

Achieving Land Degradation Neutrality Targets of Georgia through Restoration and Sustainable Management of Degraded Pasturelands

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10151

Countries

Georgia

Project Name

Achieving Land Degradation Neutrality Targets of Georgia through Restoration and Sustainable Management of Degraded Pasturelands

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/17/2019

Review completed by PM

1/21/2020

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response N/A

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Not fully.

Program Manager could not locate the confirmation letters for the following amounts listed in Table C:

- GEF Agency (FAO): \$5,100,000
- Beneficiaries (Dmanisi): \$845,000
- GIZ: \$500,000
- Govt. of Turkey: \$50,000

Please clarify / provide letters and/or adjust Table C and all other co-financing figures accordingly.

01/21/2020 UA: Has been explained as per below and missing letters provided.

DISCREPANCIES FOUND:

- Co-financing letter of FAO mentions a total of \$5.5 million, which is not in line with Table C. The two figures provided in the letter (\$3.3 million and \$1.8 million) do not add up to \$5.5 million. Also the text under table C mentions \$5.5 million and is not in line with the \$5.1 million entered in the table. Further, if \$3.3 million of the \$5.5 are coming from ENPARD III, which is a EU funded project, Table C should indicate "European Union" as the name of the co-financer instead of FAO for this amount.
- Please refrain from using "public investment" for co-financing from sources other than national and sub-national government authorities, co-financing from beneficiaries should be counted as private.
- On the 4 municipalities, the classification should be local governments instead of beneficiaries.
- On CSO Rec Caucasus, the co-financing letter indicates "in-kind" rather than grant.

- On CSO CENN, the co-financing letter indicates “in-kind” rather than grant.

Please address these issues in the resubmission.

02/10/2020 UA: CLARIFICATION REQUEST:

As requested, the agency has adjusted as follows: "As for FAO co-financing, USD 1,8 million have been inserted in Table C. USD 3,3 million are being provided by the European Union". However, the confirmation remains unchanged and does not reflect this adjustment. The letter that has been provided (a) includes a total amount of \$5.5 million, which is more than the sum of \$3.3 million plus \$1.8 million, (b) the letter is signed by the FAO representative, not the European Union, and (c) the letter does not indicate the type of co-financing. Therefore, please (a) ensure that the amounts listed in table C are fully in line with the confirmation letter by removing the reference to the "total amount of \$5.5 million; and (b) if the FAO representative is the confirming entity, please clarify whether FAO has been entrusted with EU funds to the effect that it can make decision on the utilization of the amount towards co-financing for the GEF project - should that be the case, in fact, FAO can be listed in Table C as the source of co-financing for the total amount of \$5.1 million. Finally, (c) please indicate the type of co-financing in the revised co-financing letter(s).

02/24/2020 UA: Issues have been addressed (see response of Agency below) and confirmation letter revised.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

Cofinancing letters from FAO (\$5.1m) and Turkey (\$50,000) have been uploaded into the system.

The co-financing letter from Dmanisi includes **in-kind co-financing for USD \$300,000** (the last paragraph explains how this in-kind was calculated), plus an additional 2,500,000 Georgian Lari as investment mobilized. The latter equals to **USD \$845,000 as investment mobilized** at an exchange rate of \$2.9586 Georgian Lari per USD in November 2019). Therefore total co-financing from Dmanisi municipality equals **\$1.145 million USD.**

Feb 2020

- As for FAO co-financing, USD 1,8 million have been inserted in Table C. USD 3,3 million are being provided by the European Union.
- Concerning the misuse of the term "public investment", well noted.
- The four financing municipalities have been categorized as Government

- Co-financing from REC Caucasus has been categorized as In-kind
- Co-financing from CENN has been categorized as In-kind

Feb 21 2020 (Clarification)

Total cofinancing from FAO is \$5.1m (= \$3.3m from ENPARD III + \$1.8m from NAITs). The FAO co-financing letter has been amended to reflect this total and to indicate that these are grant resources. FAO has the authority to utilize EU funding provided through ENPARD as co-finance for the GEF project, as well as for the grant resources under the NAITs program.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Note: As the project generates carbon benefits, please set Rio Marker for CC-M to the value 1.

01/21/2020 UA:

Has been corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

Rio Marker for CC has been set to 1

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

However, as the project generates carbon benefits, please set Rio Marker for CC-M to the value 1.

01/21/2020 UA:

Has been corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

CC-M Rio Marker has been set to 1

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Project Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/11/2019 UA: Yes.

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response N/A

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Risks

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

However, please spell out the acronyms when first used in this section: OP, REC Caucasus, CENN, etc.

If REC Caucasus is one of executing agencies, please list them also in Part I (Project Information) under "Other Executing Partner(s)".

01/21/2020 UA:

Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

Acronyms have been spelled out and REC has been included as other executing partner in Part 1.

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Not fully.

Please indicate in the KM section a brief timeline for the listed activities.

01/21/2020 UA:

Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

A table with activities and timelines has been included in this section.

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

However, the OPIM audit and spot checks are not eligible under the M&E budget. Please transfer them to the PMC. As the PMC are not yet fully used, this should not affect the implementation components. However, please be mindful that revised PMC will affect figures in Table A, B, and the budget table in the Prodoc.

01/21/2020 UA:

Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

Audits and spot checks have been moved to the PMC budget and removed from the M&E budget. Tables A, B and the table in the PRODOC have been updated.

Benefits

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a for MSP

Agency Response N/A

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a for MSP

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion none received

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion none received

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion none received

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Fully committed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: Available.

Cleared

Agency Response

Jan 2020

No response required

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/15/2020 UA: No. Please address comments made in this review.

01/21/2020 UA. No. Please address co-financing issues.

02/10/2020 UA: No. Please respond to clarification request on co-financing.

02/24/2020 UA: Yes. Program manager recommends MSP for (final) CEO approval.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Georgia aims to maintain and increase the amount of healthy and productive land resources in line with its national sustainable development goals and within the context of Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN), for which Georgia has set five voluntary LDN targets. The project is directly linked to the implementation of two of these targets: Target 1: Integrate LDN principles into national policies, strategies and planning documents; and Target 4: Degraded land to be rehabilitated.

The project supports the national efforts to implement LDN targets of Georgia through restoration and sustainable management of the degraded pasture lands (Targets 1 and 4) applying the “Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality” and taking a phased approach. The country has selected three municipalities based on the priorities of the LDN target setting as target landscapes for implementation activities. They are located in the Eastern part of Georgia and include Dmanisi, Gurjaani, and Kazbegi, which are characterized by key bio-physical and socio-economic parameters to set the project baseline in line with the voluntary LDN indicators.

At field level, the project will develop pastureland management plans in target municipalities and support their implementation to the extent possible under this MSP. The project will also strengthen the enabling environment for LDN, land-use planning processes, and security of tenure rights with the specific focus on pasture lands. It will be followed up by development of a LDN Decision Support System (DSS) using the proposed hierarchy of responses (avoid > reduce > reverse) based on the status of land degradation and using three LDN voluntary indicators (land cover, land productivity, and soil organic carbon (SOC)). This also involves a small area of restoration of degraded pasture lands generating GEBs related to land restored and under SLM. The approaches within three target municipalities using the land use plans and targeted capacity building programs and awareness raising campaigns can be replicated in other municipalities of the country. Local knowledge and continuous learning will be applied to validate/interpret the data, and anticipate/adjust/create new steps – feeding back into the LDN strategies and also support learning within the UNCCD context.

In terms of results, the project will restore 700 ha of pasture lands, bring 20,000 ha under SLM, sequester 770,000 metric tons of CO₂e, and will directly benefit 600 people.