



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

GEF ID:	4600		
Country/Region:	Uzbekistan		
Project Title:	Reducing Pressures on Natural Resources from Competing Land Use in Non-irrigated Arid Mountain, Semi-desert and Desert Landscapes		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4649 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3; LD-3; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$2,313,600
Co-financing:	\$9,880,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,243,600
PIF Approval:	November 14, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	February 29, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Maxim Vergeichik

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?	08/29/2011 UA: Yes.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	08/29/2011 AA: Yes, the Endorsement Letter dated 12.08.2011 has been submitted with the PIF.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	08/29/2011 UA: UNDP's comparative advantage is supported by the comparative advantage matrix.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	08/29/2011 UA: Yes. UNDP contributes \$700,000 in cash.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	08/29/2011 UA: Yes. UNDP country office will assign 6 staff members to be responsible for	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.

		this project.	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	08/29/2011 AA: Yes, total requested GEF resources for the project (\$2.54 million) are within Uzbekistan's STAR allocation for LD focal area (\$4.98 million).	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, refer above.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	n/a
	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	08/29/2011 AA: Yes, aligned with LD focal area results framework.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	08/29/2011 AA: Yes, the project addresses objective 3 of the LD focal area (LD-3).	09/12/2013 UA: LD-3
	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?	08/29/2011 UA: Yes, consistent with National Action Program to Combat Desertification (NAPCD).	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	08/29/2011 UA: Not fully. The project has a large focus on capacity building (at system, institutional and individual level). The contribution to the sustainability of the project outcomes needs to be better explained. 09/15/2011 UA: Has been addressed.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	08/29/2011 UA & AA: The extent of problem that the project seeks to address, as well broader	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.	

Project Design

financing for SLM activities have been adequately described. There is however lack of information on activities that the government or other partners are currently undertaking in relation to non-irrigated, arid mountain, semi-desert and desert landscapes that this project focuses on. Please provide more clarity on baseline activities pertaining to the above mentioned landscapes. Specifically, page 9 of the PIF document states that "...there have been significant efforts related to biodiversity conservation...pasture management and forestry...A National Forest Plan was developed...". These are the types of activities that would be considered a baseline for the current proposal. Please describe these activities in more detail, and how GEF financing will build on them.

In table 1, the PIF lists many baseline activities/projects/programs that the GoU is undertaking. Not all of them appear to be fully relevant. Please focus on the relevant activities directly related to this project.

Moreover, it would seem relevant for this project to elaborate further on the efforts of the GoU in agricultural and forest land allocation ("TACIS program") and whether and how this will be followed up by the proposed project. In this context, please explain on previous activities/baseline activities for ILUP. What is the common practice and what is the incremental part of the project in ILUP?

09/15/2011 UA & AA:

Thank you for addressing our comments, but please further elaborate on the following points:

-National programme on land management in Uzbekistan is presented as a project baseline. Please provide

		<p>this project will feed into it. -More information on the current status of land tenure and user rights on forests and rangelands, including any customary tenure, particularly in the 2 target districts. How do current land tenure arrangements affect the process of land degradation in forested land and rangelands.</p> <p>10/02/2011 Introductory remarks on land tenure and user rights in both pasture and forestry sectors have been provided.</p>	
	<p>13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>		<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>08/29/2011 UA: Not fully. From the project rationale it would appear more appropriate to focus upscaling best practices (presently component 1) and based on these experience and results to improve the enabling framework (presently component 2). Please consider to focus the GEF support on upscaling best practices in SLM and on the ground investments. Also include the category 'INV' in the project framework table and estimate the proportion of on the ground investments.</p> <p>The order in which project components are currently presented does not follow the logical sequence. Since activities in Component 2 will serve as a basis for most of activities in Component 1 (field experience will feed into legal, institutional and policy framework and addressing knowledge gaps), please consider changing the order.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the enabling framework component appears to be overfunded. Considering previous investments within the framework of</p>	<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes. The project framework has been elaborated during PPG stage.</p>

field, it would seem more appropriate to focus GEF support more on the concrete issues mentioned in table 3 (section B2): i.e. improved pasture management, sustainable forest management practices, improved integration of district management planning.

Please provide more details on the expected outcomes in component 2:

- what means "forest fund territory" (what type of ownership?)
- do the figures (12,000 ha of rangeland, 1,000 ha of forestland, 30,000 ha of landscape refer to total areas or to each district?)
- Consider to have a better coverage (upsclaing) of INRM practices in the selected districts in order to create more tangible GEBs.
- Output 2.1.2. mentions "long term pasture user rights for local population...", and Output 2.1.3. mentions "provision of secure long term user rights of forestry land and biodiversity resources by local population..." as some of the best practices to be replicated by the project. Although GEF fully supports these types of practices, provision of user rights on land is part of a broader institutional change on land tenure on the national level. Please explain how provision of long-term user rights will be achieved in the context of Component 2, and consider moving this element to the Component on institutional and enabling environment.
- It would be useful to have an approximate number of people, whose livelihoods would be impacted by this project.

09/15/2011

Thank you for addressing earlier comments on project framework. But please elaborate on the following:

- Current project framework is not

		<p>outcomes and outputs should be more concrete and short. Please consider making them less descriptive and more specific. It also appears that the framework might be over-ambitious on the scope that project entails.</p> <p>Component 1: The PIF mentions lack of government attention and action on the arid areas of the country. Proper inventories of forest cover do not currently exist in Uzbekistan. What about the extent of land degradation in rangelands on a national scale? Up-to date information is critical for creating an enabling cross sectoral environment on better management of forests and rangelands. This should serve as a strong knowledge base for decision-making. Please explain if any action will be taken on this in Component 1, or if its part of any baseline activities.</p> <p>Component 2: What are the mechanisms of upscaling/disseminating project results from target sites to other districts?</p> <p>10/02/2011 Have been addressed.</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>08/29/2011 UA: This question can only be answered after further elaborating and revising the baseline description.</p> <p>09/15/2011 UA: Has been addressed.</p>	<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>08/29/2011 UA: This question will be answered after additional information on the baseline activities has been provided (see also clarification request #11).</p> <p>10/02/2011 Yes.</p>	<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as</p>		<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes.</p>

	<p>approaches to achieve similar benefits?</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/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?</p>	<p>08/29/2011 UA: This is not fully clear. The socio-economic benefits have been described, but are difficult to assess as the number of beneficiaries is not known. Please estimate the number of beneficiaries (communities, households, people) that directly or potentially could benefit from the project.</p> <p>Please provide more details on types of economic incentives to be employed by the project in order to ensure interest of local population for investing in sustainable land management, and how those will be reflected in associated sector policies.</p> <p>09/15/2011 UA & AA: Please provide more details on economic benefits to be delivered to local people by changing current practices of overgrazing and deforestation.</p> <p>10/02/2011 Socio-economic benefits as a result of the project, as well as their contribution to achievement of incremental benefits have been well articulated.</p>	<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes.</p>
	<p>19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?</p>	<p>08/29/2011 UA: Please elaborate on public participation, in particular during the integrated land use planning process (ILUP).</p> <p>09/15/2011 UA & AA: The question of public participation needs further elaboration. Please provide specific mechanisms of participatory approach in ILUP.</p> <p>10/02/2011 Has been addressed.</p>	<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes.</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)	08/29/2011 UA: Yes.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?		09/12/2013 UA: Not fully. Refer to comments on tracking tools, STAP review response, co-financing letters. 10/01/2013 UA: Documentation is complete. Cleared
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?		09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	08/29/2011 UA: Please elaborate on the co-operation with GIZ. GIZ is listed as co-financer but the envisaged co-ordination procedures and details have not been described. It is also not clear how the proposed project will build on the listed ongoing government and donor community initiatives (CACILM, UNDP and GIZ projects, etc.) without duplication of effort. Particularly, the GEF/UNDP MSP "Achieving Ecosystem Stability on the degraded lands in Karakalpakstan and the Kyzylkum Desert" had institutional strengthening for land use management and planning as one of its objectives. Please provide information on what are the results achieved by the previous projects and how Component 1 of this project will complement them. 09/15/2011 UA: Has been addressed	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.

	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	08/29/2011 UA: Please explain the executing role of the State Committee for Land Resources and Geo Cadastre, in particular on why this institutions will execute the project and how it will co-ordinated with the other relevant national institutions. 09/15/2011 Done.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		09/12/2013 UA: Yes. The project is fully in line with what has been approved at PIF stage.
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	08/29/2011 AA: Project Management Cost (PMC) is 6.9 %. According to curent GEF guidelines on PMC, these costs should not exceed 5% of the total GEF grant amount for projects requesting over \$ 2 million in GEF resources. Please justify the current PM cost or consider reducing it to 5%. 09/15/2011 PMC has been adjusted to 4.9%.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	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?	08/29/2011 UA: As mentioned above please consider revising the GEF funding in favor on field investments. 09/15/2011 GEF grant allocation across components has been adjusted as requested.	09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	08/29/2011 UA: Overall indicated co-financing is in line. But please distinguish between in kind and cash contributions of GIZ in table C. Also include UNDP in kind contribution, if appropriate. 09/15/2011	09/12/2013 UA: Not all co-financing letters have been provided. Since there are many co-financers, it would be helpful to number the co-financing letters and make reference to Table C. The following co-financing letter were not

			<p>- ICBA \$500,000 - Karakul breeding farms \$320,000</p> <p>10/01/2013 UA: Documentation is complete.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes.</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes. Please make following clarifications:</p> <p>* Project identification: Remove UNDP PMIS number Enter date of tracking tool completion, not TBD Scale of project: select only one (the most appropriate)</p> <p>* Project Context & Impacts: 6. Development benefits: what means "37%" livestock profitability?</p> <p>10/01/2013 UA: Tracking tool has been completed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>09/12/2013 UA: Yes.</p>
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>09/12/2013 UA: No. The submitted documents do not contain a response to the STAP review. Please provide - with reference on how STAP comments have been taken into account during PPG.</p> <p>10/01/2013 UA: Has been provided.</p>

			Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		09/12/2013 UA: Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>08/29/2011 UA: No. Please address issues and clarifications requests in this review.</p> <p>09/15/2011 UA: No. Some further elaboration (see clarification requests in the review sheet) and a more concise project framework table in terms of outcomes and outputs are required.</p> <p>Please also address as far as possible the following points already at PIF stage: -Clear justification of the choice of project's target districts, including how it would contribute to sustainability of project achievements. -Is project going to address improvement of the scientific and technical knowledge base on the state of forest cover and rangelands in Uzbekistan? -What are mechanisms of disseminating project achievements from pilot districts to other districts? -Current land tenure and rights and their role in the process of land degradation in forest and rangelands.</p> <p>10/02/2011 Yes. All clarification requests have been adequately addressed. PM recommends the program for CEO clearance.</p>	
	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?		09/12/2013 UA: Yes.

	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		09/12/2013 UA: No. Please address remaining issues as listed in the review sheet. 10/01/2013 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends project for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 29, 2011	September 12, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 15, 2011	October 01, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 02, 2011	

* 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?	<p>14/12/2011</p> <p>Yes, the PPG will be used to engage stakeholders and implement activities necessary for preparation of CEO endorsement document package. The proposal is based on a well structured set of activities that will fill in the existing knowledge gaps before project implementation start. It is organized with the following Components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Component 1: Detailed assessment of policy and regulatory settings of the project. -Component 2: Assessment of the capacity of different agencies to support the implementation of project activities. -Component 3: Specifics of on-the ground actions. -Component 4: Feasibility analysis and budget.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>14/12/2011</p> <p>Yes, the budget is justified. Project proponents will provide adequate cofinancing for each PP activity. The GEF to cofinancing ratio of the PPG is 1:4.5</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>14/12/2011</p> <p>Recommended.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 14, 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.