

Facilitating agrobiodiversity (ABD) conservation and sustainable use to promote food and nutritional resilience in Tajikistan

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10821

Countries

Tajikistan

Project Name

Facilitating agrobiodiversity (ABD) conservation and sustainable use to promote food and nutritional resilience in Tajikistan

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/11/2021

Review completed by PM

8/3/2021

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Clarification question

The project has indicators on Protected areas (indicator 1) and lists them. However, table A doesn't show alignment with BD-2-7. Please clarify.

08/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Re 23 June:

The Core Indicators table has been updated.

2. Project description summary. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Not fully.

There is some incoherence with the project structure/design as presented in Table B and the alignment in Table A as well as with the core indicator 1. From Table B it is not obvious which components/outcomes/outputs link with BD-2-7 and the indicator 1.

08/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Re 23 June:

Core indicator one has been removed and only core indicator 4 remains as there is no direct link to this core Indicator and BD-2.7

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed 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, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Not fully.

- Reviewer cannot locate letter for \$800,000 co-financing from the Research Laboratory.

- Several entries do not fulfil the criteria for "investment mobilized", the respective letters state that the contributions are "in kind" or the text points to recurrent contributions. Please bring all entries in Table C fully in line with what the letters state.

08/03/2021: Please make the following corrections:

- NOOSFERA (CSO) \$500,000: change the type from ?Grant? to ?In-kind?.

- FAO \$28,300: This appears to be in-kind contribution. If so, change the type from ?Grant? to ?In-kind?.

08/13/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Re 23 June:

The co-financing from the Research Laboratory has been upload to the system.
Table C has been updated.

RE 3 Aug:

Thank you for your feedback. The Portal has been updated accordingly.

5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Resources are available.

However, please note comments on the budget:

- General Operating Expenses (GOE) are usually included in the PMC category, please adjust accordingly.

08/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Re 23 June:

Budget tables have been corrected accordingly.

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Clarification questions:

- A target on indicator 1 is welcome, however, it is unclear from Table B which project activities will help achieve it.
- The scope of the project and the work on enabling environment and mainstreaming would lead to the expectation of significantly higher targets under core indicator 4, and in particular targets under sub-indicator 4.1. Please take into consideration.
- Below the indicator table an explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification for core indicator targets are not provided. Please provide in the next submission.

08/03/2021: One correction request:

- Core Indicator table lists Indicator 4 ?Area of landscapes under improved practices? as 22,344 ha at CEO endorsement expected ? this number has to be reflected in Annex: Project Results Framework.

08/13/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Re 23 June:

Indicator 1 has been removed from the core indicators table as it does not apply to this project.

Core indicator 4 has been revised and Aichi target 7 has been included as an additional indicator and the methodology has been added.

RE 3 Aug:

We have updated the Result Framework accordingly (1,600 ha + 600 ha + 300 ha + 19,844 ha = 22,344 ha).

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for 1-step MSP

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for 1-step MSP

Agency Response

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

10. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

11. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

12. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

13. Risk. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Not fully.

- While a climate risk screening is provided, please provide a summary of related climate change risks in the risk table.

- Please also included in this section, preferably under the risk table, an assessment of the opportunities, if any, for COVID-19 recovery efforts in the context of this project.

08/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Re 23 June:

Both items have been added.

14. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Not fully.

Neither the portal template nor the project document describe the exceptional arrangement that FAO provides execution support. A letter requesting this signed by the OFP is uploaded, including a justification, however, no reference is made to that in the portal text or the prodoc.

- The description of the institutional arrangements needs to be consistent with the request.

- FAO needs to be listed as executing agency alongside the national execution entity in Part I as well.

Please amend.

08/03/2021: Addressed. Program Manager approves the proposed exceptional arrangement based on OFP request and justification provided and recommends Manager's clearance.

Agency Response

Re 23 June:

Both items have been updated accordingly (institutional arrangements for the project implementation section and the Part I).

RE 3 Aug:

Thank you for your feedback. We have addressed the above comments. We also updated the project implementation start/completion dates.

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

18. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**19. Annexes:
Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Not fully.

In Annex E: GEF budget - please provide the detailed budget as uploaded in the portal (sheet 2 of the excel file).

08/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Re 23 June:

The detailed budget has been uploaded in the Portal accordingly.

20. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

08/03/2021: Please address:

Core Indicator table lists Indicator 4 ?Area of landscapes under improved practices? as 22,344 ha at CEO endorsement expected ? this number has to be reflected in Annex: Project Results Framework.

(see also comment made under core indicators)

08/13/2021: Addressed under core indicator section above.

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for MSP

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for MSP

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Please refer to Annex C.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Have been provided.

Agency Response

Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/23/2021: No. Please address comment made in this review.

08/03/2021: No. Please address comment made in this review.

08/13/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO approval of this 1-step MSP.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/23/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/3/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/13/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The overarching aim of this project is the conservation and sustainable use of the national and globally significant agrobiodiversity of Tajikistan, including the valuation and maintenance of crop landraces, crop wild relatives and their associated knowledge and cultural values. The project will improve agrobiodiversity conservation, help facilitate its use and ensure the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from its use in view of food and nutritional security and promoting livelihoods. This MSP will establish innovative systems, tools and approaches for the protection of agricultural

species varieties in the four district sites, including the mainstreaming of collective community/farmer approaches for in-situ conservation and the establishment of incentive-based mechanisms for sustainable use and conservation. It will also play a role to reduce gender gaps including women in all project activities and promote safe space for them to actively participate in the project and benefit from it. The close involvement of the private and banking sector will help facilitate the promotion of farmer engagement in agrobiodiversity conservation and commodity enhancement. The innovative, market-based tools and approaches for the conservation of traditional varieties will support supply value chain development by developing niche markets, promoting agro-ecotourism, enhancing cultural preference branding, showcasing nutritional branding, recognizing traditional knowledge, enhancing e-commerce among rural communities, and facilitating new partnerships. This MSP will directly target a total area of 22, 344 hectares (core indicator 4.1 and 4.3) and directly reach 2370 beneficiaries.

The risks and opportunities in context of the COVID-19 pandemic have been assessed. The risk for agrobiodiversity conservation and landrace product value chain enhancement will be monitored, and adaptive management applied if necessary.