

PAD Annex: GEF Data Sheet
PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZE PROJECT

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Environmental Land Management and Rural Livelihoods		
Country(ies):	Tajikistan	GEF Project ID:	4352
GEF Agency(ies):	WB	GEF Agency Project ID:	P122694
Other Executing Partner(s):	Committee on Environmental Protection	Submission Date:	n/a
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation	Project Duration (Months)	60
Name of parent program (if applicable):		Agency Fee (\$):	540,000
• For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

GEF FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK					
Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
LD-1	1.2 Improved Agricultural Management	1.2 Types of innovative SL/WM practices introduced at field level	GEF TF	2,500,000	7,858,148
LD-1	1.3 Sustained Flow of Services in Agro-ecosystems	1.3 Suitable SL/WM interventions to increase vegetative cover in agro-ecosystems		800,000	2,207,407
LD-1	1.4 Increased Investments in SLM	1.4 Appropriate actions to diversify the financial resource base 1.5 Information on SLM technologies and good practice disseminated		1,600,000	5,294,445
Project management cost				500,000	1,500,000
Total project costs				5,400,000	16,860,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected outcomes and outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
1.Rural Production and Land Resource Management Investments	INV	See project results framework (annex 1 below)	GEF TF	2,500,000	9,433,333
2.Knowledge Management and Institutional Support	TA		GEF TF	2,400,000	5,926,667
3.Project	TA		GEF TF	500,000	1,500,000

Management and Coordination*				
Sub-total			5,400,000	16,860,000
*Project management costs		GEF TF	(500,000 under component 3)	(1,500,000 under component 3)
Total project costs			5,400,000	16,860,000

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE GEF FINANCING BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING TO THE GEF FINANCING BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$) ¹			
Sources of Cofinancing	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	Strategic Climate Fund Grant	Grant	9,450,000
Others	Project Beneficiaries (Local Communities)	In-kind	2,030,000
Bi-lateral Aid Agency (ies)	DFID/GIZ (parallel financing)	Grant	5,380,000
Total Cofinancing			16,860,000

D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY					
Type of Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area	Country Name/Global	GEF Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
GEF TF	Land Degradation	Tajikistan	5,400,000	540,000	5,940,000
Total Grant Resources			5,400,000	540,000	5,940,000

E. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO

F STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS: N/A

¹ Defined as per the GEF Cofinancing Policy, whereby the WB loans/grants and other funds are counted as ‘cofinancing’ to the GEF portion, not implying that these funds flow through this operation.

Annex 1: Results Framework and Monitoring

TAJKISTAN: Environmental Land Management and Rural Livelihoods Project Results Framework

Project Development Objective: To enable rural people to increase their productive assets in ways that improve natural resource management and resilience to climate change in selected climate vulnerable sites

PDO Level Results Indicators*	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	Target Values					Frequency	Data Source/ Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection	Description (indicator definition etc.)/Comment
				YR1	YR2	YR3	YR4	YR5				
1. Number of households supported [in project area] that have adopted climate change and sustainable land management practices ²		The number of households	0	2,000	6,800	13,800	19,500	21,000	Quarterly reports from field partners, bi-annual reports from IG	Rural investments records and database, project reports, satellite imagery.	Jamoat-level bodies, facilitating organizations, IG, District CEPs, specialists	Cumulative target. Households may participate in more than one investment. ³
2. Land users adopting sustainable land management practices as a result of the project	X	The number of households	0	800	4,400	8,200	10,000	12,000	Quarterly reports from field partners, bi-annual reports from IG	Rural investments records and database, project reports, satellite imagery.	Jamoat-level bodies, facilitating organizations, IG, District CEPs, specialists	Cumulative target.
3. Proportion of population by household in target villages reporting at least XX% increase in well-being or household/livelihood assets ⁴		The % of households	0			33%		50%	Baseline, end of project	Field surveys, interviews, participatory appraisals,	Contracted specialists, IG	Index of well-being or household assets developed through a

² Relates to PPCR Transformation Indicator (core) A1.3 (December 2012)

³ Overlap between farm production and land management will be estimated and the number reduced accordingly. Households participating in rural infrastructure investments will not be included since all households in a village can benefit.

⁴ Relates to PPCR Transformation Indicator A1.1 (December 2011)

												participatory process. ⁵ Disaggregated by gender.
4. Number of hectares in project area covered by effective agricultural, land and water management practices suited to local agro-ecological conditions and climate change resilience ⁶		The number of hectares	0	1,000	8,000	18,000	25,000	30,000	Quarterly reports from field partners, bi-annual reports from IG	Rural investment records and database, field surveys, project reports, satellite imagery,	Jamoat-level bodies, IG. District CEPs	Cumulative target. Includes both directly and indirectly affected areas. ⁷
5a. Direct project beneficiaries	X	The number of beneficiaries	0	12000	40080	10800 0	11700 0	126000	Quarterly reports from field partners, bi-annual reports from IG	Rural investments records and database, interviews, project reports	Jamoat-level bodies, facilitating organizations, IG, District CEPs, beneficiaries	
5b. Proportion of project beneficiaries who are women	X	Percentage	0			33%		40%				
Intermediate Results												
Intermediate Results (Component One): Rural Production and Land Resource Management Investments.												
1.1. Total value in USD m of rural production and land resource management investments (including	X	USD	0	0.85m	3.19m	6.98m	9.34m	10.14m	Quarterly reports from field	Financial reports, rural investment	IG,	Cumulative target. Component 1.1

⁵ Index will be developed through a participatory approach at the project's outset, and then apply this more systematically through a simple survey type activity at mid-term and then at project completion.

⁶ GEF Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy expected outcome indicator for Strategic Objective 1

⁷ Area affected by direct (e.g., area under drip irrigation, crop rotation, new crop varieties, etc.) and indirect (e.g., summer pasture made available through provision of watering holes, livestock shelter) practices and investments which result in at least one of the following:

- Prevent or reduce soil erosion
- Increase vegetative cover through perennial crops and pasture
- Provide soil and moisture conservation
- Improve soil quality
- Improve water use efficiency
- Increase sustainable fodder or wood supply
- Increase sustainable renewable energy supply
- Extend integrated pest management

at least 25% beneficiary match) in villages where project is operational									partners, bi-annual reports from IG	records and database		only
1.2.1. Number of pasture management plans under implementation by Pasture User Groups		The number of plans	0	0	4	8	8	8	Bi-annually	Project reports	IG	Cumulative number, targets may change depending on sites selected during year one of implementation
1.2.2. Number of on-farm water management plans under implementation by Water User Associations in lowland areas					4	8	8	8				
1.3 Hectares in which local communities have adopted management practices in land use and land use change, resulting in restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks.		The number of hectares	0	1,000				15,000	Year 2 and 5	Satellite imagery, ground truthing project plots, subprojects database, projects reports		Technical assistance to develop methodology and overall support
Intermediate Results (Component Two): Knowledge Management and Institutional Support.												
2.1. Degree to which villages have integrated climate change adaptation and environmental appraisals into community action plans and are implementing appropriate investments ⁸		The rating on scorecards	0					At least 75% of plans will have acceptable scores	Quarterly reports from field partners, bi-annual reports from IG	Project records and reports, scorecard developed to assess plans and their implementation	Jamoat-level bodies, facilitating organizations, IG	

⁸ Relates to PPCR Program Outcomes Indicator (core) B1 (December 2012)

2.2. Number of client days of training provided in organizational and technical topics	X	The number of days	0	2,500	17,000	15,500	7,000		Quarterly reports from field partners, bi-annual reports from IG	Project reports	Jamoat-level bodies, facilitating organizations, IG	Assumes one person per benefitting hh participates in 2 days training, results disaggregated by gender