



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

GEF ID:	6960		
Country/Region:	Turkmenistan		
Project Title:	Supporting Climate Resilient Livelihoods in Agricultural Communities in Drought-prone Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5459 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,046,347
Co-financing:	\$20,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,196,347
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Anna Kaplina

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. Turkmenistan is a non-Annex 1 country Party to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. A letter of endorsement from the OFP has been submitted, dated August 8, 2014.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

*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 SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	Yes (SCCF-A).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
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>	Yes. The project is aligned with SCCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability), CCA-2 (strengthening adaptive capacity) and CCA-3 (integrating climate change adaptation in relevant policies and processes).	
	<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>	Yes. Turkmenistan's SNC identified the water and agriculture sectors as acute adaptation priorities. The project also builds on priorities identified in the country's National Climate Change Strategy and the President's Programme for Social and Economic Development for 2012-16.	
	<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>	Yes. Baseline problem: Water shortages are common in Turkmenistan, where 96 percent of the land is characterized as arid. Agriculture, which consumes over 90 percent of available surface water, employs 50 percent of the workforce and contributes 10% to GDP. Climate models indicate that there will be significant increases in temperature, and decreases in rainfall, resulting in reduced river flows and higher evaporation rates and raising	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>the water deficit.</p> <p>Baseline project: The main baseline for the SCCF project is the President's Programme for Social and Economic Development (2012-16), which focuses on modernization of the water (reclamation) system, increase in crop productivity, improvement of traditional irrigation methods and introduction of new production technologies.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Yes. The project comprises in INV component (CBA solutions) and two TA components (contributing to capacity building and adaptation mainstreaming). Whereas investments under the baseline President's Programme are expected to benefit large farmers, smallholders who lack access to irrigation infrastructure may be neglected; it is these farmers that the SCCF project will target.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>Yes. The SCCF project will provide additional climate change adaptation benefits to vulnerable smallholder farmers. This will be done through distribution of drip irrigation kits and small tunnels for self-installation, distribution of treadle pumps, construction of wells, rainwater harvesting, establishment of greenhouses, introduction of water usage measurements, establishment of climate-resilient crop production systems, etc. These adaptive measures are designed to promote water use efficiency in a situation of growing water scarcity. The project is expected to strengthen the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		adaptive capacity of over 10,000 households in the Lebap and Dashoguz regions.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>Yes for PIF stage. Key stakeholders have been identified and their roles in project preparation discussed. Project preparation will include a gender analysis.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement: (i) Please also discuss the role of civil society organizations in project design and implementation. (ii) Please consider including SCCF activities that women can engage in and take a leadership role on.</p>	
	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)	<p>Yes for PIF stage. Political and coordination risks have been discussed.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement: Please also consider potential risks to: sustainability (including maintenance of adaptation technologies such as drip irrigation, greenhouses etc. that will be provided to smallholders -- e.g., drip irrigation systems can become clogged during periods of extended drought); please consider the potential risks posed</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		by climatic extremes on the project activities. Please also discuss potential concerns regarding the ability to effectively engage women and civil society organizations.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. The project will coordinate with UNDP's 'Central Asian Climate Risk Management Programme' that assists five Central Asian countries with addressing climate risk in their national development processes. It will also coordinate with GIZ's project on 'Drainage Waters of Khankhowuz Irrigation System', which will update maps and monitor annual hydroecological cycles.	
	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. 	<p>Sufficient for PIF stage. In boosting coordination between the water and agriculture sectors, the project is expected to pave the way for future such cross-sectoral collaboration, which is essential for upscaled, integrated adaptation solutions.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: The Agency is requested to provide clear information on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Innovative aspects of the project - Strategy for sustainability, and - Potential for scaling up the interventions 	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

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?		
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?	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?	Yes. Total co-financing is \$20 million, being provided as grant financing through baseline initiatives.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	FI, 8/15/14: The datasheet needs revision. The Agency has communicated via email that a revised OFP endorsement letter and PIF would be submitted by Aug. 22. Update 8/25/14: Yes. PMC are within 5% of the total project cost.	
	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	Yes , PPG has been requested and is within the norm.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	FI, 8/15/14: Pending Agency response on item 18. FI, 8/25/14: Yes.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	See PIF-stage comments for items 10, 11 and 13.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 15, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 25, 2014	
	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.**