

Land Restoration and Ecosystem Service Improvement through Use of Fruit and Nut Tree Biodiversity in Armenia

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11140

Countries

Armenia

Project Name

Land Restoration and Ecosystem Service Improvement through Use of Fruit and
Nut Tree Biodiversity in Armenia

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

4/26/2023

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

MSP

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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

04/26/2023: Not fully.

Please re-write the project summary by following the prompt in the template.

"Provide a brief summary description of the project, including: (i) what is the problem and issues to be addressed? (ii) what are the project objectives, and if the project is intended to be transformative, how will this be achieved? (iii) how will this be achieved (approach to deliver on objectives), and (iv) what are the GEBs and/or adaptation benefits, and other key expected results. The purpose of the summary is to provide a short, coherent summary for readers. The explanation and justification of the project should be in section B ?project description?.(max. 250 words, approximately 1/2 page)".

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

The Project summary section has been re-drafted based on the provided prompt.

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

04/26/2023: Not fully.

a) Yes.

b) Component 1 sounds like a topic while Components 2 and 3 sound like outcomes. Please make it consistent.

c) Please include the expected project outcomes and outputs for the M&E section.

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

b) Component names have been updated and aligned

c) Project outcome and outputs are defined for M&E.

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/26/2023: Yes. However, please clarify:

i. ?Finally achievement of impact and the attainment of goals of Land Restoration and Ecosystem Service Improvement through Use of Fruit and Nut Tree Biodiversity in Armenia through adoption and scaling up of gender-sensitive, multiple benefit practices.?

Question: What are gender-sensitive, multiple benefit practices?

ii. ? ?through investments into sustainable land management technologies, to strengthen the baseline gender efforts to improve women?s entrepreneurship.?

Question: What does baseline gender efforts mean?

iii. Under Barrier 3:

??and the management practices needed to implement age and gender based development action.?

Question: What does age and gender based development action mean/entail?

Please clarify these terms or rephrase to better convey what gender-specific actions/interventions are intended/planned.

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

i. We provided examples such as supporting women and youth in establishment and running tree nurseries to supply quality and diverse planting material for land restoration activities, establishment of fruit and nut crops products processing initiatives, development of eco-agrotourism business.

ii. We amended that sentence and now reads: ? through investments into sustainable land management technologies, particular attention will be paid to enhancing women entrepreneurship.?

iii. we revised the sentence and now reads??? management practices needed to implement development actions targeted to men and women and different age groups to reap the economic benefits for the communities from local fruit and nut tree diversity.?

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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

04/26/2023: Not fully.

a) Description is at a very general level with superfluous information about general context. Please make it concise and specific to the proposed project.

b) Please reword the barriers so that the statements can be understood by the reader. Please concisely describe the barriers and enablers.

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

a) The situation analysis section has been redrafted based on the provided prompt.

b) barriers have been reworded.

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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

04/26/2023: Not fully.

Core Indicator 11 on Direct beneficiaries: The number is very large. Please review the number to ensure it includes only direct beneficiaries. Pages 24-25 of the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01) provide examples of what might be counted as direct beneficiary.

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

Based on the guidance provided we assumed that the project will offer training programs to 10% of the total population in the targeted pilot regions. Therefore revised the target to 10,000 (5,000 man and 5,000 women). However we will review the number while designing training programs at PPG.

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) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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 04/26/2023: Yes.

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 04/26/2023: 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

04/26/2023: Not fully.

Please elaborate on UNCCD alignment, especially with regard to LDN targets and the project's contribution to implementing those targets.

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

We added how the project is aligned with LDN targets.

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

04/26/2023: No.

Please elaborate on the alignment with the GBF targets.

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

We provided an analysis of how the project is aligned with GBF targets.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

04/26/2023: Not fully.

Please indicate the role of the private sector in the policy section and elaborate on it as appropriate in the project description.

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

We added more clarification about the role of private sector and how their role will be further developed at the PPG phase.

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/26/2023: Yes. It is noted that the project has provided a list of stakeholders consulted during project design, including with local communities and civil society organizations. However, please more clearly describe the planned approach to consult with these stakeholders during project development and as part of the plans to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan before CEO Approval in the Project Description (Section B).

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

We added a paragraph in the end of the project rationale section.

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

04/26/2023: No.

For the LD Focal Area, the amounts requested in the portal (in all tables: GEF Financing Table, PPG Table, Source of Funds Table) are higher than the amounts endorsed by the OFP in the LoE for that focal area. Either bring in line with LoE or a new letter of Endorsement will be required so that amounts requested in Portal are not higher than the amounts endorsed in the LoE.

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023:

LoE has been revised and all tables have been updated in line with the new LoE.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments 04/26/2023: 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 04/26/2023: 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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments
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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/26/2023: No, the amounts are not consistent. Please address comment made on the Financing Tables above.

08/03/2023: Addressed.

Agency's Comments

06/26/2023

LoE has been revised and all tables have been updated in line with the new LoE.

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 Comments n/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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments 04/26/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments 04/26/2023: 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

04/26/2023: Requesting sequential PPO review.

08/03/2023: PM recommends CEO approval of this 2-step MSP.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/26/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/3/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

