



Sustainable Forest and Rangelands Management in the Dryland Ecosystems of Uzbekistan

Basic Information

GEF ID

10367

Countries

Uzbekistan

Project Title

Sustainable Forest and Rangelands Management in the Dryland Ecosystems of Uzbekistan

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO

Agency ID

FAO: 666661

GEF Focal Area(s)

Land Degradation

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes the PIF is aligned with the LD strategy and it's focus on LDN.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Not fully. Please see comments below:

-clarify which output is aligned with restoration work that will deliver 3000ha of land restored.

- include the number of small farmers that will be targeted as well as an indicator to measure the potential increase in income.

11/1/2019

Cleared

Agency Response

-clarify which output is aligned with restoration work that will deliver 3000ha of land restored.

-Output 2.1.3 corresponds to SLM and restoration activities planned under the project. The wording of the output has been amended and it now explicitly refers to restoration using SLM.

- include the number of small farmers that will be targeted as well as an indicator to measure the potential increase in income.

Additional indicator for small holders in Table B has been added.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Please indicate whether or not the financing from the Ministry of Agriculture is Investment Mobilized or Recurrent Expenditure.

11/1/2019:

Please insert the Co-financing category- Investment Mobilized in Table C.

11/4/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

11/1/2019

cofinancing category inserted.

10/17/2019

Co-financing from the Ministry of Agriculture is Investment Mobilized. There is a new estimate on co-financing from the MoA communicated to FAO on October 31.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Please indicate 'LD STAR' under the programming funds column in the portal entry.

Agency Response

Thank you. The indication is now reflected in the Portal.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes the STAR allocation is sufficient to cover the project.

Agency Response

No response needed.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes the LD focal area allocation is sufficient to cover the project.

Agency Response

No response needed.

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

No response needed.

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

No response needed.

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

No response needed.

Impact Program Incentive?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

n/a

Agency Response

No response needed.

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

No response needed.

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

-Please indicate which Output (s) is associated with the 3,000 ha mentioned under Indicator 3. This has not be mentioned under Table B. Note, results reported under Indicator 4 cannot be accounted for again under Indicator 3.

11/1/2019

Cleared

Agency Response

Output 2.1.3 corresponds to SLM and restoration activities planned under the project. The wording of the output has been amended to clarify it. A corresponding indicator for land restoration is added to Table B.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

No response needed.

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

No response needed.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2017:

-Not fully. Please explain the linkages between this proposed project and the baseline projects and how this project will build on results or planned interventions of the baseline projects described.

-What are the linkages to the second PIF submission from Uzbekistan entitled 'Conservation and sustainable management of lakes, wetlands, and riparian corridors as pillars of a resilient and land degradation neutral Aral basin landscape supporting sustainable livelihoods'?

11/1/2019:

Cleared.

Thank you for the additional information. During the PPG phase please explain (in the project document) more clearly how this project will build on results or planned interventions of the baseline projects described. Similarly, we expect to see in the project document, details on collaboration with the proposed UNDP project in the same area.

Agency Response

-Not fully. Please explain the linkages between this proposed project and the baseline projects and how this project will build on results or planned interventions of the baseline projects described.

The national initiatives now provide more detailed information on the relationships between the baseline projects and the proposed GEF project. In addition, new information communicated by the Government on October 31 indicates new increased estimates from the baseline projects. The new estimates are reflected in updated co-financing table.

-What are the linkages to the second PIF submission from Uzbekistan entitled 'Conservation and sustainable management of lakes, wetlands, and riparian corridors as pillars of a resilient and land degradation neutral Aral basin landscape supporting sustainable livelihoods'?

The proposed project will introduce the enabling environment and implement the LDN commitments. The work will include a decision support system for the three voluntary LDN indicators (land cover, land productivity, and soil organic carbon) using FAO tools and approaches (Collect Earth, LADA, PRAGA, and others), integration of LDN principles into policy and regulatory frameworks and LDN action plans that are currently not available, and implementation of LDN commitments and priorities on the ground in a large integrated forest-pasturelands landscape of Bukhara-Navoi using the hierarchy of LDN responses (avoid>reduce>restore).

The proposed FAO and UNDP projects are complimentary at two levels: 1) implementation of innovative pastureland restoration activities in riparian zones (UNDP) will be shared through national coordination mechanism (government level) and pasture management groups (local level) (FAO project) resulting in replication and scaling up at national and regional levels (also through CACILM-2 regional platform); 2) national enabling environment and decision support system (FAO project) will ensure that the UNDP interventions can contribute to Uzbekistan's LDN targets and be monitored in a standardized way using the three LDN indicators. The UNCCD focal will ensure there is no geographic overlap with field components between the two projects.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes. Please consider the following:

-It would be important to indicate how the interventions/ results can be sustained after the project ends- training of extension staff, management of the pasture users association, institutionalizing the training at agricultural schools or institutes.

-Under Section 1, the project context indicates that pilot projects in the past did not continue and were not replicated. How will this project overcome this particular challenge?

-For restoration efforts, please indicate the plan for nurseries and will native trees be used.

11/1/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

-It would be important to indicate how the interventions/ results can be sustained after the project ends- training of extension staff, management of the pasture users association, institutionalizing the training at agricultural schools or institutes.

The text of the Outcome 1.2 (policies and planning), 1.3. (capacity building), 2.2 (increased investments and value chains) has been strengthened to reflect how the results will be sustained after the project ends.

-Under Section 1, the project context indicates that pilot projects in the past did not continue and were not replicated. How will this project overcome this particular challenge?

- The Pasture Law that was recently adopted ensures the importance of pastures for the country's development priorities. In addition, LDN multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approaches ensures that the project approach is harmonized between various administrative levels and stakeholders (private sector, government, civil society), further supported by the strengthened coordination mechanism (output 1.2.2).

-For restoration efforts, please indicate the plan for nurseries and will native trees be used.

The country already has nurseries with native trees (supported by FAO GEF-6 project) and further nurseries are not envisaged. However, the possible need for additional nurseries will be further assessed during the PPG phase.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response No response needed.**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

No response needed.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/17/2019:

Not fully.

- GEBs section makes reference to 13,000 ha of land restored which does not correspond to what is stated in the Core Indicator table or Table B. Please ensure alignment.

-Given that '1' has been selected for the RIO Marker for adaption, please indicate the adaptation benefits that will be derived from the project.

11/1/2019:

Thank you for the additional information.

However the GEBs for hectares restored are still not aligned throughout the document. Please confirm if the target is 3,000 ha or 13,000 ha and make the adjustments in the portal and uploaded PIF accordingly. Section 6 of the Portal and Uploaded PIF indicate 13,000ha and the Core Indicator sheet and Table B indicate 3000ha.

-Please clarify the adaptation benefit that has been added to Table B. How is this specifically related to adaptation as it appears to have been included in relation to the Outcome 2.2 on pasture and rangeland management?

11/4/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

11/1/2019

Project is expected to restore 13,000 ha. Core Indicator Worksheet and Table B have been updated.

The project will support stakeholders adapt to climate change by demonstrating and scaling practices that are proven to enhance resilience such as grazing rotation and multipurpose agroforestry. Given the dependency of beneficiaries on livestock and agriculture, this is expected to result in strengthened/more resilient sources of livelihood and income. The project will monitor these expected changes by type of intervention.

10/17/2019

Thank you.

- GEBs section makes reference to 13,000 ha of land restored which does not correspond to what is stated in the Core Indicator table or Table B. Please ensure alignment.

GEB section has been revised to correlate with Table B and the Core Indicator table.

-Given that '1' has been selected for the RIO Marker for adaption, please indicate the adaptation benefits that will be derived from the project.

An adaptation indicator have been added in Table B: *1000 direct beneficiaries with strengthened livelihoods and sources of income (800 small-holders)*

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes there is potential for innovation and scaling up.

However in terms of sustainability, what is the enabling environment support that is in place (under the government or through other projects) for the value chain development and business development under Outcome 2.2

11/1/2019:

Cleared.

During PPG stage we expect a 'comprehensive analysis of the laws for LDN mainstreaming and targeted value chain support' in relation to the achievement of results under Outcome 2.2

Agency Response

Livestock is the main source of livelihoods in Uzbekistan. The sector is heavily dependent on rainfed, native pastures and rangelands. The new Pasture Law that has been adopted will be strengthened to ensure it correlates not only with the LDN strategies, but also provides necessary enabling environment for the livestock value chains. There are ten other laws that exist in Uzbekistan that regulate public governance of the sector, ten legislative frameworks on reforming land relations in the livestock sector, eight laws/decrees on animal breeding development, ten laws on feed production development, and 17 laws/decrees on state support for livestock development. Comprehensive analysis of the laws for LDN mainstreaming and targeted value chain support is planned under the PPG.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

No response needed.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

-Given the focus of Outcome 2.2, the private sector (such as investors or banking sectors) should be included in the stakeholder listing. Please also define their role in the project

- The local small producers organisations who are described as the main beneficiaries of the project should have an active role in project design to ensure a sense of ownership and promote sustainability of the results.

-Please also indicate which other stakeholders will be contributing to the design of the project.

11/1/2019:

Cleared

Agency Response

-Given the focus of Outcome 2.2, the private sector (such as investors or banking sectors) should be included in the stakeholder listing. Please also define their role in the project

the World Bank and the Ministry of Agriculture are in early stages of discussion on agricultural loan. The role of the Ministry of Agriculture has been further elaborated to reflect their role in ensuring coordination with planned lending initiatives.

- The local small producers organizations who are described as the main beneficiaries of the project should have an active role in project design to ensure a sense of ownership and promote sustainability of the results.

We agree with the suggestion as most livestock farmers in Uzbekistan are small holders. They play a core role in the project. Consultations to secure ownership and sustainability will be conducted during the PPG and throughout the project implementation.

-Please also indicate which other stakeholders will be contributing to the design of the project.

All stakeholders listed in the table will be engaged project design through active participation in consultations and stock takings.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

No response needed.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

-Please consider including information on other types of private sector, such as those who will be approached to finance the key value chains that will be targeted.

11/1/2019:

Cleared. At PPG we expect additional information on other types of private sector, such as those who will be approached to finance the key value chains that will be targeted.

Agency Response

- the World Bank and the Ministry of Agriculture are in early stages of discussion on an agricultural loan. The role of the Ministry of Agriculture has been further elaborated to reflect their role in ensuring coordination with planned lending initiatives.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

No response needed.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Please provide a justification for the need for FAO to potentially provide execution functions for the project and a written request to utilize this execution modality. This request will have to be considered by the GEF. Such request has to be made latest at the time of the CEO endorsement; in this case please remove any language in the PIF that premeditates the discussion of implementing/execution arrangements between GEF and the OFP.

Please also explore collaboration with the planned UNDP project working in the Bukhara/Navoi region on conservation and sustainable management in the Aral basin landscape.

11/1/2019:

The comments on collaboration with UNDP are cleared.

Regarding the implementation modality, as FAO knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an "exceptional" basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

Agency Response

-Please provide a justification for the need for FAO to potentially provide execution functions for the project and a written request to utilize this execution modality. This request will have to be considered by the GEF. Such request has to be made latest at the time of the CEO endorsement; in this case please remove any language in the PIF that premeditates the discussion of implementing/execution arrangements between GEF and the OFP.

The project is planned to be implemented using only OPIM modality through the State Committee on Forests. OPA assessment will be conducted during the PPG phase and respective implementation-execution arrangements will be set up accordingly.

- Please also explore collaboration with the planned UNDP project working in the Bukhara/Navoi region on conservation and sustainable management in the Aral basin landscape.

The two projects are complimentary at two levels: 1) implementation of innovative pastureland restoration activities in riparian zones (UNDP) will be shared through national coordination mechanism (government level) and pasture management groups (local level) (FAO project) resulting in replication and scaling up at national and regional levels (also through CACILM-2 regional platform); 2) national enabling environment and decision support system (FAO project) will ensure that the UNDP interventions will contribute to national and sub-national LDN targets and that they are monitored and reported using the LDN standard indicators. The linkages at the project activities level will be established during the PPG phase and led by the State Committee on Forestry (UNCCD focal point).

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

No response needed.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

-Please also include how the project will utilize lessons from previous similar projects undertaken in the country.

11/1/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

The project’s broad participation process, involving relevant policy making, research, extension and institutions, will ensure that knowledge is shared efficiently within the country, including lessons learned from the previous initiatives.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

No response needed.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION**RECOMMENDATION**

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above and ensure all changes made in the portal are also reflected in the uploaded version of the PIF.

11/1/2019:

Not at this time. Please address comments under Question 3- co-financing and those related to the GEBs.

11/4/2019:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for PIF approval.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

/iew Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/17/2019	10/31/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/4/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		