



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

GEF ID:	4642		
Country/Region:	Uzbekistan		
Project Title:	Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change Mitigation Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	127486 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; LD-1; Project Mana; CCM-2; CCM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$12,699,000
Co-financing:	\$75,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$87,699,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anna Lerner	Agency Contact Person:	Angela Armstrong

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes. The project will be well coordinated with the WB project Rural Enterprise Support Project (US\$75m)	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the		

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes for CC. UA, Sept 14, 2011: Yes for LD. The project component that addresses LD is in line with the LDFA strategy in implementing integrated approaches to soil fertility and water management.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes. The project is well aligned with GEF-5 CCM-1 and CCM-3 focal area objective: "Technologies successfully demonstrated, deployed and transferred", and "promote investment in renewable energy technologies" with emphasis on agribusiness and rural communities, as well as with LD-1: "maintain or improve flows of agro-ecological system services to sustain livelihoods of local communities".	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes, the project is consistent with national priorities, strategies and plans.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes in particular considering the long term support given through the RESP that further will support capacity development and empowerment of rural communities.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes, they are described well together with clear outcome indicators and baseline results. The majority of baseline activities come from the RESP-2 World Bank funded project, with an objective to increase productivity and financial and environmental sustainability of agriculture and the profitability of agribusiness in the project area.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes. The incremental reasoning is provided in that the baseline project would only allocate very limited resources to the introduction of renewable energy technologies and more sustainable irrigated land use practices. The GEF funds will therefore provide a substantial value added to the baseline. The GEF funded components would also support a key government development objective in its introduction of renewable energy technologies in rural areas and for agribusiness.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The project objective is to promote the use of renewable energy for the provision of rural energy services and improve flows of agro ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities in Uzbekistan.</p> <p>Component 1: Investment for sustainable technologies</p> <p>Component 2: Irrigated land degradation mitigation</p> <p>Component 3: Project technical support and advisory services</p> <p>Given the low level of details given to what technologies that will be employed and transferred it is difficult to provide too detailed comments on the project framework. Overall it looks good and we look forward to a more detailed description at CEO endorsement stage.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, 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?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes. Socio-economic and gender aspects are considered. We expect the financial mechanism and project components to have a gender sensitive design during PPG ensuring consultation of relevant women's group and CSO in line with the mentioned importance of ensuring a gender focus of the project.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes. We expect attention to be given to this in line with WB safeguards during the PPG phase.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. 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)	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes in an adequate way. However, not all ongoing initiatives with relevance are mentioned in the PIF, we expect an up-to-date discussion on coordination at CEO endorsement level. UA, Sept 14, 2011: The PIF emphasizes co-ordination with the CACILM program. This is welcome from a LD perspective. However, in this context it has to be noted that there are ongoing discussions on a programmatic approach in the CAC region that would include the planned GEF-5 initiatives.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes. Project management cost is 0 GEF funding and US\$2,5m from co-financing, out of the total US\$75m co-financing.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes. During PPG and the design phase, please consider to increase the matching funds of the RE	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and outputs?	investments from co-financing up from US\$8m from GEF matched with 1:1, to something around 1:2.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	AL, Sept 13, 2011: The co-finance is satisfactory.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	AL, Sept 13, 2011: Yes PIF is recommended. UA, Sept 14, 2011: I concur with the view of the first reviewer.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Cost efficiency of the project is difficult to assess since the identification of the most appropriate renewable technology for the project is yet to be identified during PPG phase. The example provided with bio-gas digesters seems	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>reasonable however and provides relevant GEB.</p> <p>Calculations of GEB look good but they are only estimates of what might take place. While we appreciate the need for a thorough assessment of the chosen technologies based on demand and other factors, we expect a detailed description of installed capacity, chosen technologies and GHG emission savings in the CEO endorsement request.</p> <p>From LD perspective, the agency is requested to coordinate with the programmatic approach under CACILM as proposed.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

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	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.