



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Medium Size Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Supporting sustainable land management in steppe and semi-arid zones through integrated territorial planning and agro-environmental incentives			
Country:	Kazakhstan	GEF Project ID:	5699
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5358
Other Executing Partner:	Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), KazAgroInnovation	Submission Date:	31 March 2015
GEF Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Project Duration (Months)	60
Name of Parent Program:	CACILM	Agency Fee (\$):	180,500

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
LD-3	Outcome 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management; Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities	Output 3.1 Integrated land management plans developed and implemented; Output 3.2 INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested	GEFTF	1,900,000	9,499,459
Total project costs					9,499,459

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To transform land use practices in steppe and semi-arid zones of Kazakhstan to ensure ecological integrity, food security and sustainable livelihoods						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
Component I. Investment in integrated territorial planning and start-up of agro-environmental incentives	INV	- Improved land management preventing ecosystem degradation over 750,000 ha of productive landscapes (pasturelands, crop & fodder production lands) in steppe and semi-arid zones of Kazakhstan - Improvements in crop and fodder productivity, soil fertility, salt content, crop rotation, efficiency in water use, etc. (indicators vary by pilot site; see logframe for details) at 145,503 ha	1.1 Integrated Land Use Plans employ the landscape management approach to inform decision-making, restore and conserve ecological functions and processes of agricultural landscapes in 5 pilot districts totaling 750,000 ha ¹ of the target ecosystems 1.2 Demonstration of sustainable land use and management of agricultural landscapes of steppe and desert ecosystems in Akmola, Almaty, East Kazakhstan, Kostanai, Kzyl Orda and North Kazakhstan oblasts (145,503 ha) 1.3 Piloting agro-environmental incentive schemes to promote SLM investments 1.4 Capacity building and awareness raising for SLM advocacy and implementation	GEFTF	1,461,137	8,165,259

¹ This is the combined area of the five pilot rural okrugs selected as pilots for integrated land use planning in Akkol district of Akmola oblast (northern & southern steppe), Enbekshikazakh district of Almaty oblast (mountain steppe, semi-desert), Aygoz district of East Kazakhstan oblast (semi-desert, northern & southern desert, southern steppe), Fedorovskiy district of Kostanai oblast (forest steppe), and Zhalygashsky district of Kzyl Orda oblast (southern & northern desert).

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
Component II. Enabling policy environment for integrated land use planning and agro-environmental incentives	TA	- Expected long-term replication effect: SLM practices up-scaled reducing land degradation at 222.6 million ha in Kazakhstan in the long run (25 years) resulting from the improved regulatory, legal and institutional base created by the project. - Agribusiness 2020 program includes agro-environmental subsidies reorienting funding from traditional to 'green' agriculture. - 20% of total agricultural subsidies are agro-environmental or green subsidies, 10 years after the agro-environmental scheme is up and running.	2.1 Inter-agency working group established to coordinate integrated land use planning 2.2 New or amended policies developed for adoption by government (at least 7 types of amendments to existing policies, regulations, and rules)	GEFTF	266,136	920,000
Subtotal					1,727,273	9,085,259
Project Management Cost (PMC)				GEFTF	172,727	414,200
Total project costs				GEFTF	1,900,000	9,499,459

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Source	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, JSC KazAgroInnovation, JSC KazAgroMarketing	Grant	4,350,000
		In-kind	150,000
Local Government	Akimats of Ayagoz district (rayon), Malgeldin, Kosagash and Saryarkin rural okrugs, East Kazakhstan Oblast	Grant	95,000
Local Government	Akimat of Karabulak rural okrug, Akmola Oblast	Grant	35,220
Local Government	Agricultural Department of Kzyl Orda Oblast Akimat	Grant	23,000
Multilateral Agency	UNDP	Grant	700,000
Other	Kazakh Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (KazFOAM)	Grant	180,000
		In-kind	20,000
Foundation	Farmers Union of Kazakhstan	Grant	300,000
Other	Analytical Center of Economic Policy in Agricultural Sector (ACEPAS)	Grant	1,900,000
		In-kind	100,000
NGO	Organic Agricultural Association (Public Union)	Grant	365,515
NGO	Agrosoyuz of Kazakhstan	Grant	211,914
NGO	Public Foundation "Farmer of Kazakhstan"	Grant	270,430
NGO	Zher-Ana Astana Public Association	Grant	371,843
Private sector	Kazakh Research Institute of Rice Cultivation named after I. Zhakhayev, LLP	Grant	141,427
Private sector	North Kazakhstan Agricultural Experimental Station LLP	Grant	285,110
Total Co-financing			9,499,459

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of	Focal Area	Country Name/	(in \$)
------------	---------	------------	---------------	---------

	Trust Fund		Global	Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEFTF	Land Degradation	Kazakhstan	1,900,000	180,500	2,080,500
Total Grant Resources				1,900,000	180,500	2,080,500

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultant	54,300	0	54,300
National/Local Consultants	526,350	0	526,350

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.:

N/A (no change)

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities:

N/A (no changes)

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

N/A (no changes)

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The situation analysis (i.e. ‘the baseline project and the problem it seeks to address’) has been considerably improved. The following is a summary of improvements to Section 1 (Situation Analysis) of the UNDP Project Document.

1.1. Geographical and land degradation context

More details have been added on the extent of the land degradation problem in the country.

1.2. Agricultural sector and sustainable land management

A more detailed description of the agriculture sector has been provided, specifically in terms of agricultural land use. This is followed by a description of crop production and the associated land degradation processes and impacts, as well as livestock production and associated land degradation processes and impacts.

1.3 Legislative context for SLM

A detailed analysis of laws, rules and regulations relevant to SLM has been provided.

1.4 Baseline programs for SLM

This has been updated since the PIF, based on discussions during the PPG.

1.5 Barriers to SLM

A long-term solution has been articulated and barriers to achieving this solution have been further elaborated and clarified since the PIF. While broadly the 4 barriers mentioned in the PIF remain the same, greater detail has been provided on the inhibiting factors that make it difficult to implement SLM.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The rationale for GEF intervention and associated global environmental benefits have been further clarified as follows:

State of ecosystems under baseline	Summary of GEF scenario	Increment/ global benefits																								
Land Use Planning and Regulation																										
Land use planning does not account for ecosystem values, leading to ecosystem degradation	<p>Integration of SLM principles into district territorial planning through Integrated Land Use Plans (ILUPs), compliance monitoring and enforcement through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of pastures and crop land capacity and incorporation of this as active components in ILUPs - Cross-sectoral mechanism at local level to oversee the ILUP process - Strengthening of local enforcement capacities <p>SLM best practices are applied across sectors and integrated management approaches are applied across different land use sectors</p>	<p>Competitive pressures between land uses in steppe and desert landscapes reduced in 750,000 ha of productive lands, in turn leading to:</p> <p>Decrease in grazing pressure and improved condition of steppe and arid ecosystems</p> <p>Well-functioning ecosystem services (such as forage productivity at steppe pastures)</p> <p>Improved productivity (see estimates for each pilot site in Annex on demonstration projects in the UNDP project document)</p>																								
Financing of agricultural land use																										
Traditional subsidies in agriculture prioritize productivity and take no heed of ecosystem carrying capacity	<p>Agro-environmental incentive scheme launched</p> <p>Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats</p> <p>analysis of existing subsidy options under Agribusiness 2020 program to generate recommendations on how existing subsidies can be amended to support agricultural producers in switching to more sustainable and environmentally friendly land use practices. This will constitute a basis for policy dialogue with the government on gradual revision of existing agricultural subsidies. Also, the project's capacity building on how to design agro-environmental subsidies will be instrumental in improving skills and understanding of win-win incentive instruments</p> <p>Agro-environmental incentives are widely accessible to local land users</p> <p>Rayon and oblast akimats undertake systematic and integrated long term financial planning for agricultural land use</p>	<p>Agribusiness 2020 Program reorients funding from traditional to 'green' agriculture.</p> <p>SLM financing increased by 20 percent</p> <p>Adverse impact of large scale producers on land is reduced (i.e. reduced erosion, greater crop diversification)</p> <p>Increased incidence of SLM approaches applied by small-scale holders leading to soil and vegetation quality improvements</p>																								
Land condition and productivity																										
<p>Low productivity of fodder crops in the Southern zone. Baseline figures:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Region</th> <th>Oats</th> <th>Barley</th> <th>Other*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">t/ ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Akmola</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>1.5</td> <td rowspan="5">1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NKz.</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kostanai</td> <td>1.1</td> <td>1.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Almaty</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>1.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kz. Orda</td> <td>-</td> <td>0.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Wheat Grass, Alfalfa, Common Sainfoin</p> <p>Low productivity of cereal crops in the Northern zone: 1.4-1.8 t/ ha (wheat)</p> <p>Soil erosion of barren degraded lands</p>	Region	Oats	Barley	Other*		t/ ha			Akmola	1.5	1.5	1.5	NKz.	1.8	1.5	Kostanai	1.1	1.3	Almaty	1.6	1.8	Kz. Orda	-	0.8	<p>Crop and soil conservation measures, i.e. crop rotation systems and green fallow, efficient use of irrigated water in rice production, restoration of abandoned arable lands</p> <p>Improved pasture management: expansion of forage areas, improvement of cultivated pastures through re-seeding, and increase the mobility of livestock to counterbalance livestock grazing pressures on rangelands in steppe and desert ecosystems</p>	<p>Increase in productivity of fodder and cereal crops (see estimates for each pilot site in Annex on demonstration projects in the UNDP project document)</p> <p>Improved condition of land and natural resources on 145,503 ha in six oblasts that results in reduced soil erosion, halting/ reversal of land degradation processes and continued provision of ecosystem services</p>
Region	Oats	Barley	Other*																							
	t/ ha																									
Akmola	1.5	1.5	1.5																							
NKz.	1.8	1.5																								
Kostanai	1.1	1.3																								
Almaty	1.6	1.8																								
Kz. Orda	-	0.8																								

State of ecosystems under baseline	Summary of GEF scenario	Increment/ global benefits
Excessive use of pesticides and fertilizers in irrigation crop management High pressure on the productive landscapes due to introduction of monoculture Overgrazing—exceeding carrying capacity by eight times resulting in increased erosion Increase in less palatable species		

2.3 Project objective, outcomes and outputs

This section of the UNDP Project Document elaborates in detail the project outcomes, outputs and activities.

The table below summarises the changes made to the outputs in the PIF, and the rationale for these changes. Please note that although the titles of different Outputs have been simplified since the PIF, details on additional elements in the original titles are still included in the description of the output in the UNDP Project Document (pages 32 to 43). For example, under Output 1.1, the feasibility study and designation documents related to the EPAs are mentioned in the detailed description of the output (even if not in the title); for Output 1.2, the elements related to zoning, economic regimes and boundary demarcation are mentioned in the details; and for Output 1.3, the enforcement system is similarly described further in the details though not mentioned in the output title.

PIF Output	GEF CEO ER Output	Rationale
<p>1.1 Integrated Land Use Plans (ILUPs) in 5 districts²: Land-use matrixes in districts optimized to preserve ecological functions of productive landscapes so that maximum productivity can be ensured in the long run. (<i>refer to main text for further details</i>). Enabled by:</p> <p>1.1.a Up-to-date inventory and classification of all lands in the districts.</p> <p>1.1.b District-level inter-sectoral committees on integrated land management set up to oversee and ensure stakeholder engagement in ILUPs process.</p> <p>1.1.c A monitoring and enforcement system for land use plans with clear roles and responsibilities of involved organizations</p> <p>1.1.d Capacities of target groups (akimats, regional government structures, agricultural land users) built on integrated land use planning</p>	No change	
<p>1.2 Improved management of 100,000 ha of productive steppe and semi-arid lands: appropriate land cultivation technologies selected (e.g. zero tillage or conventional depending on the type of crop and climatic zone) up-scaled and relevant infrastructure established in line with ILUPs (<i>refer to main text for further details</i>). Enabled by:</p> <p>1.2.a Agro-environmental incentive scheme; a financial SLM-upscale mechanism set up in partnership and with co-funding from GEF, national budget, and regional authorities on the basis of existing agricultural subsidy schemes³ (<i>refer to main text for details</i>);</p> <p>1.2.b Training of land-users in accessing agro-environmental incentives.</p> <p>1.2.c Strengthened extension services— Agricultural ‘Know-How’ Centers managed by the Ministry of Agriculture, namely KazAgroInnovation, regional Veterinary and Zoo-technical centers, local branches of the Union of Farmer’s Associations, and district cereal growing research institutions; enabling local</p>	<p>While the substantive focus and scope of this output has not changed, it has been separated out into 3 outputs as follows:</p> <p>Output 1.2 Demonstration of sustainable land use and management of agricultural landscapes of steppe and desert ecosystems in Akmola, Almaty, East Kazakhstan, Kostanai, Kzyl Orda and North Kazakhstan oblasts</p> <p>Output 1.3: Piloting agro-environmental incentive schemes to promote SLM investments</p> <p>Output 1.4: Capacity building and awareness raising for SLM</p>	<p>This change is driven by discussions with stakeholders and the project preparation team, all of whom felt that having 3 separate outputs is more logical and will make implementation easier.</p>

² In Akmola, Northern Kazakhstan, Kostanai, Kyzyl Orda, and Almaty oblast. Please see map in the text. To be confirmed at PPG.

³ Subject to feasibility study at PPG.

PIF Output	GEF CEO ER Output	Rationale
communities to better raise livestock, improve farming, and access productivity-enhancing technologies. Improved data management in these institutions to enable peer-to-peer learning, replication of project results	advocacy and implementation	
2.1 National Inter-ministerial Task Force chaired by the Committee for Land Management of the Ministry of Regional Development set up with a mandate of institutional coordination and effective implementation of integrated land use planning and development of policies for agro-environmental incentives.	No major change other than: - National Inter-ministerial Task Force is being called the inter-agency Working Group. - Determination of the chairmanship will be deferred to the project's inception stage	- The choice of title was made by stakeholders. - Given the ongoing changes in the government, stakeholders feel it is advisable to finalize chairmanship during the project's inception stage.
2.2 Policies and regulations (new or amended) adopted by National Government to enable on-the-ground implementation of agro-environmental incentives as per Output 1.2.a (ref. to Section A.1.3).	No major change, other than provision of further details on the planned amendments to policies, regulations and rules.	

The Project Results Framework is in Annex A of the GEF CEO ER.

Changes in Cofinancing:

Project Component	Indicative Co-financing at PIF(\$)	Confirmed Co-financing at CEO ER
Component 1	6,950,000	8,165,259
Component 2	814,500	920,000
Project Management	285,500	414,200
Total	8,050,000	9,499,459

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved and measures that address these risks: Project risks and risk mitigation measures have been significantly updated. The revised risks and risk mitigation measures are described in the table below:

Risks/ Assumptions	Level	Mitigation approach
Political support for integrating SLM principles into the agricultural sector becomes weak, jeopardizing further replication of SLM practices on the ground	Medium	The project has been initiated with active support, strong commitment and good understanding of the needed changes on the part of national and local authorities. A stated objective of the government is to boost the agricultural sector as part of the strategy for economic diversification. To realize this objective, the government needs to strengthen long-term competitiveness of the agricultural sector, which, in turn, needs to be grounded in SLM principles and practices. In its capacity building and awareness-raising activities, the project will continue to emphasize this link, while show-casing the successes of the demonstration projects as a means to realizing the objective of sustainable, long-term agricultural competitiveness.
Central and local governments are not willing to engage local stakeholders in land use planning	Medium	There is an ongoing process of decentralization in the country such that the responsibility for land use planning rests increasingly with local authorities. Thus conceptual support for the greater involvement of local stakeholders in land use planning is there. However, the problem has been one of local capacities (institutional and individual) keeping up with the pace of decentralization. The project strategy is grounded in decentralization and bottom-up planning. Under Output 1.1, the project will set up rayon-level, inter-sectoral committees consisting of land management, agricultural and environmental units of oblast, district and rural okrug akimats, relevant government organizations and institutions, and associations or unions of farmers. The committee will represent a platform to facilitate and engage in stakeholder consultations during the pilot process of integrated land use planning. Output 1.4 will specifically develop capacities and awareness of agricultural land users, the general public, akimats and training agents in SLM principles and practices. Through these measures, the project will minimize this risk.
Climate change-induced extreme seasonal variations or emerging new threats affect pilot projects/sites in ways that undermine the successes of the demonstration activities	Medium	The emphasis of the project on developing ILUPs whose core focus is maintaining ecosystem services of agricultural landscapes and demonstrating SLM practices is a means to improving resilience and the ability to apply adaptive management. While it is possible that some seasonal variations or new threats could impact short term progress at demonstration sites, the processes and capacities put in place by the project will enable stakeholders to adapt land use practices to the changing situation on the ground. Farmers applying SLM methods are likely to be better prepared for seasonal variations. The project will build the adaptability of all levels (from land users, local authorities, up to national institutions) to respond to changing circumstances and

Risks/ Assumptions	Level	Mitigation approach
		threats.
Building of sufficient capacity and practical know-how within essential state institutions and local authorities will take too long to allow project sustainability	Medium	One of the main lessons learned by UNDP and other development partners in Central Asia in the last 15 years is that to change and reform existing institutions and mind-sets is an extremely time consuming process if it is to be achieved effectively. Bearing this in mind, the project has chosen a 5 year time-frame for the systematic implementation of the various project activities, even though this is a medium size project.
Current political commitment to agro-environmental incentives stalls or declines	Medium	While agro-environmental incentives are terra nova for the government, small steps have been taken such as the limited subsidies/incentives to motivate farmers to shift to less intensive agricultural practices and to protect land resources (e.g. crop rotation, forage production, watering points at distant pastures) in the Agribusiness 2020 program. Thus, the intention is there but the problem lies in the design and actual implementation of such subsidies. And these are the issues that the project will address during implementation Furthermore, to ensure that the proposed agro-environmental incentive scheme does not develop as a parallel process, but rather is mainstreamed into the existing process and procedures for regular agricultural subsidies, under Output 1.3, the project—jointly with rayon and oblast akimats—will devise proposals for agro-environmental subsidies as part of the regular exercise performed by local authorities and submit to MOA for consideration and approval. Further, measures implemented at the pilot sites will demonstrate the feasibility of SLM measures that simultaneously improve productivity and reduce adverse environmental impacts creating a demand from such subsidies among agricultural land users.
Legislative changes required to realize the project objective are not agreed to nor carried through in a timely manner	Low	Output 2.1 of the project will set up a high-level inter-agency Working Group with expected members to include representatives from Departments of Green Economy, and Environmental Monitoring & Information of the Ministry of Energy, Land Management Committee and Budget Planning Department of the Ministry of National Economy, Crop and Livestock Production Departments of the Ministry of Agriculture, Committees for Water Resources, and for Veterinary Control & Oversight of the Ministry of Agriculture, JSC KazAgroInnovation, JSC KazAgroMarketing. This Working Group will oversee the introduction of legislative changes. The mandate and membership of the Working Group will help ensure that relevant government institutions are active participants and champions of necessary legislative changes.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

The project remains aligned with the proposed coordination efforts described in the PIF.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation:

At the national, oblast, rayon, and rural okrug levels, the project will engage multiple and diverse institutions, organizations and stakeholder groups. Their current and expected roles are summarized in the table below.

Table 1. Involvement of stakeholders in project design and implementation

Stakeholder group	Roles and responsibilities in the project
Government	
Ministry of Agriculture: - Department of production and processing of livestock products - Department of production and processing of crop products	<p>Mandate: This is the key government institution responsible for regulating the agricultural sector. It develops and implements state policy and programs on agriculture including the Agribusiness 2020 program.</p> <p>Role in project: Representatives from MOA will sit on the Project’s Board and will oversee the implementation of comprehensive land use planning frameworks and SLM demonstration projects in productive agricultural landscapes. The Ministry will contribute actively to the development of landscape-level land use plans and implementation of SLM demonstration projects. Its representatives will sit on the inter-agency WG and seek approval of amendments to the Land Code and its by-laws on land-use planning and rational use of land resources, on regulating</p>

Stakeholder group	Roles and responsibilities in the project
	pastures and rangelands; the Agribusiness 2020 program related to agro-environmental measures; draft laws on organic agriculture and rangelands.
JSC KazAgroInnovation and JSC KazAgroMarketing of MOA, including oblast and district level affiliates	<p><u>Mandate of JSC KazAgroInnovation:</u> It has been established to consolidate results & findings of the agricultural science to accelerate development of agriculture in Kazakhstan. In that sense, the knowledge sharing and agricultural system of KazAgroInnovation aims at broadening the use of latest scientifically tested practices and measures by agricultural producers and farmers is implemented by 11 extension centers under scientific research institutions (SRI) as its branches.</p> <p><u>Mandate of JSC KazAgroMarketing:</u> It has been established to promote competitiveness of agricultural production through provision of marketing and information-related services. KazAgroMarketing has 160 rural information & consulting centers, of which 71 centers are located in 5 oblasts covered by the project. These rural information & consulting centers are established to provide access to information, technologies and consulting services in rural areas including market analysis, logistical support for seminars and workshops, and production of information bulletins.</p> <p>Role in project: JSC KazAgroInnovation is the national executing agency of the project. The Deputy Chair of its Board of Directors will head Project Board meetings. Its representatives will sit on the inter-agency WG.</p> <p>KazAgroInnovation and KazAgroMarketing will provide capacity building training to agricultural producers and farmers on new and adapted agricultural practices and technologies (including land management), marketing services, access to markets, business planning, etc.</p> <p>Support and coordinate implementation of SLM related demonstration projects in six pilot oblasts under Output 1.2.</p> <p>Support in the analysis and review of agro-environmental incentive scheme as proposed by the project under Output 1.3.</p> <p>Support in the design of training modules on sustainable crop and forage production and livestock breeding for agricultural land users in target oblasts under Output 1.4.</p> <p>Provide training facilities for the project's capacity building activities.</p> <p>Ensure relevant staff from KazAgroInnovation and KazAgroMarketing participates in the project's capacity building efforts.</p> <p>Lead the exercise on expanding a system of distant and mobile consulting services for agricultural producers by including agricultural marketing.</p> <p>Contribute to development of SLM related policies and laws under Output 2.2.</p>
Committee of Water Resources and its territorial organizations (RBOs) of the Ministry of Agriculture	<p><u>Mandate:</u> This Committee and its territorial organizations – Balkhash -Alakol, Ishim, Tobol-Turgai, Irtysh and Aral-Syr Darya River Basin Organizations (RBOs) –are responsible for management of water resources to meet the needs of water users of different sectors of the economy in an environmentally sustainable and economically optimal way.</p> <p>Role in project: The Committee and its five territorial RBOs will contribute to the development of landscape-level planning frameworks, specifically contributing to discussions on efficiency in water use in agriculture. Its representatives are expected to sit on the inter-agency Working Group.</p>
Ministry of National Economy: Committee on Land Management	<p><u>Mandate:</u> At the national level, the Committee for Land Resources Management is responsible for development and implementation of state policy and programs on land use planning and land management, geodesies and cartography. Oblast branches of the Committee are responsible for key decisions related to zoning and allocation of land use permits for agriculture, mining, etc., at the oblast level.</p> <p>Role in project: One of the key players in development of integrated land use planning frameworks in the five pilot rural okrugs under Output 1.1.</p> <p>Its representative will sit on the inter-agency Working Group to review policies, rules and regulations under Output 2.2.</p>
Ministry of National Economy: Budget Planning Department	<p><u>Mandate:</u> Budget Planning Department oversees state budget planning in the short and long-term and ensures budget planning of government ministries and agencies as well as oblast akimats are in line with approved government programs and action plans.</p> <p>Role in project: Its representative will sit on the inter-agency Working Group and contribute to discussions on feasibility of agro-environmental subsidies vis-à-vis budget planning processes and requirements.</p>
Ministry of Energy: Department of Green Economy, Department of Environmental Monitoring & Control	<p><u>Mandate:</u> The Department of Green Economy implements state policies on green growth and development, mainly the adopted green growth strategy.</p> <p>Role in project: Both departments will sit on the inter-agency WG to review policies, rules and regulations under Output 2.2.</p>
Ministry of Energy:	<u>Mandate:</u> The Committee and its oblast branches are responsible for Environmental Impact

Stakeholder group	Roles and responsibilities in the project
Committee of Environmental Regulation & Control	<p>Assessments.</p> <p><u>Role in project:</u> One of the key players in development of integrated land use planning frameworks in the five pilot rural okrugs under Output 1.1.</p>
Akmola, Almaty, East Kazakhstan, Kostanai, Kzyl Orda and North Kazakhstan Oblast Akimats	<p><u>Mandate:</u> Oblast akimats represent the executive branch of the government and in charge of promoting government policies at the local level considering specifics of each region (i.e. region specific policies and programs).</p> <p>Role in project:</p> <p>Grant official endorsement of pilot land use planning and SLM demonstration projects.</p> <p>Facilitate cooperation of all involved parties in implementation of land use planning schemes and SLM demonstration projects under Outputs 1.1 and 1.2.</p> <p>Assist with development of proposals for agro-environmental subsidies (Output 1.3).</p> <p>Disseminate the project's lessons learned related to landscape-level planning, SLM practices and agro-environmental schemes and advocate for their replication throughout respective oblasts.</p>
District and rural okrug akimats in six target oblasts	<p><u>Mandate:</u> District and rural okrug akimats represent lower levels of the government's executive branch. They implement policies and programs adopted at oblast level.</p> <p>Role in project:</p> <p>Lead the development and implementation of the landscape-level land use plans by providing coordinating inputs of all stakeholders under Output 1.1.</p> <p>Co-finance demonstration projects under Output 1.2 in selected rural okrugs related to sustainable land and pasture management. In particular, the district akimats will provide subsidies for green fallow and forage production to complement GEF financing.</p> <p>Assist with development of proposals for agro-environmental subsidies (Output 1.3).</p> <p>Disseminate the project's lessons learned related to landscape-level planning, SLM practices and agro-environmental schemes and advocate for their replication throughout respective districts and rural okrugs.</p>
Public Associations, NGOs and community-based organizations	
Zher-Ana Astana Public Association	<p><u>Mandate:</u> It is a women's rural organization that includes 45 women of the Karabulak village as its members. It aims at expanding the engagement of women in local decision-making.</p> <p>Role in project:</p> <p>Participate in consultations and provide inputs to the development of the landscape-level land use plans in five target districts under Output 1.1.</p> <p>Co-finance a demonstration project under Output 1.2 related to sustainable landscape management in Karabulak rural okrug of Akmola oblast.</p> <p>Participate in capacity building training of the project under Output 1.4.</p>
Republican association of farmer public associations and organizations "Agrosoyuz of Kazakhstan"	<p><u>Mandate:</u> Its main goal is to consolidate interests of farmers and farming organizations and promote cooperation in the agricultural sector.</p> <p>Role in project:</p> <p>Participate in consultations and provide inputs to the development of the landscape-level land use plans in five target districts under Output 1.1.</p> <p>Co-finance a demonstration project under Output 1.2 related to restoration and sustainable management of irrigated lands in Balkhash district of Almaty oblast.</p> <p>Participate in capacity building training of the project under Output 1.4.</p>
Public Union "Farmer of Kazakhstan"	<p><u>Mandate:</u> It has been created with the purpose to enhance skills and knowledge of farmers through provision of consultations and assistance with development and implementation of projects to increase productivity of farms.</p> <p>Role in project:</p> <p>Participate in consultations and provide inputs to the development of the landscape-level land use plans in five target districts under Output 1.1.</p> <p>Co-finance a demonstration project under Output 1.2 related to sustainable management of irrigated lands in Bayterek rural okrug of Almaty oblast.</p> <p>Assist with the design of a college-level training module on distant rangeland management that will cover such topics as pasture herbage, norms and estimation of carrying capacities of pastures in different climatic zones of Kazakhstan and rangeland management under Output 1.4.</p> <p>Participate in capacity building training of the project under Output 1.4.</p>
Organic Agricultural Association	<p><u>Mandate:</u> This association was established to unite and protect interests & rights of organic farmers in Kazakhstan.</p> <p>Role in project:</p> <p>Participate in consultations and provide inputs to the development of the landscape-level land use plans in five target districts under Output 1.1.</p> <p>Coordinate implementation a demonstration project under Output 1.2 related to organic agriculture in Fedorovsky district of Kostanai oblast.</p> <p>Participate in capacity building training of the project under Output 1.4.</p>
Kazakh Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (KazFOAM)	<p><u>Mandate:</u> Established in 2013, the Federation actively promotes development of organic agriculture in Kazakhstan thus targeting both demand for and supply of organic products, and</p>

Stakeholder group	Roles and responsibilities in the project
	<p>establishment of adequate legal framework.</p> <p>Role in project: Provide inputs to the design of agro-environmental schemes under Output 1.3. Lobby for SLM related policies including the law on organic agriculture.</p>
Farmers Union of Kazakhstan	<p><u>Mandate:</u> This nationwide union was established with the purpose of uniting farmers for protection of their rights and interests, assistance in development and implementation of programs related to agricultural entrepreneurship.</p> <p>Role in project: Lobby for SLM related changes to government policies, awareness-raising among agricultural producers, farmers, government officials and parliament members.</p>
Private Sector	
“Saryagash” Limited Liability Partnership (LLP)	<p><u>Description:</u> Saryagash is a privately owned agricultural production enterprise with the total farmland area of 43,896 ha in the Denisovsky district of Kostanai oblast.</p> <p>Role in project: Implement and co-finance a demonstration project related development of integrated land use planning and management for agricultural lands in the Denisovsky district of Kostanay region under Output 1.2. Participate in capacity building training of the project under Output 1.4.</p>
Eska-Food Limited Liability Partnership (LLP)	<p><u>Description:</u> Eska-Food is a privately owned farming organization with a total farmland area of 24,000 ha.</p> <p>Role in project: Co-finance a demonstration project under Output 1.2 related to sustainable landscape management in Karabulak rural okrug of Akmola oblast. Participate in capacity building training of the project under Output 1.4.</p>
Rural consumer cooperatives, agricultural production societies, farmer associations, country farms, individual farmers and local communities	<p><u>Description:</u> These are various community-based organizations designed to serve the needs of their members.</p> <p>Role in project: Actively engaged in land use planning development in respective districts and rural okrugs under Output 1.1. Actively engaged in sustainable use demonstrations at pilot sites under Output 1.2 and will contribute labor and other inputs to implementation of demonstration projects. Participate in capacity building training of the project under Output 1.4.</p>
Academia and Research Institutions	
Kostanai State University	<p><u>Description:</u> This is a regional multidisciplinary university that is an educational, scientific and cultural center for innovations and advancing competence in social and economic development in the northern region of Kazakhstan.</p> <p>Role in project: Review and update undergraduate and graduate training modules for agriculture-related professions based on current and future needs of the agricultural sector in Kazakhstan covering SLM issues. Assist in development of case studies based on the experience, results, and lessons learned from the demonstration projects and land use planning exercises in pilot rural okrugs.</p>
Kazakh Research Institute of Livestock Breeding and Fodder Production	<p><u>Description:</u> This research institute is one of the largest scientific and methodological centers in Kazakhstan for research works related to cattle breeding, aviculture and crop production and practical implementation of research findings.</p> <p>Role in project: Support project activities related to implementation of demonstration projects on sustainable rangeland management, and monitoring land degradation under Output 1.2. Assist with the design of a college-level training module on distant rangeland management that will cover such topics as pasture herbage, norms and estimation of carrying capacities of pastures in different climatic zones of Kazakhstan and rangeland management under Output 1.4. Its representatives will participate in some meetings of the inter-agency Working Group to review policies, rules and regulations (particular those related to pastures and rangeland management) under Output 2.2.</p>
Kazakh Research Institute of Rice Cultivation named after I. Zhakhayev, LLP	<p><u>Description:</u> This research institute aims at addressing the needs of agricultural producers in new high-yield rice varieties and water saving technologies in rice production.</p> <p>Role in project: Implement and co-finance a demonstration project related to the use of soil and water saving technologies in rice production in Kzyl Orda oblast under Output 1.2. Participate in capacity building training of the project under Output 1.4.</p>
North Kazakhstan Agricultural Experimental Station	<p><u>Description:</u> This experimental station or enterprise is a large producer of agricultural products; it has a scientific department that deals with seed breeding and research on climate related changes in crop yields.</p> <p>Role in project:</p>

Stakeholder group	Roles and responsibilities in the project
	Implement and co-finance a demonstration project related to conservation and improvement of soil fertility and expansion of forage supply through cultivation of grain legume and forage crops in Akkaiyn district of North Kazakhstan oblast under Output 1.2. Participate in capacity building training of the project under Output 1.4.
Analytical Center of Economic Policy in Agricultural Sector (ASEPAS)	<u>Description:</u> The center conducts research and analytical works related to agriculture economics and its aims at development of the agricultural sector through provision of high quality information and analytical products. <u>Role in project:</u> Contribute to the analysis of existing agricultural subsidies and design of agro-environmental schemes under Output 1.3.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project aims to redirect current agricultural subsidies to finance environmentally friendly, yet economically profitable, agricultural practices via a system of agro-environmental incentives. On-the-ground investments will be undertaken to introduce crop rotation systems and green fallow, resulting in enhanced soil quality and productivity of arable lands; efficient use of irrigated water in rice production; restoration of abandoned arable lands; expansion of forage areas; improvement of cultivated pastures through re-seeding; and increase the mobility of livestock to counterbalance livestock grazing pressures on rangelands in steppe and desert ecosystems (please see Annex on demonstration projects in the UNDP project document for details). This will translate to direct economic benefits in terms of improved productivity of arable land and pastures, improved food availability and security, and an overall improvement of living standards of the rural population. Productivity of fodder and cereal crops is expected to increase over the baseline in demonstration sites (level of increase varies by pilot site; see Annex on demonstration projects in the UNDP project document for details). Revitalizing local institutions for pastureland and arable land management and governance will increase social capital and improve empowerment. Local farmers and communities will be encouraged to share benefits and experience creating a positive environment for add-on investments from landowners and users. Additional financial instruments such as tax and loan windows for investments in sustainable land use will also be assessed and tested. Further, SLM demonstration activities will be supported by various capacity building activities (Output 1.4) and changes in the policy environment to make it more supportive of SLM practices, which, in turn, will ensure sustainability of socio-economic benefits over the long term.

Support to organic agriculture by expanding the existing system of distant and mobile consulting services for agricultural producers to include experts in agricultural marketing will ensure more farmers participate in organic markets, thus increasing household incomes. The access to markets (both domestic and foreign) and sales of products have been recognized as a major hurdle for development of organic agriculture in Kazakhstan.

Gender aspects: The project covers a geographic region with an estimated population of nearly 200,000 people, of which women constitute 43%. UNDP-GEF’s annual reporting on its in-situ conservation and SLM projects (for example, conservation of agro-biodiversity or wetland ecosystems, sustainable rangelands management) has revealed that women have become a key partner in rural communities, as they are more receptive to new concepts and more willing to shift to ecosystem-friendly practices, provided that they generate enough income for a household. This project will, therefore, place particular emphasis on ensuring that women are well represented in project implementation and that the impact of project activities on women will be considered.

Representation of women in institutions

Many rural women have no college or higher education. In central towns of rural districts (rayons), the share of women with college or higher education is considerably higher. In the villages and rural districts targeted by the Project, women are visible members of society comprising up to 95% of the staff in state-funded organizations and institutions (schools, kindergartens, medical institutions), as well as in the area of agricultural products processing.

In terms of staff composition in pilot district and rural okrug akimats, women comprise about 20-30% on average, largely occupying low-level management positions (department specialists and experts, secretaries). Out of 11 heads (akims) of districts (rayons), rural okrugs and villages targeted by demonstration projects, two (2) akims are women. In the Denisovsky rural okrug of Kostanai Oblast where 18,304 hectares of land area is to be the target of sustainable land management, for example, women's representation is the highest – the head and deputy head of the akim are women, as well as the heads of departments.

Among agricultural producers and farmers, women account for up to 40%. Four (4) non-governmental organizations will participate in implementation of demonstration projects, one of which is a women's organization (Zher-Ana Astana Public Association).

Public women's councils operate in some target villages/ districts. However, as a public body, they are not active enough. Their activities are mainly limited to working together with the akimat on arranging events for International Women's Day, International Children's Day, and others. Women's councils of rural districts do not properly communicate with women's organizations at the rayon level in arranging workshops and training courses on women's entrepreneurship.

Participation of women in decisions related to natural resource management

The Project's demonstration component will be realized largely in rural areas. In theory, women have equal opportunities but, in practice, due to circumstances (lack of jobs) they are engaged in housework, livestock maintenance, backyard gardening, harvesting food for winter (butter, jam, Kurt, etc.), and bringing up children.

Women are not sufficiently engaged in and aware of discussions on and resolution of issues on sustainable use of land and water resources taking place at the district, regional and national levels. This stems from the fact that no local mechanism has yet been set up (e.g. a local self-governance council) that would ensure active participation and influence of women in decision-making for sustainable management of land, pasture and water resources.

Participation of women in project implementation

The project provides equal opportunities for men and women by considering all aspects of gender equality, i.e. equal rights during production and distribution of agricultural products. Workload is expected to be distributed in such a way that men will be largely engaged in field works while women will be active in preparation of seminars, training, project events, as well as processing of agricultural products. Men and women will benefit equally from the project.

With implementation of nine (9) demonstration projects covering an area of 145,503 ha, the project will create additional jobs, of which about 20-40% will be occupied by women. Prospective jobs will include processing and sale of farm products, educational and awareness raising events. Demonstration projects focused on forage production will create opportunities for development of livestock farming and family businesses. The project will promote the mechanization of labor processes, including women's labor. It is expected to give impetus to development of organic agriculture for domestic and foreign consumption, which will have overall positive effects on rural livelihoods. Finally, the project will contribute to capacity building of male and female residents of participating villages as well as increase awareness on sustainable land management practices.

To better understand the problems of land degradation and its environmental and socio-economic consequences that seriously affect the welfare of local people, as well for capacity building of women in resolving issues related to sustainable land and water resources management and biodiversity conservation, the Project will take the following measures:

- Encourage and support participation of women in demonstration activities by selecting them as implementers of and consultants for pilot projects and integrated land use planning (Outputs 1.1 & 1.2);
- Ensure equal representation of men and women in the project's seminars, workshops, training-of-trainers and other educational and awareness raising events of the project (Output 1.4);
- Assist in improving cooperation of women in rural districts with non-governmental women's organizations in the region and the oblast and carrying out joint "round tables" and seminars on additional fund raising for development of small business among women of villages (Outputs 1.1, 1.2. & 1.4);

- Organize training courses for women on production of goods of folk craft (carpets, clothes, embroidery, etc.), food products (horse milk, camel milk, cheese, etc.), and assist in the participation of women from project areas in rayon and oblast level discussions (Output 1.4);
- Engage women from women's organizations in monitoring and evaluation of pilot projects, and also in dissemination of good practices in neighboring rural districts. In particular, the project will actively engage women from local communities in environmental awareness raising activities for various target groups. Also, when contracting specialized institutions for field studies and assessments, the project will encourage the inclusion of a higher percentage of women on the team (Output 1.2); and
- Include activities on improving monitoring and evaluation of gender aspects in the project's annual work plans.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

GEF funding for the proposed sustainable land management project for Kazakhstan is designed to be catalytic insofar as it builds upon on-going government efforts to improve land use, and on past and current international development efforts to pilot more sustainable practices. In order to realize the project objective of transforming land use practices in steppe and semi-arid zones of Kazakhstan to ensure ecological integrity, food security and sustainable livelihoods in the most cost-effective manner, project design has been based on the following principles.

- a) The project builds on the government's existing national subsidy programs in the agricultural sector, as well as on the national environmental development approach, with the emphasis being on decentralization and bottom-up planning so that proposed SLM practices and measures are well-suited to the local context. The project also draws on and builds on the past experience of other GEF funded projects (see section on [coordination with other related initiatives](#) below).
- b) Existing best practices and approaches in SLM will be piloted within selected representative oblasts. In most cases the adoption of the selected best practices will meet the interests of land users, and the project will apply a cost sharing requirement (see [Annex on demonstration projects](#), specifically the section on proposed demonstration activities and expected costs for each of the nine pilot sites). The demonstration projects will aim to find the best management combination to manage investment cost and preserve or even enhance the crop and pastureland resources, serving to convince land users of the value of the SLM measures.
- c) In order to facilitate further replication of best practices in the most cost-effective manner, the project will focus on providing technical advice, developing "how-to" guides, and building the capacity of existing technical extension services (KazAgroInnovation, KazAgroMarketing). The project will, thus, encourage resource allocation by land users and competent authorities in sustainable land use, and only need to cover a limited proportion of direct investments required to demonstrate and propagate the selected best practices. This will lead to better allocation of GEF and non-GEF resources.
- d) Regular communication and coordination with other donor agencies working on similar interventions will be established to ensure that there are no overlaps of activities and full advantage of beneficial synergies are taken. Such donor engagement will be realized through participation in the project's inception workshop, stakeholder consultation meetings and round tables at national, oblast and district levels, field visits to demonstration sites and face-to-face consultations.
- e) In terms of policies that impact sustainable land management, while there is a good foundation of policies and legislation, there remains scope for improvement and this is the focus of Outcome 2 of the project. By strengthening the enabling policy environment, the project will ensure that resources expended in demonstration activities under the project are leveraged to effect broader change, beyond the demonstration sites. Another important element that is missing is the lack of inter-agency involvement in the development and implementation of land use policies, which is critical for sustainable land management. The most cost-effective way of ensuring that the existing policy environment is supportive of SLM, is to provide for inter-agency dialogue and engagement. The project will focus on providing such a forum (Outcome 2). Further, prior to Working Group meetings, the project will hold consultations at oblast, rayon and rural okrug levels to gather feedback from larger stakeholder groups on proposed changes to land use policies and legislation. Practical experience gained through the pilot activities of the project will inform this policy dialogue.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The Project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below

Project start:

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan. The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organization structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc... The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)

- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR (Quarterly Progress Report)
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits:

UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term of project cycle:

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (insert date). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center.

The GEF's Land Degradation Tracking Tool (excel file in standard format is attached separately) will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project:

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center.

The GEF's Land Degradation Tracking Tool (excel file in standard format is attached separately) will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and knowledge sharing:

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and visibility requirements:

Full compliance is required with UNDP’s Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP logo can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is also required with the GEF’s Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the “GEF Guidelines”). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf. Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

Table 2. M& E work plan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget USD Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	Project Manager UNDP CO, UNDP GEF	Indicative cost: 10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	Oversight by Project Manager Project team	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP EEG	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	Project manager and team	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: 20,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	Project manager and team, UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: 20,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	Project manager and team UNDP CO local consultant	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	UNDP CO Project manager and team	Indicative cost per year: 3,000	Yearly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget USD Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from Implementing Agency fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		USD 65,000	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE
N. Kapparov	Minister, National GEF Focal Point	Ministry of Environment and Water Resources	14.01.2014

B. GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator		31 March 2015	Maxim Vergeichik Regional Technical Advisor	+ 421 259 337 152	Maxim.vergeichik@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPAP for 2010-2015 : Government, educators, communities, civil society and the academic community practice an integrated approach to natural resources management in national and transboundary perspectives
Country Programme Outcome Indicators : Tools for landscape-level conservation and planning developed and integrated into the stakeholders' policies and practices
UNDP Strategic Plan Primary Outcome : Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program : Main focus is LD-3: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes : Outcome 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management; Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators : Indicator 3.1 Policies support integration of agriculture, rangeland, forest, and other land uses Indicator 3.2 Application of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions (details in Annex 3)
Objective: to transform land use practices in steppe and semi-arid zones of Kazakhstan to ensure ecological integrity, food security and sustainable livelihoods	Area of productive landscapes (pasturelands, crop and fodder production lands) in steppe and semi-arid zones under ILUPs that include a focus on maintaining ecosystem services of agricultural landscapes through SLM practices	Zero	750,000 hectares by project end (the indirect area of influence of the project is the entire agricultural landscape of the country – pasture and other agricultural lands – which totals 222.6 million ha)	Project PIR, Independent Evaluation, periodic field surveys/ visits	Political support for integrating SLM principles into the agricultural sector remains strong, facilitating further replication of SLM practices on the ground
	Improvement in % of soil humus content in area where ILUPs are in place	2% on average	8 to 10% on average	Field surveys/ visits	
	Improvement in livestock productivity (as measured by weight gain) in area where ILUPs are in place	Average live weight in degraded pastures/ rangelands is 320 kg	20% weight gain over baseline	Field surveys/ visits	
Outcome 1: Investment in integrated territorial planning and start-up of agro-environmental incentives	Indicators of on-the-ground improvements in crop and fodder productivity, soil fertility, salt content, crop rotation, efficiency in water use, etc. (indicators vary by pilot site)	See table below	See table below	Field monitoring surveys	Central and local governments show willingness to engage local stakeholders in land use planning Climate change-induced extreme seasonal variations or emerging new threats do not affect pilot

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions (details in Annex 3)
	Access of small and medium farmers in pilot sites to agro-environmental incentives	At present, the nature of agricultural subsidies is such that they are mostly accessible only to large-scale farms	At least 40% of small and medium farms eligible for agro-environmental incentives have access to them by project end	Financial and administrative reports of akimats of target oblasts and districts	<p>projects/ sites in ways that undermine the successes of the demonstration activities</p> <p>Building of sufficient capacity and practical know-how within essential state institutions and local authorities does not take too long allowing for project sustainability</p>
	Successful training program run by affiliates of KazAgroMarketing and KazAgroInnovation for small and medium farms on sustainable crop and forage production and livestock breeding	Training does not adequately cover needs of small and medium farms	At least 75% of small and medium farms in areas where training is delivered send representatives to attend sessions by project end	Training records; training evaluations	
	Successful training program on SLM run by KazAgroInnovation for akimat staff from land relations and agricultural departments in areas where pilot projects are to take place ⁴	No such targeted training program	80% of target audience attend sessions by project end	Training records; training evaluations	
	Higher education institutions producing graduates with sound understanding of SLM practices in the agriculture sector and distant rangeland management	Current national and regional higher education institutions are producing limited number of professionals with such training and skills	At least 2 institutions ⁵ have strengthened curriculums by project end	Curriculums, survey of students and graduates, PIR, terminal report.	
Outcome 2: Enabling policy environment for integrated land use planning and agro-environmental incentives	Inter-agency mechanism for ensuring coordination of integrated land use planning and agro-environmental incentives operating effectively	Does not exist	Inter-agency Working Group has a clear mandate and method of operation to ensure coordination of different land use sectors by project end	Minutes of WG, Project PIRs, Terminal report	<p>Current political commitment to agro-environmental incentives continues to grow</p> <p>Legislative changes required to realize the project objective are agreed to and carried through in a timely manner</p>
	Inclusion of agro-environmental subsidies in State programs	Agro-environmental subsidies do not exist	Agribusiness 2020 program includes such subsidies	Government reports on Agribusiness 2020 program	
	Increase in government financing for SLM practices	No existing subsidies that are 100% SLM related	20% of total agricultural subsidies are agro-environmental or green subsidies, 10 years after the	Government budget (ag. subsidy budget line)	

⁴ Balkhash and Enbekshikazakh districts of Almaty Oblast, Karabulak rural okrug and Akkol district of Akmola Oblast, Ayyagoz district of East-Kazakhstan Oblast, Denisovsky and Fedorovsky districts of Kostanai Oblast, Kzyl Orda City of Kzyl Orda Oblast, Akkaiyn district of North Kazakhstan Oblast

⁵ Kostanai State University (KSU) and Kazakh National Agriculture University (KazNAU)

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions (details in Annex 3)
			agro-environmental scheme is up and running		
	Amendments to existing policies, regulations, and rules such that the support for SLM is stronger	There are weaknesses in a number of existing policies, rules and regulations	At least 7 types ⁶ of amendments are developed	Official ordinances (for new laws), approvals from designated ministries (for amendments)	

⁶ (1) Agro-environmental measures applicable to Kazakhstan: targeted biotopes, eligible beneficial land uses and associated regimes, subsidy rates per ha, administration of subsidies and monitoring checklists; (2) amendments to the Land Code on regulating rangelands and pastures, including ownership rights for pastures and hayfields around settlements; (3) amendments to the Land Code on land use planning; (4) changes to by-laws regulating land use issues to include the definition of rational use and its criteria; (5) amendments to the Rules on Rational Land Use related to social and ecosystem dimensions of sustainable land use and non-compliance with the requirements of land use planning; (6) amendments to the Tax Code on privileges for compliance with the SLM requirements for land users, and to the Administrative Code on non-compliance with the SLM requirements by land users and failure to enforce compliance on part of land monitoring authorities; (7) proposals to the draft Law on Organic Agriculture.

Sub-table 1: Indicators of on-the-ground improvements in terms of crop and fodder productivity, soil fertility, salt content, crop rotation, efficiency in water use, etc. (indicators vary by pilot site)

	Indicator	Baseline	Target
Pilot 1:	Consumption of irrigation water	29,000 m3/ha	24,000 m3/ha
	Rice yield	46-52 hwt/ha	56-62 hwt/ha
	Lucerne share in crop rotation	29%	35%
	Salt content in inundated rice paddies	1.0 %	0.3 %
	% of soil humus in monoculture fields	0.7%	1.2 % ⁷
	Crop products output	45-60 hwt/ha	80 hwt/ha
Pilot 2:	Area of irrigated arable land	3,558 ha	4,978 ha
	Area of restored wastelands	0 ha	1,420 ha
	Number of water collectors	0	3
	Volume of water collected	0 m3	1.5 mln. m3
	Restored irrigation network	0 km	5 km
Pilot 3	Area under forage crops	0 ha	700 ha
	Green fallow land area	0 ha	360 ha
	Humus content of arable land		incr. by 2%
	Wheat yield growth	8-10 hwt/ha	12-15 hwt/ ha
	Amount of hay stocked	500 tons	1,200 tons
	Agricultural areas managed sustainably	0 ha	18,725 ha
Pilot 4	Area under monoculture	3,100 ha	3,100 ha
	Restored area of degraded arable land	0 ha	160 ha
	Meadows created in sown pastures	0 ha	200 ha
	Forage crop areas	0 ha	360 ha
	Increased humus content in soil	-	by 8 %
	Forage crop yield	8 hwt/ha	20 hwt/ha
Pilot 5	Area of distant pastures that are in use	0 ha	17,300 ha
	Pasture productivity	2 hwt/ ha	8 hwt/ ha
	Area of restored hayfields	0 ha	900 ha
Pilot 6	Area under monoculture	15,979 ha	11,979 ha
	Area under forage crops	7,906 ha	11,906 ha
	Area under green fallow	0 ha	4,000 ha
	Increased humus content in soil	2%	Incr. by 10%
	Wheat yield	8.9 hwt/ ha	12 hwt/ ha
	Ameliorated pasture, hayfields	0 ha	2,000 ha
Pilot 7	Pastures under seasonal rotation	0 ha	10,000 ha
	Area under green fallow	0 ha	500 ha
	Area of re-seeded pastures	0 ha	100 ha
	Humus content of arable land	Tbd at start	Incr. by 8%
	Increase in wheat yield	10 hwt/ha	12 hwt/ha;
Pilot 8	Increase in hay yield	8 hwt/ha	20 hwt/ha
	Restored area of degraded arable land	0 ha	200 ha
	Areas under lucerne and other forage crops	300 ha	500 ha
	Increased humus content in soil	Tbd at start	by 10 %
	Rice yield	40 hwt/ha	45 hwt/ha
	Installed equipment for water delivery to inundated rice fields and its accounting	0 units	200 units
	Installed equipment for water discharge from inundated rice fields and its accounting	0 units	200 units
	Consumption of irrigated water	29,500 m3/ ha	23,000 m3/ ha
Pilot 9	Monoculture (wheat crop) areas	10,590 ha	10,190 ha
	Forage crop areas	1,800 ha	2,200 ha
	Improvement of soil fertility	-	by 0.5%
	Increase in forage crop yield	-	by 2 hwt/ ha
	Reduced costs of forage procurement	-	by 20%

⁷ After introducing salt-resistant crops

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

No comments received.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. Describe findings that might affect the project design or any concerns on project implementation, if any:

No additional concerns were identified, other than those highlighted in the risk analysis section.

B. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	Budgeted Amount, US\$	Amount Spent to date, US\$	Amount Committed, US\$
Project Preparation Grant to formulate a medium-sized project “Supporting sustainable land management in steppe and semi-arid zones through integrated territorial planning and agro-environmental incentives”:			
International Consultants	21,000	12,000	9,000
Local Consultants	33,000	28,300	4700
Travel	7,000	7,000	0
Workshops	29,103	29,103	0
Translation	6,000	6,000	0
Supplies	1,500	1,500	0
Internet, phone and postage costs	1,500	1,500	0
Misc	897	897	0
Total	100,000	86,300	13,700

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (IF NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT IS USED)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

Not applicable.