



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

GEF ID:	9190		
Country/Region:	Uzbekistan		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Forests in Mountain and Valley Areas		
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):	CCM-2 Program 4; LD-2 Program 3; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,187,023
Co-financing:	\$13,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,187,023
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Norbert Winkler

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	07/22/2015 UA: Yes. Aligned with CCM-2, Program 4; LD-2, Program 3; SFM-3.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	07/22/2015 UA: Yes. refer to section "Consistency with National Priorities".	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and	07/22/2015 UA: No. Although the PIF is very lengthy, pages 4 - 11 only give a very general overview that is not clearly	Has been received in a separate file and filed in PMIS.

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>innovation?</p>	<p>addressing drivers of environmental degradation and provides insufficient justification for GEF involvement. Please build a stronger case on why and how GEF funds are needed to introduce SFM in Uzbekistan and on which current baseline this builds. Most information is somewhere in the PIF text, however, it would be helpful to concisely present this in the concept and to better bring this into the country's context and regional context with regard to SFM.</p> <p>Please shorten the PIF to the usual maximum of 12-15 pages of text. At the same time, please concisely describe the drivers and problems to be addressed by the project.</p> <p>08/26/2015 UA: PIF has been adequately revised. Please remove some inserts in the text that appear to be comments such as: "Error!" or "It is outdated, no?" etc.</p> <p>11/6/2015 UA: Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>07/22/2015 UA: Yes. Incremental reasoning has been applied but should be strengthened in line with remarks above in box #3.</p>	<p>Has been received in a separate file and filed in PMIS.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>08/26/2015 UA: Has been adequately addressed.</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>07/22/2015 UA: Not fully. Project objective - maybe formulate better as to INTRODUCE sustainable forest management rather than ESTABLISH?</p> <p>Explain output 2.2: trade-off and potential conflicts if this land is currently being used for food production/livestock grazing?</p> <p>Explain output 2.4: if this is solely a co-financed component that is not managed by this project, how to ensure coordination and more importantly, the results of this output?</p> <p>In general, the outcomes and outputs do not make clear what benefits the project will create for smallholder farmers and communities. As LD funding is involved, the project would need to target such beneficiaries (see also comments on socio-economic benefits below).</p> <p>Please also better outline scaling-up and replication of results to be</p>	<p>Has been received in a separate file and filed in PMIS.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>achieved by the project.</p> <p>On GEBs, please estimate direct and indirect GHG emission reduction targets as the 5.5 million tCO₂ eq seems very high for a small project. It also seems that the target of 191,750 ha has been double counted under SLM and SFM (see Table 4 on page 17).</p> <p>In addition to above comments, please also revise the paragraph on CACILM (p. 22). The recently submitted PIF "CACILM2" has already been approved by the GEF Council. Please outline clearly the coordination arrangements with CACILM2.</p> <p>08/26/2015 UA: Has mostly been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Outstanding issue: While benefits for smallholder farmers and local communities will be created and this has been responded to in the comments matrix, it is not fully incorporated into the project framework in Table B. Please explicitly include livelihood benefits into outcomes and outputs and quantify, if possible (this may be estimated and more details provided</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		at CEO endorsement stage). 11/6/2015 UA: HAs been addressed. Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	07/22/2015 UA: Not fully. What socio-economic ('local') benefits the project will create for smallholder farmers, including women? How exactly CSOs will be involved into the project. Please note that the stakeholder section in the PIF should focus on stakeholders from CSOs and on-the-ground beneficiaries in a concrete way, not only as a potential activity as currently formulated. 08/26/2015 UA: Has been adequately addressed. However, as mentioned above, the benefits for the target group should be incorporated into outcomes and outputs.	Has been received in a separate file and filed in PMIS.
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? 	07/22/2015 UA: Yes. 09/22/2015 UA: No. Per our most recent records, the	Has been received in a separate file and filed in PMIS.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>request for STAR resources for this PIF & PPG exceeds the available STAR for Uzbekistan. The request is for \$2,655,027 while only \$2,436,027 are available. Please check with the OFP and adjust accordingly.</p> <p>11/6/2015 UA: The request for STAR resources has been adjusted. At this point in time the requested resources are available.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	07/22/2015 UA: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	
	<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>Please enter Programming of funds in Table D for SFM, please select SFM from the drop down menu.</p> <p>08/26/2015 UA: Has been corrected.</p>	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>07/22/2015 UA: No. Please address comments in this review.</p> <p>08/26/2015 UA: No. Please address outstanding issues.</p> <p>09/22/2015 UA: Please also check STAR availability</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		as indicated in box #7. 11/6/2015 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	July 22, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 26, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 22, 2015	

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?		
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		