

TAJIKISTAN

ENVIRONMENTAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND RURAL LIVELIHOODS PROJECT

PPCR Sub-Committee Approval stage -- Response Matrix

(Includes response to comments from Germany/Spain, UK, US and Japan)

Comments received February 5, 2013	Team Response
<i>Coordination</i>	
Pleased that there are clear plans for coordinating with the DFID/GIZ GREAT project which will provide capacity building support in market development to match the support provided to producers by PPCR. (Germany, Spain, UK)	Noted.
We confirm the potential for synergies outlined in the proposal [with GREAT Program], and encourage exploited it to the best extent possible (Germany, Spain)	Noted.
Thank you so much for the project information. Just for information, We would like to share the related JICA agriculture project. We hope it helpful for implementing the PPCR project. http://www.taff.tj/fileadmin/taff/upload/pdf/22_Presentation_Kanamoto.pdf (Japan)	Noted.
<i>Gender</i>	
Strong gender dimension with specific plans in place to target women for participatory evaluation, appraisal of needs, building on women's skills and interests and preferred training methods. Could also consider other ways to empower women through the project through for example roles in community group decision making. (UK)	Agree with decision-making roles. These will be considered and encouraged in pasture management and water user groups and choice of investments.
We recommend very strongly not only collecting and interpreting gender disaggregated data to track recipients, but to make a conscious attempt to measure the impact that the project's outputs	Agreed. Results for indicators 1, 2, and 4b will be disaggregated by gender.

and services have on the livelihoods and in particular on the climate resilience of female beneficiaries. (Germany, Spain)	
An indicator tracking the increase of resilience of female beneficiaries would need to be added. (Germany, Spain)	Indicator 2 which is a participatory assessment of well-being and changes in household assets will be disaggregated by gender in order to show degree to which women are able to better cope with climate risk.
On results, good that breaks down by gender and expects 40% of beneficiaries to be female. (UK)	Noted.
Results	
Good that there are additional indicators on carbon sequestration and hectares protected. (UK)	Noted.
Good that there are institutional arrangements in place for Monitoring and Evaluation. (UK)	Noted.
We strongly recommend to align indicator 2.1.(a) to a much greater degree with PPCR core indicator B1, to measure that a climate change adaptation and environmental appraisal has actually resulted in planning being done in a different manner, and to also adjust other parts of the proposal accordingly, where necessary, to reflect this change in the indicator. (Germany, Spain)	Agreed. Results indicator has been modified to increase alignment with PPCR core indicator B1. Project will measure degree to which investment plans reflect climate change appraisals.
We therefore strongly recommend to aligning indicator 1. to a much greater degree with PPCR core indicator A1.3, to actually measure whether people are better able to cope, instead of just participating in investments, and to also adjust other parts of the proposal accordingly, where necessary, to reflect this change in the indicator. (Germany, Spain)	Agreed. Indicator has been modified to reflect this alignment. Also, ability to cope is also being addressed in indicator 2.
Sustainability	
Institutional sustainability will be addressed through capacity building of the participating rural population, Jamoat Resource Centres/ Social Unions for Development of Village Organisations, participating NGOs, the CEP and relevant line ministries. However it is not clear	The CEP Implementation Group is led by existing staff of the CEP, whose capacity will be strengthened during project implementation with the support of technical assistance and training. The CEP is already part of the core public administration.

<p>what the institutional status of the Implementation Group CEP is, how will it be funded in the longer term at the end of the project or alternatively is there an exit strategy for how it will be integrated into the core Government public administration? (UK)</p>	
<p>Please also provide more details on how the Government of Tajikistan will support project sustainability over time, as the project requires intensive training up-front and will likely require retraining and knowledge maintenance tools for continued sustainability. (US)</p>	<p>The project has been designed with this question in mind. Through field-based implementation and collaboration with Facilitating Organizations and others on how to better support communities in coping with climate change risks, it is expected that the CEP will be better equipped to mainstream these approaches in regional and national programs and planning exercises. It should be noted that CEP is also leading the development of a national adaptation strategy and that project results and lessons will be key inputs into this process.</p> <p>In addition, CEP will ensure the documentation, dissemination, and knowledge exchanges of successful project tools and approaches for their continued replication and support. For example, following on from PPCR Phase 1, CEP will look for ways to most effectively share this information, through knowledge management systems such as WOCAT (World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies – a global database). Furthermore, the project itself will generate a number of practical, how-to tools for various audiences, e.g., women, herders, farmers, etc., that will be shared widely. CEP plans to investigate how such material and experience can be used to provide comprehensive environmental advice in sustainable land use management at a number of scales. This approach may potentially form the basis of environmental advisory services.</p> <p>At the district level, regional Environmental Committee Protection staff will have direct oversight responsibility for monitoring project implementation.</p>
<p>Implementation</p>	
<p>The project document states that the IG in the</p>	<p>Completion of the action plan is a condition of project</p>

CEP is not yet fully component on financial management, and that the procurement risk is currently high. Whilst there is an action plan in place to improve this assurance should be provided to the sub-committee when this has been achieved. (UK)	effectiveness.
We feel, however, that the proposal is missing out on explaining which steps will be taken and which incentives will be provided to ensure that these “climate change adaptation and environmental appraisals” will not only be produced, but will actually be used in community level decision making, instead of conducting village planning business as usual, and would strongly recommend clarifying that further in the proposal. (Germany, Spain)	Only those investments that have clear linkages to the community adaptation and environmental appraisals and that address environmental (at village and jamoat-level), economic, and social feasibility will be financed. Villages will use a toolkit with best practices (e.g., those documented in the PPCR Phase 1 Assessment on SLM) to ensure that those investments selected are the most appropriate to address the climate risks identified in the jamoat-level assessments. (see pages 7 -8 of PAD)
We would therefore appreciate further clarification on who the “facilitating organisations” would be, in particular those facilitating the “climate change ... appraisals”, being a rather new and innovative approach. (Germany, Spain)	FOs will be contracted via competitive selection and selected according to criteria, including proven track record in participatory planning, resilience framework planning experience, among others.
Lessons learned	
Pleased proposal reflects lessons learned from a number of other projects and that it will ensure that results and lessons learned are disseminated to national and regional stakeholders. (UK)	Noted.
Safeguards	
Has there been social and political economy analysis of the possible impacts of the setting up of community groups, beyond just the risk of economic disenfranchisement? (UK)	Yes. This has been conducted separately by the Bank’s Governance Department, and the assessment will be re-evaluated periodically.
The PDO describes an Environmental Management Framework but doesn’t include a date for when this will be released and finalised? (UK)	The EMF was released to InfoShop on February 5, 2013.
Administrative Resources	
Please explain in more detail why additional implementation services resources are required,	Table 1 below provides the breakdown of preparation and implementation resources requested for this

<p>especially due to the fact that this is a blended project and GEF implementation services are also provided. (US)</p>	<p>project, including GEF and CIF resources.</p> <p>Now that the project is in its final preparation stages, we are able to provide up-to-date numbers on the use of funds for preparation. Approx. US\$ 334,000 has been used for preparation (mix of GEF and PPCF funds). The blending of the two sources of funds has helped to reduce some transaction costs and we will continue to use funds effectively to ensure adequate supervision of this project.</p> <p>Given the project's community driven approach, implementation oversight requirements will be rigorous. Due to the complex, field-intensive nature of this project and to meet the results monitoring and reporting requirements of both financing instruments, we anticipate that approx. US\$ 110,000 will be required for supervision per year of project implementation. This is based on average yearly supervision funds provided for projects in Tajikistan in the WB. The overall amount requested for MPIS also includes costs for mid-term review of the project and the implementation completion report.</p> <p>We are therefore requesting US\$ 150,000 over the original estimate for preparation/supervision of this project.</p> <p>The revised request for CIF MPIS is attached to the email request for consideration of the response to comments provided by SC members on the project.</p>
--	---

Table 1: Breakdown of costs of preparation/supervision services, including GEF resources and CIF MPIS

	Resources allocated for preparation and supervision	Expenses to date for preparation	Resources remaining for supervision
GEF	445,000	194,285	250,715
PPCR	550,000	139,979	410,021
Total	995,000	334,264	660,736