



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

GEF ID:	<b>5699</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Kazakhstan</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Supporting Sustainable Land Management in Steppe and Semi-arid Zones through Integrated Territorial Planning and Agro-environmental Incentives</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5358 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Land Degradation</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>LD-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,900,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$9,499,459</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$11,399,459</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>February 21, 2014</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Maxim Vergeichik</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes. Letter dated 14 Jan 2014.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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>	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:</p> <p>a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and</p> <p>b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.</p>	<p>Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.</p>
	<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>	<p>Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.</p>	<p>Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes. The project is coordinated with the CACILM partnership platform.</p>	<p>Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes. Link to CACILM has been established.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for</li> </ul>	<p>Feb 12, 2014 UA: Innovation: redirecting current agricultural subsidies to finance SLM via agro-environmental incentives.</p> <p>Sustainability: Likely to be taken up by government.</p> <p>Replication: built into the project design and capacity development efforts.</p>	<p>Mar 6, 2015 UA: Refer to comments at PIF stage.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	scaling up the project's intervention.		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes. The fully developed project is very close to what has been approved at PIF stage.
	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?		Mar 6, 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?	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 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?	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes. UNDP brings \$700,000 in grant resources to the project.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes. UNDP \$700,000 grant has been confirmed.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes.	Mar 6, 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?	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes. The PPG is within the threshold for MSPs and is recommended for approval in line with PIF approval.	Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes. Provided in Annex B of the CEO approval request.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes. LD TT submitted.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		n/a for a MSP
	• Convention Secretariat?		no comments received
	• The Council?		no comments received
	• Other GEF Agencies?		no comments received
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Feb 12, 2014 UA: Yes. Program manager recommends PIF and PPG for CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	26. <b>Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Mar 6, 2015 UA: Yes. Program recommends the MSP for final CEO approval.
	First review*	February 12, 2014	March 06, 2015
Review Date (s)	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.**