



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

GEF ID:	4630		
Country/Region:	Moldova		
Project Title:	Agriculture Competitiveness Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	118518 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-1; LD-1; LD-3; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,435,500
Co-financing:	\$21,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$25,435,500
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Angela Armstrong,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes, letter dated August 26, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. Worldbank has a longstanding engagement in the agricultural sector of Moldova.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. In line with CAS.	
Resource	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

	• the STAR allocation?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. The entire LD-STAR allocation will be used for this project.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. The project is aligned with the LDFA RBM.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	09-02-2011 UA: LD-1, LD-3	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. Aligned with National Development Strategy (NDS), NAPA, and Sustainable Development Plan.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	09-02-2011 UA: n/a - the GEF supported components are not focused on capacity building.	
	11. 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?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. The GEF's incremental support are financial incentives for farmers and communities to implement SLM.	

Project Design			
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. The framework is sufficiently clear at this stage. Further elaboration will be required at CEO endorsement stage, in particular with regards to the design of the 200-250 subprojects (comp. 3).	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes, this has been sufficiently described.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. Has been taken into consideration. Further details are required at CEO endorsement stage, in particular with regard to the participation of farmers and communities in the 200-250 subprojects.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. General climate change risks and project related risks have been taken into account.	

	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. The project is well-coordinated with several other national, bilateral and multi-lateral initiatives in the agricultural sector.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. 4.2%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. GEF's major support is to component 3: Soil conservation and climate resilience (\$3.85 million), which is appropriate and should be upheld during project preparation.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	09-02-2011 UA: World Bank and private sector co-financing is \$21 million. GEF expects a co-financing from the national / local government at CEO endorsement stage.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. WB contributes \$18 million softloan.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		

	and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	09-02-2011 UA: - National / local government co-financing required (see #25) - Project preparation to keep the focus on LD-eligible investments (see #24) - Detailed elaboration of participatory processes required (see #17) - Further elaboration of the project framework (see #14)	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 02, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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

### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

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

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.