

Strengthening the Resilience of Central Asian Countries by Enabling Regional Cooperation to Assess High Altitude Glacio-nival Systems to Develop Integrated Methods for Sustainable Development and Adaptation to Climate Change

GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project

Basic Information

GEF ID
10077

Countries
Regional (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan)

Project Title
Strengthening the Resilience of Central Asian Countries by Enabling Regional Cooperation to Assess High Altitude Glacio-nival Systems to Develop Integrated Methods for Sustainable Development and Adaptation to Climate Change

GEF Agency(ies)
UNDP

Agency ID
UNDP: 5516

GEF Focal Area(s)
International Waters

Program Manager
Steffen Hansen

Part I – Project Information

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

SHansen (21.10.18):

Please make the following changes and resubmit: currently table A references IW objective 1 and its program 1 and 2. Please look at the GEF 7 strategy and change this to objective 3 and its relevant programs.

SHansen (20.11.18): Addressed

Agency Response

Comment addressed

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

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes

Agency Response

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

SHansen (21.10.18):

Please address and resubmit: For each amount of indicative co-financing, please indicate whether the co-financing represents 'Investment Mobilized' or 'Recurrent Expenditures'. For details, please refer to Paragraph 9 of the Co-Financing Policy

(http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Policy.pdf) and the Co-Financing Guidelines

(http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

SHansen (20.11.18): addressed

Agency Response

All countries co-financing represents 50% Investment Mobilized and 50 Recurrent expenditure

All other co-financing is Investment Mobilized

Comment addressed

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
SHansen (21.10.18): Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
SHansen (21.10.18): Yes

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes, PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

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

SHansen (21.10.18): Core indicators have been calculated using the correct guidelines.

Agency Response

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

SHansen (21.10.18). Please address and resubmit:

Please apply, in the Taxonomy, Rio Markers for Climate Change Adaptation and Climate Change Mitigation. Each project needs to select one marker (0,1 or 2) for adaptation AND one marker (0,1 or 2) for mitigation. For further details, please refer to the hover tip that links to the complete Taxonomy, including definitions of the Rio Markers.

SHansen (20.11.18): addressed

Agency Response

Now applied in attached file

Part 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

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes the barriers and root causes are clear.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes the baseline description is sufficiently described at PIF stage. At the time of CEO endorsement submission stage, please further expand the baseline section and elaborate on potential synergies to initiatives such as the UN Special Programme for the Aral Sea.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SHansen (21.10.18): Please address the below comments and resubmit:

Please look at the component 4 output description and (1) add text mentioning that the steering committee will factor in the scalability of pilots as a selection criterion and (2) remove all text that is not relevant to the component 4 output description.

SHansen (20.11.18): addressed

Agency Response

Comment addressed

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes, this is a strategically important project addressing a critical need for a joint up approach towards managing the central Asian Glacial Nival systems.

Agency Response

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

SHansen (21.10.18): yes

Agency Response

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

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes, the project applies a Diagnostic Analysis approach and will develop a Strategic Action plan and subsequent national action plans. Further, the envisioned project pilots should be selected according to their innovative character (seen from a regional stand point) and subsequent potential to be scaled. Finally, UNECO will apply a subset of tech applications (new mobile driven apps etc).

Agency Response

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

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes

Agency Response

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

SHansen (21.10.18): No, please include indicative information and resubmit.

SHansen (20.11.18): addressed

Agency Response

Additional para added under 2 stakeholders on page 17

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

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes. Also, during the PPG phase, a detailed gender involvement strategy will be developed.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes the case is made sufficiently at PIF stage. The role of the private sector should be further clarified during PPG.

Agency Response

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
SHansen (21.10.18): Yes

Agency Response

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

SHansen (21.10.18): No please elaborate on the management, monitoring and evaluation aspects.

SHansen (20.11.18): addressed

Agency Response
Comment addressed

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

SHansen (21.10.18): Yes, consistency with national priorities have been described sufficiently at PIF stage. However, please note that this section should be significantly elaborated prior to CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

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
SHansen (21.10.18): Yes

Agency Response

Part 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

S. Hansen (21.10.18): In accordance with GEF policy, prior to technical clearance, all submitted LOEs must contain the signature of the current OFPs.

Please note that LOEs from Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan are not signed by the current OFPs. Please resubmit the two LOEs in question.

S. Hansen (20.11.18): Addressed. Note that a new LOE from Turkmenistan has been submitted. Uzbekistan has been removed as a project beneficiary; however, Uzbekistan is expected to join the project during PPG.

Agency Response

New LOE for Turkmenistan has been obtained and it is attached to this resubmission. The project will continue without Uzbekistan

GEFSEC 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

S. Hansen (20.11.18): Yes, the project is recommended for technical clearance. Also, the PPG is recommended for clearance.

Additional Comments

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

In accordance with the above comments:

-As part of the CEO endorsement package, please provide a letter of support from the relevant IFAS donor coordinating bodies, which shows that the regional organization is fully onboard and will be coordinated with as part of project implementation.

- It is expected that the project will work towards increasing co-finance from other sources during either PPG. Further, during PPG the project should aim to increase co-finance in connection with the development of pilot activities.

- At the time of CEO endorsement submission stage, please further expand the baseline section and elaborate on potential synergies to initiatives such as the UN Special Programme for the Aral Sea.

- The role of the private sector will be further clarified during PPG.

- The consistency with national strategies section should be expanded by the time of CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>