



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4366		
Country/Region:	Moldova		
Project Title:	Climate Resilience Through Conservation Agriculture		
GEF Agency:	IFAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,260,000
Co-financing:	\$13,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,060,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Naoufel Telahigue

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?	Yes, Moldova is a non-Annex I party.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	The letter endorsement by the OFP has not been received by the GEF SEC. Please submit the letter in the required format. Update 5/25/11: The OFP endorsement letter, dated April 13, 2011, has been received.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, IFAD has a comparative advantage in the agricultural sector and for this project.	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>Yes, as IFAD is implementing a related project (RFSADP), and IFAD in Moldova has a Programme Steering Committee (IPSC) established by Government decree and responsible for providing overall policy, guidance and oversight for all IFAD-financed projects and programmes in Moldova. For the implementation of the IFAD/GEF project, the IPSC current membership will be expanded to include representatives from the Ministry of Environment.</p> <p>Day to day management and implementation of the Project will rest with the existing Consolidated Programme Implementation Unit (CPIU-IFAD), which has carried out similar responsibilities for all previous IFAD-financed projects and programmes in Moldova. The CPIU will carry out the overall programming and budgeting of Project activities, take the lead in Project implementation in cooperation with relevant actors and beneficiary institutions, such as farmer-based organisations and rural women's groups.</p>	
Resource	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. Component A is aligned with CCA-2, and component B contributes to CCA-1 and CCA-3.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>Not yet. Recommended Action: Please complete Table A "Focal Area Strategy Framework" using the drop-down menu to select LDCF/SCCF-specific objectives</p> <p>Update 5/25/11: This has been done, with CCA-1, CCA-2, and CCA-3 having been selected for this project.</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	The current project is in line with the Second National Communication (completed in 2009), as well as the Technology Needs Assessment and Development Priorities Report. Both reports call for solutions to reduce the impact of agriculture on climate change, and device approaches and technologies that enhance the adaptive capacities of vulnerable communities, especially women, who occupy the main workforce of this economic activity.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Not quite. It refers most specifically to sustainability of project outcomes in the context of project risks: "Another risk is related to the ability of the existing	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>institutional and policy/legal context to drive a successful wider implementation of the up-scaling efforts that the project is aiming at. Lack of Incentives and institutional bottlenecks could lead to limited results. However the project will put significant efforts to create an enabling environment for mainstreaming and up-scaling conservation agriculture. The successful examples at the national level and beyond will be built upon, and policy makers will be also targeted in awareness campaigns and involved in the planning of investment choices in order to ensure a buy-in at all levels." Recommended Action: Please clarify with more precision how capacity-building elements in this project will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes, linking specifically various CB activities to specific desired outcomes that will contribute to this project's sustainability.</p> <p>Update 5/25/11: Institutional sustainability is likely through NGO involvement in the project activities, particularly outreach they provide in terms of awareness and training, and as the local authorities will also have a major role in the project and will be targeted through the institutional strengthening activities.</p>	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address,	Yes, the baseline project is the IFAD's Rural Financial Services and Agribusiness Development Project, and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	the proposal describes it as well as the rationale behind it, which is based on sound data and assumptions.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>Please see 14. The additionality argument needs to be explicitly formulated, so that it is clear what the adaptation elements of the project are, as opposed to the business-as-usual development.</p> <p>Update 05/25/2011: Please see the update under 14.</p> <p>Update 9/15/2011: Further information provided responds sufficiently to the previously-stated concern.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Not entirely. The currently proposed project is framed around a business-as-usual (as far as climate change is concerned) conservation agriculture, rather than climate change adaptation. The project needs to be reformulated as now all activities listed can be considered business-as-usual, and not adaptation. It is unclear whether the funding sought under the SCCF is for the conservation agriculture activities, or whether the USD 12.3M in cofinancing will be used to carry out those activities, with SCCF covering solely the cost of making the outcomes</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of soil conservation effort climate-resilient, and not the business-as-usual soil conservation activities, that should or would be done in absence of climate change.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please reformulate the project so that it focuses on adaptation, and builds on, rather than focuses on the soil-conservation intervention.</p> <p>Update 05/25/2011:It is unclear how this comment has been addressed. While many economic and agricultural activities build resilience in theory, they are often also "business-as-usual", but in some cases such activities can be climate-sensitive themselves, and constitute maladaptation. As previously requested, please link explicitly the activities proposed for funding under the SCCF to climate change, and show why, in light of current and foreseen climate change, these activities are necessary to complement "business-as-usual" actions. In other words, please explain why the lowest cost option "business-as-usual" action is not sufficient to ensure no-loss of productivity due to climate change.</p> <p>Update 9/15/2011: The proposed interventions have been clearly linked to improved productivity in face of reduced water availability, lower humidity, and higher erosion risk. This is satisfactory for this stage.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>Please see 14. and 15. It is important that the benefit is well-described.</p> <p>Update 5/25/2011: Please see the updates under 14 and 15.</p> <p>Update 9/15/2011: The benefit is well described. The risk of maladaptation is low and the proposed project could be considered as a no-regret intervention. However, by CEO Endorsement, please ensure that future climatic conditions in the target area are more closely analyzed, and that they adequately influence project design.</p>	
	16. 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>The potential environmental benefits are very clear. There should be a better description of the target beneficiary groups, particularly the most vulnerable groups and how their livelihoods would be affected by the intervention.</p> <p>Update 5/25/2011: This has been done.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Please provide more information on the role of civil society, including indigenous people, if appropriate, and gender issues in this project.</p> <p>Update 5/25/2011: The previous comment has been addressed somewhat concerning gender. However, by CEO Endorsement, please provide gender-specific quantifiable outcomes the project aims to achieve.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes, the risks and likelihood or mitigation measures are adequately described.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, for example with efforts by World Bank, FAO, JICA, Millennium Challenge Corporation, USAID, The National Agency for Rural Development, and the National Farmers Federation of Moldova.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, the day-to day management and implementation of the Project will rest with the existing CPIU-IFAD, which has carried out other IFAD interventions in Moldova in the past.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Update 8/11/2011: In line with the GEF Secretariat's communique to the GEF Interagency Coordinators, dated June 17, 2011, concerning project management costs, the proposed level of project management costs is too high. Recommended Action: Please revise the project management costs according to the said guidance so as to not exceed 5% of the total project cost.</p> <p>Update 9/15/2011: The project</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		management cost has been adjusted and is now below 5 percent.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Probably, but please clarify, as requested, points under 14. and 15. Update 5/25/2011: This issue continues to be unclear, as per updated comments under 14, 15, and 16. Update 09/16/2011: This issue has been resolved.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	N/A	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	It is unclear -- the PIF references an IFAD Rural Financial Services and Agribusiness Development Project (RFSADP) as the baseline. The total budget of the project is USD 20.3M, according to Section B1. However, the co-financing indicated in Tables B & C reference an amount of USD 13.8M. Please clarify the discrepancy. Update 5/25/11: Following changes in the PIF, the co-financing amount of USD is now listed as USD 13.8M throughout the proposal.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not at this time. Please make the required revisions as specified above.</p> <p>Update 8/15/2011: Not yet. Approval will be considered upon addressing the points raised in the review.</p> <p>Update 09/16/2011: All the outstanding points have now been addressed, and the PIF is ready for approval.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 17, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 01, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 16, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* 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.