



COUNTRY PILOT PARTNERSHIPS ON SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

CACILM MULTICOUNTRY PARTNERSHIP FRAMEWORK

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

GEF Council Submission

AGENCY'S PROJECT ID: 2504

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: COUNTRY: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan

PROGRAM TITLE: Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multicountry Partnership Framework (CMPF)

LEAD CPP GEF AGENCY: Asian Development Bank

GEF Agencies: ADB, FAO, IFAD, UNDP, UNEP, WB

DURATION: 10 years

GEF FOCAL AREA: Land Degradation

GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM: OP 15, Sustainable Land Management

GEF-3 STRATEGIC PRIORITIES:

SLM-1: Targeted Capacity Building

SLM-2: Implementation of Innovative and Indigenous Sustainable Land Management Practices

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PRIORITIES:

SLM-1: Fostering System-wide Change and Removing Policy, Institutional, Technical, Capacity, and Financial Barriers

SLM-2: Demonstrating and Up-scaling Successful SLM Practices

SLM-3: Generating and Disseminating Knowledge on Current and Emerging Issues

SLM-4: Demonstrating Cross Focal-area Synergies and Integrated Ecosystem Approaches

ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: 1 July 2006

ESTIMATED WP ENTRY DATE: 15 JUNE 2006

PIPELINE ENTRY DATE: GEF approval 17 May 2004

IA/EA Fee: \$1,863,000 (9% of GEF-3 funding, including PDF-B)

FINANCING PLAN (US\$)	
<i>GEF Program Allocation</i>	
Project (GEF-3)	20,000,000
Project (GEF-4)	40,000,000
Project (GEF-5)	40,000,000
PDF-B	700,000
<i>Subtotal GEF</i>	100,700,000
<i>Cofinancing (estimated)</i>	
GEF -3 (Confirmed):	
GEF Agency (ADB)	100,950,000
GEF Agency (IFAD)	400,000
GEF Agency (UNDP)	6,626,000
GEF Agency (FAO)	300,000
CAC Governments	23,997,000
Bilateral (GTZ)	1,700,000
GM	50,000
Others (ICARDA)	800,000
GEF-4 (Estimated)	819,800,000
GEF-5 (Estimated)	322,651,000
<i>Subtotal Cofinancing:</i>	1,277,274,000
<i>Total Program Financing:</i>	1,377,974,000

CONTRIBUTION TO KEY INDICATORS OF THE BUSINESS PLAN:

Area of land protected from land degradation in five countries is estimated to be 9,840,000 hectares (ha) over the ten-year program. Rehabilitation of degraded and threatened lands and creation of conditions for sustainability will occur on approximately 2,840,000 ha. Additional area benefiting from sustainable land management improvements by replication and strengthening of sustainable land management practices at all levels is estimated be 7,000,000 ha.

RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENTS:

(Enter Name, Position, Ministry)

Date: (Month, Day, Year)

Kazakhstan Mr. Kamaltin Mukhamedjanov Minister of Environmental Protection GEF Focal Point	March 23, 2006
Mr. Bulat Bekniyazov Ministry of Environmental Protection UNCCD Focal Point and Chairman of Working Group	March 17, 2006
Kyrgyz Republic	
Mr. Omor Rustembekov Ministry of Ecology and Emergency Situations GEF Focal Point	March 10, 2006
Mr. Kubanychbek. Kulov Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources, and Processing Industry UNCCD Focal Point	March 10, 2006
Tajikistan	
Mr. Abduvohod Karimov Chairman, State Committee for Environmental Protection and Forestry GEF Focal Point	March 7, 2006
Dr. Davlatsho K. Gulmakhmadov Chairman, State Committee for Land Management UNCCD Focal Point and Chairman of Working Group	March 7, 2006
Turkmenistan	
Mr. Makhtumkuly Akmuradov Minister of Nature Protection GEF Focal Point	March 14, 2006
Dr. Muhamet Durikov UNCCD Focal Point	March 14, 2006
Uzbekistan	
Mr. Sergey Myagkov Deputy Director Uzbekistan Hydrometeorological Service GEF Focal Point	March 6, 2006
Dr. Zokhid Nazirov Uzbekistan Hydrometeorological Services UNCCD Focal Point and Co-Chairman of Working Group	March 6, 2006

Approved on behalf of ADB: This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for approval.

Name and Signature:



ExA Coordinator: David McCauley
Tel. and email: (63-2) 632-4161
dmccauley@adb.org
Date: April 28, 2006



Project Contact Person: Robert Everitt
Tel. and email: (63-2) 632-6130
reveritt@adb.org
Date: April 28, 2006

ADB CONTACTS

Robert Everitt, Senior Project Specialist (Natural Resources Management)
East and Central Asia Department, ADB
Telephone: +632 632 6130
Fax: +632 636 2301
Email: reveritt@adb.org

David McCauley, Senior Environment Economist/GEF Facilitator
Regional and Sustainable Development Department, ADB
Telephone +632 632 4161
Fax: +632 636 2381
Email: dmccauley@adb.org

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	– Asian Development Bank
CACILM	– Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management
CACs	– Central Asian countries
CGIAR	– Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
CMPF	– CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework
FAO	– Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	– Global Environment Facility
GM	– Global Mechanism of the UNCCD
GTZ	– German Agency for Technical Cooperation
ICARDA	– International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas
IFAD	– International Fund for Agricultural Development
LADA	– Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands
NGO	– nongovernment organization
NPF	– national programming framework
PDF	– Project Development Facility
PFU	– Project Facilitation Unit of the CGIAR
SDC	– Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SLIM	– sustainable land management
SLIMIS	– sustainable land management information system
SPA	– Strategic Partnership Agreement for UNCCD Implementation in the Central Asian Countries
UNCCD	– United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	– United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	– United Nations Environment Programme

I. PROJECT SUMMARY

A. Multicountry Partnership Framework

1. The overall goal of the Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multicountry Partnership Framework (CMPF) is the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land leading to the improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the environmental functions of these lands in the spirit of UNCCD. The CMPF has two major sets of activities: (i) implementation of the national programming frameworks (NPFs) for sustainable land management in each of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan; and (ii) multicountry activities to support the implementation of the work program under the CMPF and to build capacity in sustainable land management.
2. NPFs have been prepared in each Central Asian country to guide the implementation of sustainable land management (SLM) activities over a 10-year period. The NPFs: define and describe the problems of land degradation specific to each country; analyze the natural and human-made causes of land degradation in the unique historical and cultural contexts of each country; and present a prioritized program of projects, technical assistance, and related concept papers. Multicountry activities have been identified by the CACILM task force to take advantage of economies of scale and cost efficiency in support of CACILM's objectives. Anticipated multicountry functions to be performed include: (i) capacity building for mainstreaming SLM and ensuring integrated SLM planning and management, (ii) development of an SLM information system, (iii) SLM research, and (iv) knowledge management and information dissemination.
3. The CMPF is being submitted to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Council for approval of its overall programmatic approach. Over its 10-year planning horizon, the CMPF is anticipated to require \$100,700,000 in funding from three GEF replenishments: \$20,700,000 (GEF-3), \$40,000,000 (GEF-4), and \$40,000,000 (GEF-5). PDF-B funding of \$700,000 from GEF-3 resources has already been approved by the GEF Secretariat and utilized during the CMPF design phase. GEF-4 and GEF-5 allocations will be dependent on the level of GEF replenishment and development of the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF).
4. At this stage, approval is sought for \$20,000,000 in GEF-3 financing to support the first set of activities under the CMPF. This comprises an initial set of 10 projects (Table 1) approved by the CACILM task force (representing all five participating countries and their development cooperation partners). Full project documentation is provided for the CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework as a whole and the CMPF Support Project. The remaining nine projects are presented at the detailed concept stage to show the direction of the program and to indicate the degree of preparation and consensus already achieved. The projects cover all five CACs and will be implemented by ADB and UNDP as GEF agencies. Total confirmed cofinancing to complement the GEF-3 resources amounts to at least \$134,823,000. This resource envelope will cover the requirements of five full-size projects (FSPs) and five medium-size projects (MSPs).
5. Council approval is sought for: (i) the structure of the CMPF and its associated program of activities, (ii) the Multicountry Partnership Framework Support Project, and (iii) delegation of authority to the GEF CEO for approval of the four planned FSPs, which will be submitted subsequently when their preparation has been completed.

Table 1: CACILM Projects Planned for Financing from the GEF-3 Replenishment

Project	Country	Type	GEF Financing	Request to GEF Council
CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework Support	Multicountry	FSP submission	\$3,025,000	Approval for Work Program Inclusion
CACILM Multicountry Capacity Building	Multicountry	FSP concept	\$3,000,000	Delegation of approval to CEO as part of CACILM Program
Land Improvement	Uzbekistan	FSP Concept	\$3,000,000	Delegation of approval to CEO as part of CACILM Program
Integrated Agricultural Development and Land Improvement	Kyrgyz Republic	FSP concept	\$2,500,000	Delegation of approval to CEO as part of CACILM Program
Rural Development	Tajikistan	FSP concept	\$3,500,000	Delegation of approval to CEO as part of CACILM Program
Rangeland Ecosystem Management	Kazakhstan	MSP concept	\$1,000,000	Acknowledgement as part of CACILM Program (PDF-A request forthcoming)
Mountain Pasture Management in Susamir Valley, Kyrgyz Republic	Kyrgyz Republic	MSP concept	\$975,000	Acknowledgement as part of CACILM Program
Demonstrating Local Responses to Combating Land Degradation and Improving Sustainable Land Management in SW Tajikistan	Tajikistan	MSP concept	\$1,000,000	Acknowledgment as part of CACILM Program
Achieving Ecosystem Stability on the degraded land in Karakalpakstan and the Kyzylkum Desert	Uzbekistan	MSP concept	\$1,000,000	Acknowledgement as part of CACILM Program
Capacity Building and On-the-Ground Investments for Integrated and Sustainable Land Management	Turkmenistan	MSP concept	\$1,000,000	Acknowledgement as part of CACILM Program
TOTAL			\$20,000,000	

CACILM = Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management; CEO = Chief Executive Officer; FSP = full-size project; GEF = Global Environment facility; MSP = medium-size project; PDF = Project Development Fund.

6. A further submission to and similar request for approval by GEF Council will be made early in the GEF-4 Replenishment period for additional funding of up to \$40,000,000 in GEF financing, subject to the status of the GEF-4 replenishment and development of the RAF. As with the current request, this submission will be fully approved by the CACILM steering committee (successor to the current task force) and will include an updated work and financing plan as well as appropriate project documentation. An indicative list of projects has been included in the project document for the GEF Council's information. The list includes a number of projects that anticipate GEF financing in 2007 and 2008. To accommodate these and other projects under preparation, approval is requested for GEF-4 pipeline entry under the Land Degradation focal area of an additional \$40,000,000 for the CACILM program.

7. A third request for additional funding of up to \$40,000,000 during the GEF-5 replenishment period also is planned, subject to the status of the GEF-5 replenishment and development of the RAF. This submission also will be fully approved by the CACILM steering committee and include a further updated work and financing plan as well as appropriate project documentation.

8. The CMPF's goals and objectives are shared with many ongoing and completed GEF projects in Central Asia (see Table 2). These projects support the CMPF's outcomes and will contribute to the overall impact of the CACILM program. It should be noted that, at the national level, some of these projects have already been incorporated by the Central Asian countries into their NPFs. Such projects will be coordinated through the national coordination councils in each country to ensure synergy with CACILM and the NPFs. The CMPF also is consistent with and complementary to a range of regional and transboundary activities supported by GEF. CACILM is, by definition, a multicountry rather than regional program. CACILM will make use of a multicountry secretariat and steering committee to coordinate its work with related national and regional activities and build on existing linkages to further develop synergies.

Table 2: GEF Projects in Central Asia Addressing Land Degradation

Project Title	Coverage	GEF Agency	Type	GEF Support (\$)	Status*
A. Land Degradation					
1. Forest Protection and Reforestation	Kyrgyz Republic	IBRD	FSP	5,000,000	CEO Endorsed
2. Disaster Hazard Mitigation Project (DHMP) Support to the Implementation of the Regional	Kyrgyz Republic	IBRD	MSP	1,000,000	Approved CEO
3. Environmental Action Plan in Central Asia Sustainable Land Management in the High Pamir and Pamir-Alai Mountains – and Integrated and Transboundary Initiative in Central Asia (Tranches 1 and 2)	Regional (5 CACs)	UNEP	MSP	1,000,000	Approved
4. Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) Enabling Sustainable Dryland Management	Global (Uzb)	UNEP	FSP	6,650,000	PDF B CEO
5. Through Mobile Pastoral Custodianship	Global (Kyr)	UNDP	MSP	7,725,000	Endorsed CEO
Total – Land Degradation					22,375,000
B. Multifocal					
1. Drylands Management Project	Kazakhstan	IBRD	FSP	5,360,000	CEO Endorsed
2. National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Global Environmental Management	Kazakhstan	UNDP	EA	200,000	CEO Approved
3. National Capacity Needs Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Global Environmental Management	Kyrgyz Republic	UNDP	EA	195,000	Approved CEO
4. National Capacity Needs Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management (NCSA) Community Agriculture and Watershed	Tajikistan	UNDP	EA	199,000	Approved CEO
5. Management National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Global Environmental Management	Tajikistan	IBRD	FSP	4,500,000	Endorsed CEO
6. National Capacity Needs Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management	Turkmenistan	UNDP	EA	200,000	Approved CEO
7. National Capacity Needs Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management	Uzbekistan	UNDP	EA	200,000	Approved
Total – Multifocal					10,854,000

	Project Title	Coverage	GEF Agency	Type	GEF Support (\$)	Status*
C. Biodiversity						
1	Integrated Conservation of Priority Globally Significant Migratory Bird Wetland Habitat In-Situ Conservation of Kazakhstan's Mountain Agrobiodiversity	Kyrgyz Republic Kyrgyz Republic	UNDP	FSP	8,847,000	CEO CEO Endorsed
2					3,023,000	CEO Endorsed
3	Dashtidzhum Biodiversity Conservation	Tajikistan	IBRD	MSP	775,000	Approved
4	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development in the Gissar Mountains of Tajikistan	Tajikistan	UNDP	MSP	1,000,000	CEO Approved
	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Globally Significant Biological Diversity in Khazar Nature Reserve on the Caspian Sea Coast (Resubmission)	Turkmenistan	UNDP	FSP	1,429,000	Council Approved
6	Establishment of the Nuratau-Kyzylkum Biosphere Reserve as a Model for Biodiversity Conservation	Uzbekistan	UNDP	MSP	750,000	CEO Approved
7	Conservation of "Tugai Forest" and Strengthening Protected Areas System in the Amu Darya Delta of Karakalpakstan	Uzbekistan	UNDP	MSP	995,000	CEO Approved
8	In Situ/On Farm Conservation and Use of Agricultural Biodiversity (Horticultural Crops and Wild Fruit Species) in Central Asia	Regional (5 CACs)	UNEP	FSP	6,093,000	CEO Endorsed
9	Development of the Econet for Long-term Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Asia Ecoregions	Regional (5 CACs)	UNEP	MSP	775,000	CEO Approved
10	Central Asia Transboundary Biodiversity Project	Regional (Kyr/Kaz/Uzb)	IBRD	FSP	10,495,000	CEO Endorsed
11	Strengthening the Network of Training Centers for Protected Area Management through Demonstration of a Tested Approach	Regional (Kaz)	UNEP	MSP	1,000,000	CEO Approved
12	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Kazakhstan Sector of the Altai-Sayan Mountain Ecoregion	Kazakhstan	UNDP	FSP	2,421,000	Pipeline
Total – Biodiversity					37,603,000	
D. International Waters						
	Water and Environmental Management in the Aral Sea Basin	5 CACs	IBRD	FSP	12,525,000	Council Approved
Total – International Waters					12,525,000	

* According to latest data posted on GEF website.

B. Rationale

9. **Land Degradation in Central Asia.** Land degradation¹ is a serious economic, social, and environmental problem in the Central Asian countries (CACs) of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. It directly affects the livelihoods of nearly 20 million rural inhabitants by reducing the productivity of land resources and adversely affecting the stability, functions of, and services derived from natural systems. Agricultural yields are reported to have declined by 20–30% across the region since these countries achieved independence over a decade ago. Annual losses of agricultural production from salinization

¹ Land degradation is defined by GEF as "...any form of deterioration of the natural potential of land that affects ecosystem integrity either in terms of reducing its sustainable ecological productivity or in terms of its native biological richness and maintenance of resilience." Cited in GEF. 2003. *Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management (OP 15)*.

alone are estimated at \$2,000,000,000. The situation is equally serious from an environmental viewpoint. The CACs contain unique dryland, mountain and riparian ecosystems of importance to global biodiversity. These are being degraded and lost as rural populations become more desperate to sustain their livelihoods. Significant further progress in poverty reduction in the CACs will rely to a large extent on their ability to achieve growth in the agricultural sector—a major contributor to CAC economies—and, hence, on attaining sustainable land management (SLM). The anthropogenic causes of land degradation are multiple, complex, and varied across these countries, but they are largely attributable to the abuse and overexploitation of the natural resource base, particularly through inappropriate and unsustainable agricultural policies and practices, forest degradation and complications derived from natural disasters.

10. Consistent with the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), desertification is taken to mean “degradation of lands in arid, semi-arid and dry subhumid regions as a result of the effect of different factors, including climatic variations and human activity.” Dynamic interplay of anthropogenic factors with climatic variability is driving land degradation processes on the fragile drylands of Central Asia. Previously sustainable traditional agricultural practices have become less viable due to changing economic and political circumstances, including population growth and a trend toward more settled communities. It is now generally acknowledged that land and water management practices, which among other things have failed to consider climatic variation, are among the primary causes of land degradation in Central Asia. By definition, drylands have limited freshwater supplies, and climate variability also has an important but often subtle influence on desertification processes through its impact on the hydrological cycle, soils, and vegetation. In addition to seasonal variability of precipitation in Central Asia, wide fluctuations occur over years and decades, frequently leading to drought.

11. The principal forms of land degradation currently experienced across the CACs include: (i) erosion, salinization, and water logging; (ii) deteriorating fertility of pastureland; (iii) decrease in fertility of the arable drylands of the steppes; (iv) decreased area and productivity of forests; (v) on-site and off-site impacts of mining operations; (vi) exacerbated risks from landslides and flooding due to poor watershed management; (vii) reduced stability and functioning of desert, mountain, wetland, and riparian ecosystems; and (viii) contaminated sites from resource extraction and nuclear testing operations.

12. The root causes of the anthropogenic land degradation problems in all the CACs can be traced to three barriers to sustainable land management. The first include inappropriate agricultural and water policies, regulations, and incentives. These relate to land tenure, restrictions on crop choices and marketing, and access to factors of production. Second, governments are unable to adopt and implement sustainable land management practices due to their relatively weak capacity to formulate and monitor integrated sustainable land-use development initiatives at the central and local levels. Third, a host of environmental problems—forest loss and degradation, water pollution in its many forms, and weak natural resource management and biodiversity conservation in general—result from environmental laws across the CACs that suffer from inadequacy, inconsistency, and weak implementation.

13. **CAC and GEF Responses.** The CACs have responded to land degradation problems by acceding to or ratifying the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), preparing UNCCD national action plans or programs (NAPs), designing a Sub-regional Action Programme for Central Asian Countries on Combating Desertification and Drought (SRAP-CD) as well as preparing national environmental action plans (NEAPs) and a regional environmental

action plan (REAP) that give prominent attention to drought and desertification. However, for various reasons these initiatives have not had the desired impact.

14. NAPs were generally well prepared by interagency groups of specialists. They contain a wealth of data and include limited analyses of the nature and scale of desertification processes, their geographic characteristics, and their natural and anthropogenic causes and consequences. However, they are weaker on policy and programmatic content, lacked a participatory approach in their formulation, and are not linked to national planning and budgeting. SRAP-CD is a means to elevate the importance of the problem within each country as well as to identify transboundary issues and take advantage of multicountry synergies, while the NEAPs and REAP have similar status in the broader environment field. Implementation of NAPs has been slow because of weak institutions, insufficient capacity, and—because governments have allocated resources to other urgent development priorities—a lack of funds. This situation prevented the NAPs and SRAP-CD from making headway.

15. The Global Environment Facility has been actively addressing problems of land degradation in the CACs. GEF's total portfolio in the region to date is \$159,121,000 covering 60 activities. In collaboration with its implementing agencies, GEF has invested a total of \$83,357,000 in 26 projects, \$33,700,000 of which is for national projects and \$49,657,000 for regional/global² projects. There are 12 projects under the biodiversity (BD) focal area, 6 projects under land degradation (LD) and 7 projects under the multifocal area (MFA). Further resources were devoted to the regional Aral Sea Basin Management Project under the international waters (IW) focal area (Table 2). The portfolio of GEF projects in Central Asia has provided a foundation for the design of the CACILM framework and its proposed interventions. The linkages between related GEF projects and CACILM are discussed in the section on Core Commitments and Linkages (para. 74 and Table 6).

16. To improve the impact of its investments in the CACs, GEF felt that a multicountry pilot partnership under GEF Country Pilot Partnerships (CPP) program was desirable. CACILM entered the GEF pipeline as a multicountry CPP under the LD focal area in May 2004, and a PDF-B grant to develop the CACILM program was approved in February 2005.

17. The combination of the CPP concept—which caters to countries' needs in a holistic way over an extended time frame needed to reverse land degradation—with a partnership of virtually all the major development cooperation partners active in Central Asia offers the best chance for the CACs to resolve their land degradation problems in a coordinated manner that will result in extensive global environmental benefits.

18. **CACILM Partnership.** CACILM is a partnership of CACs and development cooperation partners dedicated to combating land degradation and improving rural livelihoods in the five countries of Central Asia. The main partners from the countries are the UNCCD Working Groups on Partnership Development for UNCCD Implementation (hereafter referred to as national working groups) and the UNCCD national focal points. The development cooperation partners include the members of the Strategic Partnership Agreement for UNCCD Implementation in the Central Asian Countries (SPA), which was originally formed among the Global Mechanism (GM), Asian Development Bank (ADB), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and CCD Project of the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ). The membership has since expanded to include the International Center for Agricultural Research on Dry Areas (ICARDA), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Swiss Agency

² Not all regional/global funds cited were fully devoted to the CACs, so this overstates the financial commitment.

for Development and Cooperation (SDC), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The World Bank has also applied to join. The design and development of CACILM have been directed by the CACILM task force, which includes all members of the Partnership plus other interested international organizations.

19. The underlying orientation of the CACILM approach is to maintain substantive country ownership and drivenness, expand and deepen stakeholder participation, and facilitate an action-oriented and transparent dialogue with development partner agencies. The keys to achieving this are the national working groups, which, through their membership, broaden the participation of all stakeholders in CACILM. Their role includes guiding consultant experts and endorsing their reports, coordinating various workshops and meetings, and facilitating government approvals. Under CACILM, the national working groups were directly responsible for preparation of the NPFS.

20. The CACILM Partnership, with GEF assistance and ADB serving as lead GEF agency, worked together during CACILM's development to produce four outputs: (i) NPFS for each country, including a prioritized program of projects and technical assistance and related concept papers; (ii) the CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework (CMPF) and supporting GEF documentation, prepared as a multicountry CPP in accordance with GEF guidelines on the programmatic approach (this document); (iii) mechanisms for consultation and coordination within and among countries that enhance the participation of stakeholders, provide efficient and effective mechanisms for the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of CACILM, and enhance harmonization of funding agencies; and (iv) increased awareness and commitments by national stakeholders and development cooperation partners.

21. *National Programming Frameworks.* The NPFSs broaden, deepen, and operationalize the UNCCD NAPs and SRAPCD and were developed through a process of review, updating, and problem analysis. A series of multistakeholder meetings was held in each country to develop the NPFSs in a participatory manner. The NPFSs were then reviewed at national workshops in September–October 2005 and February–March 2006. The NPFSs: define and describe the problems of land degradation specific to each country; analyze the natural and human-made causes of land degradation in the unique historical and cultural contexts of each country; present a prioritized program of projects and technical assistance and related concept papers; and provide mechanisms for consultation and coordination at national and multicountry levels that will enhance participation of stakeholders and increase awareness and commitments by national and development cooperation partner stakeholders.

22. *CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework.* The CMPF—this document—was prepared under the direction of the CACILM task force. A draft outline of the CMPF was presented to the Almaty CACILM Task Force Meeting in June 2005 and was approved at the Tashkent CACILM Task Force Meeting in November 2005. The first draft was prepared and circulated to the task force in early February 2006 and reviewed at the Bishkek Task Force Meeting later that month. The Bishkek CACILM Task Force Meeting approved the list of CACILM projects to be funded in part from the resources pipelined under GEF-3, and it provided guidance for further revision and preparation of the CMPF documentation. The CMPF guides the activities of the CACILM partnership and encompasses: (i) support for implementation of the NPFSs, (ii) multicountry activities, and (iii) program coordination.

23. *Mechanisms for Consultation and Coordination.* Efficient and effective mechanisms for national and multicountry consultation and coordination were developed through a series of multicountry stakeholder workshops in each country to develop, review, and approve the NPFSs.

Future consultation at the multicountry level will occur through the CACILM steering committee, which will convene multicountry meetings. In addition, consultation and coordination will occur through the implementation of multicountry activities. Finally, appropriate and effective arrangements for improved coordination and harmonization of development cooperation partners at the country level are a basic tenet of the CMPF, and strong efforts through regular consultations, teleconferences, and workshops are features of its development.

24. *Increased Awareness and Commitments.* CACILM has increased awareness of the need for a coordinated approach to combating land degradation and increased commitments by national stakeholders and development cooperation partners to sustainable land management (SLM) in the CACs. This has been accomplished mainly through frequent national consultations and meetings with key stakeholders to disseminate information and discuss the CMPF concept, and to work out the responsibilities of national stakeholders and development cooperation partners. The NPFs are one visible result. Dialogue during multicountry workshops and CACILM task force meetings has sought increasing commitment by development cooperation partners to support the NPFs and their commitment to programming and financing.

C. Objectives and Outcomes

25. The overall objective of the CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework is the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of UNCCD.

26. This objective is to be achieved largely through the successful implementation of national programs of the CACs that were developed using a framework formulated under CACILM. The CMPF supports the implementation of the NPFs in a way that ensures comprehensive and integrated approaches to SLM in the region.

27. The anticipated outcomes of the 10-year program under the CMPF are:

- (i) favorable environment for SLM investments in CACs, supported by SLM mainstreaming and improvements in policies, regulations, and land administration;
- (ii) improved capacity of the institutions in the CACs to adopt integrated land-use planning and management;
- (iii) rehabilitation and improved productivity of selected lands, thereby leading to improved livelihoods, foreign exchange earnings, and food security, and providing indirect protection to threatened ecosystems;
- (iv) enhanced protection of ecosystem integrity and landscapes;
- (v) broader involvement of civil society and other stakeholders in SLM in the CACs; and
- (vi) sustained and harmonized commitments of financial and human resources through mainstreaming of SLM in development cooperation partner programs and national budgets of the CACs.

28. Stemming desertification and restoration of vegetation on denuded and degraded areas with appropriate species should reduce further habitat loss, protect ecosystems and landscapes, and improve biodiversity and carbon sequestration. The increased vegetative cover and the adoption of more sustainable agricultural and land management practices—e.g., low tillage agriculture—should help stabilize soils, reduce erosion, improve water retention, reduce

the increasing trend toward desertification, and increase the capture and storage of carbon. Improved management of irrigated lands and lessened soil erosion should improve the quality and in-stream flows of transboundary rivers, especially those of the Aral Sea Basin.

29. CACILM recognizes that water and irrigation management is part and parcel of sustainable land management. The project design incorporates efforts to overcome barriers to SLM derived from inappropriate policies governing land use, irrigation, drainage and other dimensions of water management. These are captured in the NPFs in proposed policy reforms under the subprogram for strengthening the enabling environment.

30. In terms of global environment benefits, the sustainable land-use practices that will result from policy and institutional strengthening, coupled with on-the-ground investments under the GEF scenario, will not only result in a reversal land degradation in targeted locations in accordance with the goals of the UNCCD, but also will improve the conservation of biodiversity, in accordance with the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, achieve increased carbon sequestration or reduction in carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and contribute to improved management of international waters.

31. The logical framework for the CMPF further articulates the objectives and outcomes of the partnership (Annex A).

D. Activities

32. The CMPF is structured around two basic sets of activities that will take place over a 10-year period: (i) implementation of the NPFs, and (ii) multicountry activities, as presented in the program's logical framework. During the GEF-3 replenishment, eight projects are anticipated to be initiated from the NPFs with two multicountry activities to take place. These 10 items have been agreed on by all cooperating partners and approved by the CACILM task force. The eight NPF-based projects cover priority problem areas in the respective CACs: rangeland ecosystem management in Kazakhstan; integrated agricultural development and mountain pasture management in the Kyrgyz Republic; demonstrating local responses to land degradation in Tajikistan; a set of capacity building and on-the-ground projects toward SLM in Turkmenistan, and achieving ecosystem stability in degraded lands around the former Aral Sea in Uzbekistan.

33. Two projects at the multicountry level also are central to a successful outcome of the overall CMPF programmatic approach. These are the CMPF Support Project and the Multicountry Capacity Building (MCB) Project. The CMPF Support Project will provide essential support to NPF implementation through: (i) preparation and operation of a sustainable land management information system, (ii) oversight or knowledge management and dissemination activities, and (iii) sustainable land management research. In addition, it will support coordination at the multicountry and national levels. Capacity building, while a core activity of the NPFs at the national level, is considered sufficiently important to warrant focused attention through a separate multicountry project. The MCB Project will comprise three sets of activities: (i) support to national capacity building activities, (ii) multicountry training activities, and (iii) land-user and community mobilization.

1. National Activities

34. Most of the anticipated activities under CACILM comprise the national and local interventions called for in the NPFs. Specific projects have been identified and agreed for the first stage of work by all cooperating partners and fall under nine program areas:

capacity building for strengthening the enabling environment,
capacity building for integrated land-use planning and management,
sustainable agriculture – rainfed lands,
sustainable agriculture – irrigated lands,
sustainable forest and woodland management,
sustainable pastureland management,
integrated resource management,
protected area management and biodiversity conservation, and
remediation in the region of the former Aral Sea.

35. Each of the five NPFs includes a review of the major land degradation problems facing the country and a recommended program of action to address them. Briefly, they may be summarized as follows:

- **Kazakhstan.** The NPF identifies the causes of land degradation to be: weak national policies, legal and institutional frameworks; lack of economic incentives; insufficient knowledge and capacity of immediate land users and responsible officials; and weak monitoring and land management-related research. The activities comprise projects designed to: remedy policy and institutional weaknesses and ensure that SLM is integrated into government policy and land-use planning and practice in a participatory manner; create sustainable incomes for local land users and those in processing industries; contribute to the country's welfare, including the prevention of natural disasters; and provide environmental benefits of domestic and global importance.
- **Kyrgyz Republic.** As well as a weak policy and institutional framework, inadequate management capacity, and lack of resources, the NPF notes specific factors contributing to degradation, such as: weak research infrastructure and extension services; widespread use of monoculture without crop rotation; inadequate access to markets and credit, and lack of a market-based incentive framework for land husbandry. Priority activities, therefore, are to: strengthen policy, legislative, and institutional frameworks aimed at creating an enabling environment for SLM, including at the local level; build the capacity of the relevant agencies; and improve land, water, and natural resource management through project investments, within the framework of local programs of social and economic development, and national strategies for poverty reduction and growth.
- **Tajikistan.** The NPF focuses on the need to pursue and deepen the land reform process, which is seen as the primary means of attaining SLM. The program's activities will focus on: improving the capacity of national institutions to integrate SLM considerations into their operations and budgets and their ability to promote and implement investments in SLM; rehabilitation and enhancement of the productivity of selected lands to improve livelihoods while giving direct and indirect protection to ecosystems; and widening the support to SLM to include service providers and civil society.
- **Turkmenistan.** The NPF identifies two categories of problems related to land degradation: economic policies, legislative acts, administrative regulations, institutional arrangements, and land-use rights that are still evolving unevenly from those in place during the Soviet period; and lack of data, experience, and consensus on how to modernize agricultural infrastructure to improve water-use

efficiency, or to supervise use of the fragile rangelands for livestock. The major program activities are to: improve the water-use efficiency of agricultural systems in various integrated ways on a pilot basis to demonstrate the benefits that will justify investment and the process of change required to achieve a more sustainable system of land use; and build national institutional capacity to mainstream SLM and to improve the incentives for land and water users to manage these resources sustainably.

- **Uzbekistan.** The major impacts of environmental deterioration, mainly due to land degradation, are summarized in the NPF as: decreased productivity of agricultural crops and a reduction of areas under crops; decreased efficiency of animal industries and fisheries in connection with ecosystem disruption; deterioration of the quality of foodstuffs as a result of the pollution of water and soil; and increased levels of disease of the population, especially from poor water quality and among women of child-bearing age. The program seeks to combat land degradation through the strengthening and mainstreaming of SLM among all land management stakeholders. The activities focus on: building strong institutional and human resource capacity in SLM; establishing a strong policy, regulatory, and economic incentive framework; improving the ecological viability of degraded ecosystems whether agricultural land, pasturelands, forests or critical areas, such as the Aral Sea, with resultant local and global benefits; and increasing the economic productivity of land and enhancing the livelihoods of populations directly dependant on the land.

36. The CACILM partnership has reviewed the NPFs and, with the full consultation of the CACs, has chosen an initial set of high priority national projects eligible for GEF financing to recommend for GEF support from the GEF-3 replenishment. In addition to the significant cofinancing identified for these projects, resources also have been mobilized for a number of other complementary project activities in the NPFs, which will not seek GEF support. The national level projects proposed for GEF support are summarized below:

- **Rangeland Ecosystem Management, Kazakhstan.** The overall goal of the project is to lay the foundation of sustainable pastureland management to prevent further degradation of land resources, to create conditions for restoration of earlier degraded lands, and to improve wellbeing of local population. The main idea of the project is to develop and introduce replicable modalities of mobile grazing, various approaches to conservation, and sustainable use of pasturelands in different climatic, economic and social conditions of communities. The project will make use of other relevant local initiatives being implemented in the pilot region as well as results and lessons learned of projects implemented in other areas of the country.
- **Integrated Agricultural Development and Land Improvement, Kyrgyz Republic.** The expected impact of the proposed project is to increase the incomes of farmers in three regions. The outcome will be an increase in productivity and profitability of farms and nonfarm enterprises within a sustainable land management framework. The project will help to improve the coordination of development activities, efficient use of resources, and effective implementation and monitoring of development activities; generate economies of scale for marketing and processing activities; more effectively stimulate and

encourage private sector development through farmers' groups, cooperatives, and private companies; and provide a more dynamic environment for piloting and implementing policy, legislation and regulations, and institutional mechanisms.

- **Mountain Pasture Management in Susamir Valley, Kyrgyz Republic.** The goal of this project is to improve local livelihoods and functional integrity of mountain ecosystems by introducing and testing sustainable pasture management practice in the highland pastures by assisting the Department of Pasture Management and local land users to design and implement an appropriate pasture regime. The project will result not only in an effective pasture management mechanism in the target area, but also in strengthened national institutional network capacities to play a key role in sustainable land management and its nationwide promotion and development; and building capacities of local communities via appropriate training, and introduction of new forms of self- development organization and marketing.
- **Rural Development, Tajikistan.** The project expects to increase the scope and depth of economic opportunities for farm and non-farm rural residents in five contiguous districts (*raions*) by increasing the productivity of farms and non-farm enterprises within a sustainable land management framework. The following outputs are envisaged: (i) implementation of policy and institutional reforms; (ii) strengthened capacity of districts governments and village associations in support of the government's decentralization efforts; (iii) farm and enterprise development to improve input supply, extension, machinery services, marketing and processing; (iv) adoption of improved land management techniques, including pilot demonstrations on environmental improvements in micro catchments; (v) establishment of a community-based development fund; and (vi) establishment of project management systems.
- **Demonstrating Local Responses to Combating Land Degradation and Improving Sustainable Land Management in SW Tajikistan.** The overall goal of the project is to contribute to improving the sustainability of arid climate irrigation land management in Tajikistan in order to safeguard the livelihoods and economic well-being of rural populations and the functional integrity of national ecosystems. The objective is to demonstrate the potential to implement replicable SLM initiatives at the local level and to build the capacity of local structure to do this. The outcomes are expected to be: (i) increased awareness at all levels within the project area of land degradation and unsustainable land management issues, and (ii) demonstrated appropriate and replicable local-level initiatives for improving sustainability of land and water management.
- **Capacity Building and On-the-ground Investments for Integrated and Sustainable Land Management, Turkmenistan.** This project will create an enabling environment for the integration of SLM principles into the sectoral and nationwide development policies and strategies. At the local level the project will contribute to increased livelihood standards in the three pilot areas through improved management of land resources. Capacity building for participatory land-use planning and management in three agro-ecological zones will be a key element in order to overcome the existing gap between the decision-making process and the needs of farmers. The results are expected to be: (i) an increased number of land users who utilize the results of technical and scientific

support for improved land management, and the acceptance and active support of land-use plans by local stakeholders, local administration, and decision makers with regard to further investments in sustainable land management; and (ii) increase of the capacity of land users for sustainable land management.

- **Achieving Ecosystem Stability on the Exposed Aral Seabed and the Kyzylkum Desert, Uzbekistan.** The project goal is to mitigate the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the structure and functional integrity of ecosystems through sustainable land management practices as a contribution to improving people's livelihoods and economic wellbeing. The outcomes are expected to be: (i) sustainable land management through the stabilization of loose sand by vegetative cover and through assisting local people to stop over-stressing land by overcoming poverty and providing them with choices as well as greater awareness and information; and (ii) a revival of traditional ways of resource management and sound government policies and planning for integrated land-use planning and management to guide local officials and community leaders.
- **Land Improvement, Uzbekistan.** The objective of this project is to arrest and reverse land degradation and improve the livelihood of farmer households in the project area through the adoption of sustainable land management practices on a significant scale and in a manner that makes it possible for project benefits to accrue beyond the immediate project area. The project's expected results are (i) a lasting improvement of land productivity on some 162,300 ha in Bukhara, Navoi, and Kashkadarya provinces, and (ii) restoration of normal ecological functioning of these lands resulting in local and wider environmental benefits.

2. Multicountry Activities

37. In addition to national and local actions, certain multicountry level activities also have been identified by the CACILM task force as appropriate to take advantage of economies of scale and cost efficiency in support of CACILM's objectives. Anticipated multicountry functions to be performed include: (i) capacity building for mainstreaming SLM and ensuring integrated SLM planning and management; (ii) development of an SLM information system; (iii) SLM research; (iv) knowledge management and information dissemination; and (v) program coordination. The main elements of the first four of these functions are summarized below.

38. **Capacity Building.** NPFs have established a need for all five CACs to acquire sufficient capacity to mainstream SLM and do it well, to tackle the variety of legal, regulatory, and policy preconditions of SLM. Capacity building is also needed to make land management an integrated endeavor in which different disciplines, institutions, and stakeholders have a contribution to make. These proposed capacity building activities need to be better integrated into single set of activities in each country. However, it must be recognized that in many cases countries are proposing similar types of activities that would benefit from a common approach at the multicountry level. In addition, there are specific training activities that are best implemented at the multicountry level. These factors combined with the cost effectiveness of administering a single project, argue for a multicountry capacity building project.

39. **Sustainable Land Management Information System.** All NPFs highlight a poor state of land degradation monitoring and information. These weaknesses are widely recognized by both the scientific and land management communities in the CACs. But proposals for improving

this state of affairs have been largely uncoordinated, often driven by equipment-related concerns, and lacking a unified vision of SLM monitoring requirements. To counter the lack of coordination, CACILM proposes to develop a sustainable land management information system (SLMIS) to be managed and administered at the multicountry level, with implementation at the national level taking account of each country's capacity and specific needs. A common set of indicators will be developed and monitored in each country. Ultimately, the system will be used for mutually beneficial collaboration among the CACs toward reduction of agricultural land degradation.

40. Sustainable Land Management Research. The adoption of SLM strategies and programs needs to be supported by demand-driven research as well as dissemination of the research results to target audiences in all CACs. CACILM's analytical agenda is directed at filling gaps in knowledge, which will (i) help to understand better the policy and institutional failures that drive land degradation, and (ii) help design innovative SLM practices and technologies. It is anticipated that the multicountry SLM research program for CACILM will be implemented through existing national centers to ensure that information on best practices and success stories can be made available widely to land users and policy makers in each country. It also will be essential for the research component to make suitable arrangements with ongoing SLM projects for a rapid transfer of the results to CACILM partners.

41. Knowledge Management and Information Dissemination. In the course of the 10 years needed to implement the NPFs, the CACILM program will generate a number of lessons and develop many knowledge products. CACILM proposes to organize knowledge management and dissemination activities at the multicountry level. A knowledge management plan will be developed, which will include the overall plan for stakeholder-oriented knowledge generation, capture, storage, and exchange. A bilingual (Russian and English) website will be developed as the electronic platform for knowledge management. While the administrative services will be provided at the multicountry level, these will be developed in close cooperation with the national secretariats and include national modules. In addition to capturing knowledge products and lessons learned from implementation of the activities under the NPFs and multicountry activities, this component also will include separate commissioned knowledge products.

42. To accomplish these functions, as well as overall program coordination (see below), two multicountry projects are included in the package for financing from the GEF-3 replenishment with the CMPF support project proposed for Council approval along with the overall CACILM program framework.

- **CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework Support.** This project is intended to provide multicountry coordination of the CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework (CMPF) so that national program implementation ensures a comprehensive and integrated approach to sustainable land management across the CACs—as well a series of multicountry activities intended to improve the ability of institutions in the CACs to adopt integrated land-use planning and management. The overall objective is the same as that for the CMPF, which is the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productivity of land in the CACs, leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources, while preserving the environmental functions of these lands. Apart from enhanced coordination, project outputs will include: a target-oriented and user-friendly sustainable land management information system designed, developed, and operated; a knowledge management plan developed, and knowledge products disseminated;

and a sustainable land management research program designed and implemented.

- **CACILM Multicountry Capacity Building Project.** The objective of the project is to help overcome the barriers to SLM that are related to current capacity shortcoming and, in this way, contribute to the principal goal of the NPFs, to improve the incomes and livelihoods of rural populations through activities that reverse the trend of land degradation, and generate broad environmental benefits. The project will contribute to two outcomes: a favorable environment for SLM investments supported by SLM mainstreaming, and policy, regulatory, and land administration improvements; and (ii) improved capacity of the institutions in the CACs for integrated land-use planning and management.

3. Coordination

43. To ensure effective coordination of all CMPF activities, a CACILM steering committee, supported by its secretariat (and drawing resources from the CMPF Support Project) will manage the overall implementation of the CACILM program and coordinate among the five CACs, GEF agencies, bilateral agencies, and other participating international organizations. At the national level, five national coordination councils for sustainable land management, supported by national secretariats, will manage implementation of projects and activities mandated by the NPF. These multicountry and national-level institutional mechanisms are described below in Section V-C on Program Implementation Arrangements.

E. Key Indicators, Assumptions, and Risks

44. The indicators of program performance include both qualitative—such as presence or absence of appropriate policy—and quantitative measures, such as hectares or percentage of land managed sustainably or hydrological conditions.

45. Commitment of governments will be shown by recognition of the NPFs in national development or poverty reduction policies by SLM-related activities incorporated into national development planning and budgeting and by the establishment of policy frameworks for SLM across different classes of land. Development cooperation partner commitment will be evident in the resources provided and length of commitment to the program.

46. With regard to monitoring the results of interventions, indicators will include: reductions in proportions of different classes of degraded land; percentage gains in productivity in different land classes; improved watershed and transboundary river conditions; and increased area of forest cover and biodiversity conservation areas. Related indicators include percentage increases in trained government personnel and the extent of integrated land-use planning in relevant public investment projects.

47. Public participation will be measured by changes in the number of private service providers, by the amount of household managed land, by the funds devoted to NGO involvement as facilitators of program implementation and by the proportion of women represented in local bodies implementing SLM interventions.

48. Several key assumptions have been made in preparing the CACILM program. These include the following considerations:

- *Commitment*—of central and local governments to land reform, a coordinated approach to land management, and improved governance, and of donors to continue to place high priority on sustainable land management in the CACs beyond their normal planning cycles;
- *Land reform*—that it will continue and enable productivity improvement and that enough land will be made available to private land holders to enable the creation of SLM incentives;
- *SLM interventions*—that anthropogenic problems are the main cause of land degradation and that SLM interventions will work and be transferable;
- *Protection of ecosystems*—that the SLM interventions will allow increases in the area of lands in protected status and that ecosystems will respond to management interventions; and
- *Public participation*—that ongoing reforms and SLM interventions will provide wide public benefit and private profitability.

49. Further detail regarding indicators, assumptions, and risks is provided in the CACILM multicountry logical framework (Annex A).

II. COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

A. Country Eligibility

50. All five CACs are GEF-eligible. They have ratified the UNCCD and have designated focal points for national UNCCD implementation.

B. Country Drivenness

51. The governments of the CACs are all well aware of the extent of their land degradation problems and the benefits that would accrue if they can be solved. In recognition of these challenges, all five countries have prepared national UNCCD action plans or programs to prioritize and guide interventions to address land degradation. National working groups for UNCCD implementation have been established in each country, and these UNCCD working groups prepared the NPFs. All the CACs recognize the importance of multicountry activities to support and synergize their national programs.

52. Three multicountry workshops were held to bring together key sectoral interests and civil society representatives from each country to ensure that the NPFs reflect a participatory approach to addressing land degradation problems and that the views of all relevant sectors were taken into account. Draft NPFs were reviewed at national workshops in September–October 2005 and February–March 2006.

53. Further evidence of country drivenness is seen in the positive results of the stakeholder consultations held by SPA members prior to a multicountry workshop in 2004. The workshop itself reached a consensus on the vision of a joint initiative to combat land degradation (i.e., CACILM) and the necessary steps to move the process forward. In total, 70 participants from the CACs took part in the meeting, with country delegations including diverse government and civil society representation. SPA members and other development cooperation partners and international organizations also attended and have further expanded participation through their country and regional stakeholder networks.

54. Land degradation is also prominent in steps being taken by the CACs in addressing broader environmental concerns. All the countries have national environmental plans/programs and have subscribed to a Regional Environmental Action Plan that includes transboundary land degradation as one of its five program areas. Environmental concerns are also increasingly included in national poverty reduction strategies.

III. PROGRAM AND POLICY CONFORMITY

A. Fit to GEF Operational Program and Strategic Priority

55. During development of the NPFs, care was taken to ensure consistency with the GEF Operational Strategy, with Operational Program 15 Sustainable Land Management under the focal area of Land Degradation (OP15), and the strategic priorities in the GEF-3 replenishment period of targeted capacity building and implementation of innovative and indigenous SLM practices. Although the strategic objectives of GEF-4—fostering system-wide change and removing policy, institutional, technical, capacity, and financial barriers to SLM; demonstrating and up-scaling successful SLM practices for the control and prevention of desertification and deforestation; generating and disseminating knowledge addressing current and emerging issues in SLM; and demonstrating cross focal-area synergies and integrated ecosystem approaches to watershed-based sustainable land management—were developed only recently, the CACILM approach is consistent with these objectives. CACILM is aimed at removing the major SLM barriers, devising innovative practices for SLM, disseminating relevant knowledge, and providing benefits across several GEF focal areas. It is expected that integrated ecosystem approaches will be adopted in the course of developing SLM practices because the ecosystem approach is now recognized as essential component of sustainable development—land degradation itself is defined by GEF OP 15 as a loss of ecosystem integrity. The individual project submissions will similarly align with GEF-3 and GEF-4 strategic priorities. The framework also allows and encourages the submission of projects in other GEF focal areas as long as the fit with the framework objectives is presented. The programming framework allows the countries to plan GEF initiatives strategically in the context of natural resources management.

56. The NPFs are also consistent with GEF guidance on application of a programmatic approach as contained in relevant GEF documents (*The Programmatic Approach: Current Understandings*; 12 April 2001, GEF/C.17.Inf.11: *Draft Discussion Note on the Proposed Pilot Country Partnership on Sustainable Land Management*, 18 November 2003, GEF country-partnership 11-17-03.doc; *Ensuring that the CPPs Work*; 3 March 2005, GEF Memorandum to Land Degradation Task Force).

57. The CACs' acceptance of the GEF programmatic approach has been demonstrated through their commitments of human and financial resources to fully participating in the CACILM PDF-B design phase, the NPFs, and this multicountry partnership framework.

B. Sustainability

58. The emphasis on policy, legislative, and institutional reforms to address the root causes of land degradation, the anticipated investments in institutional strengthening, and the investment in integrated approaches to land management are specifically designed to achieve sustainable progress in addressing land degradation problems in the CACs. In particular, it is expected that the adoption of more comprehensive and integrated approaches to addressing land degradation will result in significant local and national benefits that will provide additional

incentives to government, other stakeholders, and development cooperation partners to sustain activities. The long-term perspective of the 10-year program, the already high country ownership of CACILM, and the increasing interest and commitment of development cooperation partners provide a strong foundation for the achievement and sustainability of significant improvements in both land management and human welfare in the CACs. Over the longer term, with the progressive mainstreaming of SLM into the national policy, planning, and budgetary systems, there should be a diminishing need for GEF and other external resources.

59. To ensure institutional sustainability at the national level, emphasis will be placed on working with and strengthening existing institutions. All activities will be developed in consultation with the CACILM national coordination councils in each country and implemented in conjunction with the CACILM national secretariats. To ensure sustainability at the multicountry level, capacity building activities will encourage the development of existing networks for knowledge exchange, research, training and policy dialogue. The multicountry capacity building project will be overseen by the CACILM steering committee and administered by the CACILM multicountry secretariat.

60. To achieve social sustainability, the CACILM will emphasize the early and continuous involvement of key stakeholders in project preparation and implementation, including policy makers, local public officials and community leaders, farmers, their associations, and NGOs. Such involvement will create a sense of ownership and contribute to social sustainability.

C. Replicability

61. CACILM was developed with built-in means to maximize replicability, including the scaling-up of piloted good practices in SLM and in institutional reform. In particular, two mechanisms to be developed under the program will be used to this end. The first is SLMIS, which, by making available data on relevant indicators, will allow for use of harmonized land degradation assessment methodologies and the establishment of information systems that are useful at local, national, regional, and global scales. The second vehicle is the knowledge management system, which will provide a coordinated approach to capturing lessons learned, storing them in easily accessible forms, and actively disseminating them to stakeholders in ways appropriate to each type of stakeholder. Special attention will be paid to replicability options across similar land types, such as mountain ecosystems or lands with similar irrigation systems. CACILM will develop a SLM network and work with key individuals and organizations to establish a SLM community of practice that *inter alia* will ensure that methodologies developed are replicable within and beyond the CACs. The most obvious forms of dissemination for replicable lessons learned are publications and presentations. In addition, a bilingual website will be developed and administered by the CACILM secretariat. CACILM also expects to establish a project library and e-learning center. CACILM-supported investment projects are also effective for disseminating knowledge through incorporating good practices to address certain development issues.

62. The integrated approach under CACILM includes a blend of pilot demonstrations with policy and institutional reform that can be readily scaled up, adapted, and /or replicated within each country or in other countries affected by serious land degradation. The multicountry and development cooperation partner composition of the CACILM partnership and the proposed knowledge management and dissemination mechanisms will ensure that sharing of knowledge and good practice is extended not only among the CACs but also to other countries.

D. Stakeholder Involvement

63. CACILM has been designed to embody the principles of participatory development. Stakeholder participation was encouraged during the design phase through three national workshops in each country and three multicountry workshops. A formal stakeholder plan for the implementation phase recognizes that participation must occur from the project beneficiary level through the multicountry level.

64. Creation of a large and broad-based constituency for SLM that reaches deep into civil society is seen by CACILM and all NPFs as a necessary precondition of success in SLM. There are three levels of activities in the partnership framework—partnership, national, and project—each having a different stakeholder composition. At the CACILM partnership level, the major stakeholders are the CAC governments, SPA members, and other development cooperation partners. At the national level, stakeholders represented in the national coordination councils include varying mixtures of government (including local government and village organizations), NGOs, and development cooperation partners, and strong efforts are being made to include nontechnical agencies, private sector, academe, and civil society.

65. At the project level, there is a very large number of stakeholders. According to the NPFs, high percentage of people, from 43% in Kazakhstan to 75% in Tajikistan, depend on the land for their livelihood, and land degradation affects perhaps one third of the CACs' combined population, some 20 million full- or part-time farmers, pastoralists, and their families. Specific activities have been designed in the public participation plan to ensure the involvement of these stakeholders.

E. Monitoring and Evaluation

66. The partnership assigns an important role to monitoring and evaluation (M&E) both at the NPF and CACILM framework levels. The M&E system at the national level will target four types of variables:

- (i) land degradation and SLM indicators embodied in project and program logical frameworks;
- (ii) compliance with environmental and social safeguards that may be prescribed by SPA members' cofinancing agreements;
- (iii) project implementation, including recording and tracking of work plan progress, all project inputs, and all activities; and
- (iv) project finances, including disbursements, contract awards, and annual audited financial statements.

67. An important feature is that the sustainable land management information system will be directly linked to the performance monitoring system to ensure that important sustainable land management indicators are systematically tracked. Monitoring and evaluation at the level of the CACILM partnership framework will consolidate and analyze both the multicountry activities and the results of national reporting for dissemination to the members of SPA.

68. National and multicountry secretariats will ensure that the design of their M&E systems will be compatible with those of GEF and relevant donors. The secretariats will encourage project proponents to familiarize themselves with these requirements and reflect them in the logical framework on which their proposed M&E system will be based.

69. Overall program monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established GEF procedures and will be provided by the CACILM multicountry secretariat. The logical framework matrix in Annex B provides performance and impact indicators for program implementation and lists their corresponding means of verification. These will form the basis on which the program monitoring and evaluation system will be built. Periodic independent M&E will be conducted in order to track progress against the stated outcomes. An annual program implementation report (PIR) covering the CACILM program will be presented to GEF, possibly replacing individual project's PIRs. Reports will be made available to all stakeholders in a systematic fashion.

IV. FINANCIAL MODALITY AND COST EFFECTIVENESS

A. Financing Plan

70. The current financing plan for the full 10-year program is presented in Table 3, which is based on: (i) information provided in the NPFs by the CACs; (ii) cost estimates for implementation of the multicountry activities; and (iii) the current understanding of development cooperation partner commitments. The list of projects under CACILM proposed to be funded from the GEF-3 replenishment is in Table 4. A financing plan for the projects being brought forward for GEF-3 support and in subsequent GEF replenishments is presented in Table 5.

71. As indicated, CACILM expects to receive GEF financing from the GEF-3, GEF-4, and GEF-5 replenishments. Cofinancing for GEF-3 activities is confirmed, while arrangements for GEF-4 are currently under discussion between the development cooperation partners and the CACs. It is expected that these arrangements will be finalized and the resultant GEF-4 work plan and financing plan approved by the CACILM steering committee in late 2006. Confirmation of the GEF-5 financing plan and associated work plan must await the results of the implementation of CACILM activities funded under GEF-3, and will depend on the countries' changing needs and evolving development cooperation programs. It is acknowledged that GEF-4 and GEF-5 financing is dependent upon the level of these replenishments and development of the RAF.

B. Benefits from GEF Support

72. GEF support will allow the combined synergies of coordination among both CACs and development cooperation partners to be realized. CMPF activities at both the national and multicountry levels are centered around the strategic priorities of OP 15. This includes capacity building toward mainstreaming of sustainable management practices and priorities into rural development, agricultural planning processes and land-related policy reforms and the implementation of innovative sustainable land management practices. The outcomes of these activities will be attributable to GEF support not only through benefits for the integrity of dryland ecosystems (OP 15), but also to biodiversity conservation (OPs 1, 3, 4, 12, and 13), improved quality of transboundary rivers (OP 8), and reduced global climate change (mainly OPs 5 and 6).

Table 3: CACILM 10-year Program Financing Plan based on Current National Programming Frameworks and Development Cooperation Partner Estimates (\$)

	Country							
	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyz Republic	Tajikistan	Turkmenistan	Uzbekistan	Multicountry	PDF B Funding	Total
Financier								
Kazakhstan	294,310,000					1,000,000	100,000	295,410,000
Kyrgyz Republic		5,412,000				1,000,000	100,000	6,512,000
Tajikistan			5,830,000			1,000,000	100,000	6,930,000
Turkmenistan				5,455,000		1,000,000	100,000	6,555,000
Uzbekistan					89,100,000	1,000,000	100,000	90,200,000
Donors	333,303,000	48,509,000	66,080,000	5,530,000	401,529,000	16,166,000	550,000	871,667,000
ADB	*	20,700,000	17,350,000	*	100,800,000	1,700,000	500,000	141,050,000
UNDP	2,400,000	805,000	700,000	1,000,000	2,696,000	1,950,000		9,551,000
World Bank	241,800,000	*	15,000,000	*	*	*		256,800,000
UNEP	*	*	*	*	*	*		-
IFAD	9,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	*	*	400,000		21,400,000
FAO	*	*	*	*	*	300,000		300,000
CIDA	*	*	*	*	*	*		-
CCD - GTZ	*	*	*	*	*	3,750,000		3,750,000
SDC	*	*	*	*	*	*		-
ICARDA	*	*	*	*	*	800,000		800,000
GM	*	*	*	*	*		50,000	50,000
Other/to be obtained	80,103,000	21,004,000	27,030,000	4,530,000	298,033,000	7,266,000		437,966,000
GEF (adjusted)	20,000,000	14,424,000	13,850,000	16,110,000	20,000,000	15,616,000	700,000	100,700,000
Total	647,613,000	68,345,000	85,760,000	27,095,000	510,629,000	36,782,000	1,750,000	1,377,974,000

1 Initial estimate based on national programming frameworks and development cooperation partner programmed funding

2 Donor funding updated based on List of Approved Projects from GEF-3 Replenishment

3 GEF adjustments made to reduce total GEF funding to \$100,700,000.

Requests for Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan reduced to \$20,000,000.

* To be determined

ADB = Asian Development Bank; CIDA = Canadian International Development Agency; FAO = Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; GEF = Global Environment Facility; GM = Global Mechanism; GTZ = German Technical Cooperation Agency; ICARDA = International Center for Agricultural Research on Dry Areas; IFAD = International Fund for Agricultural Development; SDC = Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation; UNDP = United Nations Development Programme; UNEP = United Nations Environment Programme.

Table 4: List of Projects under CACILM Proposed to be Funded from the GEF-3 Replenishment

Title	Timeframe	Location	Partner(s)	Total Funding	Government/ Other	Development Partner	CACILM GEF-3	GEF Agency/ Type
CACILM National and Multicountry Partnership and Framework Design and Preparation	April 2005 – June 2006	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	National WGs, ADB, GM, GEF, cooperation with all SPA/task force partners	1,750,000	550,000	500,000	700,000	ADB/PDF-B
Rangeland Ecosystem Management	July 2006 - June 2010	Kazakhstan	Ministry of Environment Protection, Ministry of Agriculture; CCD Project of GTZ; NGOs , local communities	3,550,000	2,100,000	450,000	1,000,000	UNDP/MSP
Integrated Agricultural Development and Land Improvement	Dec 2006 – June 2010	Kyrgyz Republic	Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Industrial Processing; ADB	23,200,000	TBD	20,700,000	2,500,000	ADB/FSP
Mountain Pasture Management in Susamir Valley, Kyrgyz Republic	Sept 2006 – March 2010	Kyrgyz Republic	Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Industrial Processing; Chui Oblast, UNDP	1,950,000	170,000	805,000	975,000	UNDP/MSP
Rural Development	Jan 2007 – June 2010	Tajikistan	Ministry of Agriculture; State Committee on Land Management, ADB	25,188,000	4,338,000	17,350,000	3,500,000	ADB/FSP
Demonstrating Local Responses to Combating Land Degradation and Improving Sustainable Land Management in SW Tajikistan	July 2006 – March 2010	Tajikistan	State Committees on Environment and Forests and on Land Management, Tajik Forestry Research and Devel. Institute, UNDP	1,700,000	TBD	700,000	1,000,000	UNDP/MSP
Achieving Ecosystem Stability on the degraded land in Karakalpakstan and the Kyzylkum Desert	April 2005 – March 2010	Uzbekistan	Forestry Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources, Uzhydromet, Academy of Science, Goscompriroda, UNDP	3,810,000	114,000	2,696,000	1,000,000	UNDP/MSP
Land Improvement	Jan 2007 – Dec 2010	Uzbekistan	Min. of Agriculture and Water Resources, ADB	79,400,000	15,600,000	60,800,000	3,000,000	ADB/FSP
Capacity Building and On-the-Ground Investments for Integrated and Sustainable Land Management	Jan 2007- Dec 2009	Turkmenistan	UNDP, CCD Project of GTZ , other partners to be identified	2,100,000	175,000	925,000	1,000,000	UNDP/MSP
CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework Support	July 2006 – Dec 2008	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	National WGs, ADB, ICARDA, FAO, CCD Project of GTZ in cooperation with other SPA partners	6,325,000	500,000	2,800,000	3,025,000	ADB/FSP
CACILM Multicountry Capacity Building	Sept 2006 – Dec 2008	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	National WGs, UNDP, ADB, CCD Project of GTZ, ICARDA, IFAD in cooperation with other SPA partners	6,550,000	500,000	3,050,000	3,000,000	UNDP/FSP
All Projects				155,523,000	24,047,000	110,776,000	20,700,000	

Table 5: CACILM Cofinancing Sources

Name of Cofinancier (Source)	Classification	Type	Amount (\$)	Status
GEF-3				
Kazakhstan	Government	Cash/In-kind	2,400,000	Confirmed
Kyrgyz Republic	Government	Cash/In-kind	470,000	Confirmed
Tajikistan	Government	Cash/In-kind	4,638,000	Confirmed
Turkmenistan	Government	Cash/In-kind	475,000	Confirmed
Uzbekistan	Government	Cash/In-kind	16,014,000	Confirmed
ADB	Executing Agency	Loan and Grant	100,950,000	Confirmed
UNDP	Implementing Agency	Grant/In kind	6,626,000	Confirmed
FAO	Executing Agency	Cash/In-kind	300,000	Confirmed
IFAD	Executing Agency	Grant	400,000	Confirmed
ICARDA	SPA Partner	Cash/In-kind	800,000	Confirmed
GM	Executing Agency	Grant	50,000	Confirmed
GTZ	Bilateral Donor Agency	Grant	1,700,000	Confirmed
		Total	134,823,000	
GEF-4				
Kazakhstan	Government	Cash/In-kind	212,610,000	<i>Indicative Amounts. To be confirmed in GEF-4 Financing Plan</i>
Kyrgyz Republic+A1	Government	Cash/In-kind	2,942,000	
Tajikistan	Government	Cash/In-kind	1,192,000	
Turkmenistan	Government	Cash/In-kind	39,050,000	
Uzbekistan	Government	Cash/In-kind	17,786,000	
ADB	Executing Agency	Loan /Grant	60,000,000	
UNDP	Implementing Agency	Grant	3,000,000	
UNEP	Implementing Agency	Grant	-	
WB	Implementing Agency	Loan/Grant	255,000,000	
IFAD	Executing Agency	Loan	21,000,000	
Cofinancing to be Determined			207,220,000	
		Total	819,800,000	
GEF-5				
Kazakhstan	Government	Cash/In-kind	80,400,000	<i>Indicative Amounts. To be confirmed in GEF-5 Financing Plan</i>
Kyrgyz Republic	Government	Cash/In-kind	3,100,000	
Tajikistan	Government	Cash/In-kind	1,100,000	
Turkmenistan	Government	Cash/In-kind	3,030,000	
Uzbekistan	Government	Cash/In-kind	20,400,000	
ADB	Executing Agency	Loan /Grant		
UNDP	Implementing Agency	Grant		
UNEP	Implementing Agency	Grant		
WB	Implementing Agency	Loan/Grant		
GTZ	Bilateral Donor Agency	Grant		
Cofinancing to be Determined			214,621,000	
		Total	322,651,000	
	ESTIMATED TOTAL: GEF-3, GEF-4, & GEF-5		1,277,274,000	

ADB = Asian Development Bank; CIDA = Canadian International Development Agency; FAO = Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; GEF = Global Environment Facility; GM = Global Mechanism; GTZ = German Technical Cooperation Agency; UNDP = United Nations Development Programme; UNEP = United Nations Environment Programme.

73. **Without GEF Scenario.** The baseline situation with respect to land degradation in the CACs consists of the current institutional arrangements, human capacities, and land-use practices that contribute directly or indirectly to degradation of soil and biological resources, pollution and sedimentation of water bodies, diminishing carbon stocks, and loss of broader ecological services. There is a partially and unevenly reformed policy and institutional environment of CACs for SLM that has crossed several important hurdles (partly as a result of preparing the CACILM program) but is likely to stall in the absence of further purposeful and coordinated action, backed by investments.

74. The baseline scenario assumes that, in the absence of GEF assistance, land degradation will continue to be addressed in the CACs primarily through a piecemeal implementation of site-specific projects lacking clear connections to policy and institutional reforms needed to achieve broad-based and sustainable progress in promoting SLM. Outdated and inconsistent policies will continue to prevail, the ability to protect areas under threat and adopt mitigation measures for degraded areas will remain limited, and potential for wider environmental damage, typified by the Aral Sea crisis, will persist. Apart from the multi-agency nature of the national working groups (created in response to CACILM), there will be narrow participation by stakeholders in the planning and implementation of SLM activities. While the SPA will continue as a partnership of external agencies focusing on land degradation, there will be limited incentives for the further expansion of SPA work and less motivation to refocus assistance programs on land degradation.

75. **GEF Alternative.** The GEF alternative makes possible the development and implementation of sustainable land-use practices at the landscape level in each of the CACs. Availability of predictable, incremental grants helps remove critical barriers to long-term planning and resources mobilization, allowing systematic planning and implementation of interventions to prevent and control land degradation. It encourages the development and harmonization of an appropriate policy and legislative framework, increased institutional cooperation and participation of key stakeholders, more effective focus and implementation of capacity building programs, and increased political awareness and commitment of budgetary resources.

76. Under the GEF alternative, the CMPF will create an enabling environment for mainstreaming sustainable land management considerations—accompanied by a participatory, programmatic and multicountry mode—into national development planning and implementation. SPA will see an expanded membership and a much-improved framework for mainstreaming land degradation into the programs of the external agencies. There will be an integration of both GEF and non-GEF supported activities, providing stronger coordination and collaboration under the CACILM partnership.

77. **Benefits from the GEF Alternative.** The sustainable land-use practices that will result from policy and institutional strengthening, coupled with on-the-ground investments under the GEF alternative, will result in tangible environmental benefits of global significance. These include: a reversal of desertification in accordance with the goals of the UNCCD; improved conservation of biodiversity, in accordance with the goals of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity; enhanced carbon sequestration or a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions, in accordance with the goals of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and contributions to the improved management of international river basins.

C. Incremental Costs

78. Quantification of the incremental cost of a 10-year multicountry program is possible only at a conceptual level. However, each activity to be cofinanced by GEF under the CMPF will be accompanied by a quantified incremental cost analysis. Details of the baseline activities on which the CMPF will build are described with respect to their expected outcomes are in Annex B, Table B.1, and for projects to be financed under GEF-3 in Table B.2.

79. Under the baseline alternative, progress will be achieved in many areas, but it will be slow, uneven, probably with reversals, and achieved without cost efficiency that comes with good coordination. CACILM has already demonstrated initial benefits from such coordination: the national programs of the NPFs, once endorsed, represent a commitment to mainstream or institutionalize sustainable land management into national policies, regulations, and budgets. All the major development cooperation partners will be able to focus on assisting the CACs in implementing their national programs without duplicating or wasting resources. The GEF alternative seeks to maintain this momentum by grasping the incremental benefits of reversal of land degradation that otherwise may either not occur or would occur at a much slower pace. These include: significant reductions in loss of vital soil in dust storms that create regional and even intercontinental hazards; reduction in soil and pesticide runoff into rivers that cause downstream and transboundary water quality deterioration; improvements in water availability that will, in turn, help to moderate the harsh climate associated with desertification and maintain reverine ecosystems; reversal in the loss of carbon stocks sequestered in soils or forests, and hence a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, as agriculture becomes sustainable and forests regenerate; and reversal of the loss of biodiversity that is inevitable, if the present trend of habitat loss continues.

D. Cost Effectiveness

80. The potential to reduce the unit cost of achieving SLM objectives was among the reasons—if not the principal rationale for establishing the SPA and adopting the multicountry pilot partnership modality. Examples of cost saving include: the production of only one set of country and sector or subsector analyses for all development cooperation partners and cofinanciers; monitoring and evaluation costs or the cost of developing and conducting training that can be spread over many projects or countries; and scope for replication and learning among the CACs from successful practice. Further, close coordination of CMPF activities at multicountry and national levels is designed to slash duplication among development cooperation partners. The program's multicountry activities are the means of capturing other potential cost savings.

81. The second and less obvious source of potential cost savings is a better allocation of responsibilities and timing of SLM investments at the national level. The 10-year programming approach makes it possible, in principle, to phase investments largely on the basis of progress already made, rather than on the need to seize the first available funding opportunity.

V. INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. Core Commitments and Linkages

82. The NPFs, which include the gradual integration of SLM into the policy, budgeting, investment, and monitoring mainstream, build on previous efforts including the NAPs and SRAP-CD. They also attempt to integrate the land degradation aspects of national

environmental action plans. In all five CACs, plans for implementation arrangements of the NPFs have been drawn up for government endorsement.

83. Some SPA partners already have significant related programs being implemented in Central Asia or under preparation that can be shaped to fit within CACILM and contribute to its objectives. Also, there are increasing commitments from GEF agencies (ADB, World Bank, UNDP, and UNEP) and other multilateral and bilateral agencies to SLM. These ongoing and proposed activities—and particularly their linkages contributing to SLM—are assessed within the agreed national programming frameworks.

84. The overall design of the CMPF has benefited from interaction and information exchange with other CPPs and the guidance provided by the GEF Secretariat. Lessons learned from other GEF activities in Central Asia will help target and focus the proposed capacity-building as well as other activities.

85. During CACILM development, discussions with GEF agencies on linkages between CACILM and ongoing and complete GEF SLM projects were held where possible. All GEF agencies active in the region are members of the CACILM steering committee, and this facilitates further discussions on the nature of possible linkages and complementarities as the various projects evolve. It is expected that these projects will contribute to achieving CACILM objectives particularly in terms of: improved decision-support systems in SLM, strengthened regional capacity, replication and scaling-up of best SLM practices, environmental monitoring and assessment, and dissemination of SLM knowledge. Similarly CACILM activities will have much to contribute to the attainment of benefits under ongoing GEF projects with land degradation dimensions. At this stage, however, only broad statements are possible in most cases because CACILM projects are still being developed. The general nature of these linkages with GEF projects addressing land degradation in the CACs is indicated in Table 6.

Table 6: Ongoing or Completed GEF Projects in Central Asia Addressing Land Degradation, Showing Linkages to CACILM

Project Title	Brief description	Linkage
A. Land Degradation		
1. Forest Protection and Reforestation (FSP) Coverage- Kazakhstan (<i>included in NPF</i>) GEF Agency- IBRD GEF Support – US\$5,000,000	The project seeks to develop environmental and economic services through more sustainable use, increased productivity and enhanced conservation of forest and associated rangeland resources, focusing in the northeastern pine forest and southern saxaul woodlands.	Opportunities will be sought for linkages between this and other projects in aspects dealing with the policy, legal, organizational, and information framework, which will require capacity building components, a major feature of CACILM.
2. Support to the Implementation of the Regional Environmental Action Plan in Central Asia (MSP) Coverage- Regional (5 CACs) GEF Agency-UNEP GEF Support-US\$1,000,000	Objectives of the project are (i) Strengthened political and institutional basis for regional cooperation and REAP implementation, (ii) Strengthened information support to decision-making process in environment for SD and IEM; (iii) Enhanced civil society (CS) participation to strengthen regional cooperation in environment for SD and IEM; (iv) Enhanced regional capacity for REAP implementation.	The project will complement CACILM by enhancing integrated ecosystems management; and specifically through its intention to support the SRAP-CD and its transboundary elements. Links with CACILM will be sought to assist (and to learn from) activities in the REAP support project related to strengthening the political and institutional basis for regional cooperation, strengthened information support, and strengthened regional capacity for REAP implementation.
3. Sustainable Land Management in the High Pamir and Pamir-Alai Mountains – and Integrated and Transboundary Initiative in Central Asia (tranches 1 and 2) (FSP)	The project aims to develop and implement an integrated management system for the preservation and rehabilitation of the natural resources in the High Pamir and Pamir-Alai mountain areas as a framework for sustainable land management and development of the	The project will have important lessons for CACILM and these will be disseminated to the CACs through the CMPF Support Project. The Pamir-Alai project will contribute to achieving CACILM objectives in terms of improved decision-support

Project Title	Brief description	Linkage
Coverage- Regional(Taj/Kyr) GEF Agency- UNEP GEF Support-US\$6,650,000	natural environment and local populations living in the concerned mountain ranges and the adjacent lowlands.	systems in SLM, replication and scaling-up best SLM practices, environmental monitoring and assessment, and dissemination of SLM knowledge, and these will hence contribute to the multicountry dimension of CACILM. Like CACILM, the Pamir-Alai project approach uses direct short-term supportive measures while simultaneously developing policy options involving all stakeholders. The policy-related objective of the project—creation and institutionalization of a transnational regional policy dialogue and development of joint management plans and policy frameworks—suggests that the capacity-building activities of CACILM will be of assistance to that project by helping to create the enabling environment for such dialogue and plans.
4. Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) (FSP) Coverage-Global (Uzb; included in NPF) GEF Agency-UNEP GEF Support-US\$ 7,725.000	LADA's objectives are: (i) to develop and implement strategies, tools and methods to assess and quantify the nature, extent and severity of land degradation and the overall ecosystem resilience of dryland ecosystems; and will build national, regional and global assessment capacities to enable the design and planning of interventions to mitigate land degradation and establish sustainable land use and management practices.	CACILM intends to adopt the LADA methodology, approach, and indicators. CACILM will work with FAO in design, development, and deployment of the Sustainable Land Management Information System (SLMIS). A distinct and separate set of activities is planned for development of SLMIS under CACILM. However, it is anticipated that there will be considerable synergy between SLMIS and the LADA project.
5. Enabling Sustainable Dryland Management Through Pastoral Custodianship. (MSP) Coverage- Kyrgyz Republic (included in NPF) GEF Agency-UNDP GEF Support – US\$1,000,000	Dryland Mobile Global The project aims to enable sustainable land management in extensive rangelands by helping remove policy and capacity obstacles and to identify innovative practical ways in which sustainable drylands ecosystem management through livestock mobility can be made both viable and attractive.	The project has major components on helping remove policy and capacity obstacles to livestock mobility practices; links will be sought where practical with CACILM capacity-building activities.
B. Multifocal		
1. Drylands Management Project (FSP) Coverage- Kazakhstan GEF Agency-IBRD (included in NPF) GEF Support- US\$5,360,000	Overall objective of the project is conservation, rehabilitation and sustainable utilization of natural resources in marginal cereal growing areas in the Shetsky Rayon of Karaganda Oblast in Kazakhstan.	This project will be relevant in formulating national integrated ecosystem management addressing land degradation interventions under the CACILM umbrella and will have lessons of importance in this regard for CACILM.
2. National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Global Environmental Management (EA) Coverage- Regional (5 CACs; included in NPFs) GEF Agency- UNDP GEF Support Kazakhstan- US\$ 200.000 Kyrgyz Republic- US\$195,000 Tajikistan- US\$199,000 Turkmenistan- US\$200,000 Uzbekistan-US\$200,00	Objective of the NCSA project is to determine the priority needs, and a plan of action, for developing each country's capacity to meet its commitments to global environmental management. It: (i) focuses on capacity related issues within each thematic area; (ii) assesses the capacities needed to address these in a synergistic fashion, (iii) strengthens the dialogue, information exchange, and cooperation amongst all stakeholders, provides and publishes deep analysis of the implications and impacts of global environmental commitments on each country's development, and develops a national implementation plan.	The NCSAs determined the priority needs and formulated plans of action for developing national capacity in each country to meet their respective commitments to global environmental agreements including UNCCD. The outputs from the NCSAs have provided guidance in the preparation of the NPFs and subsequently in the design of CACILM and especially its capacity building components. The NSCs provide invaluable baseline data on capacity for CACILM capacity-building activities.
3. Community Agriculture and Watershed Management (FSP)	The objective of the project is to help reduce rural poverty and improve livelihoods of rural	This project will be relevant in formulating national integrated ecosystem

Project Title	Brief description	Linkage
<i>Coverage- Tajikistan (included in NPF) GEF Agency- IBRD GEF Support- US\$4,500,000</i>	communities in selected watersheds by supporting productive activities aimed at increasing incomes in a sustainable manner while reducing the pressure on the environment and ensuring the preservation of fragile mountain lands and ecosystems.	management addressing land degradation interventions under the CACILM umbrella and will have lessons of importance for CACILM.
C. Biodiversity		
1. In-Situ Conservation of Kazakhstan's Mountain Agrobiodiversity Kazakhstan (FSP) <i>Coverage- Kazakhstan GEF Agency- UNDP GEF Support- US\$3,023,000</i>	The project focused on the conservation of key areas of mountain agro-biodiversity in two priority sites within Kazakhstan's Tien Shan Mountains by developing and applying new methods and tools for conservation.	Linkages with this project will be made in view of its applicability to the CACILM program area on protected area management and biodiversity conservation, especially in addressing biodiversity issues related to land degradation.
2. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development in the Gissar Mountains of Tajikistan <i>Coverage- Tajikistan GEF Agency-UNDP GEF Support-US\$1,000,000</i>	The project seeks to conserve the global biodiversity of the Gissar mountains by strengthening protected areas and increasing the security and sustainability of the livelihoods of the rural populations around them.	Linkages with this project will be made in view of its applicability to the CACILM program area on protected area management and biodiversity conservation, especially in addressing biodiversity issues related to land degradation.
3. Conservation of "Tugai Forest" and Strengthening Protected Areas System in the Amu Darya Delta of Karakalpakstan (MSP) <i>Coverage-Uzbekistan GEF Agency-UNDP GEF Support- US\$995,000</i>	The project aims to strengthen the Karakalpakstan system of protected areas through the enhanced enabling environment and establishment of a multi-zoned National Park which demonstrates the collaborative conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Amu Darya Delta and provides lessons and best practices replicable throughout the national protected areas system.	The project is very relevant to the CACILM program area on protected area management and biodiversity conservation. Its lessons and best practices will be disseminated through CACILM and there are opportunities for collaboration in capacity building activities.
4. In Situ/On Farm Conservation and Use of Agricultural Biodiversity (Horticultural Crops and Wild Fruit Species) in Central Asia (FSP) <i>Coverage- Regional (5 CACs) GEF Agency- UNEP GEF Support- US\$6,093,000</i>	The purpose of the project is to provide farmers, institutes and local communities with knowledge, methodology and policies to conserve globally significant in situ/on-farm horticultural crops and wild fruit species in Central Asia.	Linkages with this project will be made in view of its applicability to the CACILM program area on protected area management and biodiversity conservation, especially in addressing biodiversity issues related to land degradation.
5. Development of the Econet for Long-term Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Asia Ecoregions (MSP) <i>Coverage- Regional (5 CACs) GEF Agency- UNEP GEF Support- US\$775,000</i>	Aim of the project is to elaborate and implement the scheme of econet development, based on a regionally unified and integrated information management system (GIS), combining existing data on biodiversity and natural resource (at the regional scale), existing system of protected areas, economic development, together with newly obtained data through limited targeted research to fill key gaps.	This regional project is under the CACILM umbrella as a component of the national programming frameworks in the program area on protected area management and biodiversity conservation.
6. Central Asia Transboundary Biodiversity Project (FSP) <i>Coverage- Regional(Kyr/Kaz/Uzb) GEF Agency- IBRD GEF Agency- US\$10,495,000</i>	The project prepared management plans and investment programs for 4 protected areas (Pas); a social assessment to identify the impacts of PAs on local inhabitants and vice versa, and options for aligning conservation and economic activities, design of a public awareness component; institutional and legal assessments; assessment of training needs; detailed project costing.	Linkages with this project will be made in view of its applicability to the CACILM program area on protected area management and biodiversity conservation, especially in addressing biodiversity issues related to land degradation.
7. Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity in the Kazakhstani Sector of the Altai-Sayan Mountain Ecoregion (FSP)	This project is an integral element of a tri-national initiative represented by three complementary projects in Mongolia, Russia, and Kazakhstan. The overall goal of the Kazakhstan project will be to secure globally	Linkages with this project will be made in view of its model national approaches to sustainable biodiversity conservation and efficient protected area management, which are relevant to the CACILM

Project Title	Brief description	Linkage
Coverage- Kazakhstan GEF Agency- UNDP GEF Support- US\$2,421,000	important biodiversity benefits through replicable and sustainable biodiversity conservation and efficient protected areas management in the Kazakhstani sector of the Altai-Sayan ecoregion.	program area on protected area management and biodiversity conservation.
D. International Waters		
1. Water and Environmental Management in the Aral Sea Basin (FSP) Coverage- Regional (5CACs) GEF Agency- IBRD GEF Support- US\$12,525,000 (completed)	The project objective was to address the root causes of the overuse and pollution of water in the Aral Sea Basin, support the sustainable mgmt. and future development of its natural resources by formalizing, and then implementing the first stage of, a regional strategic action plan.	CACILM has learned from the problems encountered by the Aral Sea Water and Environmental Management Project. CACILM's multicountry approach is partly a response to the weak country ownership experienced during that project's implementation.

CACs = Central Asian countries; FSP = full-size project; GEF = Global Environment Facility; IBRD = International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; MSP = medium-size project; PDF = Project Development Facility; UNDP = United Nations Development Programme; UNEP = United Nations Environment Programme

B. Consultation, Coordination, and Collaboration between IAs and EAs

86. CACILM is, at its core, a mechanism created to ensure strong consultation, coordination and collaboration among the CACs and development partners, and especially among GEF agencies. Building on the strong foundation established through the CACILM task force and SPA, the CACILM partnership will endeavor to include all interested GEF implementing and executing agencies and their bilateral partners and will also maintain close coordination with both the UNCCD and GEF secretariats. Consultations on the preparation of this proposal were held among SPA members and other development partners on numerous occasions. In addition, drafts of all CACILM documents are routinely circulated among members of the CACILM task force for comment.

87. Consultations with participating bilateral agencies increased in 2004 and 2005 and were formalized in a development cooperation partners' consultation in Rome in February 2006. Possibilities of attracting additional partners to SPA continue to be explored.

C. Program Implementation Arrangements

88. ADB will continue to serve as the lead GEF Agency for CACILM. In this role, ADB will be responsible for the overall coordination of CACILM activities in cooperation with all CAC and development cooperation partners. The CACILM steering committee (successor to the task force), which will consist of national government representatives, GEF agencies, participating bilateral agencies, and other interested international organizations, will be responsible for: overall direction of the CMPF; approval of changes to the CACILM work plan and financing plan; endorsement of proposals for submission to GEF; oversight of those multicountry projects and activities that are the direct responsibility of the steering committee; monitoring performance of the multicountry projects and activities undertaken in the CMPF; and reporting to GEF on all projects and activities undertaken under the CMPF.

89. A CACILM multicountry secretariat, to be facilitated by ADB, will support the work of the CACILM steering committee.

90. National coordination councils will be created in each country (as successors to the current working groups), consistent with national administrative laws and procedures. Their composition will vary, but they will likely be chaired by the UNCCD Focal Point and consist of

representatives of key government ministries, SPA, NGOs, private sector, and civil society. The councils' main functions will be to: coordinate the overall implementation of projects and activities mandated by the NPF; supervise implementation of the activities that are the direct responsibility of each council; monitor the performance of all projects and activities and report to the CACILM steering committee; and review and endorse proposals for consideration by the CACILM steering committee. The councils will be supported by national secretariats.

91. The SPA will continue to play a role in CACILM by providing a forum for the development cooperation partners to discuss implementation and funding issues.

ANNEX A: CACILM MULTICOUNTRY PARTNERSHIP LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Summary	Performance Targets/Indicators Measures	Sources of verification/reporting mechanisms	Assumptions and risks
Impact			
1. Overall Restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land in the CACs leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the environmental functions of these lands in the spirit of UNCCD	Zero net increase in the area of degraded land in each land management class	Enhanced consolidated national reporting on the productive use of lands Sustainable Land Management Information System (SLMIS) monitoring reports	Assumptions Commitment of CACs' governments to a coordinated approach to tackling land degradation Commitment of CACs' governments to improvement of economic and environmental governance
	10% reduction in the total area of degraded land	Enhanced and consolidated national reporting on the state of the county's land resources SLMIS monitoring reports	
	Improved welfare of those relying on land resources	Poverty assessment updates and/or livelihood surveys Ministries of finance and International Monetary Fund SLMIS monitoring reports	
1.1. Development impact Greater and more efficient private and other investments in the maintenance and improvement of land assets backed by land reform and other reforms	50% increase in average productivity by land management class	Enhanced consolidated reporting by relevant technical ministries of CACs SLMIS monitoring reports	Commitment to land reform as a principal avenue to renewed investment in land maintenance and improvement Land reform can be implemented in CACs in ways that enhance productivity Sufficient area of degraded lands and ecosystems that can be economically rehabilitated exists
	100% increase in average financial returns by land management class	Enhanced consolidated reporting by relevant technical ministries of CACs SLMIS monitoring reports	
	100% increase in household-managed land supported by cadastre and registration in each class of productive land	Household expenditure surveys Consolidated socio-economic impact surveys developed under SLMIS Enhanced consolidated data on the progress of land reform SLMIS monitoring reports	
1.2 Environmental Benefits Mitigation of the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the structure and functional integrity of principal ecosystems of Central Asia through: (i) protection	Improved conditions of watersheds leading to greater water storage and less erosion	Watershed environmental impact surveys developed under SLMIS	Land degradation is overwhelmingly anthropogenic in origin Proposed program interventions will gradually improve the protective and other environmental functions of the lands
	100% Increase in area of biodiversity conservation areas	National reports to Convention on Biological Diversity	

Summary	Performance Targets/Indicators Measures	Sources of verification/reporting mechanisms	Assumptions and risks
ecosystems of global significance; (ii) decreasing GHG emissions and enhancing carbon sequestration; and (iii) improved management of transboundary waters	10% gain in carbon sequestration. Zero change in the long-term average annual flow of transboundary rivers at established points and a statistically significant improvement in key water quality parameters	Analysis based on the results of surveys of lands of each management type River monitoring reports SLMIS monitoring reports	targeted
Outcomes			
Favorable environment for SLM investments in CACs, supported by SLM mainstreaming, and policy, regulatory, and land administration improvements	SLM recognized as a budget category in relevant ministries and in PIP NPF accepted by the CACs' governments as an action-oriented culmination of the NAPCD. NPF recognized in the PRSP or similar documents	Instructions by the government to its agencies to undertake the changes necessary Reviews of evolving public expenditure practices, the role of PRSP or a similar document, and the role of SLM in PRSP or a similar document	Assumptions Readiness to deepen the reform of institutions and public expenditure practices in each CAC Local governments are committed to facilitating reformed land use
	100% increase in share of SLM investments in government budgets and PIPs	Public expenditure and PIP monitoring data by ministries of finance and budget	
	Policy frameworks for sustainable management of pasturelands, rainfed lands and forests formulated	Completion and endorsement of policies for rainfed lands, pasturelands, and forests Commissioned evaluation reports on streamlining of land-related legislation	
	Policy frameworks for sustainable management of pasturelands, rainfed lands, and forests implemented	Periodic reporting by local governments on the area and number of pasture leaseholds, grazing permits, and numbers of livestock Periodic reporting of land administration authorities on progress of cadastral surveys and land registration.	
	90% of all areas of mainly rainfed lands are under long term use rights.	Periodic reporting of land administration authorities on the progress of cadastral surveys and land registration	
	50% of rural households in areas engaged in woodlot establishment and sustainable management	SLMIS monitoring reports	
Improved capacity of the institutions in Central Asia to adopt integrated land-use planning and management	Integrated approach to land-use planning and management used in 100% of relevant public investment projects.	CACILM and national secretariat reporting	Assumptions Continued interest and support from the relevant institutions and government

Summary	Performance Targets/Indicators Measures	Sources of verification/reporting mechanisms	Assumptions and risks
	All monitoring and evaluation reports of relevant public investment projects meet CACILM standards Improved land use practices adopted by no less than 50% of land-using households 100% increase in research budgets 100% increase in SLM budgets in disaster preparedness programs	SPA members' periodic assessments SLMIS monitoring reports SLMIS monitoring reports National agencies responsible for disaster preparedness	Flow of information from research to extension to farmers' fields is maintained Land reform situation continues to provide incentives for farmers to adopt practices
Rehabilitation and enhancement of the productive functions of selected lands, thereby improving livelihoods and according indirect protection to ecosystems	50 % increase in average productivity by land management class privately managed lands 100 % increase in average financial returns by land management class-privately managed lands 50% reduction in the area of degraded lands – salinized or waterlogged 10% increase in forest cover with no reduction of standing timber volume At least 40% increase in average productivity of pastureland in each country 50% increase in average productivity of irrigated lands by "reformed" farm enterprises 20% increase in average productivity of pasturelands around settlements	Farm expenditure and income surveys by state statistical agencies Farm practice surveys developed under SLMIS SLMIS monitoring reports Regular reporting by overseeing technical agency Field surveys SLMIS monitoring reports Field survey SLMIS monitoring reports Field surveys SLMIS monitoring reports	Assumptions Under suitable structure of incentives, targeted ecosystem can respond to the right types of technical and management interventions. Enhanced private profitability can co-exist with public benefit rather than compete with it.
Enhanced protection of ecosystems' integrity and landscapes	200% increase in rural communities involved in integrated land management 100% increase in area of Biodiversity conservation areas where public-private partnerships for natural resource conservation are established 200% increase in the number of government staff trained in ecosystem and landscape conservation	SLMIS monitoring reports Enhanced consolidated database of agencies responsible for the management of protected areas SLMIS monitoring reports	Assumptions Technical agreement exists on minimum conditions necessary to preserve ecosystems' integrity. Coordinated attention is given to the question of energy provision in areas unconnected to the grid
Broader involvement of civil society and other stakeholders in SLM in Central Asia.	100% increase budgets for NGO involvements as facilitators in the program's activities	Periodic (quarterly, yearly) reports by the CACILM secretariat	Assumptions Sufficient number of qualified and motivated service providers exists

Summary	Performance Targets/Indicators Measures	Sources of verification/reporting mechanisms	Assumptions and risks
	Number of private-sector SLM service providers (land reclamation advice, extension, etc.) trebles	Enhanced consolidated database of relevant national agencies	and their skills can be easily upgraded if necessary
	Number of women represented in local bodies implementing the program's activities no less than 30%		Experience in implementation of SLM interventions is transferable
Long-term sustained harmonized commitments of financial and human resources through mainstreaming of SLM in donor programs for Central Asia	Sustained average annual disbursements for SLM multicountry activities Complete accounting for all donor-implemented SLM activities in CACs Shared understanding about the technical content of proposed SLM interventions Inclusion of SLM in donors' assistance programs	Donor financing for the NPFs and the CMPF Analysis of the full range of activities within donor programs in Central Asia	Donors will be able to make long-term commitments beyond their normal programming cycle Donor programs will place increasingly higher priority on sustainable land management activities in the short term; and continue to place high priority in the long term
Activities			Inputs (\$)
1. Implementation of national programming frameworks 1.1 Kazakhstan 1.2 Kyrgyz Republic 1.3 Tajikistan 1.4 Turkmenistan 1.5 Uzbekistan			Kazakhstan 295,410,000 Kyrgyz Republic 6,512,000 Tajikistan 6,930,000 Turkmenistan 6,555,000 Uzbekistan 90,2000,000 Development Partners 871,667,000 GEF 100,700,000 Total 1, 377,974,000
2. Multicountry activities 2.1 Capacity building 2.2 Sustainable land management information system 2.3 Sustainable land management research 2.4 Knowledge management and information dissemination			
3. Program coordination 3.1 Program coordination at multicountry level 3.2 Program coordination at national level			

* See monitoring and evaluation plan for definition of proposed indicators

CACs = Central Asian countries; CACILM = Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management; CMPF = CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework; NGO = nongovernment organization; NAP = national action plan or program; NPF = national programming framework; PIP = public investment program; PRSP = poverty reduction strategy paper; SLM = sustainable land management; SPA = Strategic Partnership Agreement for UNCCD Implementation in the Central Asian Countries; SLMIS = sustainable land management information system; UNCCD = United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.

ANNEX B: INCREMENTAL COST OF THE PROGRAM UNDER GEF ALTERNATIVE

1. The identification of the incremental cost of a 10-year multicountry program is possible only at a project level, not at the program level. However, each activity to be cofinanced by GEF under the CMPF will be accompanied by a quantified incremental cost analysis.
2. The baseline against which incremental costs are estimated is the current land use under a partially and unevenly reformed policy and institutional environment of CACs that has crossed several important hurdles but is likely to stall with respect to land degradation in the absence of further purposeful and coordinated action, backed by investments.
3. The baseline activities on which the CMPF will build can be described by reference to its expected outcomes. With respect to the first outcome—creation of an environment favorable to SLM investment—all CACs have taken steps to create a legal and institutional basis for post-collective land use. This process varies in depth and quality, and progress is handicapped by weaknesses of land administration as well as economic transition difficulties. The large body of new legislative and regulatory provisions needs to be streamlined, internally reconciled and made better known among the rural constituency. Several elements of policy need to be developed further or revised. The process of SLM mainstreaming is yet to take place, especially in linking SLM firmly to budgets and public investment programs.
4. With respect to the second outcome—integrated land use planning and management—the need to overcome the legacy of narrow technical specialization in promoting agricultural development is becoming better understood in the CACs, in part as a result of development externally-financed rural development activities. The socioeconomic, vulnerability, and ecological perspectives are gradually finding their place in the formulation and implementation of projects. Stakeholder participation is slowly replacing command approaches and those with technical components only. However, the progress has been slow and largely driven by development cooperation partners.
5. The third outcome—the actual rehabilitation of degraded lands and introduction of SLM practices—has been closely connected in the irrigated lowlands with efforts to establish a sound approach to and capacity for management of the irrigation infrastructure. Some progress has been achieved, but the reform efforts are seriously incomplete in many cases. Pastureland use practices remain poor, and in mountainous areas farming on sloping lands continues to exact a heavy environmental price.
- 6. Conservation efforts toward greater ecosystems integrity have been largely limited (due to considerable budget shortages in some CACs) to official protected areas and to policing access to and use of different classes of land. A more proactive approach is needed in order to identify opportunities for combining productivity improvements with achieving greater integrity of ecosystems and landscapes.**
7. The changed political and institutional landscape of Central Asia has meant a changing role for land management stakeholders. The limited dialogue of a command economy is gradually being replaced by a more complex structure of decision making and broader stakeholder participation. Civil society is emerging as an indispensable part of the process. The breadth and quality of the process varies substantially among the CACs.
8. As to harmonized commitments of SLM in development cooperation partner programs in the CACs, the past decade saw a number of initiatives supported by development partners,

linked to land and its management. These have helped integrate the CACs into the international environmental community, facilitate dialogue, and create new capacity, but they also exposed the limits of uncoordinated external assistance agency approaches in a domain where such coordination is vital.

9. Under the baseline alternative, the trends summarized in the preceding sections are assumed to continue. Progress will be achieved in many areas but it will be slow, uneven, with reversals, and achieved without cost efficiency that normally comes with coordination. CACILM has already demonstrated initial benefits from such coordination: the national programs of the NPFs, once endorsed, represent a commitment to mainstream or institutionalize sustainable land management into policies, regulations, and budgets. On the development cooperation partner side, all the key partners will be able to focus on assisting the CACs to implement their national programs without duplicating or wasting resources. The GEF alternative seeks to maintain this momentum to grasp the incremental benefits from reversing land degradation; reducing the loss of vital soil in dust storms that create regional and even intercontinental hazards; reducing soil and pesticide runoff into rivers that causes downstream and transboundary water quality deterioration; improving water availability that will, in turn, help to moderate the harsh climate associated with desertification; reversing the loss of carbon stocks in forests and soils, and hence reducing greenhouse gas emissions, as agriculture becomes sustainable and forests regenerate; and reversing the loss of biodiversity that is inevitable with the present trend of habitat loss continues.

10. Expected incremental activities and incremental costs are summarized in Table A.1 below.

11. Table A.2 below shows the estimated composition of incremental costs by expected program outcomes for projects to be financed under GEF-3.

Table B.1 Incremental Costs of the Program under the GEF Alternative

Baseline	GEF Alternative <i>(Elements of Design Generating Global Benefits in Italics)</i>	Domestic Benefits of Enhanced (“GEF”) Alternative	Global Benefits of GEF Alternative	Incremental Cost of GEF Alternative
Main features of Existing Land Management and the Alternative Design				
1. Improving but incomplete and at times dysfunctional environment for SLM	<p>1.1 Improved environment for SLM investment</p> <p>1.2 <i>Additional measures to enhance ability to formulate and support investments that generate global benefits, such as</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>training in formulation of land management policies that are informed by global environmental concerns,</i> • <i>increasing the profile of UNCCD and other key conventions in national policy documents</i> • <i>creation of incentives for globally responsible land use, and</i> • <i>filling gaps or weaknesses in relevant policies.</i> 	Greater capacity to support and coordinate SLM in the country and confidence of stakeholders to invest in SLM	<i>Additional capacity to formulate and support investments that generate global benefits</i>	<p><i>Cost of</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Training in formulation of land management policies informed by global environmental concerns</i> • <i>Increasing the profile of UNCCD and other key conventions in national policy documents</i> • <i>Formulation and testing of incentives for globally responsible land use</i> <p><i>Improving policies that have major bearing on global environmental outcomes (e.g., forest and biodiversity management)</i></p>
2. Some capacity to adopt an integrated approach to land planning and management	<p>2.1 Steps to enhance the domestic capacity to adopt integrated land use planning and management</p> <p>2.2 <i>Additional measures that make integrated land use planning and management a</i></p>	Enhanced use of integrated land use planning and management	<i>Use of integrated land-use management as also</i>	

Baseline	GEF Alternative <i>(Elements of Design Generating Global Benefits in Italics)</i>	Domestic Benefits of Enhanced (“GEF”) Alternative	Global Benefits of GEF Alternative	Incremental Cost of GEF Alternative
Main features of Existing Land Management and the Alternative Design				
	<p><i>tool of protection and enhancement of globally important variables, such as</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>creation of local capacity to plan and implement land rehabilitation projects with due consideration of ecosystem integrity and landscape values,</i> • <i>incorporation of SLM into natural disaster preparedness plans and programs, and</i> • <i>improving capacity of national institution to monitor the conditions of land and ecosystems.</i> 		<p><i>a tool of promoting land use outcomes with positive global repercussions</i></p>	<p><i>Cost of</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>creating the local capacity to plan and implement land rehabilitation projects with due consideration of ecosystem integrity and landscape values;</i> • <i>others, as in column 2.</i>
3. Slowly increasing area of land under rehabilitation	<p>3.1 Major increase in the adoption of SLM practices and investments in SLM</p> <p>3.2 Additional investments in SLM that target global environmental benefits, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>establishment of woodlots beyond immediate local or national requirements,</i> • <i>piloting and introduction of crops or cropping practices that improve long-term productivity and resilience of the land, and</i> • <i>soil erosion control measures in the</i> 	<p>Reduction or reversal of land degradation, productivity increases, livelihood improvements, and positive environmental externalities of SLM investments</p>	<p><i>Environmental benefits generated by investments in excess of immediate national needs</i></p>	<p><i>Cost of</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>establishing woodlots beyond immediate local or national requirements;</i> • <i>others, as in column 2</i>

Baseline	GEF Alternative <i>(Elements of Design Generating Global Benefits in Italics)</i>	Domestic Benefits of Enhanced (“GEF”) Alternative	Global Benefits of GEF Alternative	Incremental Cost of GEF Alternative
Main features of Existing Land Management and the Alternative Design				
	watersheds of transboundary rivers			
4. Limited efforts to formulate and implement projects that target ecosystem integrity	4.1 Additional steps to undertake projects that target ecosystem integrity	Production benefits and local positive environmental externalities of less fragmented ecosystems	Value to the global community of less fragmented ecosystems of global importance	Cost of formulating and implementing activities that target the integrity of ecosystems of global importance
5. Growing but still insufficient stakeholder involvement in SLM	5. 1 Deliberate measures to promote public awareness of SLM issues, and increase stakeholder participation 5.2 Steps to increase the understanding among stakeholders of the global dimensions of SLM	Greater efficiency of SLM project design and implementation Speeding up of SLM investment through greater understanding of issues and collaboration of stakeholders	<i>Smoother implementation of SLM activities designed to also address global environmental concerns</i>	Cost of activities that increase the understanding among stakeholders of the global dimensions of SLM
6. Pre-CACILM pattern of development partner involvement in SLM	6.1 Enhanced development partner coordination and harmonization of approaches through CACILM	Greater cost effectiveness and synergies in financing national SLM activities Increased attention to financing of activities that deliver also global environmental benefits	Generation of global environmental benefits through improved development partner coordination and cooperation	Cost of achieving and maintaining greater development partner coordination and cooperation in a program that delivers also global environmental benefits

CACILM = Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management; GEF = Global Environment Facility; SLM = sustainable land management.

Table B2: Incremental cost analysis for GEF 3 Replenishment

Location	GEF Agency	Incremental Cost by Program Outcome Categories						Total Incremental Cost
		Creation of favorable environment for SLM investments	Improved capacity of institutions in the CACs for integrated land use management	Rehabilitation of productive functions of land to improve livelihoods and improve environment	Enhanced protection of ecosystem integrity and landscapes	Broader involvement of civil society in SLM	Long-term sustained harmonized commitments of resources through mainstreaming of SLM	
Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic	ADB							700,000
Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan								700,000
Kazakhstan	UNDP	100,000		200,000	700,000			1,000,000
Kyrgyz Republic	ADB	400,000	350,000	1,500,000		250,000		2,500,000
Kyrgyz Republic	UNDP	100,000	250,000	525,000		100,000		975,000
Tajikistan	ADB	400,000	550,000	2,100,000	200,000	150,000		3,500,000
Tajikistan	UNDP		100,000	200,000		700,000		1,000,000
Uzbekistan	UNDP		100,000	150,000	650,000	100,000		1,000,000
Uzbekistan	ADB	250,000	700,000		1,600,000	450,000		3,000,000
Turkmenistan	UNDP		250,000	650,000		100,000		1,000,000
Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic	ADB			1,800,000			1,225,000	3,025,000
Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan								
Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	UNDP	400,000	1,100,000				1,500,000	3,000,000
		2,100,000	5,750,000	4,325,000	3,150,000	1,850,000	3,425,000	20,700,000
Percent of total		10.1	27.8	20.9	15.2	15.2	16.5	100.0

ANNEX C: RESPONSE TO REVIEWS

a) Convention Secretariat Comments. No comments were received from the UNCCD Secretariat.

b) STAP Expert Review of Executive Summary and Responses

STAP Reviewer: Professor Martin Williams PhD, ScD, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia.
 Date: April 26, 2006

1. Scientific and technical soundness of the project, including the degree of stakeholder involvement.

In evaluating this proposal, I will take into account the following questions:

- Will the approach taken in the project proposal achieve the objectives of addressing land degradation?
- What are the risks and constraints associated with the approach?
- Are there any gaps in the project? Are there any controversial aspects about the project?
- What aspects of the interventions proposed require further research?
- How will the model of sustainable use outlined in the project be developed?
- How effective will the proposed model be?
- Is there sufficient evidence in the document that the project offers the best long-term solutions?

The overall objective of the Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multi-country Partnership Framework is specified as: 'The restoration, maintenance and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of UNCCD'.

The geographical focus is on the three adjoining arid countries of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan and the two contiguous mountain countries of Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan. The project is for ten years, in three stages: inception (2006-08); full implementation (2009-13); and consolidation (2014-16). The key indicators of its success will be the rehabilitation of some 2.84 million hectares of degraded land and the strengthening of sustainable land use practices on some 7 million hectares of land, thereby protecting some 9.84 million hectares of land from degradation in the five countries concerned.

One unproven and potentially misleading assumption mentioned several times in the Executive Summary under the heading Sustainable Land Management (SLM) interventions is 'that anthropogenic problems are the main cause of land degradation and that SLM interventions will work and be transferable.' I have raised some doubts over the issue of transferability in section 5 dealing with the scope for replication. I here question whether desertification is indeed invariably and primarily caused by human actions. This view was fairly widespread until the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development at Rio de Janeiro in 1992, when the effects of climatic variations and drought on land degradation were extensively discussed. As an outcome of this discussion, desertification was defined as 'land degradation in arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid regions resulting from various factors *including climatic variations and human activities.*' [For further elaboration of this point, please consult Williams, Martin A. J. and

Balling, Robert C. Jr, 1996, '*Interactions of Desertification and Climate*', Arnold, London, with UNEP and WMO, 270 pp.]. Neglect of the role of climatic variations and extreme droughts on land degradation in Central Asia seems, at best, extraordinarily myopic. At worst, it could lead to faulty identification of causal factors and so to inappropriate forms of land management. This assumption needs to be defended and justified or else modified.

2. Identification of the regional and global environmental benefits and/or drawbacks of the project.

The regional environmental benefits that would accrue from reversing land degradation include a reduction in accelerated soil erosion in the headwaters of the major rivers; reduced loss of topsoil in the form of windblown dust; reduced input of pesticides and fertilizers into rivers, lakes and irrigation canals during runoff events; and increased soil and surface water availability and water quality. Reducing forest loss in the mountainous watershed areas would ensure a more equitable flow regime in the rivers and an overall improvement in soil aggregate stability and water holding capacity.

Global benefits likely to accrue from reversing desertification and from enhancing forest and pasture preservation include improved soil fertility with a concomitant increase in soil carbon storage and in soil and forest biodiversity, reduced carbon emissions and restoration of ecosystem integrity.

3. Project consistent with GEF goals, operational strategies, program priorities and relevant international conventions.

The project has a number of aims that fall within the ambit of GEF Operational Programs #15 (Sustainable Land management) as well as #12 (Integrated Ecosystem Management). These global environmental objectives include the reversal of land degradation, reduction in biomass burning and an overall reduction in biodiversity loss.

The project is entirely consistent with the aims of the International Convention to Combat Desertification as well as with several other international conventions, notably those relating to biodiversity conservation and to climate change. Any increase in plant biomass through increased agricultural productivity in this impoverished environment will enhance carbon storage in growing plants and soils and will help to minimise soil loss through erosion by water and mass movement. An additional benefit would be to enhance the ability of ecosystems to adapt to existing and possible future variations in climate.

The project aims to restore and maintain critical ecosystem functions in degraded desert and mountain lands in five Central Asian countries by identifying, reducing and preventing the various processes leading to land degradation, which is fully consistent with GEF goals. GEF support in minimizing soil loss from the upland areas will help to improve the present low levels of upland productivity, and, most importantly, will address the severe off-site effects of upland erosion, namely sedimentation in the irrigation schemes downstream.

4. Regional conservation context.

There is a real concern that greater use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides may further degrade water quality, with adverse effects for all the biota, including humans. This applies particularly to the Aral Sea basin in the two countries of Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. More might have been made of the biodiversity status of the five countries, notably the numbers of endemic species and of those endangered by current land use practices. Surprisingly, there is no mention of the potential for ecotourism to augment local incomes.

5. Scope for replication of the project.

The geographical focus is on the five Central Asian republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Two of these countries are mountainous; three contain extensive areas of desert plains. Each country differs in climate, geology, topography, soils, vegetation cover, land use

history and processes of land degradation. It will therefore be difficult to extrapolate experience gained in one area to a wider region unless the influence of local factors can be separated from those of more regional import. Is this considered? Given that the lessons learned in one country may not necessarily apply to others, the scope for replicating the outcomes would appear *a priori* more limited than suggested in this proposal.

The Executive Summary (ES) argues that the project 'was developed with built-in means to maximize replicability, including the scaling-up of piloted good practices in SLM and in institutional reform.' How, in practice, is such scaling achieved? The ES notes that one way is 'by making available data on relevant indicators...and the establishment of information systems that are useful at local, national, regional and global scales.' This scaling issue is always a difficult one to achieve. How, precisely, will the local dissemination of information be effected? Without such local mechanisms the project risks the dangers of top down management, an approach that is seldom, if ever, sustainable. Under the discussion of data storage and retrieval there is mention of a project library and a bilingual website. The levels of literacy are remarkably high in all five countries, but Russian and English are not the national languages, so that the website will be less useful at local level than if available in all of the national languages concerned. Has this been considered?

My sources suggest that the percentage of the population dependent on agriculture is as follows: Kazakhstan (23%), Kyrgyz Republic (40%), Tajikistan (50%), Turkmenistan (45%) and Uzbekistan (40%). These figures differ from the estimates in the ES of 43% and 75 % for Kazakhstan and Tajikistan, respectively. A note on the sources used might clarify this apparent discrepancy.

6. Project effectiveness and sustainability.

Given its objectives, this project has considerable potential to be both effective and sustainable. However, its long-term success can only be gauged through an efficient system of monitoring in which inputs and outputs are measured and compared to a specified set of performance indicators. I was a mite surprised to see the amount of funds committed specified as an output since in reality funds can only act as an input. The important thing, of course, is what emerges from the input of funds. A small amount of money spent well is likely to achieve far more than copious amounts squandered.

One possible concern is that the monitoring and evaluation procedures conducted at a national level that may not always be sufficiently sensitive to local geographical and social variations. The indicators tabulated are based on very general criteria and may not always offer the level of detail required at local land use planning level.

As a general comment, one can note that ecologically sustainable development requires that social and economic needs be met through maintenance of the life-support functions of ecosystems, both natural and humanly modified. Any action that systematically removes materials from a natural system at a rate faster than the ability of that system to produce a surplus will cause the system to become degraded. Likewise, any action that systematically adds substances to a natural system at a rate faster than the capacity of the system to absorb and recycle such materials will also lead to system impoverishment. Since the only source of an increase in net global primary productivity is via photosynthesis, maintenance of a resilient plant cover is the prerequisite for achieving sustainable land use and effective ecosystem management.

The only lasting guarantee that this project can fulfil these fundamental requirements lies in its ability to improve the capacity of farmers, irrigators and pastoralists in this highly diverse region to achieve viable crop and livestock yields over the long-term without damage to both natural and humanly modified ecosystems.

7. Stakeholder involvement

The ES shows an intelligent awareness of the need for capacity strengthening of all stakeholders but apart from repeatedly stressing the need to clarify the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders is

devoid of detail as to how this capacity building and stakeholder participation are to be achieved in practice. The ES refers to the inclusion of 'policy makers, local public officials and community leaders, farmers, their associations, and NGOs' in early project preparation and implementation. Once again, how, in practice, will this be achieved, particularly in some of the more sparsely populated desert and mountainous terrain?

The general principles enunciated are sensible but what is needed is precise information on how they might be put into practice. Specifically, who, at the local and community levels, will be responsible for devising policy and for implementing such policies? For example, how, precisely, will the project ensure the effective participation of rural populations in diagnosing problems and identification possible solutions viable at the local level? Since this is a ten-year project, over what time frame will any investment in infrastructure be conditioned by the performance of stakeholders? Having said that, I commend the principle of seeking to 'phase investments largely on the basis of progress already made, rather than on the need to seize the first available funding opportunity.'

8. Consistency with operational strategies of other focal areas

The project as enunciated in the ES appears to fully satisfy this requirement.

9. Linkages to other programs and action plans.

The project builds on an impressive number of existing national and regional programs and actions plans, especially those relating to desertification and to other social and environmental issues, including air and water quality and human health.

10. Other beneficial or damaging environmental effects.

Proper account needs to be taken of the impact of droughts, floods and other aspects of climatic variability on desertification processes in this region. Experience from elsewhere in Asia, Africa and Australia has shown that humans are not always the prime agents of land degradation. Any action plans that do not provide for innate climatic variability are unlikely to prove sustainable.

11. Mechanisms for participation and influencing project management

The ES stresses that this project is, 'at its core, a mechanism created to ensure strong consultation, coordination and collaboration among the [five countries concerned] and development partners, and especially among GEF agencies.' The success of this project will depend to a considerable degree on the skill and persistence with which genuine participation is achieved and maintained. There are ample mechanisms for national working groups to participate in this project; the acid test will be on how effectively local farmer and pastoral communities are consulted in identifying problems and suggesting possible solutions applicable at the local level.

12. Capacity building.

Throughout the ES there is frequent mention of a lack of capacity to devise and implement integrated land management policies at every level, from regional to national to local. To this end, one of the targets of the project is a 200% increase in the number of government staff trained in ecosystem and landscape conservation management [the term used in the ES for management is 'quadruples' which seems needlessly arcane]. Other targets include a minimum of 30% of women in local bodies responsible for implementing program activities. The other percentages for achieving various targets relating to capacity building are at best indicative but certainly within the appropriate order of magnitude.

13. Innovativeness of the project.

The raison d'être for this project is to 'provide multi-country coordination of the...CMPF so that national program implementation ensures a comprehensive and integrated approach to sustainable land management' across the five countries concerned. The overall objective is the 'restoration, maintenance and enhancement of the productivity of land [in the Central Asian Countries] leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources, while preserving the environmental functions of these lands.' The operative words here are *coordination* and *integration*.

I agree that a greatly improved approach to integrated natural resource management is essential at local, national and regional level and wonder whether such an approach could be enshrined in national legislation and day to day government practice, perhaps through some form of Natural Resources Council comprising the CEOs of each government department and agency, together with the chairs of relevant working groups and steering committees.

14. Potential for greatest impact and lessons learned from other similar projects.

The rationale for this project is well argued and the succinct review of the economic impacts of land degradation in this region is clear and persuasive. The identification of the root causes in each country is likewise clear and shows that a multi-disciplinary approach will be essential if land degradation is to be controlled and ecological restoration achieved. There is a substantial body of existing knowledge and experience within each country, specifically as focused in the National Action Plans to Combat Desertification, and the reasons for past failures are clearly identified for each of the five countries involved in this project.

15. Final editorial comment

This Executive Summary is very well structured and lucidly written with a minimum of repetition and jargon. Except for the opening paragraph, there are very few words omitted and most of the acronyms cited in the text are defined in the glossary.

RESPONSES TO STAP REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
In evaluating this proposal, I will take into account the following questions:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the approach taken in the project proposal achieve the objectives of addressing land degradation? • What are the risks and constraints associated with the approach? • Are there any gaps in the project? Are there any controversial aspects about the project? • What aspects of the interventions proposed require further research? • How will the model of sustainable use outlined in the project be developed? • How effective will the proposed model be? • Is there sufficient evidence in the document that the project offers the best long-term solutions? 		
<p>The overall objective of the Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multi-country Partnership Framework is specified as: 'The restoration, maintenance and enhancement of the productive functions of land in Central Asia leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources while preserving the ecological functions of these lands in the spirit of UNCCD'.</p> <p>The geographical focus is on the three adjoining arid countries of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan and the two contiguous mountain countries of Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan. The project is for ten years, in three stages: inception (2006-08); full implementation (2009-13); and consolidation (2014-16). The key indicators of its success will be the rehabilitation of some 2.84 million hectares of degraded land and the strengthening of sustainable land use practices on some 7 million hectares of land, thereby protecting some 9.84 million hectares of land from degradation in the five countries concerned.</p>	<p>1. Scientific and technical soundness of the project, including the degree of stakeholder involvement.</p> <p>One unproven and potentially misleading assumption mentioned several times in the Executive Summary under the heading Sustainable Land Management (SLM) interventions is 'that anthropogenic problems are the main cause of land degradation and that SLM interventions will work and be transferable.' I have raised some doubts over the issue of transferability in section 5 dealing with the scope for replication. I here question whether desertification is indeed invariably and primarily caused by human actions. This view was fairly widespread until the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development at Rio de Janeiro in 1992, when the effects of climatic variations and drought on land degradation were extensively discussed. As an</p>	<p>The STAP Reviewer's point about the documentation's lack of emphasis on climatic variation as a cause of desertification and drought in Central Asia is well taken.</p> <p>Climatic variation was identified as a potential cause of land degradation during the situational analysis conducted in each of the five Central Asian countries during the preparation of the National Programming Frameworks. However it should be noted that, in Central Asia, there is limited understanding of the interactions beyond</p>

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
<p>outcome of this discussion, desertification was defined as 'land degradation in arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid regions resulting from various factors <i>including climatic variations</i> and human activities.' [For further elaboration of this point, please consult Williams, Martin A. J. and Balling, Robert C. Jr, 1996, '<i>Interactions of Desertification and Climate</i>', Arnold, London, with UNEP and WMO, 270 pp.]. Neglect of the role of climatic variations and extreme droughts on land degradation in Central Asia seems, at best, extraordinarily myopic. At worst, it could lead to faulty identification of causal factors and so to inappropriate forms of land management. This assumption needs to be defended and justified or else modified.</p>	<p>the qualitative description of impact that climatic variation has on the hydrological cycle, soils, and vegetation.</p> <p>We have now better reflected the interaction between climate variability and land degradation in the Multicountry Partnership Framework documents.</p> <p>It should be noted that to overcome the limitations of our knowledge and limitations of relevant data, CACILM has proposed a sustainable land management research program and sustainable land management information system. In spite of limited knowledge, CACILM has recognized that appropriate community action is an important part of the long term solution. It is also been recognized that there is need to improve soil quality through introduction of conservation agriculture techniques.</p> <p>This raises the broader issue of potential impacts of global climate change on land degradation in the region, and several CACs have suggested that this topic should be taken up at the national level in future under CACILM.</p>	<p>Framework document (para. 2)</p> <p>Executive Summary (para. 10)</p>
<p>2. Identification of the regional and global environmental benefits and/or drawbacks of the project.</p> <p>The regional environmental benefits that would accrue from reversing land degradation include a reduction in accelerated soil erosion in the headwaters of the major rivers; reduced loss of topsoil in the form of windblown dust; reduced input of pesticides and fertilizers into rivers, lakes and irrigation canals during runoff events; and increased soil and surface water availability and water quality. Reducing forest loss in the mountainous watershed areas would ensure a more equitable</p>	<p>We concur with the Reviewer's comments. These are consistent with the presentation of global benefits in the Framework document (para 223).</p>	<p>Executive Summary para. 79</p>

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
<p>flow regime in the rivers and an overall improvement in soil aggregate stability and water holding capacity.</p> <p>Global benefits likely to accrue from reversing desertification and from enhancing forest and pasture preservation include improved soil fertility with a concomitant increase in soil carbon storage and in soil and forest biodiversity, reduced carbon emissions and restoration of ecosystem integrity</p>		
<p>3. Project consistent with GEF goals, operational strategies, program priorities and relevant international conventions.</p> <p>The project has a number of aims that fall within the ambit of GEF Operational Programs #15 (Sustainable Land management) as well as #12 (Integrated Ecosystem Management). These global environmental objectives include the reversal of land degradation, reduction in biomass burning and an overall reduction in biodiversity loss.</p> <p>The project is entirely consistent with the aims of the International Convention to Combat Desertification as well as with several other international conventions, notably those relating to biodiversity conservation and to climate change. Any increase in plant biomass through increased agricultural productivity in this impoverished environment will enhance carbon storage in growing plants and soils and will help to minimise soil loss through erosion by water and mass movement. An additional benefit would be to enhance the ability of ecosystems to adapt to existing and possible future variations in climate.</p> <p>The project aims to restore and maintain critical ecosystem functions in degraded desert and mountain lands in five Central Asian countries by identifying, reducing and preventing the various processes leading to land degradation, which is fully consistent with GEF goals. GEF support in minimizing soil loss from the upland areas will help to improve the present low levels</p>	<p>We concur.</p>	

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
<p>of upland productivity, and, most importantly, will address the severe off-site effects of upland erosion, namely sedimentation in the irrigation schemes downstream.</p>		
<p>4. Regional conservation context.</p> <p>There is a real concern that greater use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides may further degrade water quality, with adverse effects for all the biota, including humans. This applies particularly to the Aral Sea basin in the two countries of Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. More might have been made of the biodiversity status of the five countries, notably the numbers of endemic species and of those endangered by current land use practices. Surprisingly, there is no mention of the potential for ecotourism to augment local incomes</p>	<p>The use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides was identified as a problem during the situational analysis during the preparation of the national programming frameworks. This of particular concern with respect to the use of persistent organic pesticides (POPs) associated with cotton production. ADB is currently developing a proposal to address the problems of POPs in CAC cotton agriculture. However, this proposal has not yet been considered for inclusion as part of CACILM by the CACILM steering committee.</p> <p>The biodiversity status was considered during the situational analyses for the national programming frameworks. However, it should be recognized that the information collected is limited and not up to date. This will be one of the priorities for gap filling in the SLM Research and SLM Monitoring Programs.</p> <p>Ecotourism projects have been considered by the national working groups and some countries have considered or included project proposals in the national programming frameworks for the countries.</p>	<p>National Programming Frameworks Situational Analyses</p> <p>National Programming Frameworks Situational Analyses</p> <p>Project Proposals in National Programs for Sustainable Land Management</p>
<p>5. Scope for replication of the project.</p> <p>The geographical focus is on the five Central Asian republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Two of these countries are mountainous; three</p>	<p>The Reviewer's point with respect to differences in geography limiting the scope of replication is well taken. We would also add that the countries</p>	

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
<p>contain extensive areas of desert plains. Each country differs in climate, geology, topography, soils, vegetation cover, land use history and processes of land degradation. It will therefore be difficult to extrapolate experience gained in one area to a wider region unless the influence of local factors can be separated from those of more regional import. Is this considered? Given that the lessons learned in one country may not necessarily apply to others, the scope for replicating the outcomes would appear <i>a priori</i> more limited than suggested in this proposal.</p>	<p>have very different financial capability, institutional capacity, and governance conditions that will place limitations on replicability. However, with those caveats, we do see opportunities for replication, when we look from the perspective of sustainable land management practices for irrigated agriculture, rainfed agriculture, pasturelands, and protected area management.</p>	
<p>The Executive Summary (ES) argues that the project 'was developed with built-in means to maximize replicability, including the scaling-up of piloted good practices in SLM and in institutional reform.' How, in practice, is such scaling achieved? The ES notes that one way is 'by making available data on relevant indicators...and the establishment of information systems that are useful at local, national, regional and global scales.' This scaling issue is always a difficult one to achieve. How, precisely, will the local dissemination of information be effected? Without such local mechanisms the project risks the dangers of top down management, an approach that is seldom, if ever, sustainable. Under the discussion of data storage and retrieval there is mention of a project library and a bilingual website. The levels of literacy are remarkably high in all five countries, but Russian and English are not the national languages, so that the website will be less useful at local level than if available in all of the national languages concerned. Has this been considered?</p>	<p>Dissemination at the local will be effected in two ways: (i) specifically, capacity building will be directed toward community mobilization and awareness; and (ii) at the project level, support, capacity building, and information sharing will take place through communities, and where appropriate water user associations and farmers' associations.</p>	<p>Multicountry Capacity Building Project Project Proposals in National Programs for Sustainable Land Management</p>
<p>My sources suggest that the percentage of the population dependent on agriculture is as follows: Kazakhstan (23%), Kyrgyz Republic (40%), Tajikistan (50%), Turkmenistan (45%) and Uzbekistan (40%). These figures differ from the estimates in the ES of 43% and 75 % for Kazakhstan and Tajikistan, respectively. A note on the sources used might clarify this apparent discrepancy.</p>	<p>At this stage of development we have not considered how we will reach people who do not speak Russian or English. We agree that the website may have limited utility at the local level.</p> <p>This will need to be taken into account in the design of the knowledge management plan.</p> <p>The current estimates on the population dependent on agriculture were developed during the situational analysis during the preparation of the NPFs. We relied on the UNCCD Focal Points and their consultants to provide this information.</p> <p>The document source has been noted in the Executive Summary.</p>	<p>National Programming Frameworks</p> <p>Executive Summary, para. 65</p>

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
<p>6. Project effectiveness and sustainability.</p> <p>Given its objectives, this project has considerable potential to be both effective and sustainable. However, its long-term success can only be gauged through an efficient system of monitoring in which inputs and outputs are measured and compared to a specified set of performance indicators. I was a mite surprised to see the amount of funds committed specified as an output since in reality funds can only act as an input. The important thing, of course, is what emerges from the input of funds. A small amount of money spent well is likely to achieve far more than copious amounts squandered.</p> <p>One possible concern is that the monitoring and evaluation procedures conducted at a national level that may not always be sufficiently sensitive to local geographical and social variations. The indicators tabulated are based on very general criteria and may not always offer the level of detail required at local land use planning level.</p> <p>As a general comment, one can note that ecologically sustainable development requires that social and economic needs be met through maintenance of the life-support functions of ecosystems, both natural and humanly modified. Any action that systematically removes materials from a natural system at a rate faster than the ability of that system to produce a surplus will cause the system to become degraded. Likewise, any action that systematically adds substances to a natural system at a rate faster than the capacity of the system to absorb and recycle such materials will also lead to system impoverishment. Since the only source of an increase in net global primary productivity is via photosynthesis, maintenance of a resilient plant cover is the prerequisite for achieving sustainable land use and effective ecosystem management.</p> <p>The only lasting guarantee that this project can fulfil these fundamental requirements lies in its ability to improve the capacity of farmers, irrigators and pastoralists in this highly</p>	<p>In general, we do not consider the funding levels as an output. The exception is related to indicators of outcome – "Long term sustained harmonized commitments of financial and human resources through mainstreaming of SLM in donor programs for Central Asia", which is an outcome related to a successful implementation of the CACILM partnership.</p> <p>The Executive Summary has been revised to clarify this.</p> <p>We intend to use the LADA methodology to develop the specifics of the M&E. This methodology has identified indicators at global, regional, national, and local levels. We will be refining the monitoring system through development of the sustainable land management information system.</p> <p>We concur.</p> <p>This is a specific program outcome and we have included indicators to monitor progress of this outcome in the program logical framework.</p>	<p>Executive Summary, para. 27</p> <p>Framework document para 132, 133 and Multicountry Support Project</p>

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
<p>diverse region to achieve viable crop and livestock yields over the long-term without damage to both natural and humanly modified ecosystems.</p>		
<p>7. Stakeholder involvement</p> <p>The ES shows an intelligent awareness of the need for capacity strengthening of all stakeholders but apart from repeatedly stressing the need to clarify the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders is devoid of detail as to how this capacity building and stakeholder participation are to be achieved in practice. The ES refers to the inclusion of 'policy makers, local public officials and community leaders, farmers, their associations, and NGOs' in early project preparation and implementation. Once again, how, in practice, will this be achieved, particularly in some of the more sparsely populated desert and mountainous terrain?</p> <p>The general principles enunciated are sensible but what is needed is precise information on how they might be put into practice. Specifically, who, at the local and community levels, will be responsible for devising policy and for implementing such policies? For example, how, precisely, will the project ensure the effective participation of rural populations in diagnosing problems and identification possible solutions viable at the local level? Since this is a ten-year project, over what time frame will any investment in infrastructure be conditioned by the performance of stakeholders? Having said that, I commend the principle of seeking to 'phase investments largely on the basis of progress already made, rather than on the need to seize the first available funding opportunity.'</p>	<p>The Reviewer's point with respect to stakeholder involvement is well taken, as we see this as an essential element of CACILM. A Public Participation Plan has been developed and is included in the Framework Document (Annex E).</p> <p>We have identified two mechanisms to work toward this. The first is the role of the national coordination councils and national secretariats in project preparation and implementation. The second is specific capacity building activities that will be targeted at mobilization at the community and local levels.</p>	<p>Framework document, Annex E</p> <p>Framework document paras. 243, 244. Multicountry Capacity Building Project</p>
<p>8. Consistency with operational strategies of other focal areas</p> <p>The project as enunciated in the ES appears to fully satisfy this requirement.</p>	<p>We concur.</p>	

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
9. Linkages to other programs and action plans. The project builds on an impressive number of existing national and regional programs and actions plans, especially those relating to desertification and to other social and environmental issues, including air and water quality and human health.	We concur. However, this aspect of project document and executive summary has been strengthened	Framework document para 235 and Table 10; Executive Summary, para. 85 and Table 6
10. Other beneficial or damaging environmental effects. Proper account needs to be taken of the impact of droughts, floods and other aspects of climatic variability on desertification processes in this region. Experience from elsewhere in Asia, Africa and Australia has shown that humans are not always the prime agents of land degradation. Any action plans that do not provide for innate climatic variability are unlikely to prove sustainable.	See Response to Comment 1. We would emphasize that the applied research program and monitoring plan will play an important role in developing the necessary information and knowledge to ensure that proposed activities consider inherent climatic variability.	
11. Mechanisms for participation and influencing project management The ES stresses that this project is, 'at its core, a mechanism created to ensure strong consultation, coordination and collaboration among the [five countries concerned] and development partners, and especially among GEF agencies.' The success of this project will depend to a considerable degree on the skill and persistence with which genuine participation is achieved and maintained. There are ample mechanisms for national working groups to participate in this project; the acid test will be on how effectively local farmer and pastoral communities are consulted in identifying problems and suggesting possible solutions applicable at the local level.	Please see our response to Comments 5 and 7. Here we would like to emphasize that (i) there will be specific capacity building directed towards community mobilization and awareness; and (ii) at the project level, support, capacity building and information sharing, which will take place through communities and, where appropriate, water users' associations and farmers' associations.	
12. Capacity building. Throughout the ES there is frequent mention of a lack of	"Quadruples" has been replaced.	Exec Summary, Annex A

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
<p>capacity to devise and implement integrated land management policies at every level, from regional to national to local. To this end, one of the targets of the project is a 200% increase in the number of government staff trained in ecosystem and landscape conservation management [the term used in the ES for management is 'quadruples' which seems needlessly arcane]. Other targets include a minimum of 30% of women in local bodies responsible for implementing program activities. The other percentages for achieving various targets relating to capacity building are at best indicative but certainly within the appropriate order of magnitude.</p>		
<p>13. Innovativeness of the project.</p> <p>The raison d'être for this project is to 'provide multi-country coordination of the...CMPF so that national program implementation ensures a comprehensive and integrated approach to sustainable land management' across the five countries concerned. The overall objective is the 'restoration, maintenance and enhancement of the productivity of land [in the Central Asian Countries] leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources, while preserving the environmental functions of these lands.' The operative words here are <i>coordination</i> and <i>integration</i>.</p> <p>I agree that a greatly improved approach to integrated natural resource management is essential at local, national and regional level and wonder whether such an approach could be enshrined in national legislation and day to day government practice, perhaps through some form of Natural Resources Council comprising the CEOs of each government department and agency, together with the chairs of relevant working groups and steering committees.</p>	<p>It is expected the national coordination councils (NCCs) will be formally established in country to coordinate and oversee CACILM activities during implementation. These will be constituted based on the appropriate institutional arrangements in each country. These NCCs will be have senior representatives from the relevant government departments as well representatives of land users, civil society in general, and the private sector.</p>	<p>Framework document, para. 244.</p>
<p>14. Potential for greatest impact and lessons learned from other similar projects.</p> <p>The rationale for this project is well argued and the succinct</p>	<p>We concur.</p>	

Summary of STAP Comments	Responses	Revisions/References to Documentation
review of the economic impacts of land degradation in this region is clear and persuasive. The identification of the root causes in each country is likewise clear and shows that a multi-disciplinary approach will be essential if land degradation is to be controlled and ecological restoration achieved. There is a substantial body of existing knowledge and experience within each country, specifically as focused in the National Action Plans to Combat Desertification, and the reasons for past failures are clearly identified for each of the five countries involved in this project		
<p>15. Final editorial comment</p> <p>This Executive Summary is very well structured and lucidly written with a minimum of repetition and jargon. Except for the opening paragraph, there are very few words omitted and most of the acronyms cited in the text are defined in the glossary.</p>	<p>Thank you for this considerate comment. We have edited the document to improve readability and reduce errors and omissions.</p>	

c) GEF Secretariat and Other Agencies' Comments

Comments	Responses	Revisions / References to Documentation
<p>1. COUNTRY OWNERSHIP Country Drivenness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project consistent with national development frameworks and NAPs and Regional Environment Action Plan. 	<p>The national programming frameworks (NPFs) developed in each country take national action plans (NAPs) as a point of departure and supplement the NAPs drawing on other relevant national and regional action plans.</p> <p>In particular, the NPFs are consistent with and complementary to the 2004 Sub-regional Action Programme for the Central Asian Countries on Combating Desertification within the UNCCD Context (SRAP-CD), which was formulated to give additional impetus to the implementation of national programs. The SRAP identified six priority areas for possible joint subregional or national pilot implementation, i.e., (1) monitoring and evaluation of desertification processes, (2)</p>	<p>Framework document, paras. 165, 166. Executive Summary, para. 21.</p>

	<p>improved water use in agriculture, (3) agroforestry and management of forest resources and watersheds, (4) pastureland management, (5) biodiversity conservation and development of eco- and ethno-tourism, and (6) capacity building of local communities. The SRAP's priorities are well reflected in the overall CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework (CMPF) and in each of the NPFs.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The REAP and SRAP should function as anchor for regional activities that are part of the proposed action framework for SLM. 	<p>CACILM is also consistent with and complementary to the Regional Environmental Action Plan (REAP). It should be noted the REAP is a much broader environmental plan and has land degradation as only one of five priority problem areas, the others being air pollution, waste management, mountain ecosystems, and water pollution.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that CACILM takes a multicountry approach, recognizing that despite substantial variability of physical conditions and differences in the speed of economic transition observed among the CACs, the barriers to SLM are similar in all of them. This argues strongly for a coordinated multicountry approach to their removal. CACILM and REAP are complementary, with the latter working on transboundary issues and development of interstate subregional environmental accords and CACILM focusing its efforts at the country level.</p>	
2. PROGRAM AND POLICY CONFORMITY <p>Program Designation and Conformity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programming framework is consistent with LD Focal Area objectives and OP# 15 program objectives and strategic priorities. Since most of the project will be delivered for approval by the CEO in GEF-4, please make sure that the GEF-4 SPs are fully addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During development of the NPFs, care was taken to ensure consistency with the GEF Operational Strategy, with Operational Program 15 Sustainable Land Management under the focal area of Land Degradation (OP15), and the strategic priorities in the GEF-3 replenishment period of targeted capacity building and implementation of innovative and indigenous SLM practices. Although the strategic objectives of GEF-4—fostering system-wide change and removing policy, institutional, technical, capacity, and financial barriers to SLM; demonstrating and up-scaling successful SLM practices for the control and prevention of desertification and deforestation; generating and disseminating knowledge addressing current and emerging issues in SLM; and demonstrating cross focal-area synergies and integrated ecosystem approaches to watershed-based sustainable land management—were developed only recently, the CACILM approach is fully consistent with these objectives. CACILM is aimed at removing the major SLM barriers, devising innovative practices for SLM, disseminating relevant knowledge, and providing benefits across several GEF focal areas. It is 	Framework document cover sheet and para.176; and Executive Summary, para. 55.

	<p>expected that integrated ecosystem approaches will be adopted in the course of developing SLM practices because the ecosystem approach is now recognized as an essential component of sustainable development. The individual project submissions will similarly align with GEF-3 and GEF-4 strategic priorities.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The framework also allows and encourages the submission of projects in other GEF FAs as long as the fit with the framework objectives is presented. The programming framework allows the countries to strategically plan GEF initiatives in the context of NRM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The national programming frameworks for sustainable land management are directed at the problems of land degradation and desertification but also include program areas for integrated resources management and protected area management and biodiversity conservation and sustainable agriculture on irrigated lands. For this reason, it is possible that some future projects submitted to GEF for financing may be multifocal. Natural resource management is also encouraged through multicountry-level monitoring and evaluation, which includes “exchange of ecological, economic, and social data, using computerized systems, for mutually beneficial cooperation and integrated management of natural resources.” 	<p>Framework document, para. 178; and Executive Summary, para. 27.</p> <p>Framework document, para. 203.</p>
<p>Project Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The programming framework and the projects under it will address adequately sector issues, root causes and global environmental threats. It is well designed to respond to these challenges in terms of objectives, components and expected outputs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is fundamental to the CMPF as well as the national programming frameworks. Well structured logical frameworks underpin the overall programming frameworks. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding the current presentation, GEF Sec strongly recommends presenting the programming framework only and only list the projects that are in preparation under this framework. The framework should present clear criteria for the eligible projects under the framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised Framework document outlines the overall programming framework only and describes projects that are in advanced preparation (consistent with GEFSec guidance—see below—only the CMPF Support Project is submitted for Council approval along with the overall program framework). The framework presents the criteria for selection of eligible projects. Projects to be funded in GEF-3 are listed. The list of projects includes only those projects that have been approved by the CACILM Task Force. 	<p>Framework document, paras. 99–101; and Executive Summary, paras. 32,33.</p> <p>Framework document paras. 260, 261.</p> <p>Tables 1 and 4 of the Executive Summary.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The benefit of the proposed programmatic approach is that council will not receive individual projects for WP consideration. This authority will be delegated to the CEO who will post the project on the GEF website for comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We agree with the approach. 	Executive Summary, paras. 4, 5 and Table 1; and Framework document, para. 253.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project framework should also be restructured to clearly reflect the two umbrella support programs that cut across all the countries and the individual component projects that form part of the first GEF commitment of US \$ 20 million. 	The revised documents now reflect this structure.	Framework document, paras. 99–101; and Executive Summary, paras. 32,33.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A suitable anchor is the REAP and the SRAP. The presentation needs strengthening regarding the regional link between the involved countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relationships between CACILM and REAP and SRAP were discussed above, in relation to the first GEFSec comment in the Country Ownership section. 	Framework document, paras. 165, 166.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This regional program will allow the five targeted countries to address factors affecting the management of natural resources, including transboundary issues in a more coordinated and cost-effective manner. The individual countries will have country-based SLM programs addressing their specific barriers to the sustainable management of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We concur. Coordination and cost effectiveness are key advantages of CACILM. The individual national programming frameworks all include programs to address the barriers to sustainable management of natural resources. 	<p>Framework document paras. 224–227, and Executive Summary, paras. 80,81.</p> <p>Framework document, para. 101.</p>

natural resources, incl. water, soil and biological resources in the wider landscape.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The framework should also reflect the other regional GEF projects in SLM which are being funded through the other agencies. Please see the example of presentation of the Namibia GEF CPP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEF SLM-related projects in the Central Asian countries are noted and listed. Linkages between these projects and CACILM are described. 	<p>Framework document, para. 31 and Table 1.</p> <p>Framework document, para. 235 and Table 10; and Executive Summary, para. 85 and Table 6.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended, in order to avoid a negative impact on environmental commons, that the design for the CPP includes land use, water, and irrigation policy reforms to improve flows to the Aral Sea as a first step before the demos can be undertaken. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CACILM recognizes that water and irrigation management is part and parcel of sustainable land management. The project design incorporates policies for land use, water, and irrigation policy reforms. These are captured in the national programming frameworks in proposed policy reform activities under the subprogram for strengthening the enabling environment and for sustainable agriculture on irrigated lands. (Specific projects will also be supported as part of the CACILM Multicountry Capacity Building Project). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have clarified in the Framework document that the SLM reforms are a set of integrated land, water, and irrigation reforms (see next comment response). The CACILM program allows each country to proceed at its own appropriate pace in policy reform while undertaking on-the-ground projects. Most ADB lending projects have policy reform component combined with improvements in infrastructure and technical assistance in integrated land use management. This approach has proven effective as it demonstrates the benefits of the policy reforms. This is based on ADB's (successful) experience that gradual policy reform measures should always be included in such projects—not simply stand alone water or land management projects—but that such projects should not be conditional on prior policy reform. It should also be noted that in cooperation with other partners ADB is currently providing technical assistance to strengthen Central Asian cooperation on the management of shared water resources in the Aral Sea Basin and other transboundary basins. The technical assistance is expected to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) improve transboundary water management on a pilot basis to demonstrate good basin management practices in two smaller catchment areas as 	<p>Framework document paras. 103–107; and Executive Summary, para. 29.</p>

	<p>examples;</p> <p>(ii) facilitate regional water policy discussions among regional stakeholders on high priority water policy issues with special focus on extension and revision of the 1998 Framework Agreement on water and energy use in the Syr Darya basin;</p> <p>(iii) build regional water management capacity for regional water management institutions and their national affiliates for efficient management of shared water resources.</p> <p>The technical assistance is brokering an Agreement "On the use of water and energy in the Syr Darya River Basin and a parallel agreement on Agreement "On the use of water and energy resources of Amu Darya River Basin"</p> <p>With respect to the Aral Sea ecological tragedy, CACILM recognizes the importance of integrated resource management to improve flows to the Aral Sea through both increased drainage waters discharged to rivers and reduced salinity of these flows. However, this is only one of nine program areas being addressed by CACILM. Given the past and ongoing efforts to address this problem, it does not seem appropriate for CACILM to focus unduly on the Aral Sea. However, the CACILM approach seems to be in line with the 2004 World Bank review of its Aral Sea Water and Environmental Management Project that suggested regional water management can best be addressed by improving water management at the national level, through investments and improved policies.</p> <p>We believe that our current approach to land use, water, and irrigation policy reforms is practical and will achieve the results. We do not see the need to impose conditionality, requiring specific "policy reforms to improve flows to the Aral Area as a first step before demos can be undertaken."</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the ADB includes this in the design and logframe, the CEO approval / endorsement of subprojects under the framework will be subject to an appropriate reference and actions related to water, land use and irrigation reforms. This has to be reflected in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not see the necessity to revise the logical framework to introduce conditionality with respect to policy reforms. • However, the existing log frame and monitoring and evaluation plan contain a number of general targets and indicators directed to irrigation efficiency, stream flows, water quality, and water utilization. Targets and indicators have been developed at the program level. The indicators and targets most relevant to the international waters focal area are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Zero change in the long-term average annual flow of transboundary rivers at 	<p>Framework document, paras. 79, 97, 104–106, 111–114 are relevant.</p> <p>Executive Summary, para. 29.</p>

<p>logframe and the list of criteria for the projects under the framework.</p>	<p>established points (environmental status)</p> <p>(ii) statistically significant improvement in key water quality parameters at established points (environmental status)</p> <p>(iii) 50% reduction in the area of degraded lands – salinized or waterlogged (stress reduction)</p> <p>Individual projects will also have specific indicators and targets with respect to irrigation efficiency and reductions in salinized and waterlogged areas as well as improved drainage. The point is taken and will be noted during project development involving irrigation systems.</p>	
<p>Sustainability (including financial sustainability)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been assured through proposed mainstreaming and capacity building at both the national and regional level. Individual projects have to present how the individual project will ensure the sustainability of projects results and how this project will contribute to the overall sustainability of SLM in the 5 countries and the region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual projects are being designed to ensure the sustainability of projects results (it is one of the eligibility criteria: projects should have activities whose benefits are sustainable beyond the life cycle of the interventions), and that they contribute to the overall sustainability of SLM in the five countries and the region. Conformity with this criterion will be ensured in the subsequent submission of individual projects for CEO approval/endorsement. With regard to overall financial sustainability, over the longer term, with the progressive mainstreaming of SLM into the national policy, planning, and budgetary systems, there should be a diminishing need for GEF and other external resources. 	
<p>Replicability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been adequately addressed through provision for capacity building and knowledge management components. The proposed framework is a suitable vehicle for replication of lessons learned and best practices not only in the individual countries, but because of its regional focus, between the involved countries as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each country in Central Asia has developed a national programming framework (NPF) as a part of CACILM. In all countries, NPFs identified a need to develop national capacity to deal better with a variety of institutional, policy and other barriers to sustainable land management (SLM). These barriers were broadly divided into two groups: (i) absence of enabling conditions for SLM, and (ii) non-integrated practices of land use planning and management. Within these groups, each of the NPFs identified a number of specific activities or projects. <p>The two multicountry projects (CMPPF Support Project and Multicountry Capacity Building [MCB] Project) that will be implemented during GEF-3 Replenishment are central to a successful outcome of the overall programmatic approach. The CMPPF Support Project will provide essential support to NPF implementation through three multicountry activities: sustainable land management information system,</p>	<p>Framework document, paras. 125–128); and Executive Summary, paras. 32,33.</p>

<p>well. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to define the value added of promoting a SLM framework that involves 5 countries.</p>	<p>knowledge management and dissemination, and sustainable land management research. In addition, it will support coordination at the multicountry and national levels. Capacity building, while a core activity in two program areas of the NPFs, is considered sufficiently important to warrant focused attention through a separate project. The MCB Project will comprise three sets of activities: (i) national capacity building activities, (ii) multicountry training activities, and (iii) land-user and community mobilization.</p> <p>These multicountry activities were selected, not only for their essential contributions to SLM and intrinsic value-adding features, but also to take advantage of economies of scale and cost efficiency. The CMPF Support Project is necessary to ensure that the strategic objectives of CACILM as well as a coherent planning and coordination of the CACILM initiative are achieved. Without support for continuation of multicountry activities, the national activities will revert to independent, uncoordinated projects, with the resulting loss of economies of scale and increased transaction costs for donor agencies. There would be less, if any, coordination of GEF and nonGEF activities in land degradation. The likely result would be loss of motivation and political will. Apart from the multi-agency nature of the national working groups, there would be narrow participation by stakeholders in the planning and implementation of sustainable land management activities. While development cooperation partners would continue in a partnership of external agencies focusing on land degradation, there would be limited incentives for the further expansion of their cooperation and reduced motivation for a refocusing of assistance programs on land degradation.</p> <p>The MCB Project is an important part of the overall implementation of activities planned under the CMPF, and one that will accelerate progress toward CMPF outcomes. Without this project many of the benefits of the Partnership will not accrue. Individual countries will be left to find alternate resources to fund their proposals for building capacity and strengthening of sustainable land management institutions. This will result in a fragmented approach to capacity building that is inconsistent with the CMPF and the NPFs. A country-by-country approach would carry a disproportionately high administrative cost. In many cases countries are proposing similar types of activities that would benefit from a common approach at the multicountry level. In addition, there are specific training activities that are best implemented at the multicountry level. These factors combined with the cost effectiveness of administering a single project, argue for a multicountry approach to capacity building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the course of the 10-year implementation of NPFs, the CACILM program will	
--	--	--

	generate a number of lessons and develop many knowledge products, mainly through the SLM research program and SLMIS. To ensure effective sharing and uptake of knowledge, CACILM will establish a knowledge management system to efficiently and effectively process knowledge internally, and to quickly capitalize on the skills and knowledge in different countries and in different SLM areas.	
Stakeholder Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The consultative process has been adequately documented and reflects a thorough stakeholder consultative process and continued involvement in project implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We concur.	
Monitoring and Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An adequate monitoring and evaluation plan has been presented for both the national and regional initiatives which will be supplemented by implementing agency programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We concur.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The RBF for the program is adequate and focuses at objective level on impacts on the global environmental system. With the proposed time frame of 10-12 years, this approach is appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We concur.	
3. FINANCING Financing Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There seems to some discrepancy in the co-financing figures sub-total on the first page. Please check on the addition (our calculations show a subtotal of 1,412,097,000).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The presentation of the Tranche 1 figures included both the aggregate (\$134,823,000) as well as the individual figures by cofinancing source. This leads to double counting of \$134,823,000, which is difference between \$1,277,274,000 and your calculation of 1,412,097,000)• We have not included the aggregate numbers in the revised presentation of the financing plan.	Coversheet adjusted to avoid confusion.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">The GEF can only confirm at this time the commitment of US \$ 20 million. Therefore, this program needs to be phased instead of tranches. Program title and table 1 should be amended to reflect this. It should also be restructured to indicate US \$ 20 million for the whole framework and then the individual component projects which add up to that amount.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">We understand that the GEF commitment is \$20 million from the GEF-3 Replenishment and the Framework document and Executive Summary have been revised accordingly. Further, we understand from the bilateral discussions (24 April 2006) that it is still appropriate to use the tranche approach.<ul style="list-style-type: none">Note that, despite some confusion over a notification that the draft Work Program proposed only \$15 million for the GEF-3 CACILM allocation, we have followed the guidance received and agreed during the bilateral discussions.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The GEF Council is being requested to approve the framework for US \$ 20 million together with the first support program. As already pointed out earlier, the FSP for Uzbekistan should be removed from the Council approval action and put with the rest of the other component projects and be resubmitted for CEO approval after the framework has been approved by Council.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Uzbekistan Land Improvement Project has been removed from the Council approval action and put with of the other component projects to be submitted for CEO approval after the framework has been approved by Council.The documentation for this project has been removed from Annex J (FSPs and MSPs for GEF Council Approval) and included in Annex K (Concepts for Projects under Preparation).	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The framework will not be CEO endorsed, but the individual projects under the program will be subject to expedited procedures: rolling PL and by-passing the GEF Council. This should present no delay as it can be done immediately after Council meeting but you will have to revise the current submission to reflect this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We concur. 	<p>Framework document , para. 153; and Executive Summary, paras. 3, 4.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected financing for future tranches should clearly be qualified to depend on the status of future GEF replenishments and development of the RAF. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected financing for future phases has been clearly qualified to depend on the status of future GEF replenishments and development of the RAF. 	<p>Framework document, paras. 155–156; and Executive Summary, paras. 5–7.</p>
<p>Implementing Agency Fees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9% for the entire first phase of the program. Individual project fees will be subject to negotiations between the ADB and the involved GEF agencies. Contact should be made with UNDP—the agency successfully negotiated the fee structure for projects under the Namibia and Cuba CPPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We agree with approach and have contacted UNDP for their advice and intend to adopt an approach consistent with the Namibia and Cuba CCPs. 	
<p>4. INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT</p> <p>Core Commitments and Linkages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This has been assured through the SPA and donor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We concur 	

participation in CACILM preparation process.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The other IA activities related to SLM should be reflected as part of the framework but being funded separately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This has now been clearly shown. 	Framework document, Table 1; and Executive Summary, Table 2.
Consultation, Coordination, Collaboration between IAs, and IAs and EAs, if appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We concur that a thorough coordination structure from regional to national levels has been elaborated and already is functioning well. The initial implementation arrangements and cofinancing arrangements are adequate for WP entry. As noted in the response on linkages with GEF SLM projects in the CACs, discussions on linkages with ongoing and proposed GEF projects of relevance to addressing land degradation were held where possible. The GEF agencies involved are members of the CACILM steering committee, and further discussions on the nature of possible linkages and complementarities will take place as the CACILM moves forward. Statements on linkages with GEF projects related to land degradation in the CACs have been added. 	Framework document, para 235 and Table 10; and Executive Summary, para. 85 and Table 6.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.g. it is not clear how the Aral Sea Basin SAP could be included in this proposal. It is important that the CPP will strive to pursue integrated land and water resources management since water is one of the most limiting and sensitive factors in the region that has caused the degradation of the NR in the 5 countries. GEF needs to support SLM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted above, CACILM recognizes that water and irrigation management is part and parcel of sustainable land management and that there will be downstream benefits from upstream integrated land and water management as well as irrigation improvements. Indeed, the World Bank's conclusion on its Aral Sea Water and Environmental Management Project was that "regional water management can best be addressed by improving water management at national level, through investments and improved policies" it is a lesson well learned in the CACILM approach. The CACILM attention to capacity building to create an enabling environment for policy reform carries this lesson to the next step. See also comments above. 	

<p>that addresses the dynamics between upstream-downstream effects and the impact of irrigation on the groundwater gradient. The IW project was concluded and was rated not satisfactory because countries did not reform their water policies. This is one of the root causes of the desertification, salinization, and water logging. The CPP can help make progress but only with a first land, water and irrigation policy reform component in each sub-project or a stand-alone project.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing links need to be established with the OP 15 UNEP regional project (Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan) which has a geographic and thematic overlap and is also submitted in the same WP. The presentation of the CACILM and the UNEP proposal has to be coherent and logical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UNEP project is meant to develop and apply a participatory approach to <i>transboundary</i> resources management in the Pamir-Alai Mountains shared by Tajikistan and the Kyrgyz Republic. While this is strongly complementary to country-level activities planned under the CACILM framework in these countries, it falls outside of the immediate CACILM program due to the transboundary nature of the effort. • Since UNEP has recently joined the SPA and is a full member of the CACILM Task Force, strong coordination in implementation will be ensured. 	<p>Framework document, Table 10; and Executive Summary, Table 6.</p>
<p>5. RESPONSE TO REVIEWS</p> <p>Other IAs and RDBs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond satisfactorily to issues raised by other Implementing Agencies <p>Comment from UNEP: "ADB</p>		

<p><i>OP 15: CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework (CMPF) There are some inconsistencies between the Executive Summary and the project document. UNEP officially joined the Strategic Partnership Agreement on 3 March 2006. Paragraphs 13 and 79 of the Executive Summary needs to be corrected accordingly."</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This has been corrected in the program documentation. 	Framework document, para. 32; and Executive Summary, para. 18.
<p>STAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond satisfactorily to STAP reviews. <p>Review by expert from STAP Roster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no STAP roster review attached to the programming framework documentation. Please add the review and how ADB responds to the raised issues as well how it was addressed in the programming document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAP review has been completed and is attached to the Executive Summary. 	Executive Summary, Annex C.b.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond satisfactorily to STAP roster expert reviewer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have responded to the comments of the STAP Reviewer (see above). 	Executive Summary, Annex C.b.