



Integrated Management of Seascapes of the Kazakhstani part of the Caspian Sea and Land Resources of Adjacent Territories

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11524

Countries

Kazakhstan

Project Name

Integrated Management of Seascapes of the Kazakhstani part of the Caspian Sea and Land Resources of Adjacent Territories

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/21/2024

Review completed by PM

4/22/2024

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

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

3/27/2024

Yes for BD.

The LD elements of this MFA project are in line with the LDFA strategy and correctly aligned to LD-1 and LD-2 objectives. The main LD-related activities are described in output 2.3: Piloting SLM, and partly in output 3.2 on Restoration.

However, the SLM activities in output 3.2 should result in a target for core indicator 4.3 (land under SLM in production landscapes), which is currently set at zero. Please set an adequate core indicator target reflecting the proposed activities under output 3.2.

The CCM elements of this MFA project should be strengthened as currently the PIF refers mostly to climate adaptation, which while can be a co-benefit of CCM/BD/LD-funded projects, cannot be in itself the main anchor of CCM FA eligibility.

The CCM 1.4 window requires that interventions supported are able to produce "high mitigation potential". While some level of emission reductions/carbon sequestration could be reasonably expected from activities contemplated under component 2 (SLM) and component 3 ("NbS for ecosystem restoration"), the level of detail provided is minimal which makes it difficult to make a judgement call on whether the TOC is reasonable. Please provide more details on how the project interventions can be reasonably expected to generate CCM GEBs.

4/22/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 12th April 2024

1. UNDP Agency ID is not entered to Portal and kindly add 9727 as UNDP Agency ID for this project.

2. The SLM activities under Output 3.2 is now transferred to Core Indicator 4.3 in the Core Indicator Worksheet in Annex I. (refer Annex I)

Thank you for the comment regarding CCM. The section in terms of alignment with CCM FA has been revised accordingly to align with CCM 1.4 "Promote nature-based solutions with high mitigation potential" the project will support mitigation actions in terms of reduced fires in terrestrial protected areas, improvement in steppe grassland through improved management with medium inputs, reduction in excavation of tidal marshes in the shoreline of the Caspian Sea and improvements in arable crop lands that will generate climate benefits. (Page 32) Additionally, a preliminary estimate of carbon mitigation benefits (core indicator 6) is provided in Annex I that takes into consideration benefits from terrestrial landscape protection from fires, improved pasture management and protection of tidal marshes. These figures will be reassessed at PPG along with a calculation of benefits from improvements in arable crop lands (see Page 32 of PIF and Annex H)

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

3/27/2024

Cleared for BD.

The CCM elements of this MFA project should be strengthened as currently the PIF refers mostly to climate adaptation, which while can be a co-benefit of CCM/BD/LD-funded projects, cannot be in itself the main anchor of CCM FA eligibility.

The CCM 1.4 window requires that interventions supported are able to produce "high mitigation potential". While some level of emission reductions/carbon sequestration could be reasonably expected from activities contemplated under component 2 (SLM) and component 3 ("NbS for ecosystem restoration"), the level of detail provided is minimal which makes it difficult to make a judgement call on whether the TOC is reasonable. Please provide more details on how the project interventions can be reasonably expected to generate CCM GEBs.

4/22/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 12th April 2024

Refer responses under Comment 1 above in relation to CCM elements

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

Please include best practices in advancing gender equality and gender mainstreaming in Output 4.2. Please explicitly state and identify how activities in the Gender Action Plan to be developed are budgeted, monitored and reported on.

4/22/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 12th April 2024

The section on gender equality and mainstreaming is now strengthened under Component 4 (page 22), Output 4.1 (page 23), Output 4.2 (page 23) and Output 5.1 (page 24)

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

See comments above on CCM 1.4 and address accordingly.

4/22/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

In section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project", UNDP answered "Yes" to the question of whether the GEF Agency expected to play an execution role. UNDP is not endorsed as executing partner. Please remove any mention for UNDP to carry out executing functions.

4/22/2024

- Still in section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project", UNDP states that they will carry out executing functions. Please remove any mention to this as it has not been endorsed by the OFP. Please do this in the portal and do not resubmit until this is done.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 2 May 2024:

Thank you, please be informed that the Portal entries (neither check box or text) in this section are not referring to UNDP carrying out executing functions.

UNDP Response - 12th April 2024

The reference to UNDP Execution Role is marked as "NO" (see section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" on Page 28 of PIF).

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

3/27/2024

Cleared for BD related core indicators.

The SLM activities in output 3.2 should result in a target for core indicator 4.3 (land under SLM in production landscapes), which is currently set at zero. Please set an adequate core indicator target reflecting the proposed activities under output 3.2.

Please include at least a conservative expectation for Core Indicator 6. Without this, it is not possible to evaluate eligibility (at least an initial stage) vs. CCM funding requirements.

4/22/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 12th April 2024

The core indicator for SLM activities in Output 3.2 is now marked under 4.3 (see Annex I)

A conservative estimate has been made in terms of Core Indicator 6 and included in Annex I. This figure will be reassessed at PPG stage (see Annex H)

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

NA

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

Cleared for BD and LD.

The CCM elements of this MFA project should be strengthened as currently the PIF refers mostly to climate adaptation, which while can be a co-benefit of CCM/BD/LD-funded projects, cannot be in itself the main anchor of CCM FA eligibility.

The CCM 1.4 window requires that interventions supported are able to produce "high mitigation potential". While some level of emission reductions/carbon sequestration could be reasonably expected from activities contemplated under component 2 (SLM) and component 3 ("NbS for ecosystem restoration"), the level of detail provided is minimal which makes it difficult to make a judgement call on whether the TOC is reasonable. Please provide more details on how the project interventions can be reasonably expected to generate CCM GEBs.

4/22/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 12th April 2024

Refer responses under Comment 1 above in relation to CCM elements

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

3/27/2024

Please remove the decimals from the PPG and Sources of Funds tables.

4/22/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 12th April 2024

The decimals have been removed (see Annex A)

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

NA

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

NA

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(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

3/27/2024

Letter of Endorsement states the executing partner is ?to be determined?. However, in Portal the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR) is shown as the Executing Partner. Please remove the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR) and type (Government) as this is not formally endorsed by the Government in the LOE (it can be included later during the preparation phase as needed).

4/22/2024

- Still the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR) is shown as the Executing Partner. Please remove the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR) and type (Government) as this is not endorsed by the Government. Do not resubmit the project until you make these corrections in the portal please.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 2 may 2024:

Thank you. The entry in the Portal has been adjusted accordingly. Please note that Executing Partner Type cannot be removed from our side after previously submitted:

Executing Partner ⓘ	Executing Partner Type
tbd	Government

UNDP Response - 12th April 2024

This is now rectified in the portal

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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 Comments

3/27/2024

NA

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

Cleared.

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

3/27/2024

NA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

Please make the revisions requested above and resubmit as soon as possible.

4/22/2024

- Still the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR) is shown as the Executing Partner. Please remove the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR) and type (Government) as this is not endorsed by the Government.

- Still in section ?Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project?, UNDP states that they will carry out executing functions ? please remove any mention to this as it has not been endorsed by the OFP.

Please revise and resubmit. Please do this in the portal and do not resubmit until this is done.

5/2/2024

Yes, PIF is recommended for clearance.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 2 May 2024:

Thank you. The entry in the Portal and in PIF have been adjusted accordingly.

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/27/2024

This is a very ambitious and comprehensive project. During project design phase, please continue to assess the feasibility of implementation of the proposed actions and adjust if needed.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response - 12th April 2024

Agreed, the PPG team will reassess the feasibility of activities suggested and adjust accordingly

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review

3/27/2024

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

4/22/2024

Additional Review (as necessary)

5/2/2024

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)