

# Sustainable Management of Agricultural Biodiversity in Vulnerable Ecosystems and Rural Communities of Samtskhe-Javakheti Region in Georgia

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10829

**Countries**

Georgia

**Project Name**

Sustainable Management of Agricultural Biodiversity in Vulnerable Ecosystems and Rural Communities of Samtskhe-Javakheti Region in Georgia

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

6/25/2021

**Review completed by PM**

9/13/2021

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

MSP

## PIF

### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Not fully.

- The type of co-financing for REC Caucasus needs to be completed (one entry missing in table C).

09/13/2021: ADDITIONAL correction request:

- for GIZ change 'source type' from 'Other' to 'Donor Agency'?

10/07/2021: Corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

25/08/2021

We have corrected REC Caucasus co-finance investment type as 'investment mobilized'

01/10/2021

We corrected the GIZ's source type to donor agency

**GEF Resource Availability**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response  
Project Preparation Grant

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
Core indicators

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
08/13/2021: Not fully.

- The hectares should be listed under 4.1 not 4.3. This is a BD funded project to benefit agrobiodiversity and the results as measured on an area basis should reflect that. If there are additional targets for SLM under 4.3, that may be included as well but the focus should be on BD benefits.

- Please briefly explain how the number of 55,000 beneficiaries has been derived at.

09/13/2021: Addressed & clarified.

Cleared

Agency Response

27/08/2021

1. The comment was addressed and reflected in the table 'GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet' of the Annex B (p.42) of PIF. Figures were edited and now target under 4.1 is 20,000 ha.

2. The number of beneficiaries (55,000) was calculated based on assumption that around half of population of rural settlements in Samtskhe-Javakheti Region who are

users of arable lands and lands under permanent plantations will benefit from the project.

**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
08/13/2021: Not fully.

- Please provide additional referenced information on climate change projections and scenarios at the project location if available for at country level.
- The project mentions 'Weak land tenure systems' as an important driver. But it is not clear how the project will work around this to achieve sustained results. Will this be looked at by an alternative initiative?
- What have been the implications of COVID in Georgia and in the targeted project region? Is there an opportunity to incorporate green recovery into the project.

09/13/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

25/08/2021

1. The comment was addressed and reflected under the section "National Context?"

(p.8 ? in Part II, 1a. Project Description, 1) *The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed*) of PIF.

2. The comment was addressed and reflected under the section "3) Proposed alternative scenario" under Component 2, Outcome 2.1. The main incentive will be that for participating in the project activities, Farmers should have registered their land plots in Cadaster.

3. The comment was addressed and reflected under the section "National Context?" (pp. 8-9 ? in Part II, 1a. Project Description, 1) *The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed*) and section "Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)" (pp. 26-27 ? in Part II, 1a. Project Description, 6) "Global environmental benefits GEFTF and/or adaptation benefits LDCF/SCCF) of PIF.

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6. Are the project?s/program?s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Please note:

- The information provided is sufficient for PIF stage, however at CEO Endorsement additional details on the ?how? will be necessary.

Agency Response

25/08/2021

Yes, additional details will be addressed during the CEO Endorsement stage.

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project?s/program?s intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion



08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Please note:

- The information provided at PIF is sufficient, however more concrete details on private sectors role in implementation is expected at CEO Endorsement.

Agency Response

25/08/2021

Yes, additional details will be addressed during the CEO Endorsement stage.

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes. In particular, GEFSEC welcomes the execution arrangements with REC Caucasus.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

09/13/2021: ADDITIONAL clarification request:

- We note that the agency classified the project ESS risk as moderate, and attached the UNEP Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). The SRIF, however, does not seem to have been reviewed by the UNEP safeguard team and it does not include a Safeguard Review Summary and Recommendations from the safeguard team (as usually is the case). Please clarify whether the SRIF have been reviewed by the safeguard team and include the review summary and recommendations, as appropriate.

10/07/2021: Addressed. New SRIF version uploaded to documents section of the portal.

Cleared

Agency Response

01/10/2021

The ESS documents (SRIFs) were reviewed by UNEP's safeguard officers. The SRIF version we uploaded was missing the safeguard's review and recommendations. We updated the SRIF on the GEF portal.

**Part III ? Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**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 the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08/13/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

09/13/2021: No. Please address two additional correction/clarification requests.

10/07/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends PIF approval.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- More detailed information is requested at the next stage, especially for (i) sustainability, innovation, and scaling-up, and (ii) private sector engagement.

#### **Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>8/13/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/13/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/7/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### **PIF Recommendation to CEO**

#### **Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

This project aims at mainstreaming biodiversity in agriculture sector through sustainable management of agrobiodiversity in vulnerable ecosystems and rural communities of Samtskhe-Javakheti Region of Georgia by strengthening larger-scale policy and regulatory frameworks, demonstrating and scaling-up investment in supporting in-situ conservation and use of plant genetic resources of the ancient vine and wheat varieties throughout farmer management to improve livelihoods of local people, revitalize rurally agrotourism and generate impacts necessary to advance progress at national level. To

achieve this, the project will focus on three main inter-related components. Component 1 will strengthen policy and legal frameworks enabling sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity and support livelihoods in agricultural production in Samtskhe-Javakheti region, component 2 will be facilitating technical assistance and investment in diversified agricultural biodiversity-friendly practices and products and component 3 will support capacity development, knowledge management and M&E for effective and sustainable agricultural biodiversity management. The project will improve management of landscapes covering 20,000 ha under sub-indicator 4.1, 'area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity' and mitigate around 613,041 tCO<sub>2</sub> of GHG emissions over the lifetime of the project. The project will generate socio-economic co-benefits for 55,000 direct beneficiaries, including 28,600 women.

While COVID-19 pandemic has had negative effects on biodiversity, nature-based solutions in promoting a green and resilient economic recovery in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic are recognized by the GoG. Those include e.g., supporting and funding conservation programs that help to protect biodiversity and safeguard ecosystems. Other measures include promoting environmentally sustainable practices in agriculture, so as to: reduce deforestation, habitat destruction and fragmentation; strengthen the functioning of ecosystems; and lower the risks of future infectious zoonotic disease outbreaks. The project will incorporate green recovery approaches during demonstration projects related to the diversified agricultural biodiversity-friendly practices as described in component 2.