



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

|  |   |                              |                     |
|--|---|------------------------------|---------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 4352  |                              |                     |
| Country/Region:                            | Tajikistan  |                              |                     |
| Project Title:                             | Second Upland Agricultural Livelihoods and Environmental Management |                              |                     |
| GEF Agency:                                | World Bank  | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 122694 (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; Project Mana;                                     |                              |                     |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$0   | Project Grant:               | \$5,400,000         |
| Co-financing:                              | \$17,900,000  | Total Project Cost:          | \$23,300,000        |
| PIF Approval:                              | February 25, 2011   | Council Approval/Expected:   | March 01, 2011      |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                     |
| Program Manager:                           | Mohamed Bakarr  | Agency Contact Person:       | Angela Armstrong    |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| Eligibility     | 1. Is the participating country eligible?   | September 13, 2010<br>Yes Tajikistan is eligible.<br>Cleared  |  |
|                 | 2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? |   |  |
|                 | 3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?  | September 13, 2010<br>An endorsement letter was included but it is not signed by the Operational Focal Point. Please clarify designation of person signing on behalf of the OFP.<br><br>01-19-2010 UA:<br>Signed endorsement letter by OFP is |  |

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 9-8-2010

|                                       |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                                       |  | <p>attached; however, Agency fees are inside the STAR allocation and figures need to be revised to: project amount \$5,400,000 + Agency fee 540,000 = total amount requested of \$5,940,000.</p>   |  |
| <p>Agency's Comparative Advantage</p> | <p>4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?</p>      | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, the World Bank has a track record of investing in agriculture and land management sectors, including a strong presence in the country.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |
|                                       | <p>5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p> | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>The co-financing amount is a \$10 million IDA grant for a baseline project that is intended to create incentives for smallholder farm households to invest agriculture and small-scale infrastructure. It is noted that the benefit of this grant will be limited in scope and impact, hence the need for GEF incremental financing. The cofinancing ratio is, however, low (~1:2). And even if the level of investment might be appropriate for the country, it does not appear to match the magnitude of problem outlined. Furthermore, the nature and relative sustainability of global environmental benefits are not clear.</p> <p>January 27, 2011<br/>The GEBs and potential for sustainability has been clarified and will be further elaborated during project preparation.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |  |
|                                       | <p>6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?</p>            | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, the World Bank has a Country Partnership Strategy with Tajikistan (2010-2013), which includes a focus on improving agricultural productivity and poverty reduction. It also has a Country Office in the country which supports project implementation.</p>   |  |

|                       |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
|                       |  | Cleared  |  |
| Resource Availability | 7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): |  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Tajikistan has a total of \$5,940,000 available under the STAR (i.e. across the BD, LD and CC focal areas). The full amount is being requested for this project, which means Tajikistan will no longer have any funds left. It will therefore be very important to get some clarification on how the decision was arrived at to allocate all the funds to this project.</p> <p>01-19-2010 UA:<br/>See above comment: Agency fees are included into the STAR allocation of the countries. All tables need to be corrected accordingly, including the OFP letter.</p> <p>A separate letter has been provided by the OFP to clarify that decision on allocation of resources was made in consultation by key stakeholders in the Government.</p> <p>January 28, 2011<br/>Mohamed and Ulrich consulted with Angela Armstrong and agreed to have the tables corrected and resubmitted before the PIF is recommended for CEO clearance.</p> |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>The LD allocation of \$2,440,000 is included in the total GEF grant requested.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?</li> </ul>                          | N/A  |  |

|                     |   |   |  |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>   | N/A   |  |
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>No Focal Area set-aside has been requested.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |  |
| Project Consistency | 8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?  | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, the project is consistent with LD1, but the project components need to be better aligned with Outcomes and Expected Outputs of the focal area. Based on what is presented, the project will also contribute to Outcome iii (sustained flow of ecosystem services) and Outcome iv (increased investments in SLM), and certainly the measureable outputs should extend beyond just diverse sources of investment for SLM.</p> <p>01-19-2010 UA:<br/>Has been addressed.</p> |  |
|                     | 9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?  | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, but a more clear articulation of the relevant LD1 Outcomes and Outputs is needed as noted in #8 above.</p> <p>01-19-2010 UA:<br/>Has been addressed.</p>  |  |
|                     | 10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA? | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, but no specific reference is made to an existing or planned UNCCD NAP, especially given the relevance of the project to this Convention. Furthermore, Tajikistan is a partner country under the Central Asia Countries Initiative on Land Management (CACILM), for which GEF is a donor partner. It is not clear how this project aligns with the Tajikistan's commitment under the CACILM partnership.</p>   |  |

|                |  |   |  |
|----------------|--|---|--|
|                |  | 01-19-2010 UA:<br>Has been addressed. The revised PIF states that the project is "consistent with the LD focus of the CACILM and Natinal Framework Programmme (2005) to Combat Desertification".  |  |
|                | 11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes? | September 13, 2010<br><br>No specific details have been provided, but working with NGOs could enhance sustainability of project outcomes. This needs to be clarified further.<br><br>January 27, 2011<br><br>This has been clarified but needs to be elaborated in detail during project development.<br><br>Cleared                  |  |
| Project Design | 12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?   | September 13, 2010<br><br>Yes the baseline project is sufficiently described, and some data provided on potential beneficiaries. This needs to be further elaborated during development of the full proposal, including data and assumptions on the land degradation challenge and risks to agricultural productivity.<br><br>Cleared |  |
|                | 13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?     | September 13, 2010<br><br>A careful assessment of land degradation trends and risks is lacking. But it is clear from the PIF that the problem is pervasive and should be better articulated during development of the full proposal.<br><br>Cleared   |  |
|                | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?   | September 13, 2010<br><br>No. The expected outcomes and outputs under Component 1 are not adequately presented. For example, successful   |  |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>investment of \$9.9 million in the villages cannot be an output. Please indicate the kinds of operational farm productivity, land management and rural infrastructure investments (i.e. outcomes) that will be triggered (as outputs) by the investment.</p> <p>01-19-2010 UA:<br/>Has been revised.</p>             |  |
|  | <p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p>                      | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>The incremental cost reasoning is based on additional land parcels that will be brought under effective management, with a larger number of beneficiaries. However, no specific case is made for generating global environmental benefits.</p> <p>01-19-2010 UA:<br/>Has been revised.</p> |  |
|  | <p>16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?</p>   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>There is no indication of what specific global environmental benefits (such as described in the LD focal area strategy) will be generated and how they will be measured.</p> <p>01-19-2010 UA:<br/>Has been adequately addressed.</p>  |  |
|  | <p>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p> | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Not yet. This needs to be addressed in relation to #15 above.</p> <p>01-19-2010 UA:<br/><br/>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |  |
|  | <p>18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/</p>                                     | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, the socio-economic benefits are described, but it is not clear how they will support the delivery of global</p>   |  |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?  | <p>environmental benefits.</p> <p>January 27, 2011</p> <p>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |
|  | 19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, a specific case is made for gender and NGOs.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |
|  | 20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience) | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Not yet. Climate change risks need to be described even if briefly, especially when the larger Central Asia region is known to be quite vulnerable.</p> <p>01-19-2010 UA:<br/>A special section has been added in the risk description.</p> |  |
|  | 21. Is the provided documentation consistent?   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Not yet. As noted in several points above, there are inconsistencies that need to be resolved.</p> <p>January 27, 2011</p> <p>Yes, all inconsistencies have been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |
|  | 22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?                       | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>The description provided is adequate for the PIF stage, but needs to be elaborated during project development.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |  |
|  | 23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?  |  |  |

|                   |   |  |  |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
|                   | 24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?  | September 13, 2010<br><br>This is not clear even though the project is intended to serve as follow-up to another World Bank/GEF finance initiative. Please provide a more constructive explanation.<br><br>01-19-2010 UA:<br>Explanation has been provided.<br><br>Cleared |  |
|                   | 25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?  |  |  |
|                   | 26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?  |  |  |
| Project Financing | 27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?   | September 13, 2010<br><br>Yes, GEF component of project management cost is 10% of the GEF grant. But the co-financing component is significantly larger.<br><br>Cleared  |  |
|                   | 28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle? | September 13, 2010<br><br>Yes, the project will address only one objective in the LD focal area (LD1) which is quite appropriate.<br><br>Cleared   |  |
|                   | 29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.  | September 13, 2010<br><br>The IDA grant of \$10 million appears to be confirmed, but additional sources will need to be explored to increase the amount.<br><br>01-19-2010 UA:<br>An additional grant of \$5 million from the PPCR is proposed (not yet confirmed)         |  |



|                                   |   |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                   |   | and a \$3 million in kind contribution by beneficiaries added. This would raise the co-financing to a ratio of 1:3.  |  |
|                                   |   | Cleared  |  |
|                                   | 30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | September 13, 2010<br><br>The amount allocated for investments seems reasonable relative to the number of beneficiaries, but as noted in #5 above it is not clear whether the objectives and outcomes will be achieved.<br><br>January 27, 2010<br><br>This has been addressed.<br><br>Cleared |  |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?                            | September 13, 2010<br><br>This will be required at CEO Endorsement.  |  |
|                                   | 32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?               |  |  |
| Agency Responses                  | 33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:   |  |  |
|                                   | • STAP?   |  |  |
|                                   | • Convention Secretariat?   |  |  |
|                                   | • Council comments?   |  |  |
|                                   | • Other GEF Agencies?   |  |  |
| <b>Secretariat Recommendation</b> |   |  |  |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage       | 34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?  | September 13, 2010<br><br>No, the PIF is not recommended for clearance. Please address the issues raised in this review resubmit.<br><br>February 25, 2010<br><br>All issues have been addressed, and the PIF is now recommended for CEO Clearance.  |  |

|   |   |                    |  |
|---|---|--------------------|--|
|   | 35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.  |                    |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |                    |  |
|   | 37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?  |                    |  |
| Review Date (s)                             | First review*   | September 13, 2010 |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  | January 21, 2011   |  |
|   | 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.

## 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.