



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5403		
Country/Region:	Uzbekistan		
Project Title:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agricultural Biodiversity to Improve Regulating and Supporting Ecosystem Services in Agriculture Production		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,235,845
Co-financing:	\$4,150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,385,845
PIF Approval:	December 24, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Marieta Sakalian

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Uzbekistan has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An endorsement letter signed by the OFP has been attached. The project budget and fees are slightly different from the PIF but the total budget is the same.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, Uzbekistan has a remaining BD STAR allocation of \$1.6 million.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, note above.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	n/a	n/a
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	The project could be in line with BD 2 and BD 4. However, as noted below under item 7, the PIF requires further revision and clarification to conform with these objectives.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes. The project is fully aligned with BD-2 and BD-4.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	No, please further clarify the linkage/prioritization of agricultural diversity in the NBSAP of Uzbekistan.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	No. While the substantial national program on fruits production and other programs are noted, it is unclear what exactly the over 240 million government investment is funding and how this project is going to build on the work. Please clarify and provide clear linkage between the initiatives.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	No. A. The suggested project activities do not correspond to the barriers that have been identified. The barriers that have	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>been identified are systematic issues, including legal and legislative issues, land use management and planning, and market issues. The suggested activities are largely site level pilot and research initiatives that do not directly address these barriers. For example, in order to promote traditional varieties, the current agriculture policy that supports subsidies toward modern varieties and associated agriculture inputs needs to be reviewed and revised. It is also understood that site level pilots have already been conducted by USAID, JICA, and others in the past. The project design requires substantial revision and address systemic issues that has been identified as barriers to promote traditional fruit crops, including policy and institutional change, multi-sectoral land use management and planning, market transformation and creation, and others.</p> <p>B. Project objective is missing in the Table B on project framework.</p> <p>C. It is not considered cost effective to have three pilot sites scattered all over the country. This was also the case for similar proposals in Nepal and India. The PM suggests that the project to focus more on systematic issue, while focusing on one or two sites that are close and could be effectively managed.</p> <p>D. On the Component 3 which is related to ABS, we have the following comments:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>1) Uzbekistan has not ratified the Nagoya Protocol, and they would need to do that first before getting into Model Agreements, procedures for PIC and MAT, etc. The PMs would suggest that the project to first focus on the following activities related to the Nagoya Protocol on ABS: 1) scoping studies and analysis of the existing laws and regulations related to ABS; and 2) drafting documentation for ratification of the Nagoya Protocol by the legislature.</p> <p>2) Uzbekistan would need to build a legal and regulatory framework on ABS as identified under the barrier section. However, none of the outputs directly addresses the matter. Output 3.1.3. and 4. are too vague for that matter, and they needs to be revised in a following manner: Develop a legal and regulatory framework for the implementation of the NP.</p> <p>3) In order to manage ABS framework in the country, an administrative structure and procedures are required (again, barrier 3). What are the proposed activities to put in place such a system?</p> <p>In conclusion, as noted above, substantial review and revision are expected on the project design.</p> <p>7-16-13 A. The systematic and fundamental barriers that were identified under the initial PIF are understood as very relevant</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in order to ensure sustainability and success of the project initiative. While site level initiatives are already initiated by other donor support, we suggest that this project to focus on some of the key systematic issues in promoting traditional varieties for agrobiodiversity.</p> <p>C. While the suggestion to work on three sites are interesting from a research perspective, as suggested above, learning from other similar projects, the PM strongly suggest to focus and invest more on systematic issues rather scatter resources on site level</p> <p>D. While we appreciate the further information provided on the national efforts on ABS, we still consider that it is fundamental to first work on the ratification efforts and legal and regulatory framework, before working on specific varieties and agreements.</p> <p>Please revise the PIF according to the comments provided above and resubmit.</p> <p>19 Aug 2013, A. The responses do not address the specific issue that has been raised repeatedly by the GEFSEC. As noted above, how does the project ? While the benefit of traditional varieties of fruit trees are well understood, policy/planning/market level interventions are required, in addition or more than additional site level interventions that are already supported</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>by many other donors. Please respond directly to the comments and revise the project design. The PM would be available to discuss in person if the comments are unclear.</p> <p>D. While we appreciate the revision that has been made under this section, BD-4 is principally to support the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, and the language and explanation provided under this section is still vague in this regard. It is unclear whether the country is ready to engage in and build capacity to ratify the Nagoya Protocol or just want to "consider" as it is put under 3.1.1 and other section. As noted above, we suggest that the component 3 focuses on: 1) scoping studies and analysis of the existing laws and regulations related to ABS; and 2) drafting documentation for ratification of the Nagoya Protocol by the legislature. Further, as noted above, we consider 3.1.3. is premature until the necessary national legal and regulatory frameworks are developed on Nagoya Protocol on ABS, and suggest to delete. In addition, the GEF grant under the table B, component 3 does not match the amount identified under table A, BD-4. Please make the table A coherent with amount identified under the table B.</p> <p>21 Oct 2013 Outcomes 1.2 and 2.2 have been added to address the systematic barriers, policy and market issues, to promote traditional</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>varieties of fruit trees. While gap analysis, capacity building, institutional structure, and NBSAP revision are all relevant outputs, it is unclear why this project does not directly engage in mainstreaming fruit tree biodiversity conservation and use into relevant local land management plans and national agriculture development plans. As repeatedly noted in earlier review, building on former and ongoing investments in promoting fruit tree diversity, it seems timely and necessary to directly address the issue in agriculture policy and land management plans to overcome the key barrier, Barrier One, as articulated in page 7. Please further clarify and revise.</p> <p>Market and ABS issues are now adequately addressed based on comments provided earlier.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The GEBs are very vague. Please provide concrete species and ecosystem information, and substantiate the GEBs.</p>	<p>07/17/2015 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>07/17/2015 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified</p>	<p>Please further clarify involvement of local CSOs and IPs.</p>	<p>07/17/2015 UA: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and explicit means for their engagement explained?		
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Policy and market issues are not addressed. Please address these issues which could be considered critical risks.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Not very clear. The linkage with the large scale national programs are not clearly articulated. Please provide further information on coordination with ongoing initiatives.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	The activities that are listed in the innovation section of the PIF does not reflect the activities identified under the project framework. Please review and revise as needed. 7-15-13 While some revision has been made, it is still not clear what is the innovative elements of this project approach. Please clarify.	The project is innovative as it aims to use local fruit tree varietal diversity and its functional traits and facilitative interactions for pest, disease, and pollinator regulation, nutrient cycling, and soil-water retention to support ecosystem regulating services. It also promotes long term stability of agricultural production systems in the water scarce environment. The project is also aimed to scale up some of the relevant activities that were initiated by the government and other partners in the past, and address systematic issues (policy, strategy, and planning) to promote agro-biodiversity and sustainable agriculture practices.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		07/17/2015 UA: Yes. The project is fully in line with what was approved at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The cofinancing ratio is about 1 to 3. Considering significant local benefit and related national programs that are ongoing, it is expected that the cofinance (particularly cash cofinancing ratio) to be larger. 7-15-13 As noted, if larger cofinance is expected, indicate all potential cofinancing at this stage.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Refer above comment.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	PMC is about 10% and considered adequate.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, it is within the norm.	07/17/2015 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		07/17/2015 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		n/a for a MSP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		none received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		none received
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>YW and JC: No. Please refer to the above comments and revise the PIF accordingly.</p> <p>7-15-13 No, please refer to item 7, 13, and 16, and revise the PIF accordingly and resubmit.</p> <p>8-19-13 No, please carefully and further refer to comments made under item 7 above. The PM would be available to discuss and clarify the issue through teleconference or other means.</p> <p>10-21-13 No. Key revision has been made with the addition and revision of outcomes and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>outputs based on the comments made earlier. However, further explanation and revision is required on mainstreaming into the agriculture policy and land management plans as noted under item 7. Please address the issue and resubmit.</p> <p>12-20-13 Yes, appropriate activities to address the key systemic barriers (policy and strategic) on mainstreaming fruit tree biodiversity conservation and use have been incorporated at this stage. The PM recommends that further measures, including possibility to reform national agriculture policy and other relevant policies, to be clarified during the PPG phase. The approach and activities on systemic issue, including relevant policy, institution, and management plan needs to be substantiated by CEO approval. The PM recommends the PIF and PPG for CEO approval.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	12-20-13 YW & JC: At CEO endorsement stage, the project must fulfill the stipulations set forth in the review sheet, in particular the ones listed in box #24.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		07/17/2015 UA: Yes, all items to be considered at CEO approval have been considered. The Program Manager recommends the fully developed MSP for final CEO approval.
	First review*	April 25, 2013	July 17, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	July 15, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 19, 2013	

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**