

Conservation and Sustainable Management of Land Resources and High Nature Value Ecosystems in the Aral Sea Basin for Multiple Benefits

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10352

Countries

Turkmenistan

Project Name

Conservation and Sustainable Management of Land Resources and High Nature Value Ecosystems in the Aral Sea Basin for Multiple Benefits

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/4/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

However, please check the submission date: currently entered is 10/03/2019 (?)

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Not fully

- Please strive for proportionality between the overall and PMC con-financing.

Agency Response

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

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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Table D is adequate. However, please address comments on the budget:

- The total travel costs for the project with approximately \$370,000 seem to be comparably high, especially considering that not many international experts are travelling. Please justify the costs.
- Miscellaneous costs are not eligible.
- Operational costs for cell phone contracts and internet, postal cost and pouches, as well as bank charges are GOE and should be included in the PMC. Please use co-financing resources to cover.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

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

06/25/2021: Please include the overview table with stakeholder and their roles in the portal section.

Agency Response

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

06/25/2021: Please provide a short summary of the gender analysis in line with the referenced project document annex in this section.

Agency Response

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

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

06/25/2021: Not adequately

What is included here seems to be the UNDP SESP, which is repeated further below. In this risk section GEF is requesting a summary table of the major risks that might prevent project objectives from being achieved. Assessment of Climate change related risks and COVID-19 pandemic are mandatory. Please also include, preferably under the table, an assessment of the opportunities for green recovery, if any.

Agency Response

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

06/25/2021: Not fully.

(1) In this section, no reference is being made to the OFP request for execution support. Please summarize the exceptional arrangement and reference the support letter.

The Program Manager finds the request justified and will recommend Manager's clearance.

(2) Please explore synergies with the GEF financed and UNDP implemented International Waters Project titled "Strengthening the Resilience of Central Asian Countries by Enabling Regional Cooperation to Assess High Altitude Glacio-nival Systems to Develop Integrated Methods for Sustainable Development and Adaptation to Climate Change" (GEF ID 10077) and update Annex 24 and 19 of the Project Document, as appropriate. Note that Turkmenistan is one of five countries part-taking in this regional project that will promote and facilitate the establishment/strengthening of national and regional glacier centers and with an eye towards continuously assessing current and future water flow in key rivers, including the Amu Darya, Syr Darya and the Illi River. The regional project is fully coordinated with IFAS and will deliver national action plans informed by inter-ministerial dialogues and knowledge and data exchanges and may provide key building blocks for other planned/ongoing projects specific to increasing climate change adaptation and informing management practices.

The following Turkmenistan national ministries/agencies will be involved in the execution of the regional project: Ministry of Agriculture and Environment Protection, State Committee for Water Management and National Committee for Hydrometeorology (Turkmengidromet).

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

06/25/2021: 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 CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: Yes.

However, it is suggested to provide the detailed information in Part B in a separate document uploaded to the portal documents section.

Agency Response
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
06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
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
06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
06/25/2021: Not fully.

Annex B: Please also include a response to the Council comment from France (as filed in the portal under stakeholder comments).

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
06/25/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
06/25/2021: UNDP checklist has been submitted. Program Manager found it in order.

Cleared

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
06/25/2021: Not fully.

Annex B: Please also include a response to the Council comment from France (as filed in the portal under stakeholder comments).

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
06/25/2021: Yes. Has been responded to.

Cleared

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 06/25/2021: Has been provided in Annex C. Unused portion will be returned to GEF TF.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 06/25/2021: Has been provided.

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

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/25/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/25/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations