



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9094		
Country/Region:	Regional (Kyrgyz Republic, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan)		
Project Title:	Integrated Natural Resources Management in Drought-prone and Salt-affected Agricultural Production Landscapes in Central Asia and Turkey (CACILM2)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$210,845	Project Grant:	\$10,874,659
Co-financing:	\$64,885,046	Total Project Cost:	\$75,970,550
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Asha Bobb-Semple	Agency Contact Person:	Giovanni Munoz

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	03/25/2015 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	03/25/2015 UA: Yes. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	03/25/2015 UA:	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>Not fully.</p> <p>Please better describe the role of CACILM-2 in all these aspects.</p> <p>The use of the term resilience was not fully clear to me – does it refer to climate change resilience?</p> <p>03/30/2015 UA: Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>03/25/2015 UA: Not fully.</p> <p>The PIF needs to better justify the multi-country approach. This can be achieved by basing it on the results and lessons on CACILM-1 and outline the objectives of CACILM-2 and adding Turkey for fresh input on innovation and knowledge transfer.</p> <p>Please clarify to what extent CACILM-1 is still functional in view of sustainability and how it can be revitalized. GEFSEC should also not be involved in re-establishing a Steering Committee, but the countries need to be in the driver's seat.</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>03/30/2015 UA: Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>03/25/2015 UA: Not fully.</p> <p>It would make sense to move component 3 up to become component 1, to give the project clear emphasis on multi-country collaboration. After the regional component, the two national components can be described. As the contribution of countries is very different, it would make sense to include a table of what the countries will undertake at national level and how that links to the CACILM-2 objectives.</p> <p>Please also insert the figures for carbon benefits estimations in Table B - currently only xx tCO2 are provided. The figures are in the text and should also be entered in Table B.</p> <p>03/30/2015 MY & UA: The missing amounts of GHG emission reductions in Table B were added. The total of these amounts is 4 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>which is consistent with that in the text on pages 17 and 18. Thus, comments were cleared.</p> <p>Component 3 has been revised and put upfront as component 1, which gives the project clear emphasis on multi-country collaboration.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>03/25/2015 UA: Yes, adequate at this stage. More detailed information is expected at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	<p>03/25/2015 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>03/25/2015 UA: Table A indicates CCM-2 with \$2.6 million but in Table D only with \$1.8 million? Please check and correct.</p> <p>03/30/2015 UA: Has been corrected.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of 	n/a	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	<p>03/25/2015 UA:</p> <p>Table D includes a request for \$2.6 million LDFA set aside. We only have \$2 million LD FA set aside earmarked for CACILM-2, please adjust Table D accordingly.</p> <p>03/30/2015 UA: Has been adjusted requesteing now \$2 million LDFA set-aside.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>03/25/2015 UA: No. Please address above comments and the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide endorsement letter from Kazakhstan Please radically shorten the PIF to a maximum of 12-15 pages. This can be achieved by cutting all the non-essential information that is provided under "project description" (pages 7 – 16) and by providing a concise baseline description for the entire project, not for each component. <p>03/30/2015 UA: All issues have been adequately addressed in the re-submission. OFP</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Endorsement letter from Kazakhstan is forthcoming.</p> <p>Program Managers technically clear the project. It may be included in an upcoming work program.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 25, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 30, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	The CEO Endorsement has two changes to the wording of two outputs. Suitable justification has been provided.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The project overall is well designed and logically sequenced. Please address/clarify the following:</p> <p>Component 1 (Output 1.2.1)- -Who will manage/host the knowledge platform?</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>-Does the target audience for the platform include herders and farmers, famers organizations and similar civil society groups? If so, how easily can they access the platform?</p> <p>-Who are the intended buyers of information for the "knowledge market"? (Pro Doc Pg., 43)</p> <p>-Early warning systems has a clear adaptation focus and so if it is to be included in the project scope, it would need to be funded out of co-financing.</p> <p>-Component 2- Output 2.1.1 (Pro Doc Pg. 45)- Where possible, consider integrating resilience into policies or strategies related to gender, insurance (specifically insurance targeting farmers/herders), disaster preparedness/prevention. This goes beyond NRM to look at areas where unsustainable natural resource management has an impact on and is impacted by people.</p> <p>Output 2.2.1 (Pro Doc Pg. 50) Where possible please consider strengthening the capacity of extension service providers across all countries to improve the farmers' ability to access credit. This will encourage sustainability of this project output.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Output 2.2.2 (Pro Doc Pg. 51)- Please provide additional details on how the value chains in the different countries will be strengthened.</p> <p>Output 3.1.1 (Pro Doc Pg. 53)- How will the project ensure the alignment of community-based land use planning with national level land use planning and designation of land categories?</p> <p>Output 4.2.1 is a standard project cycle activity and does not need to be included as a project activity. Please clarify what activities will be funded under \$1.5M (component 4) as only \$260,000 have been allocated to the M&E Plan. Please make reference to the items in the overall budget plan.</p> <p>Outputs related to CACILM regional support: Please clarify which outputs in Table B are in support of CACILM regional activities and provide a breakdown how the regional set-aside funding will be used. Specifically, how will the CACILM secretariat be supported?</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Institutional Arrangements -Institutional arrangements described in the prodoc are suitable, however, please include a summary of the institutional arrangements in the CEO Endorsement Request, in particular with regard to the regional CACILM arrangements.</p> <p>-In addition, as TORs have not been provided for all experts, please indicate which expert (s) or project staff will be assisting with implementation of activities related to Outputs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2</p> <p>Results Framework -Please disaggregate the data on the no. of beneficiaries by gender -Please consider including indicators related to land area for Outputs 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 -On Pg. 15 of the CEO Endorsement Request, there is a target for improvement in incomes. Please include a related indicator(s) in the Results Framework.</p> <p>Global Environment Benefits The targets (for land under integrated management) in Table E and in the Table on Page 15 do not match. Please clarify. In addition, please include the upscaling figure as we are</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>interested in recording the catalytic effect of integrated land management.</p> <p>Budget -Please provide justification for the purchase of vehicles using GEF grants. Why is this not covered by co-financing? -GEF grants can't be used for paying maintenance/fuel (\$409,000). This is clearly co-financing. -Please clarify which percentage of the GEF grant and which budget items will promote SLM activities on the ground, benefitting smallholders and local communities.</p> <p>2/6/2017 ABS: Cleared.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	Yes	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Co-financing letters are provided for all earmarked co-financing.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>However please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -double check the figures for ICBA, as the amount in the letter does not match the amount in Table C. -provide accurate descriptions of the co-financing for TKM, ICBA, Turkey, ICARDA, GIZ i.e. cash, in-kind, or parallel financing. <p>2/6/2017 ABS: This has been corrected.</p>	
	<p>6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?</p>	<p>The Tracking Tool for LD is partially complete. Please address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Question 1a- provide a response -Question 1d- provide the answer in the required unit/measure -Question 2a- verify the figures as they are the same -Question 4- provide the answer in the required unit/measure <p>2/6/2017 ABS & UA: Please review and adjust the emissions estimates in the CEO endorsement request (Table B and E) and accordingly in the LD and CCM tracking tools. The estimates need to be relative to a baseline and we encourage a more conservative</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>estimate that can be fully attributed to and are commensurate with the GEF investment. At PIF stage, the estimates provided were 4 million tCO₂e and it is not fully clear how the much higher estimates in the CEO endorsement request have been derived at whether they can be realistically achieved.</p> <p>A reminder to also change the figures in Table E of the CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>3/6/2017 ABS & UA: Cleared.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The project responds to the UNCCD NAP (205-2023), the Sub-Regional Action Programme for Combatting Desertification and supports alignment with the Central Asian Countries NAPs to combat DLDD with the UNCCD Strategy (2008-2018). The project also supports National Communications to the UNFCCC and National Biodiversity Action Plans (NBSAP).</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Yes. In addition, knowledge management and knowledge sharing has been infused into the design of the project (Component 1-Multi-country collaboration and partnership to foster the effective delivery of INRM).	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	Yes	
	• STAP	Yes	
	• GEF Council	Yes. The German Council member representative commented on the disparities in funding available to the different countries and establishment of a knowledge platform. FAO has addressed both comments on Pg 23.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	Not at this time. Please address the abovementioned questions and requests for clarification. 2/6/2017 ABS: Not at this time. Please address additional comments on the Tracking Tools. 3/6/2017 ABS & UA: The project is recommended for CEO	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	December 16, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 06, 2017	March 01, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 06, 2017	