



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

GEF ID:	<b>9094</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Regional (Kyrgyz Republic, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Integrated Natural Resources Management in Drought-prone and Salt-affected Agricultural Production Systems in Central Asia and Turkey (CACILM2)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>LD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$210,845</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$10,981,815</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$38,606,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$49,798,660</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 28, 2015</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ines Beemaerts</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	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
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	03/25/2015 UA: Not fully.  Please better describe the role of CACILM-2 in all these

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>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>
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<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 re-vitalized. GEFSEC should also not be involved in re-establishing a Steering Committee, but the countries need to be in the driver's seat.</p> <p>03/30/2015 UA: Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<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</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>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 &amp; 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 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 emphasisi 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>
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed 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>03/25/2015 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>03/25/2015 UA:</p> <p>Table A indicates CCM-2 with \$2.6 million but in Table D only with \$1.8 million? Please check and correct.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		03/30/2015 UA: Has been corrected.  Cleared
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a
	• Focal area set-aside?	03/25/2015 UA:  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.  03/30/2015 UA: Has been adjusted requesteing now \$2 million LDFA set-aside.  Cleared
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	03/25/2015 UA: No. Please address above comments and the following points:  1. Please provide endorsement letter from Kazakhstan 2. 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 â€“ 16) and by providing a concise baseline description for the entire project, not for each component.  03/30/2015 UA: All issues have been adequately addressed in the re-submission. OFP Endorsement letter from Kazakhstan is forthcoming.  Program Managers technically clear the project. It may be included in an upcoming work program.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 25, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 30, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	
	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)	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council	
	• Convention Secretariat	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

<sup>3</sup> 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.