



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

GEF ID:	<b>6943</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Azerbaijan</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Conservation and Sustainable Use of Globally Important Agro-biodiversity</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5482 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,160,502</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$20,700,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$25,160,502</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>September 04, 2014</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>October 30, 2014</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Saliha Dobardzic</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Maxim Vergeichik</b>

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 <b>country eligible</b> ?	<p>Yes, the country is eligible for both GEF BD and LD financing.</p> <p>The project should be categorized as Multi-Focal Area project (not BD as stated in the first table of Part I of PIF) as it addresses both BD and LD benefits. Please revise.</p> <p>8/25/2014 UA: Has been revised.</p>	No change since PIF.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes, a duly signed endorsement letter by the OFP is attached. The country is applying a partial flexibility by reallocating \$2m from LD to BD.	No change since PIF.

\*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, the project uses the entire GEF-6 BD and LD STAR allocation for this project.	No change since PIF.
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	No change since PIF.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	Yes, the project conforms well with BD 3 Program 7, and LD1 Program 1.	No change since PIF. However, the project has not explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).  Recommended action: Please note in the revised proposal the relevant Aichi target(s), and the indicators that will track progress towards achieving the target(s).  Update 5/23/2016: This has been done.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes, it is in line with the NBSAP, NAP, and other key strategies.	No change since PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>In addition to the government efforts to promote agrobiodiversity, it would be useful to understand the ongoing efforts made through the projects that are noted in the coordination section of the PIF. Any of the projects are conducting activities that can be considered as baseline and can this project build on those? Please clarify.</p> <p>8/25/2014 UA: Has been clarified.</p>	Yes, cleared.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes, the project description is sufficiently clear.	<p>Not clear. The information presented under Outputs is generally vague.</p> <p>Recommended action: Where possible, please revise to include additional key information, for example "Output 3.2: Improve access to markets for local farmers through establishment of 10 cooperatives, and 15 agreements with wholesale buyers" (hypothetical)</p> <p>One of the outcomes listed under component 3 is that the area under native wheat, vegetable and forage crop production increases to at least 6%, 2% and 2% of the total area under all crop production (from less than 2%, 0.5% and 0.5%).</p> <p>Recommended action: Please clarify how these targets were defined.</p> <p>Also under component 3, it is stated that at least 400 small farmers would benefit from grant funding support1 (US\$500-</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>\$1,500/farmer or household) to native crop agriculture and at least 5 processors and retailers benefit from grant funding support for trading in niche high value products derived from native crops.</p> <p>Recommended action: The "benefit" should be more explicitly defined as successful access to funding is merely an intermediary outcome.</p> <p>Update 5/23/2016: This has been done.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, global environmental benefits are sufficiently described in table A.1.5.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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?</p>		<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide further information, particularly regarding gender dimension. Also please see comment under no. 10.</p> <p>Update 5/23/2016: This has been done.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Yes, stakeholder and their roles are sufficiently described. Are there any indigenous peoples in the area and any linkage with their traditional knowledge? Please clarify.</p> <p>While gender consideration has been described, it is not clear "how" the project would be ensuring women's involvement (e.g. gender analysis, consultation, gender specific activities, etc). Please</p>	<p>Not clear. The proposal, for example, states that the project will target the direct or indirect involvement of at least 2,000 women in project activities and that priority will be given to supporting female farmers to access agrobiodiversity subsidies and to directly benefit from technical and financial support from the projects small grant programs. However, the proposal does not provide any information on</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>clarify.</p> <p>8/25/2014 UA: Has been clarified.</p>	<p>how this will be ensured.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please discuss further how gender considerations will be reflected in the project implementation.</p> <p>Update 5/23/2016: This has been done.</p>
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes, sufficiently described at this stage.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes, please refer above question on baseline contribution of these projects.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>The sustainability of the Agriculture Advisory Services Center which is suggested to be newly established through this project is highly questionable. Please clarify how the centers are expected to be financially and institutionally sustained.</p> <p>8/25/2014 UA: Has been clarified.</p>	<p>The project is innovative, potentially sustainable, and has potential for scaling up. The innovative aspect is that this is an area of conservation that has not received much attention in this particular context to date, yet it is potentially a marketable and therefore sustainable (economically and environmentally), and if the pilot is successful, could be replicated more widely in the country and regionally with some incentives.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please supply further information on the cost-effectiveness, particularly with regards to the comparison with alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits, or provide clarifications.</p> <p>Update 5/27/2016: This is cleared.</p>
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, cofinancing is identified at 1 to 5 ratio, mostly in cash, and considered adequate.	No major change. The bulk of cofinancing, around \$20 million, is from the country and in the form of parallel cofinancing.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes in general. UNDP is providing a cash contribution of 200k.	As at PIF stage.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes, PMC is identified at 5% and considered adequate.	Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency	Yes, PPG is requested in an amount of 150k and considered adequate.	Yes, cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>Not clear.</p> <p>The Biodiversity tracking tool has been included. However, the Land Degradation Focal Area tracking tool for GEF-6 has not been included.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please include the LD tracking tool in the revised submission, considering the LD strategic objective, targets, and the proportion of funding from the FA towards this project.</p> <p>Update 7/19/2016: The LD tracking tool has been provided.</p>
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• The Council?		Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	No, please address the above comments and resubmit the PIF.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		25 Aug 2014 Yes, the GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately address the comments made earlier, including the issue of sustainability of the agriculture center. The PM recommends the PIF for Work Program inclusion.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Not yet. Please consider the comments under sections 4, 7, 9, 10, and 15.  Update 7/19/2016: All pending comments have been addressed. The proposal is now recommended for CEO Endorsement.
	First review*	August 20, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 25, 2014	
	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.**