system.

Please also see response to comment#2 in tandem

b) Changed to ?No?

c) The relevant programs were added as well as a reference to the relevant consultations and more detailed indication of coordination in the CEO document.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Partly

(i) This investment cannot be moved ahead unless Core Indicator 7 is targeted. Please complete all sub-indicators of Core Indicator 7. For IW:LEARN, please mark "1" and progress to "4" by project closure.

(ii) The CI11 target is 50,000 direct beneficiaries, of which 30,000 are women. Is this a realistic target of 10,000 more women than men?

The preliminary methodology for this target does not include a percentage of the total population in the project's geographic locations. Please include.

(iii) For CI6, please better explain how 10,000 tCO₂e GHG was reached, beyond "indicative indirect benefit from NbS and reduced pumping energy". How is this number actually derived?

(iv) For CI4, please better explain how 30,000 ha was reached, beyond "captures demonstrable adoption of water-efficient irrigation, watershed measures and sustainable grazing across pilot and linked uptake areas". How is this number actually derived?

(v) For CI3, please better explain how 10,000 ha was reached, beyond "10,000 ha of active ecosystem restoration is a realistic cumulative outcome from clustered NbS pilots, community restoration and adjacent upscaling". How is this number actually derived?

(vi) For CI1, please better explain how 20,000 ha was reached, beyond "20,000 ha under improved terrestrial management reflects aggregated riparian buffer and upstream catchment patches that can be placed under improved management through targeted restoration, protected-area extension and co-management agreements". What is the name of the Protected Area and please include the WDPA/IUCN Category.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

(i) Addressed

(ii) 15,000 people is too low for a \$6.5M investment. The comment was about the disproportionate women/men, where there were 10,000 more women targeted than men, which cannot be true. Please revise.

(iii) Given the low GEBs, please reconsider omitting the GHG reduction target.

(iv) Not addressed. This target is now far too low for a \$6.5M investment. Please revise.

(v) Not addressed. This target is now far too low for a \$6.5M investment. Please revise.

(vi) Addressed

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th April 2026:

Core Indicators	(ii) 15,000 people is too low for a \$6.5M investment. The comment was about the disproportionate women/men, where there were 10,000 more women targeted than men, which cannot be true. Please revise.	Changed from 150
Core Indicators	(iii) Given the low GEBs, please reconsider omitting the GHG reduction target.	GEBs indicators re 200,000tCO ₂ e ove reduction target w more precise data and validation of b information, biom and associated eco restoration measur methodologies and accuracy and cons The FAO ExAct to ER package.
Core Indicators	(iv) Not addressed. This target is now far too low for a \$6.5M investment. Please revise.	According to the N Kazakhstan and th ecosystem restorat Kazakhstan and 2, pasture, and floodp aggregated target o stage, as it reflects this figure may be during the PPG ph consultations with land-cover verifica
Core Indicators	(v) Not addressed. This target is now far too low for a \$6.5M investment. Please revise.	The indicator is re ha

6th March 2026:

GEF Reviewer comments	UNDP Response
(i) This investment cannot moved ahead unless Core Indicator 7 is targeted. Please complete all sub-indicators of Core Indicator 7. For IW:LEARN, please mark "1" and progress to "4" by project closure.	Thank you for the comment. Addressed as required
(ii) The CI11 target is 50,000 direct beneficiaries, of which 30,000 are women. Is this a realistic target of 10,000 more women then men? The preliminary methodology for this target does not include a percentage of the total population in the project's geographic locations. Please include.	Addressed. The revised PIF has reduced and ration beneficiaries, of whom 50% are women, and now c these beneficiaries are direct and expected to inclu and communities in and around the selected pilot a is linked mainly to Outputs 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, and 4.2, th management, ecosystem-supporting measures, and project-supported planning, demonstrations, training refined during PPG once final sites and delivery m
(iii) For CI6, please better explain how 10,000 tCO ₂ e GHG was reached, beyond " indicative indirect benefit from NbS and reduced pumping energy". How is this number actually derived?	The team has decided to omit this indicator and, as use of the target areas will be identified.

<p>(iv) For CI4, please better explain how 30,000 ha was reached, beyond "captures demonstrable adoption of water-efficient irrigation, watershed measures and sustainable grazing across pilot and linked uptake areas". How is this number actually derived?</p>	<p>The original 30,000 ha represented a broader preliminary indirect uptake beyond the direct intervention areas attribution and methodological consistency: The revised figure of 3,000 ha aligns the target more closely with the GEF CI 4 methodology. The revised figure reflects directly demonstrate improved land and water management especially through Outputs 2.1?2.3 on irrigation-related measures. As explained in the Core Indicators section, improved practices around the selected pilot sites are</p>
<p>(v) For CI3, please better explain how 10,000 ha was reached, beyond "10,000 ha of active ecosystem restoration is a realistic cumulative outcome from clustered NbS pilots, community restoration and adjacent upscaling". How is this number actually derived?</p>	<p>The CI3 target was revised from 10,000 ha to 2,500 ha in scope, sequencing and realistic scale of restoration plans of Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic for the project. It represented a broad preliminary estimate of the wide range of areas from project-supported NbS and community-based restoration. Only 2,500 ha can be credibly attributed to direct, a realistic, evidence-based and methodologically sound</p>
<p>(vi) For CI1, please better explain how 20,000 ha was reached, beyond "20,000 ha under improved terrestrial management reflects aggregated riparian buffer and upstream catchment patches that can be placed under improved management through targeted restoration, protected-area extension and co-management agreements". What is the name of the Protected Area and please include the WDPA/IUCN Category.</p>	<p>CI1 has been removed following a more detailed re-evaluation of Indicator methodology. The initially proposed 20,000 ha areas that could indirectly benefit from project intervention were not to a clearly identified protected area with a verified management plan that not improve the management of a specifically designed management, CI1 was deleted to ensure methodological consistency</p>

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) The Stakeholder risk states "High level involvement in Kyrgyzstan of the Primer-Minister in the capacity of the Chair of the National Water Council to approve SAP and three ministers? signature and approval of the SAP in Kazakhstan serve confident foundation for overcoming this risk." Does this mean the SAP is not ministerially endorsed? The SAP must be ministerially endorsed before this SAP implementation investment can proceed.

For the Financial Risk, it is critical that this project develop and implement a SAP financing strategy. Please include in the project architecture and include here as a mitigation measure.

For Political and Governance, it is critical that national action plans to implement the SAP are developed and operationalized. Please include in the project architecture and include here as a mitigation measure.

(b) Yes

(c) Yes

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) Capacity. National/regional institutions should play a small executing role to build their capacity for SAP implementation over the long term. Please see comment in first section above.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th April 2026:

Addressed in first section

6th March 2026:

GEF Reviewer comments	UNDP Response
<p>(a) The Stakeholder risk states "High level involvement in Kyrgyzstan of the Primer-Minister in the capacity of the Chair of the National Water Council to approve SAP and three ministers? signature and approval of the SAP in Kazakhstan serve confident foundation for overcoming this risk." Does this mean the SAP is not ministerially endorsed? The SAP must be ministerially endorsed before this SAP implementation investment can proceed.</p>	<p>The SAP approved first on ministerial level than on</p> <p>This risk revised as follows:</p> <p>Weak inter-sectoral coordination within countries a of project activities or slow implementation of cross</p> <p>Mitigation measures: The project will use the CT and local implementation arrangements to strengthen priorities. Participation of key ministries, technical communities will be built into planning, demonstration processes.</p>
<p>For Financial Risk, it is critical that this project develop and implement a SAP financing strategy. Please include in the project architecture and include here as a mitigation measure.</p>	<p>Included in Output 3.3. and revised the mitigation m</p> <p>Governments, IFIs, or donors may not commit fund implementation of priority investments.</p> <p>Mitigation measures: The project will develop SA engagement packages early to engage partners thro national investment plans and IFI pipelines to secu</p>

For Political and Governance, it is critical that national action plans to implement the SAP are developed and operationalized. Please include in the project architecture and include here as a mitigation measure.

Included in Output 1.1.

NAPs are developed and operationalized uploaded

The risk revised:

Institutional and leadership changes in both countries of transboundary water allocation, could delay appropriate NAPs implementation, and slow agreement on protocols

Mitigation measures: The project will anchor improved coordination structure supported by stable technical staff to implement NAPs and SAP. During PPG and inception procedures, and coordination arrangements through MoUs/instruments, sequence technically neutral and high-level reporting and review to maintain continuity despite

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

- (a) To be assessed on resubmission
- (b) To be assessed on resubmission
- (c) To be assessed on resubmission

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw): To be further assessed.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments 6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Please contextualize the meaning of the Strategic Action Program, drawing on descriptions in GEF literature on SAPs, and include the status of national action plans to implement the SAP. Are these developed? Will the project work with the countries to develop them?

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

There must be a detailed summary of the SAP and associated NAPs in this PIF. Please include.

Please explain what is meant by "the project will support implementation of SAP and national plans through the outputs of outcome 1 and output 3.3 on follow-on finance" . Does this mean the rest of the project is not geared toward SAP implementation? All activities should be responding to SAP priorities.

Please include a list of policies in each country that this project aligns with.

Please state here that the countries are Parties to the Water Convention and what this means in the context of the Chu Talas. What about its Protocols , i.e, Kazakhstan recently joining the Protocol on Water and Health etc.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th of April 2026

Summary information on SAP and NAPs was extended in the Project Rationale namely in *Baseline programs in transboundary environmental and climate threats*. SAP summary is also visualized in the same section in [Figures 2 and 3](#).

Sub-section on Project Outputs was complemented with references of each output to a particular goal, task and actions of the

List of the relevant national policies as well as more details on the project contribution to the Water Convention were added *the international, regional and national environmental and development priorities*.

6th of March 2026 (The Project Rationale includes a brief overview of the development and endorsement of SAP including its division into Joint Action Programme and national action plans (already developed and approved). SAP endorsement was also followed by acknowledging the importance of monitoring its implementation at the most recent meeting of the CTWC in September 2025 in Bishkek. The SAP is the jointly agreed transboundary framework for implementation in the Chu-Talas Basin and the project will support implementation of SAP and national plans through the outputs of outcome 1 and output 3.3 on follow-on finance.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Partly. Please explain which indicative activities will contribute to each of the targets identified (2,3,7,8,10,14,19 and 22).

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

Agency response states that Target 3 is not retained, yet the PIF includes:

"The project will contribute by improving the integration of biodiversity priorities into transboundary basin planning, strengthening cooperative management arrangements in ecologically important inland water and riparian areas, and supporting better connectivity and management of priority ecosystems within the wider landscape Output 1.1 (CTWC-led SAP coordination and reporting mechanism), Output 1.3 (harmonized basin monitoring and joint basin reporting for ecosystem indicators), Output 1.4 (legal/procedural proposals to strengthen the CTWC mandate), Output 2.3 (ecosystem-supporting measures in riparian and upper-catchment areas)."

Please clarify.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th of April 2026

Apologies for the confusion. As we have restructured core indicators a number of times and we excluded CI-1, it is the part Areas that is not retained. However, we have the OECM part which we would like to retain and explore more profoundly at OECM-type management where appropriate. The project's contribution is therefore more narrow and specifically through s monitoring, management, and restoration of ecologically important inland-water and riparian areas, which can support OEC connectivity within the wider basin landscape.

6th of March 2026 The response is revised and provided in Part ?Alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies and country/regional priorities? for following targets:

Target 2 ? Restoration of Degraded Ecosystems - Output 2.3.

For Target 3, not retained as we don't have PA relevant work .

Target 7 ? Pollution Reduction- the project will support through the following activities: Output , Output 3.2 , Output 3.3 through screening, preparing, and helping mobilize investments for pollution reduction

Target 8 ? Climate Change and Ecosystem Resilience - the project will promote ecosystem-based adaptation through the following outputs Output 1.2, Output 2.2, Output 2.3 , Output 3.1 ? 3.3. (e.g. climate risks into diagnostics)

Target 10 ? Sustainable Management of Productive Areas - Output 2.1, Output 2.2 , Output 3.1 (irrigation-efficiency and water-loss reduction measures)

Target 14 ? Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Decision-Making - Output 1.1, Output 1.2 , Output 1.3 , Output 1.4 (climate, and water-quality considerations into CTWC coordination, monitoring etc)

Target 19 ? Mobilizing Financial Resources - Output 3.1, Output 3.2), Output 3.3 (financing engagement materials to mobilize follow-on financing)

Target 22 ? Participation and Inclusive Decision-Making - Output 1.1, Output 1.2 , Output 2.1 ? 2.3 , Output 3.1 ? 3.3 , Output 4.2 (e.g. participatory and gender-inclusive approaches in SAP coordination, stakeholder engagement)

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): No.

(i) See below comments on stakeholder engagement. In the project description, please describe the roles of stakeholders in ensuring each output is successfully delivered.

(ii) See above comments on gender mainstreaming

(iii) See above comments on knowledge management

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Not addressed. Please see comments accordingly.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th of April 2026 Addressed.

6th of March 2026(i) In line with comments, stakeholder roles are clearly defined to ensure effective delivery of all project outputs.

(ii) The current PIF uses cross-component gender mainstreaming plus Component 4's gender-inclusive M&E/KM framework. In particular, gender consideration is mainstreamed across Outputs 1.1?4.2. In addition, the project commits to a Gender Analysis + GAP + budget + SESP during PPG as well as to include gender-responsive and socially inclusive participation measures into a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP).

(iii) Thank you, this is well noted knowledge management described in a separate Component 4. Specific knowledge products and services are also listed in the section on Knowledge in Project Description.

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Partly.

The proponents note that "key stakeholders were consulted throughout PIF development in line with GEF requirements". This does not appear to be true, as the listed consultations appear few, outdated or tangential.

(i) Consultations with Kazakhstan have not taken place since August 2024 (about 18 months before PIF submission), while consultations with Kyrgyz Republic are more recent (December 2025). Please explain this difference, as the consultations dates seem to demonstrate that Kazakhstan has not been informed of, nor engaged in, latest PIF development.

Further, there appears to be only one formal consultation meeting for this PIF, which took place on December 12, 2025 with Kazakhstan stakeholders. Please explain how there is demonstrated buy in for this project.

(ii) The latest consultation with the Commission appears to be in December 2023. Please explain how a consultation over two years ago reflects the Commission's current support and empowerment needs that are argued for in this PIF? Please explain why "an extended CTWC

session will be convened with national, municipal and civil society representatives to validate the project scope" is proposed for PPG and was not at PIF stage, when the project scope is approved?

(iv) Please explain how the 2024 capacity building/stakeholder process, which focused on climate change models and hydrological projects, informed PIF development.

(v) The proponents note that IPLCs, CSOs and private sector were consulted during the project identification phase, yet there is no evidence that these groups were consulted, based on the list of consultations provided. Please explain/revise.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

(i) Addressed. Please confirm that the proponents will execute a robust stakeholder consultation process that includes all stakeholder groups and utilize inputs accordingly to design the full project.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th of April 2026 Confirmed and added as a footnote under the section on stakeholder engagement

6th of March 2026

i) Added additional consultations, incl. recent ones for Kazakhstan. Please see respective section.

ii) Added the Commissions meetings in 2024 and 2025. The PIF was presented to the Commission and the Commission supported the project overall back in April 2024 and confirmed the importance of SAP implementation for the Commission in September 2025. The Commission active engagement and validation are still needed for detailing the activities to be done at PPG stage.

iv) The revised PIF now explains in the Stakeholder Engagement section that the 2024 multi-stakeholder training and scenario-planning processes in Kyrgyzstan strengthened stakeholder understanding of climate forecasting, hydrological risk, and scenario-based basin planning in the Chu-Talas Basin.

v) CSOs and private sector were consulted indirectly through their active participation in the development of SAP, which forms the foundation of the PIF.

During the PPG phase, the project will further strengthen direct engagement with these stakeholders to ensure their continued and more structured participation in project design and implementation.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments 6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments 6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments 6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

It is concerning that few specific co-financiers have been identified at PIF stage. Please seek additional sources of co-financing to demonstrate the partnership mobilization within this project.

Nearly all public investment co-financing is listed for a period that precedes project implementation and therefore cannot be counted as project co-financing:

"Investments mobilized will be analyzed in detail during the PPG phase and finalized by the time of CEO endorsement. For Kazakhstan it includes investment to the construction of the waste-water treatment facilities in Taraz (USD 35 mln.) and rehabilitation of the irrigation facilities on the territory of Chu and Talas basins under the State programme of the agro-industrial development (2017-2021) and investments to the agricultural development in Zhambyl province (USD 40 mln.). The newly developing state water resources management programme for 2020-2030 is yet to be included. For Kyrgyzstan the State water and sanitation programme for Chui province 2020-2026 (USD 41 mln.) and the part of the State programme on irrigation development (2020-2027) covering Chu and Talas river basins are counted (USD 44 mln.). Funding of these programmes will include ODA and IFI investments, which are not specified in these programmes."

- (a) The co-financing ratio is extremely high for a \$6M investment (ratio 1: 45). Please carefully review large co-financing contributions and ensure they are realistic and realized within the project period.
- (b) Co-financiers must be on individual lines in the table and not grouped. "IFIs - World Bank, ADB, EBRR" is not permitted. Please remove this co-financing line.
- (c) "IFIs" is vague and not permitted. Please include specific co-financiers only. Please remove this co-financing line.
- (d) "Group private companies" is vague and not permitted. Please include specific co-financiers only. Please remove this co-financing line.
- (e) "Government of Kazakhstan" and "Government of Kyrgyzstan" are not specific. Please identify the ministries or entities within the government that will provide this co-financing.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) Only indicative co-financing that will be active during the project implementation can be included. Baseline public investments that precede the GEF project cannot be included. Please revise.

(b) Ratio is addressed.

(c) Addressed, but please address the following new co-financing inputs:

- Chu Talas Commission in-kind cannot be investment mobilized. Please change to in-kind/recurrent expenditures.

- Please spell out UNESCO IHP, ADB, EBRD. Please do not include on co-financing lines "Climate Resilient Water Services Project" "SDC ? Water Accountability in Chu?Talas Basin)" "programmes on municipal and environmental infrastructure" "Water Resources / Irrigation Projects". Please instead explain these in the field below the co-financing table.

(d) Addressed

(e) Please indicate which Ministries.

New:

(f) Please include in-kind co-financing from UNDP and UNECE, as implementing and executing entities for this project.

(g) The old co-financing description remains for high public investment, much of which is baseline financing and cannot count " The high dollar amount shown as "Public investment" represents the approximate value of the components relevant for the project of the following ongoing and planned investments. Investments mobilized will be analyzed in detail during the PPG phase and finalized by the time of CEO endorsement. For Kazakhstan it includes investment to the construction of the waste-water treatment facilities in Taraz (USD 35 mln.) and rehabilitation of the irrigation facilities on the territory of Chu and Talas basins under the State programme of the agro-industrial development (2017-2021) and investments to the agricultural development in Zhambyl province (USD 40 mln.). The newly developing state water resources management programme for 2020-2030 is yet to be included. For Kyrgyzstan the State water and sanitation programme for Chui province 2020-2026 (USD 41 mln.) and the part of the State programme on irrigation development (2020-2027) covering Chu and Talas river basins are counted (USD 44 mln.). Funding of these programmes will include ODA and IFI investments, which are not specified in these programmes." Please remove.

(h) Please describe each investment mobilized line in the field below the co-financing table and how it relates to the GEF Project: (i.e.), the UNESCO-IHP co-financing refers to _____. The ADB co-financing refers to _____. The Islamic Development Bank loan is _____.

(i) It is still concerning that the other stakeholders (outside government and international institutions) are not providing co-financing, which demonstrates that there is not strong initial stakeholder mobilization for this investment. Please explain, as typically IW investments see in-kind contributions from CSO networks, academia, and NGOs at PIF stage.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

(a) Addressed

(c) Addressed

(e) Please ensure the following co-financing sources include the respective government.

i.e, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Government of Kyrgyz Republic.

Ministry of Emergency Situations, Government of _____.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Industry and Construction
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Emergency Situations
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture
Recipient Country Government	Water Resources Service under Ministry of Water Resources, Agriculture and Processing Industry of KR
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision of KR
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Emergency Situations of KR (Kyrgyzhydromet and Forestry Services under this body)

+ National Academy of Science (what country?)

+ National Academy of Science (what country?)

(f) Addressed

(g) Addressed

(h) Please be specific on which co-financiers (specific ministries, specific academic institutions, specific CSOs) in the descriptions in paras 91, 92, 93.

Please confirm UNESCO-IHP is providing a grant and please be more specific in the description section on what this constitutes.

What does the Switzerland investment mobilized constitute?

Please be more specific on what the investment mobilized constitutes for Islamic Development Bank (not included), EBRD, World Bank, and ADB. What are these indicative grant and loans?

(i) Please disaggregate these CSOs onto separate lines.

Civil Society Organization	Global Water Partnership in Kazakhstan Kazakh Scientific Research Institute of Water Economy Kazakh National University of Water Management and Irrigation
Civil Society Organization	Kyrgyz National Agrarian University CAMP Alatoo Public Foundation Forestry Association of Kyrgyzstan Global Water Partnership in Kyrgyzstan

13th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

10th of April 2026

Co-financing (8.3)	(e) Please ensure the following co-financing sources include the respective government. i.e, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Government of Kyrgyz Republic. Ministry of Emergency Situations, Government of ____. + National Academy of Science (what country?) + National Academy of Science (what country?)	Inc ent fur of
Co-financing (8.3)	(h) Please be specific on which co-financiers (specific ministries, specific academic institutions, specific CSOs) in the descriptions in paras 91, 92, 93. Please confirm UNESCO-IHP is providing a grant and please be more specific in the description section on what this constitutes. What does the Switzerland investment mobilized constitute? Please be more specific on what the investment mobilized constitutes for Islamic Development Bank (not included), EBRD, World Bank, and ADB. What are these indicative grant and loans?	Ad Is ind pro Inc Ple at E tog
Co-financing (8.3)	(i) Please disaggregate these CSOs onto separate lines.	CS

5th of April 2026

(a) Only indicative co-financing that will be active during the project implementation can be included. Baseline public investments that precede the GEF project cannot be included. Please revise.	Addressed
(c) Addressed, but please address the following new co-financing inputs: - Chu Talas Commission in-kind cannot be investment mobilized. Please change to inkind/recurrent expenditures. - Please spell out UNESCO IHP, ADB, EBRD. Please do not include on co-financing lines "Climate Resilient Water Services Project" "SDC ? Water Accountability in Chu?Talas Basin)" "programmes on municipal and environmental infrastructure" "Water Resources / Irrigation Projects". Please instead explain these in the field below the co-financing table.	Addressed Addressed
(e) Please indicate which Ministries.	Addressed: The indicative co-financing references to the Governments of Kyrgyz Republic, specific ministries and institutions ex
(f) Please include in-kind co-financing from UNDP and UNECE, as implementing and executing entities for this project.	Addressed

<p>(g) The old co-financing description remains for high public investment, much of which is baseline financing and cannot count " The high dollar amount shown as ?Public investment? represents the approximate value of the components relevant for the project of the following ongoing and planned investments. Investments mobilized will be analyzed in detail during the PPG phase and finalized by the time of CEO endorsement. For Kazakhstan it includes investment to the construction of the waste-water treatment facilities in Taraz (USD 35 mln.) and rehabilitation of the irrigation facilities on the territory of Chu and Talas basins under the State programme of the agro-industrial development (2017-2021) and investments to the agricultural development in Zhambyl province (USD 40 mln.). The newly developing state water resources management programme for 2020-2030 is yet to be included. For Kyrgyzstan the State water and sanitation programme for Chui province 2020-2026 (USD 41 mln.) and the part of the State programme on irrigation development (2020-2027) covering Chu and Talas river basins are counted (USD 44 mln.). Funding of these programmes will include ODA and IFI investments, which are not specified in these programmes." Please remove.</p>	<p>Addressed: The previous co-financing investments and ongoing/planned pro co-financing has been removed. The present a more focused and project-re specifically identified institutions and place during PPG.</p>
<p>(h) Please describe each investment mobilized line in the field below the co-financing table and how it relates to the GEF Project: (i.e.), the UNESCO-IHP co-financing refers to _____. The ADB co-financing refers to _____. The Islamic Development Bank loan is _____.</p>	<p>Addressed</p>
<p>(i) It is still concerning that the other stakeholders (outside government and international institutions) are not providing co-financing, which demonstrates that there is not strong initial stakeholder mobilization for this investment. Please explain, as typically IW investments see inkind contributions from CSO networks, academia, and NGOs at PIF stage.</p>	<p>Included</p>

6th of March 2026

GEF Reviewer comments	UNDP Response
<p>It is concerning that few specific co-financiers have been identified at PIF stage. Please seek additional sources of co-financing to demonstrate the partnership mobilization within this project.</p> <p>Nearly all public investment co-financing is listed for a period that precedes project implementation and therefore cannot be counted as project co-financing:</p> <p>"Investments mobilized will be analyzed in detail during the PPG phase and finalized by the time of CEO endorsement. For Kazakhstan it includes investment to the construction of the waste-water treatment facilities in Taraz (USD 35 mln.) and rehabilitation of the irrigation facilities on the territory of Chu and Talas basins under the State programme of the agro-industrial development (2017-2021) and investments to the agricultural development in Zhambyl province (USD 40 mln.). The newly developing state water resources management programme for 2020-2030 is yet to be included. For Kyrgyzstan the State water and sanitation programme for Chui province 2020-2026 (USD 41 mln.) and the part of the State programme on irrigation development (2020-2027) covering Chu and Talas river basins are counted (USD 44 mln.). Funding of these programmes will include ODA and IFI investments, which are not specified in these programmes."</p>	<p>At PIF stage, the co-financing presented is indicating national programmes and IFI-supported investments priorities, and were identified in consultation with further specified, time-aligned with the project period letters during the PPG phase . We acknowledge that the GEF project; however, they were included to demonstrate and strong government commitment to priority sectors (wastewater treatment, and basin resilience) that the project will implement. In the meantime, these sectors? programme updated. Importantly, the project included as a category Output 3.3 will develop SAP-aligned financing engagements to actively mobilize additional co-financing from sources EBRD, SDC, Islamic Development Bank, and private concepts into concrete, finance-ready investments. expanded, disaggregated by partner, and aligned with ensuring a robust, realistic, and partnership-driven</p>
<p>(a) The co-financing ratio is extremely high for a \$6M investment (ratio 1: 45). Please carefully review large co-financing contributions and ensure they are realistic and realized within the project period.</p>	<p>This ratio was confirmed during the development of the project. Passed, the co-financing has been revised and is now it will reflect a more realistic and time-aligned co-f</p>

(b) Co-financiers must be on individual lines in the table and not grouped. "IFIs - World Bank, ADB, EBRR" is not permitted . Please remove this co-financing line.	Thank you, removed as required and each donor ag
(c) "IFIs" is vague and not permitted. Please include specific co-financiers only. Please remove this co-financing line.	Thank you, removed as required and each donor ag
(d) "Group private companies" is vague and not permitted. Please include specific co-financiers only. Please remove this co-financing line.	Group of private companies removed
(e) "Government of Kazakhstan" and "Government of Kyrgyzstan" are not specific. Please identify the ministries or entities within the government that will provide this co-financing.	The co-financing for two Governments includes all the Chu?Talas Basin (2022?2030) where several re

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments **6th of March 2026** (thenshaw): Yes

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Yes

5th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

The Kyrgyz Republic LOE is now missing from the Portal. See below (missing blue icon at right). Please upload.

Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):

Name	Position	Ministry	Date
Mrs. Saule Sabiyeva	Director of the Climate Policy department	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Kazakhstan	2/25/2026 
Mr. Almaz Musaev	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision of the Kyrgyz Republic	2/17/2026

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's CommentsAddressed

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

Please provide English high-resolution maps.

Please provide basin coordinates

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

English map provided

Coordinates provided

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

We note that UNDP attached Social and Environmental risk Screening Template, and an overall ESS risk is classified as Moderate. For effective implementation of this project, it is critical to have strong engagement with local communities including small-hold farmers.

1. Please clarify whether the project consulted with vulnerable populations particularly small-hold farmers about the project concept (PIF) and how the results of consultations were integrated into project concept (PIF).
2. Please ensure recognizing vulnerable communities including small-hold farmers not only as beneficiaries, but also as partners in the project governance including the project steering committee.
3. SESP said moderate risk. However, environmental and social risk in the key Risk table mentioned ?Substantial? risk (PIF, page 40). Please make these risks consistent.
4. Please consider integrating local governance and traditional and local knowledge as a part of project activities, particularly in Component 2 and 3.
5. Please also consider integration of vulnerable communities including small-hold farmers governance, traditional and local knowledge, capacity building, and number of vulnerable populations? beneficiaries as monitoring indicators where appropriate during PPG.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

1. Addressed
2. Addressed
3. The SESP [SESP_MSP_PIF_Chu Talas_PIMS 6301_6Feb26 \(1\)](#) should now be removed, as it has been replaced. Please remove.
Agency response is truncated. "After this revision of ToC/logframe the SESP assigned substantial risk to ESS. The SES risks outlined in the pre-SESP are very preliminary and must be carefully re-examined and refined during the PPG phase in consultation with the SES Technical Adviser . The Risk" Please revise.
4. In the response matrix please explain what the specific activities are: "The traditional and local knowledge management described in a separate Component 4. Specific knowledge products and services are also listed in the section on Knowledge in Project Description."
5. Addressed, but please state this directly in the PIF.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw):

3. Addressed
4. Addressed
5. Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th of April 2026

<p>3. The SESP SESP_MSP_PIF_Chu Talas_PIMS 6301_6Feb26 (1) should now be removed, as it has been replaced. Please remove.</p> <p>Agency response is truncated. "After this revision of ToC/logframe the SESP assigned substantial risk to ESS. The SES risks outlined in the pre-SESP are very preliminary and must be carefully re-examined and refined during the PPG phase in consultation with the SES Technical Adviser. The Risk" Please revise.</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>
<p>4. In the response matrix please explain what the specific activities are: "The traditional and local knowledge management described in a separate Component 4. Specific knowledge products and services are also listed in the section on Knowledge in Project Description."</p>	<p>Importantly, the project will benefit from the technical guidance of the UNECE WSS on knowledge integration, validation, and application of traditional knowledge within internationally recognized frameworks for cooperation.</p> <p>These activities are operationalized through Output 4.1 (two-way KM system) and Output 4.2 (two-way KM system) ensuring that traditional and local knowledge is an integral element but is systematically embedded into the investment planning processes across the project.</p>
<p>5. Addressed, but please state this directly in the PIF.</p>	<p>Re-addressed.</p>

6th of March 2026

GEF Reviewer comments	UNDP Response
<p>i. Please clarify whether the project consulted with vulnerable populations particularly small-hold farmers about the project concept (PIF) and how the results of consultations were integrated into project concept (PIF).</p>	<p>Vulnerable populations, including smallholder farmers, participated in active participation in the development of the Strategy for the foundation of the PIF. Farmers contributed to the identification of challenges and priority interventions, and their input have been carried forward into the PIF.</p> <p>In addition, discussions of the project concept were held with the Water Commission (CTWC) and its related meeting management organizations (vodkhozes) participated in the interface between project developers and local communities. Local needs and perspectives are adequately represented.</p> <p>As a result, the PIF incorporates priorities and solutions for vulnerable groups, including smallholder farmers. During the PPG phase, direct engagement with these stakeholders to ensure their participation in project design and implementation.</p>
<p>ii. Please ensure recognizing vulnerable communities including small-hold farmers not only as beneficiaries, but also as partners in the project governance including the project steering committee.</p>	<p>During the PPG phase, specific mechanisms for stakeholder participation be further elaborated, including clear modalities for project governance structures including the project steering committee mechanisms, and capacity-building measures to ensure their participation.</p>
<p>iii. SESP said moderate risk. However, environmental and social risk in the key Risk table mentioned "Substantial" risk (PIF, page 40). Please make these risks consistent.</p>	<p>After this revision of ToC/logframe the SESP assigned moderate risk outlined in the pre-SESP are very preliminary and must be carefully re-examined during the PPG phase in consultation with the SES Technical Adviser.</p>
<p>iv. Please consider integrating local governance and traditional and local knowledge as a part of project activities, particularly in Component 2 and 3.</p>	<p>Integrated local governance and communities in Component 2 and 3.</p> <p>The traditional and local knowledge management and knowledge products and services are also listed in the Project Description.</p>

v. Please also consider integration of vulnerable communities including small-holder farmers governance, traditional and local knowledge, capacity building, and number of vulnerable populations? beneficiaries as monitoring indicators where appropriate during PPG.

The project will ensure the systematic integration of smallholder farmers, across governance, knowledge frameworks. Vulnerable groups will be engaged not only in project governance structures, including representation (PSC) and technical working groups, ensuring their voices are heard in all processes.

The project will also incorporate traditional and local knowledge in the implementation of interventions, particularly in areas such as ecosystem-based approaches, and climate adaptation strategies to ensure the effectiveness of project outcomes.

Targeted capacity-building activities will be designed to enhance the skills and leadership capacities of vulnerable communities, using responsive approaches and the inclusion of marginalized groups.

During the PPG phase, the project will further develop meaningful engagement, including participatory approaches.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): No, please reconsider the Rio Marker selections re: biodiversity, land degradation and climate change mitigation.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw): It is likely that CCA is a significant objective and not a principal objective. Please indicate "1".

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5th of April 2026

It is likely that CCA is a significant objective and not a principal objective. Please indicate "1".	Thank you, this is now changed back to the previous section. We may revisit at PPG as requested. We have added CCM as we now reinstated C
--	---

6th of March 2026 CCA is a principal objective (CCA = 2), as reflected in the project objective and in Outputs 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 on climate-resilient diagnostics, monitoring, hotspot measures, and follow-on investments. BD and LD are significant objectives (BD = 1; LD = 1), reflected mainly through Outputs 2.3, 1.3 and 3.2

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments 6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

13th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency's Comments, 10th of April 2026 Many thanks for the constructive comments. The team has done their best to address in the tight timeframes of the cycle.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

6th of March 2026 (thenshaw):

In the development of the Gender Analysis and Action Plan, please ensure that the activities developed are included in the project documents and that the GAP aligns with the project components. Please ensure that in the development of the results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

5th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Please acknowledge the above comments will be addressed in PPG.

10th of April 2026 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency's Comments

We acknowledge that above comments will be addressed during PPG

In the PIF we

? added a dedicated gender section,

- committed to a Gender Analysis + GAP + budget during PPG,
- added sex-disaggregated monitoring and reporting,
- added gender-responsive grievance/consultation measures, and
- mainstreamed gender language across Outputs 1.1?4.2, instead of leaving gender outside the results architecture.

The current PIF uses cross-component mainstreaming plus Component 4?s gender-inclusive M&E/KM framework.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	2/16/2026	2/25/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/6/2026	4/10/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/5/2026	4/13/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/10/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/13/2026	