

ANNEXES

- A. CACILM Multicountry Partnership Logical Framework
- B. Estimated Costs
- C. Work Plan
- D. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
- E. Public Participation Plan
- F. Incremental Cost of the Program under GEF Alternative
- G. Background and Context

ANNEX A: CACILM MULTICOUNTRY PARTNERSHIP LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

| Summary | Performance Targets/Indicators Measures | Sources of verification/reporting mechanisms | Assumptions and risks |
|---|---|--|---|
| Impact | | | |
| <p>1. <u>Overall</u> 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</p> | 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 | <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Commitment of CACs' governments to a coordinated approach to tackling land degradation Commitment of CACs' governments to improvement of economic and environmental governance</p> |
| | 10% reduction in the total area of degraded land | Enhanced and consolidated national reporting on the state of the country'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 | |
| <p>1.1. <u>Development impact</u> Greater and more efficient private and other investments in the maintenance and improvement of land assets backed by land reform and other reforms</p> | 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 |
| | 100% increase in average financial returns by land management class | Enhanced consolidated reporting by relevant technical ministries of CACs SLMIS monitoring reports | Land reform can be implemented in CACs in ways that enhance productivity |
| | 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 | Sufficient area of degraded lands and ecosystems that can be economically rehabilitated exists |
| <p>1.2 <u>Environmental Benefits</u> Mitigation of the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the</p> | 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 |

| Summary | Performance Targets/Indicators Measures | Sources of verification/reporting mechanisms | Assumptions and risks |
|---|--|--|--|
| structure and functional integrity of principal ecosystems of Central Asia through: (i) protection ecosystems of global significance; (ii) decreasing GHG emissions and enhancing carbon sequestration; and (iii) improved management of transboundary waters | 100% Increase in area of biodiversity conservation areas | National reports to Convention on Biological Diversity | interventions will gradually improve the protective and other environmental functions of the lands targeted |
| | 10% gain in carbon sequestration. | Analysis based on the results of surveys of lands of each management type | |
| | 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 | River monitoring reports SLMIS monitoring reports | |
| 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 | Instructions by the government to its agencies to undertake the changes necessary | Assumptions Readiness to deepen the reform of institutions and public expenditure practices in each CAC Local governments are committed to facilitating reformed land use |
| | NPF accepted by the CACs' governments as an action-oriented culmination of the NAPCD. | 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 | |
| | NPF recognized in the PRSP or similar documents | Public expenditure and PIP monitoring data by ministries of finance and budget | |
| | 100% increase in share of SLM investments in government budgets and PIPs | 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 formulated | 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. | |
| | Policy frameworks for sustainable management of pasturelands, rainfed lands, and forests implemented | Periodic reporting of land administration authorities on the 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 | |

| Summary | Performance Targets/Indicators Measures | Sources of verification/reporting mechanisms | Assumptions and risks |
|---|--|---|---|
| | 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 Flow of information from research to extension to farmers' fields is maintained Land reform situation continues to provide incentives for farmers to adopt practices |
| | All monitoring and evaluation reports of relevant public investment projects meet CACILM standards | SPA members' periodic assessments | |
| | Improved land use practices adopted by no less than 50% of land-using households | SLMIS monitoring reports | |
| | 100% increase in research budgets | SLMIS monitoring reports | |
| | 100% increase in SLM budgets in disaster preparedness programs | National agencies responsible for disaster preparedness | |
| 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 | Farm expenditure and income surveys by state statistical agencies | 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. |
| | 100 % increase in average financial returns by land management class-privately managed lands | Farm practice surveys developed under SLMIS | |
| | 50% reduction in the area of degraded lands – salinized or waterlogged | SLMIS monitoring reports | |
| | 10% increase in forest cover with no reduction of standing timber volume | Regular reporting by overseeing technical agency | |
| | At least 40% increase in average productivity of pastureland in each country | Field surveys SLMIS monitoring reports | |
| | 50% increase in average productivity of irrigated lands by “reformed” farm enterprises | Field survey SLMIS monitoring reports | |
| | 20% increase in average productivity of pasturelands around settlements | Field surveys SLMIS monitoring reports | |

| Summary | Performance Targets/Indicators Measures | Sources of verification/reporting mechanisms | Assumptions and risks |
|---|--|--|--|
| Enhanced protection of ecosystems' integrity and landscapes | 200% increase in rural communities involved in integrated land management | SLMIS monitoring reports | <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Technical agreement exists on minimum conditions necessary to preserve ecosystems' integrity.</p> <p>Coordinated attention is given to the question of energy provision in areas unconnected to the grid</p> |
| | 100% Percent increase in area of Biodiversity conservation areas where public-private partnerships for natural resource conservation are established | Enhanced consolidated database of agencies responsible for the management of protected areas | |
| | 200% increase in the number of government staff trained in ecosystem and landscape conservation quadruples | SLMIS monitoring reports | |
| 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 | <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Sufficient number of qualified and motivated service providers exists and their skills can be easily upgraded if necessary</p> <p>Experience in implementation of SLM interventions is transferable</p> |
| | Number of private-sector SLM service providers (land reclamation advice, extension, etc.) trebles | Enhanced consolidated database of relevant national agencies | |
| | Number of women represented in local bodies implementing the program's activities no less than 30% | | |
| Long-term sustained harmonized commitments of financial and human resources through mainstreaming of SLM in donor programs for Central Asia | <p>Sustained average annual disbursements for SLM multicountry activities</p> <p>Complete accounting for all donor-implemented SLM activities in CACs</p> <p>Shared understanding about the technical content of proposed SLM interventions</p> <p>Inclusion of SLM in donors' assistance programs</p> | <p>Donor financing for the NPFs and the CMPF</p> <p>Analysis of the full range of activities within donor programs in Central Asia</p> | <p>Donors will be able to make long-term commitments beyond their normal programming cycle</p> <p>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</p> |

| Summary | Performance Targets/Indicators Measures | Sources of verification/reporting mechanisms | Assumptions and risks |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| Activities | | Inputs (\$) | |
| 1. Implementation of national programming frameworks | | Kazakhstan | 295,410,000 |
| 1.1 Kazakhstan | | Kyrgyz Republic | 6,512,000 |
| 1.2 Kyrgyz Republic | | Tajikistan | 6,930,000 |
| 1.3 Tajikistan | | Turkmenistan | 6,555,000 |
| 1.4 Turkmenistan | | Uzbekistan | 90,200,000 |
| 1.5 Uzbekistan | | Development Partners | 871,667,000 |
| 2. Multicountry activities | | GEF | 100,700,000 |
| 2.1 Capacity building | | Total | 1,377,974,000 |
| 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: ESTIMATED COSTS

| | |
|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Table B.1. | Total Estimated Costs |
| Table B.2. | Estimated Costs - GEF 3 Financing |
| Table B.3. | Estimated Costs - GEF 4 Financing |
| Table B.4. | Estimated Costs – GEF 5 Financing |

Table B.1: Estimated Total Costs (\$)

Multicountry Actviities

| | GEF 3 | GEF 4 | GEF 5 | Total |
|--|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Sustainable Land Management Information System | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 1,700,000 | 6,500,000 |
| Knowledge Management and Information Dissemination | 625,000 | 600,000 | 300,000 | 1,525,000 |
| Sustainable Land Management Research | 1,300,000 | 1,000,000 | 700,000 | 3,000,000 |
| Capacity Building | 6,550,000 | 5,300,000 | 4,007,000 | 15,857,000 |
| Subtotal | 10,875,000 | 9,300,000 | 6,707,000 | 26,882,000 |

Program Coordination

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| National Secretariats | 700,000 | 700,000 | 700,000 | 2,100,000 |
| National Coordination Councils | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 900,000 |
| CACILM Secretariat | 900,000 | 900,000 | 800,000 | 2,600,000 |
| CACILM Steering Committee | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 300,000 |
| Subtotal | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 1,900,000 | 5,900,000 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| NPF Activities | 140,898,000 | 848,500,000 | 354,044,000 | 1,343,442,000 |
| TOTAL Estimated Cost | 153,773,000 | 859,800,000 | 362,651,000 | 1,376,224,000 |
| CACILM PDF B Phase | 1,750,000 | | | 1,750,000 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 155,523,000 | 859,800,000 | 362,651,000 | 1,377,974,000 |

Table B.2: Estimated Costs - GEF 3 Financing (\$)

| | | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| Multicountry Activities | | |
| Sustainable Land Management Information System | 2,400,000 | |
| Knowledge Management and Information Dissemination | 625,000 | |
| Sustainable Land Management Research | 1,300,000 | |
| Capacity Building | 6,550,000 | |
| Subtotal | 10,875,000 | 10,875,000 |
| Program Coordination | | |
| National Secretariats | 700,000 | |
| National Coordination Councils | 300,000 | |
| CACILM Secretariat | 900,000 | |
| CACILM Steering Committee | 100,000 | |
| Subtotal | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| NPF Activities | | |
| Rangeland Ecosystem Management | 3,550,000 | |
| Integrated Agricultural Development and Land Improvement | 23,200,000 | |
| Mountain Pasture Management in Susamir Valley, Kyrgyz Republic | 1,950,000 | |
| Rural Development | 25,188,000 | |
| Demonstrating Local Responses to Combating Land Degradation and Improving Sustainable Land Management in SW Tajikistan | 1,700,000 | |
| Achieving Ecosystem Stability on the degraded land in Karakalpakstan and the Kyzylkum Desert | 3,810,000 | |
| Land Improvement | 79,400,000 | |
| Capacity Building and On-the-Ground Investments for Integrated and Sustainable Land Management | 2,100,000 | |
| Subtotal | 140,898,000 | 140,898,000 |
| TOTAL Estimated Cost | | 153,773,000 |
| CACILM PDF B Phase | | 1,750,000 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | 155,523,000 |

Table B.3: Estimated Costs - GEF 4 Financing (\$)

| | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| Multicountry Actviities | | |
| Sustainable Land Management Information System | 2,400,000 | |
| Knowledge Management and Information Dissemination | 600,000 | |
| Sustainable Land Management Research | 1,000,000 | |
| Capacity Building | 5,300,000 | |
| Subtotal | 9,300,000 | 9,300,000 |
| Program Coordination | | |
| National Secretariats | 700,000 | |
| National Coordination Councils | 300,000 | |
| CACILM Secretariat | 900,000 | |
| CACILM Steering Committee | 100,000 | |
| Subtotal | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| NPF Activities | | |
| Irrigation Ecosystem Management -Irrigation and Drainage II | 306,000,000 | |
| Syr Darya Delta Control and Northern Aral Sea Preservation - Phase ii | 105,000,000 | |
| IFAD Indicative Commitment* | 9,000,000 | |
| IFAD Indicative Commitment* | 8,000,000 | |
| IFAD Indicative Commitment* | 8,000,000 | |
| Second Land Improvement | 100,000,000 | |
| Enabling Sustainable Dryland Management through Mobile Pastoral Custodianship (UNDP - Includes Kyrgyz Rep., Kazakhstan, and 6 other non-CA countries) | 4,000,000 | |
| Kazakhstan -TBD | 107,063,000 | |
| Kyrgyz Republic -TBD | 16,546,000 | |
| Tajikistan - TBD | 24,172,000 | |
| Turkemenistan - TBD | 12,650,000 | |
| Uzbekistan - TBD | 148,069,000 | |
| Subtotal | 848,500,000 | 848,500,000 |
| TOTAL Estimated Cost | | 859,800,000 |

Table B.4: Estimated Costs – GEF 5 Financing (\$)**Multicountry Activities**

| | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|
| Sustainable Land Management Information System | 1,700,000 | |
| Knowledge Management and Information Dissemination | 300,000 | |
| Sustainable Land Management Research | 700,000 | |
| Capacity Building | 4,007,000 | |
| Subtotal | 6,707,000 | 6,707,000 |

Program Coordination

| | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| National Secretariats | 700,000 | |
| National Coordination Councils | 300,000 | |
| CACILM Secretariat | 800,000 | |
| CACILM Steering Committee | 100,000 | |
| Subtotal | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 |

NPF Activities

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Kazakhstan -TBD | 117,000,000 | |
| Kyrgyz Republic -TBD | 18,649,000 | |
| Tajikistan - TBD | 26,700,000 | |
| Turkemenistan - TBD | 12,345,000 | |
| Uzbekistan - TBD | 179,350,000 | |
| Subtotal | 354,044,000 | 354,044,000 |
| TOTAL Estimated Cost | | 362,651,000 |

ANNEX C: Work Plan

| CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework Work Plan | | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 201 |
|---|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| ID | Task Name | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | Multicountry Activities | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | SLM Information System(SLMIS) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Inception | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | SLMIS Design | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Capacity Development | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | SLMIS Development | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Initial Deployment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Operation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Knowledge Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Knowledge Management Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | CACILM Learn | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Design | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Development: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Operation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Knowledge Generation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Knowledge Dissemination | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | SLM Research | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Research Prospectus | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Research Activities | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Multicountry Capacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | National Capacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | National Capacity Building 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | National Capacity Building 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | Institutionalization | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | Multicountry Training | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | MC Training Phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | MC Training Phase 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | Land User and Community Mobilization | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | LUCM Phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | LUCM Phase 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | National Secretariats | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | Establishment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | Capacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Full Operation | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| CACILIM Multicountry Partnership Framework Work Plan | | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 201 |
|--|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| ID | Task Name | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 35 | CACILIM Multicountry Secretariat | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | Establishment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | Procedures and Systems | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | Operation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | National Coordinating Councils | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | Establishment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | Meetings | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | CACILIM Steering Committee | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | Establishment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | Meetings | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | NPF Projects - GEF3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 68 | KAZ- Rangeland Ecosystem Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | KYG- Integrated Agricultural Development and Land In | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | KYG- Mountain Pasture Management in Susamir Valle | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | TAJ- Rural Development | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | TAJ- Demonstrating Local Responses to Combating Li | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | UZB- Achieving Ecosystem Stability on the degraded l | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | UZB- Land Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | TRK-Capacity Building and On-the-Ground Investment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | NPF Projects - GEF 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | KAZ- Irrigated Ecosystem Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | Enabling Sustainable Dryland Management through M | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | KYG- IFAD Indicative Commitment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 80 | TAJ- IFAD Indicative Commitment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | UZB - Land Improvement Project- II | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | Kazakhstan - TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | Kyrgyz Republic-TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | Tajikistan -TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 85 | Turkmenistan- TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 86 | Uzbekistan- TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 87 | NPF Projects GEF 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 88 | Kazakhstan - TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 89 | Kyrgyz Republic-TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90 | Tajikistan -TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | |

CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework Work Plan

| ID | Task Name | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 91 | Turkmenistan- TBD | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 92 | Uzbekistan- TBD | | | | | | | | | | | | |

ANNEX D: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

| Objectives | Key performance indicator target at Program's end | Baseline | Critical benchmarks and target dates | Sampling frequency |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Program objective: Restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productive functions of land leading to improved economic and social well-being and preservation of environmental functions of these and other lands | Zero net increase in the area of degraded land in each land management class | Averages for the period 2000–2005 | 10% decrease in the area of land considered degraded in CACs by 2012 | Estimates commissioned by CACILM secretariat and derived from data on land cover and conditions derived in 2012 and 2016 |
| | 10% reduction in the total area of degraded land | Averages for the period 2000–2005 | 5% decrease in the total area of degraded land by 2012 | Consolidation based on national estimates in 2012 and 2016, respectively |
| | Improved welfare of those relying on land resources | Averages for the period 2000–2005 | Targets set in existing PRSP or similar documents to apply | Bi-annual poverty assessment updates |
| | 50% increase in average productivity by land management class | Averages for the period 2000–2005 | Average productivity by each land management class to increase by 20% by 2012 | Annual reporting by the relevant technical agency of the government |
| | 100% increase in average financial returns by land management class | Averages for the period 2000–2005 | Average financial profitability on each class of production land to increase by 40% by 2012 | Annual reporting by the relevant technical agency of the government |
| | 100% increase in household-managed land supported by cadastre and registration in each class of productive land | Situation in 2005 | 75% increase in household-managed land supported by cadastre and registration in each class of productive land by 2012 | Annual reporting by the relevant technical agency of the government |
| | Improved conditions of watershed leading to greater water storage and less erosion | Average conditions for the period 2000–2005 | No net increase in average water-induced erosion by 2012 | Periodic watershed environmental impact surveys developed by SLMIS |
| | 100% increase in areas of biodiversity conservation | Situation in 2005 | 100% increase in areas of biodiversity conservation to increase by 50% by 2012 | Annual reporting by the relevant technical agency of the government |
| | A 10% gain in carbon sequestration | Averages for the period 2000–2005 | A 5% gain in carbon sequestration due to expansion of woody biomass and better conditions of pastures by 2012 | Sample survey of land use in CACs' watersheds conducted in 2011 and 2015 for consolidation and analysis in 2012 and 2016, respectively |

| Objectives | Key performance indicator target at Program's end | Baseline | Critical benchmarks and target dates | Sampling frequency |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| | Zero change in the long-term annual flow of transboundary rivers at established points and a statistically significant improvement in key quality parameters | Averages for the period 2000–2005 established during phase I of the program | Agreement on the location of measurement points and quality parameters to be agreed not later than December 2008 | Consolidation based on national estimates in 2012 and 2016, respectively Annual monitoring adapted to CACILM requirements |
| Outcome 1: 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 | Situation in 2005 | SLM recognized as a budget category in relevant ministries and in PIP by 2011 | One-time assessment by NCC |
| | NPF accepted by the CACs' governments as an action-oriented culmination of the NAP | Situation in 2005 | NPF officially endorsed by the Governments by June 2006 | One-time assessment by NCC |
| | NPF recognized in the PRSP or similar documents | Situation in 2005 | PRSP formally to incorporate SLM by June 2008 | One-time assessment by NCC |
| | 100% increase in share of SLM investment in government budgets and PIP | Situation in 2005 | Share of SLM investment in government budgets and PIP to increase by 50% by 2011 | Annual monitoring of public expenditure by relevant national agencies |
| | Policy frameworks for sustainable management of pasturelands, rainfed lands and forests implemented | Situation in 2005 | Policy frameworks for sustainable management of pasturelands, rainfed lands and forests formulated not later than December 2008 | One-time assessment by NCC and CACILM secretariat in 2010 |
| | 90% of all areas of mainly rainfed production lands are under long-term use rights | Situation in 2005 | 50% of all areas of mainly rainfed production lands are under long-term use rights | Annual reporting by the relevant technical agency of the Government |
| | 50% of rural households in forestland areas engaged in woodlot establishment and sustainable forest management | Average conditions for the period 2000–2005 | 20% of rural households in forestland areas engaged in woodlot establishment and sustainable forest management | SLMIS monitoring reports |

| Objectives | Key performance indicator target at Program's end | Baseline | Critical benchmarks and target dates | Sampling frequency |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Outcome 2: 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 | Estimate of the percentage of public investment projects in agriculture, livestock and forest management that used an integrated approach during 2000–2005 | Integrated approach to land use planning and management used in 75% of relevant public investment projects by 2011 | One time assessments by NCCs in 2012 and 2016 |
| | All monitoring and evaluation reports of relevant public investment projects meet CACILM standards | CACILM monitoring and evaluation guidelines to be formulated during phase I of the program | 50% of monitoring and evaluation reports of relevant public investment projects meet CACILM standards by 2011 | Periodic assessments by SPA members |
| | Improved land-use practices adopted by no less than 50% of land using households | Latest official estimate of the households predominantly relying on farming and livestock | Improved land-use practices adopted by no less than 25% of land using households by 2011 | Annual compilation of results by SLMIS, starting in 2008, supported by reporting by technical agencies responsible for agriculture |
| | 100% increase in research budgets | The average of SLM-related budgets for the period 2000–2005 | SLM research budgets to increase by 50% by 2012 | Annual reporting by relevant research agencies |
| | 100% increase in SLM budgets in disaster preparedness programs | Estimate of SLM elements as percentage of total national disaster preparedness budgets during 2000–2005 | SLM budgets in disaster preparedness programs to double by 2011 | Reports by disaster preparedness authorities and national secretariats in 2012 |
| Outcome 3: 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 | Average conditions for the period 2000–2005 | 20% increase in average productivity by land management class privately managed lands | Annual reporting by technical agencies responsible for agriculture |
| | 100% increase in average financial returns by land management class privately managed lands | Average conditions for the period 2000–2005 | 60% increase in average financial returns by land management class privately managed lands | Annual reporting by technical agencies responsible for agriculture |
| | 50% reduction in the area of degraded lands-salinized or waterlogged | Estimates of the extent of waterlogging and salinity in 2005 NPFs | Area affected by waterlogging and salinity reduced by 25% by 2001 | SLMIS monitoring reports based on annual reporting by technical agencies responsible for agriculture |

| Objectives | Key performance indicator target at Program's end | Baseline | Critical benchmarks and target dates | Sampling frequency |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | 10% increase in the forest cover with no reduction of standing timber volume | The most recent official data of forest cover plus estimates of forest and woody vegetation cover outside state forest carried out during Phase I of the Program | No net decrease in the countries' forest cover and no reduction of standing timber volume by 2011 | Forest and shrub sample survey conducted in 2011 to be analyzed in 2012, and in 2015 for analysis in 2016 |
| | At least 40% increase in average productivity of pastureland in each country | Estimates of average productivity of principal categories of pasturelands in NPFs or other official sources | Country-wide pastureland productivity increased by 10% by 2011 | Annual reporting by relevant technical agency and by SLMIS |
| | 50% increase in average productivity of irrigated lands by "reformed" farm enterprises | Latest official estimates of average yields of principal crops on irrigated lands during the period 2000–2005 | Average yields on irrigated lands managed by "reformed" farm enterprises to increase by 10% by during the period 2006–2011 | Annual reporting by relevant technical agency and by SLMIS |
| | 20% increase in average productivity of pasturelands around settlements | Existing estimates of average productivity of pasturelands around settlements | Average productivity of pasturelands around settlements to increase by 25% by 2011 | One-time aggregation and analysis of spatial results carried out in 2012 and 2016 |
| Outcome 4: Enhances protection of ecosystems' integrity and landscapes | 200% increase in rural communities involved in integrated land management | Cumulated population involved in integrated land management, 2000–2005 | Rural communities involved in integrated land management to double by 2011 | Bi-annual reporting by relevant local level technical agencies of the government |
| | 100% increase in area of biodiversity conservation where public-private partnerships for natural resource conservation are established | Cumulated area where public-private partnerships for biodiversity conservation were established during 2000–2005 | Area of different ecosystems where public-private partnerships for biodiversity/natural resource conservation increases by 50% by 2012 | Bi-annual reporting by relevant local level technical agencies of the government |
| | 200% increase in the number of government staff trained in ecosystem and landscape conservation | Cumulated total of active government staff up to 2005 | Number of government staff trained in ecosystem and landscape conservation doubles by 2012 | Bi-annual reporting by relevant local level technical agencies of the government |

| Objectives | Key performance indicator target at Program's end | Baseline | Critical benchmarks and target dates | Sampling frequency |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Outcome 5: Broad involvement of civil society and other stakeholders in SLM in Central Asia | 100% increase in budgets for NGO involvement as facilitators in Program's activities | Average annual amounts during the period 2000–2005 estimated during phase i of the program | Budgets for NGO involvement as facilitators in Program's activities increases by 60% by December 2011 | Annual reporting by national secretariats |
| | 200% increase in the number of private-sector SLM service providers (land reclamation advice, extension, etc.) | Average annual amounts during the period 2000–2005 estimated during phase i of the program | Number of private-sector SLM service providers (land reclamation advice, extension, etc) doubles by 2011 | Annual reporting by technical agency responsible for agricultural extension |
| | Percentage of women represented in the local bodies implementing program's activities no less than 30% | Annual average for the period 2000–2005 | Percentage of women represented in the local bodies implementing Program's activities no less than 15% | National secretariat, bi-annually |
| Outcome 6: 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 | Average annual disbursements for SLM multicountry activities during 1995–2005 | Increase of average annual disbursements for SLM multicountry activities by 50% by 2011 | A spot evaluation in 2011 |
| | Complete accounting for all donor-implemented SLM activities in the region | Listing of donor-implemented SLM activities in 2005 NPFs | Listing of past and present donor-implemented SLM activities in CACs complete by June 2007 | Completeness and accuracy checked annually throughout the program's duration |
| | Shared understanding about the technical content of proposed SLM interventions | Descriptions of the technical content and lessons learnt in 2005 NPFs and other available documents | Ordered set of technical summaries and lessons learnt of all donor-funded SLM activities complete by December 2007 | Annual checks by SPA members of completeness and quality of the summaries |
| | Inclusion of SLM in donors' assistance programs | Review of the latest donor assistance programs in CACs | All SPA members formally to program SLM in their assistance no later than their next assistance cycle and in any case not later than December 2008 | A report by CACILM secretariat by March 2009 |

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

ANNEX E: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

| Program areas | Stakeholders | Capabilities/ current role | Interest in MCPF | Possible conflicts/mitigati on strategy |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| A. Project level | | | | |
| 1. Capacity building | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | Farmers, pastoralists | Daily experience of land management | The Program seen as a chance to acquire SLM know-how and apply it in a reformed local environment | Building of farmers' capacity may be thwarted by incomplete or limited land tenure. Attention to strengthening land tenure in project locations to proceed in parallel with capacity building |
| | Water user associations | Early but insufficient experience of on-farm water- and financial management | To gain more experience, institutional acceptance and financial stability | The imprint of old ways of managing water too strong. Patient but principled insistence on WUAs' duties needed. |
| | Government agencies implementing projects | Mandated responsibilities in each agency's technical area and varying capacity to live up to the mandate | To improve the qualifications and experience of own staff, to improve the capacity of the entire agency to implement projects. | Risk of monopolization of capacity building by small groups within agencies. Design of capacity building activities to guard against this risk. |
| | Donors supporting capacity building | Body of experience with capacity building projects at project- and higher levels | To see the capacity of farmers and others improved for more effective implementation of SLM | |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | Research and training establishments | Experience, not always relevant, of research and training in SLM-related disciplines | To update own skills, gain international experience and contacts, improve employment prospects of staff. | Preconceived notions about the "right" sort of capacity to create. Exposure to international experience required. |
| | NGOs | History of contacts with local population and facilitation of change | To improve own pool of experience, improve own staff's employment prospects, become a more effective force for progress in the project location | NGOs seen as competitors for "capacity building dollars". Analysis needed of the advantages in each project of building Government and NGO capacity at the same |

| Program areas | Stakeholders | Capabilities/ current role | Interest in MCPF | Possible conflicts/mitigati on strategy |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | time. |
| 2. Sustainable agriculture, sustainable forest management; sustainable pastureland management, integrated resource management and Aral Sea remediation | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | Farmers, pastoralists | Actually working the land | To improve livelihoods, provide for their families, pass on inheritance | Rural households may find the proposed interventions ineffective or unresponsive. Solutions to be found in participatory design. Risk of inappropriate interference (rather than facilitation) by local powers. Policy dialogue by the donors and central governments needed. |
| | Technical agencies executing projects | Usual project-executing responsibilities supported by uneven management and other skills. | Employment and indirect benefits for own staff, institutional influence, wish to do well for the project location | Self-serving implementation of projects. Answers in making room in implementation for third parties (NGOs, other agencies) and otherwise fighting institutional "empire building". |
| | Donors financing project interventions | Depending on the budget situation of each country, to finance varying parts of project cost, bring in own technical and policy expertise | To see own creation (i.e. MCPF) deliver its promise at project level. | Donors' own biases may influence the design of field interventions. Donor consultation and humility to even out the biases. |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | NGOs, civil society | Contacts with rural population and facilitation of change | To act as trainers and facilitators in project implementation | Risk of "one-issue" bias in the work of NGOs. Consultation, attention to TOR and monitoring required. |
| 3. Targeted research | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | Research and training establishments | Experience, not always relevant, of research and training in SLM-related disciplines | To act as trainers, to carry out field level applied research | Own research interest could distort the impacts. Attention to TOR and monitoring is essential. |
| | Farmers, pastoralists | Potential recipients and disseminators of research findings | To benefit financially from field research activities | Valid research finding may not reach the potential beneficiaries. |

| Program areas | Stakeholders | Capabilities/ current role | Interest in MCPF | Possible conflicts/mitigati on strategy |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | Active dissemination required. |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | Donor financing applied research | Experience of grafting applied research on SLM projects | To use own experience in the domain for the benefit of project location and beyond. | |
| 4. Protected area management and biodiversity | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | Local communities | Often affected directly by the conditions of natural resources within and close to protected areas. | To see that better management of biological resources delivers local benefits | Protection may be in conflict with improved livelihoods. Creative design needed that seizes opportunities. |
| | Global community | May attach high importance to particular ecosystems and locations | To ensure that some benefits of local biodiversity management accrue also to the "world". | Global considerations may demand a more costly design of interventions. GEF incremental cost funding a possible answer. |
| | Government agencies technically responsible for protected area management | Bear usual responsibilities for protected area management. Typically handicapped by limited budgets. | The Program seen as an opportunity to overcome budget constraints | |
| | Donors financing | Experience in local protected area management. | To encourage protected area management that benefits local communities and adds to global objectives | |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | Civil society | In some cases acting as facilitators in attempts to improve the status of local valuable ecosystems | To increase own contribution to local protected area management | |
| B. NPF level | | | | |
| 1. Capacity building | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | Technical agencies of the central government in each CAC | Central role in mainstreaming SLM and adopting an integrated approach to land management | The Program seen as an opportunity to achieve livelihood and environmental objectives. | Weak inter-agency cooperation, and conflict over influence and budget allocations could hamper |

| Program areas | Stakeholders | Capabilities/ current role | Interest in MCPF | Possible conflicts/mitigati on strategy |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>Finance, budget and economic development ministries</p> <p>Donors supporting capacity building</p> | <p>against numerous weaknesses that need to be overcome.</p> <p>Translating policy priorities into budget allocations</p> <p>Grant and loan funds, substantial technical and administrative know-how. Through SP, they are the driving force behind the Program</p> | <p>Potential increase in donor contributions to PIP.</p> <p>The SP members have a vested interest in MCPF's success.</p> | <p>progress. Active mediation by the NCCs required to defuse potential disagreements.</p> <p>Possible resistance to changed ways of doing things. Advantages of proposed reforms need to be well explained.</p> |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | <p>Technical agencies at the local level</p> <p>Local elected governments or bodies</p> <p>Farmers and pastoralists</p> <p>Civil society</p> | <p>Some experience implementing donor-funded land-related projects</p> <p>Varying ability to communicate with political constituency and present SLM as an attractive option Articulation</p> <p>To press local representative for changes that make investment in SLM more attractive.</p> <p>Varied skills and perspectives, often good knowledge of field conditions and local perceptions.</p> | <p>MCPF and NPFs as a means of upgrading their technical and human resources</p> <p>MCPF and NPFs as a means of attracting more finance into rural areas and tackle poverty</p> <p>To see more favorable conditions for investment in SLM.</p> <p>To see their multiple concerns about land use and management addressed at the high level; to be given a chance actively to participate in the process.</p> | <p>In some cases, local level agencies too weak or demoralized to play an active part. The answer lies in creating a constructive role for them in investment design.</p> <p>Sometimes a very narrow view of the problem best overcome by facilitating exchanges of complementary or conflicting points of view with other stakeholders.</p> |
| 2. Sustainable agriculture, sustainable forest management; sustainable pastureland management, integrated resource management and Aral Sea remediation | | | | |

| Program areas | Stakeholders | Capabilities/ current role | Interest in MCPF | Possible conflicts/mitigati on strategy |
|----------------------|--|---|--|---|
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | <p>Farmers and pastoralists in NPF project areas</p> <p>Technical agencies of the central government in each CAC.</p> <p>Local governments or quasi-government bodies in areas where NPF projects are being implemented</p> <p>Donors supporting on-the-ground investments in SLM.</p> | <p>Some know-how of land management in post-kolkhoz conditions; varied technical skills, desire to succeed.</p> <p>Creating (or not) the suitable environment for filed activities to take place and succeed.</p> <p>Limited technical and suitable administrative skills and low motivation that can be changed under right circumstances.</p> <p>Grant and loan funds, substantial technical and administrative know-how.</p> | <p>Improvement of livelihoods.</p> <p>To demonstrate their contribution to society;</p> <p>Increased local tax revenues, continued influence.</p> <p>To see the financial and technical support translated into changed field realities.</p> | <p>Skepticism based on slow progress of land reform and a variety of obstacles to more profitable farming. Multipronged approach needed to overcome the skepticism.</p> <p>Desire to maintain influence and preserve practices that benefit some in local government might pose an obstacle to implementing some reform measures.</p> |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | <p>Farmers and herders outside immediate NPF project areas.</p> <p>Civil society</p> <p>Water user associations</p> | <p>Some know-how of land management in post-kolkhoz conditions; varied technical skills, desire to succeed.</p> <p>Varied skills and perspectives, often good knowledge of field conditions and local perceptions.</p> | <p>To learn from lessons and innovations emerging from project areas.</p> <p>To see their multiple concerns about land use and management addressed at the field level; to be given a chance actively to participate in the process.</p> | <p>Sense of frustration at insufficient room created for civil society to participate. Answers to be sought in deliberate steps in Program activities to increase public involvement.</p> |

| Program areas | Stakeholders | Capabilities/ current role | Interest in MCPF | Possible conflicts/mitigati on strategy |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| 3. Targeted research | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | Farmers and pastoralists engaged in activities that are targeted by the research | Serious shortage of experience in land management that is supported by modern applied research adapted to new institutional circumstances. | Improved livelihood | Temptation to use the research to ensure survival of the institution rather than be useful. Preparation of a targeted research plan and its management by outside agency to avoid that risk. |
| | Research institutions and individual researchers involved | Highly relevant experience available to international research bodies; varying amounts of relevant experience at local research bodies; strong desire to revive research activities | Work satisfaction, wages, sustainability of research, addition to regional and global SLM know-how | |
| | Donors supporting the research | Grant and loan funds, substantial technical and administrative know-how | Sense of achievement and usefulness that can be communicated to domestic and international audience. | |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | Technical agencies responsible for land management | Facilitating the work of research institutions | Demonstration of usefulness, contribution to the nation's livelihood, contribution to positive local environmental outcomes | |
| 4. Protected area management and biodiversity | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | Global community | Holder of high expectations expressed through support for GEF and other multilateral activities aimed at conserving environmental assets. | MCPF seen as an efficient way to achieve environmental objectives related to land degradation. | In the absence of the right incentive structure, local communities can go |
| | Local communities and community-based bodies in | Under the right incentives, capable of carrying out the necessary conservation and sustainable use activities. Providers of | To find employment, to see the quality of local physical | |

| Program areas | Stakeholders | Capabilities/ current role | Interest in MCPF | Possible conflicts/mitigati on strategy |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | <p>areas where protected area and ecosystem conservation projects are implemented.</p> <p>Agencies of the government responsible for ecosystem conservation, biodiversity and protected areas.</p> | <p>specialized local experience and labor.</p> <p>Hold much of specialized knowledge related to environmental protection.</p> | <p>environments improved, and sustainable livelihood opportunities increased.</p> <p>To see NPF activities offer additional layer of support for ecosystem conservation.</p> | <p>back to old unsustainable ways. The response to be sought in robust design of interventions.</p> <p>Attention to conservation outside protected areas could be seen as diluting the mandate of environmental agencies. Answers in good inter-agency dialogue and coordination.</p> |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | Civil society | Varied skills and perspectives, often good knowledge of field conditions and local perceptions. | To see their multiple concerns about environmental protection and ecosystem conservation addressed at both central and local levels and to be given a chance actively to participate in the process. | Existence of numerous partial interests can create obstacles to action. Wide-ranging stakeholder consultation and participation usually the best mechanism for resolving potential conflicts. |
| C. Multicountry level | | | | |
| 1. Capacity development and knowledge management | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | <p>Land managers in CACs</p> <p>National technical agencies dealing with land management</p> <p>Civil societies in CACs</p> | <p>They can adopt SLM if sufficiently supported.</p> <p>Actual or potential conduits for useful SLM-related knowledge.</p> <p>Active participants in the flow of knowledge.</p> | <p>A road to improved livelihoods.</p> <p>To see the performance of land-based sectors improved and environment less threatened.</p> <p>To learn more from lessons of SLM implementation and research.</p> | |

| Program areas | Stakeholders | Capabilities/ current role | Interest in MCPF | Possible conflicts/mitigati on strategy |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | SPA members | Bring own funding and experience to knowledge management. | MCPF considered an effective means of disseminating lessons | |
| 2. Sustainable Land Management Research | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | Land managers in CACs | Potential users of research results. | To derive maximum livelihood benefits from research and its dissemination in CACs. | |
| | Participating research institutions and groups in CACs. | Research practitioners. | Chance to be involved in new things, earn a living, gain in self-esteem, contribute to society's improvement. | |
| | The research organization coordinating multi-country research program. | Bring wide-ranging international research experience and help make national research more purposeful. | Opportunity to contribute global experience and add to it through interaction with local researchers; wages for own staff | |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | SPA members | Funding of targeted research, facilitation of contacts with own research bodies, sharing of experience. | To be informed about the progress of land-related research in CACs to better calibrate assistance. | |
| | International land research organizations | Can add to new body of insights on SLM and positively affect the direction of SLM research in CACs | To learn from the research achievements of the Program | |
| 3. Land degradation and SLM information system | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | National technical agencies dealing with land management | Contribute and interpret information relevant to SLM. | MCPF can make up for serious weaknesses of current database and information systems. | |
| | SPA members | Finding SLM information activities and share own technical | To obtain a more reliable information about the | |

| Program areas | Stakeholders | Capabilities/ current role | Interest in MCPF | Possible conflicts/mitigati on strategy |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | and administrative knowledge in this domain. | conditions of land resources and the factors influencing them as a basis for targeting own assistance to countries. | |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | Global environmental monitoring bodies | Provide a synthesis of land-related information and act as validating and dissemination arms. | To obtain a more accurate picture of land degradation trends and gain better understanding of causal factors. | |
| | CACILM steering committee | To coordinate activities of CACILM partnership. | To have a handy management tool that facilitates re-calibration of the Program, if necessary. | |
| 4. Program coordination | | | | |
| | Primary stakeholders | | | |
| | CACILM steering committee | To coordinate activities of CACILM partnership. | To be able to discharge coordination and administrative activities efficiently. | |
| | National coordination councils (NCCs) | To coordinate NPF-related activities. | as above | |
| | National secretariats | To assist NCCs to discharge their responsibilities | To be able to perform its assistance, facilitation and other tasks efficiently | |
| | SPA members | | | |
| | Secondary stakeholders | | | |
| | GEF | Provides a vital grant funding to overcome a variety of barriers standing in the way of SLM | MCPF seen as an efficient way of discharging GEF's mandate under OP 15. | |

CACs = Central Asian countries; CACILM = Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management; CMPF = CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework; GEF = Global Environment Facility; NCC = national coordination council; NPF = national programming framework; OP = Operational Program; PIP = public investment plan; SLM = sustainable land management; SPA = Strategic Partnership Agreement for UNCCD Implementation in the CACs; TOR = terms of reference; WUA = water users' association.

ANNEX F: 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 a 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 and 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 better understood in CACs, in part as a result of development cooperation partner-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 some 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 cooperation

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 development cooperation partner 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 donors 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 of reversal of land degradation that otherwise may either not occur or occur at a much slower pace—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 causes downstream and transboundary water quality deterioration; improvements in water availability that will in turn help to moderate the harsh climate associated with desertification; enable a reversal in the loss of carbon stocks, and hence a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, as agriculture becomes sustainable and forests regenerate; and reverse the loss of biodiversity that is inevitable with the present trend of habitat loss.

10. The nature of expected incremental activities and incremental cost is summarized in Table F.1 below.

11. Table F.2 below shows the estimated composition of the incremental cost by expected Program outcomes for projects to be financed under the GEF3 tranche.

Table F.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>Cost of</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</i></p> | Enhanced use of integrated land use planning and management | | |

| 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>make integrated land use planning and management a 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>Use of integrated land-use management as also 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 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 <i>Additional investments in SLM that target global environmental benefits, such as</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>establishment of woodlots beyond immediate local or national requirements,</i> | Reduction or reversal of land degradation, productivity increases, livelihood improvements, and positive environmental externalities of SLM investments | <p><i>Environmental benefits generated by investments in excess of immediate national needs</i></p> | <p><i>Cost of establishing woodlots beyond immediate local or national</i></p> |

| 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 | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 watersheds of transboundary rivers</i> | | | <i>requirements;</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>others, as in column 2</i> |
| 4. Limited efforts to formulate and implement projects that target ecosystem integrity | 4.1 <i>Additional steps to undertake projects that target ecosystem integrity</i> | Production benefits and local positive environmental externalities of less fragmented ecosystems | <i>Value to the global community of less fragmented ecosystems of global importance</i> | <i>Cost of formulating and implementing activities that target the integrity of ecosystems of global importance</i> |
| 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 <i>Steps to increase the understanding among stakeholders of the global dimensions of SLM</i> | 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> | <i>Cost of activities that increase the understanding among stakeholders of the global dimensions of SLM</i> |
| 6. Pre-CACILM pattern of development partner involvement in SLM | 6.1 <i>Enhanced development partner coordination and harmonization of approaches through CACILM</i> | Greater cost effectiveness and synergies in financing national SLM activities <i>Increased attention to financing of</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 | | | | |
| | | <i>activities that deliver also global environmental benefits</i> | <i>Generation of global environmental benefits through improved development partner coordination and cooperation</i> | <i>Cost of achieving and maintaining greater development partner coordination and cooperation in a program that delivers also global environmental benefits</i> |

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

Table F2. Incremental cost analysis for GEF 3 Replenishment

| Title of project | Timeframe | Location | Agency | Incremental cost by Program outcome categories | | | | | | | Total incremental cost | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--------|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|------------------------|------------|
| | | | | Creation of favorable environment for SLM investments | Improved capacity of institutions in the 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 | | | |
| CACILM National and Multicountry Partnership and Framework Design and Preparation | April 2005 – June 2006 | Kazakhstan, K. yrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan | ADB | | | | | | | | 700,000 | 700,000 |
| Rangeland Ecosystem Management | July 2006 - June 2010 | Kazakhstan | UNDP | 100,000 | | 200,000 | 700,000 | | | | | 1,000,000 |
| Integrated Agricultural Development and Land Improvement | December 2006 – June 2012 | K. yrgyz Republic | ADB | 400,000 | 350,000 | 1,500,000 | | 250,000 | | | | 2,500,000 |
| Mountain Pasture Management in Susamir Valley, Kyrgyzstan | September 2006 – March 2010 | K. yrgyz Republic | UNDP | 100,000 | 250,000 | 525,000 | | 100,000 | | | | 975,000 |
| Rural Development | January 2007 – June 2012 | Tajikistan | ADB | 400,000 | 550,000 | 2,100,000 | | 150,000 | | | | 3,500,000 |
| Demonstrating Local Responses to Combating Land Degradation and Improving Sustainable Land Management in SW Tajikistan | July 2006 – March 2010 | Tajikistan | UNDP | 100,000 | 200,000 | | | 700,000 | | | | 1,000,000 |
| Achieving Ecosystem Stability on the Degraded Land in Karakalpakstan and the Kyzylkum Desert | April 2005 – March 2010 | Uzbekistan | UNDP | 100,000 | 150,000 | | 650,000 | 100,000 | | | | 1,000,000 |
| Land Improvement | January 2007 – December 2010 | Uzbekistan | ADB | 250,000 | 700,000 | | 1,600,000 | 450,000 | | | | 3,000,000 |
| Capacity Building and On-the-Ground Investments for Integrated and Sustainable Land Management | January 2007- December 2009 | Turkmenistan | UNDP | 250,000 | 650,000 | | | 100,000 | | | | 1,000,000 |
| CACILM Multicountry Partnership Framework Support | July 2006 – December 2008 | Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan | ADB | | 1,800,000 | | | | | | 1,225,000 | 3,025,000 |
| CACILM Multicountry Capacity Building Project | September 2006 – December 2008 | Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan | UNDP | 400,000 | 1,100,000 | | | | | | 1,500,000 | 3,000,000 |
| All Projects | | | | 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 |
| | | Capacity Building - Percent of Total | | 37.9 | | | | | | | | |

ANNEX G: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Contents

1. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
2. UNCCD National Action Plans
3. UNCCD Subregional Action Programme
4. GEF Sustainable Land Management Focal Area
5. GEF Country Pilot Partnership Program
6. Development and Design of CACILM

2. The CMPF is the result of linkages between initiatives at the global level by UNCCD and related United Nations agencies, efforts by the CACs to reverse land degradation and desertification, and strategic partnerships among donor and other concerned agencies. UNCCD provided the initial impetus to the CACs to become more active in this vital concern. They made national action plans and then a subregional action program on desertification and drought, in line with UNCCD. Difficulties in implementing national plans and the subregional program led the Global Mechanism of UNCCD to urge donors to form a partnership to formulate a sustainable and coherent strategy for UNCCD implementation in the CACs. The result was the Strategic Partnership Agreement for UNCCD Implementation in the Central Asian Countries (SPA). The CACILM concept was developed by SPA following wide stakeholder consultation.

3. New and timely opportunities were presented by the GEF with the opening of a new Focal Area on Land Degradation and the elaboration of the GEF Country Pilot Partnership (CPP) initiative. Given the extent of land degradation and the presence of the SPA, Central Asia was selected as one of the regions where the GEF CPP initiative would be undertaken. As a result it was decided to submit CACILM, with ADB as lead agency, for funding under the GEF – CPP initiative. Details of these developments and initiatives follow.

A. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

4. The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) was adopted in June 1994. To date, more than 170 countries have ratified the Convention as a legally binding framework that contributes to providing a comprehensive answer to problems related to the environment and sustainable livelihoods. The objective of UNCCD is to “..combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa, through effective actions at all levels, supported by international cooperation and partnership arrangements, in the framework of an integrated approach which is consistent with Agenda 21, with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in the affected areas”

5. The UNCCD calls upon both “affected” and “developed country” parties to take the necessary actions for tackling root causes of land degradation and specifically poverty, which forces communities to adopt unsustainable livelihood practices. It recommends that countries experiencing problems associated with land degradation:

- (i) adopt a bottom-up approach to identifying the root causes of land degradation;
- (ii) elevate the priority assigned to land degradation at the national level;
- (iii) create an enabling policy, legislative and institutional environment to facilitate actions to combat desertification; and
- (iv) undertake intersectoral and coordinated responses in consultation with civil society actors and donors.

6. Similarly, developed countries are recommended to support countries experiencing land degradation through (i) provision of substantial resources for developing long-term strategies, (ii) new and additional finances beyond official development assistance, and (iii) access to appropriate technologies and expertise.

B. UNCCD National Action Plans

7. In view of the serious threat posed by desertification and drought to the national economies of the Central Asia, all the CACs became parties to UNCCD in the late 1990s and quickly formulated national action programs (NAPs). Since their formulation, a series of obstacles has hindered the effective implementation of NAPs. The following issues have been identified as needing attention:

- (i) Governments need to more openly acknowledge the direct links between poverty and the state of the environment as well as recognize the real impact of desertification on the economy.
- (ii) An enabling policy, legislative, and institutional environment needs to be created to encourage active responses to desertification by principal stakeholders.
- (iii) The UNCCD should be integrated into national development plans and strategies.
- (iv) Activities of the various ministries should be coordinated in order to encourage harmonized responses across a broad range of economic sectors.
- (v) Local communities and civil society organizations need to be more involved in decision-making processes and in implementation of anti-desertification measures .
- (vi) More funds need to be allocated both nationally and from external sources to combat desertification and drought.

C. UNCCD Sub-regional Action Programme

8. In September 2003, recognizing that desertification and drought are problems of transboundary nature and that coordinated actions of countries are needed to combat desertification and drought as well as poverty on a sufficiently large scale, the CACs formulated the *Sub-regional Action Programme for the Central Asian Countries on Combating Desertification within the UNCCD Context* (SRAP/CD) to reinforce the implementation of national action programs. It identified six priority areas for possible joint sub-regional or national pilot implementation, i.e. (1) monitoring and evaluation of desertification processes, (2) 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 ethnotourism, and (6) capacity building of local communities. SRAP/CD emphasizes synergy of any proposed measures with other environmental conventions and contains a menu of project ideas suitable for implementation in all CA countries. The objectives of SRAP/CD are to

- (i) provide additional impetus and create new mechanisms for NAP implementation;
- (ii) coordinate subregional interests, solve problems related to the mutual use of cross-border resources, and prevent possible conflicts ;
- (iii) strengthen the subregional and international exchange of information and experience;

- (iv) mobilize bilateral and multilateral donors for implementation of the UNCCD in the subregion;
- (v) ensure synergy in the subregional implementation of environmental conventions;
- (vi) encourage greater participation of countries in the region in implementing the Regional Action Programme (RAP) for Asia, develop cooperation with other regional programs, and promote joint participation in events organized at the international level, in particular at sessions of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UNCCD;
- (vii) develop and implement joint programs; and
- (viii) contribute to sustainable improvement of socioeconomic conditions especially of disadvantaged and vulnerable people.

D. GEF Sustainable Land Management Focal Area

9. GEF has a long association with the fight against desertification and land degradation more generally. Initially, GEF addressed land degradation within the initial suite of focal areas—biodiversity, climate change, international waters, and ozone layer depletion. However, this presented operational difficulties for the countries developing projects related to land degradation. The situation was improved by addition of operational programs on integrated ecosystem management, and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture (OP12 and OP13, respectively), which provided a way of supporting efforts to create the preconditions for systematically dealing with land degradation.

10. At the 2nd GEF Assembly in 2002, land degradation, primarily desertification and deforestation, was designated as a focal area, making sustainable land management a primary focus of GEF assistance. The objective of the new focal area is to remove critical barriers to sustainable land management. These barriers are of four types: institutional and governance, economic and financial, social and behavioral, and technological and knowledge related.

11. The Assembly also confirmed that the GEF would act as a source of finance for the UNCCD pursuant to Article 21 of the Convention. In 2003, the GEF Council approved an operational program (OP 15) on sustainable land management (SLM). Its objective is to mitigate the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the structural and functional integrity of the ecosystems through sustainable land management practices, as a contribution to enhancing ecosystem functions and services and improving people's livelihoods and well-being. The strategic priorities of OP 15 for GEF-3 are SP-1: targeted capacity building; and SP-2: implementation of innovative and indigenous sustainable land management practices. SP 1 is addressed through efforts to address the deficit in systemic capacities for SLM, through policy reforms, mainstreaming of SLM objectives into the national planning framework and sector frameworks and capacity building within key institutions responsible for SLM. SP2 is addressed through pilot activities in the field aimed at modifying harmful land-use practices, replicating successful interventions and disseminating good practices.

E. GEF Country Pilot Partnership Program

12. GEF noted that several problems face developing countries in addressing land degradation issues: "First, sustainable land management does require a coordinated approach with a longer time frame than most conventional projects, which rely on 3–5 year implementation cycles. This longer-term framework requires a partnership approach because it goes beyond the capacity and planning frameworks of individual organizations and institutions both at the national and international level. Second, the implementation of such a long-term

program would need to be supported by sizeable commitments of financial resources, which would need to be made in a predictable manner over the implementation period of the program. Such a level of commitment would go beyond the capacity of individual countries or development partners. Third, since many GEF developing country partners are at different levels of development, the availability of such sizeable financial resource packages in a predictable manner would allow each country to design and pursue a sustainable land management program suitable to its needs and capacity. A country would not be compelled to adjust to varying timetables of different [donors], which has largely contributed to project failure in the past.”¹

13. In view of the above conditions, country pilot partnerships (CPPs) were felt by GEF to offer the best opportunities to achieve sustainable land management. The CMPF is one of six GEF CPPs on sustainable land management at different stages of implementation, the other five being for Burkina Faso, Cuba, Ethiopia, Namibia, and Viet Nam. The World Bank is taking the lead for Ethiopia and Viet Nam, and is in the process of developing the concepts for GEF Pipeline entry. UNDP is taking the lead for Namibia and Cuba. IFAD and UNDP are co-leading the process in Burkina Faso. Namibia and Cuba have made the most progress so far, with countries taking ownership and leadership in developing the concept and providing both political and financial commitment.

14. The intention of the CPPs is to enable developing countries to carry out the following:

- (i) Mainstream land management issues, including policy reforms, into country sustainable development priorities.
- (ii) Adopt integrated and sustainable land management practices, including water use efficiency measures, as part of development programs.
- (iii) Promote synergies between the environment and other sectors of the economy.
- (iv) Address the issue of cofinancing up front and at a programmatic level.
- (v) Reduce the transaction costs as the partners use streamlined and harmonized project cycle procedures to develop and approve partnership components.
- (vi) Strengthen the enabling environment for sustainable land management.
- (vii) Scale up viable traditional land management practices as well as innovative and cost-effective practices.
- (viii) Facilitate replication and sustainability of projects and programs.

F. Development and Design of CACILM

1. Development Agencies and the Strategic Partnership Agreement

15. At the international level, aside from the extensive attention devoted to the Aral Sea crisis, support from development cooperation agencies for the UNCCD implementation in Central Asia has been inadequate. A need has clearly emerged to

¹ Source: Annex 3 in GEF. 2005. Scope and Coherence of the Land Degradation Activities of the GEF. (GEF/C.24/6/Rev.2 May 18)

- (i) raise awareness amongst donor agencies of the causes and effects of desertification and land degradation and how these processes inevitably result in increased levels of poverty;
- (ii) enhance coordination between and within donor agencies, and between headquarters and country offices;
- (iii) promote the integration of sustainable land management into national policies and the ongoing market transition; and
- (iv) integrate desertification and land degradation issues into the programs and strategies of development cooperation partners.

16. Based on the above needs, the Global Mechanism of the UNCCD (GM)—mandated to “increase the effectiveness and efficiency of existing financial mechanisms”—entered into negotiations with the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the UNCCD Project of GTZ, and Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) for formulating a sustainable and coherent strategy for UNCCD implementation in the CACs.

17. These donor organizations formed the initial *Strategic Partnership Agreement for UNCCD Implementation in the Central Asian Countries* (SPA), which was constituted at the Fifth Conference of the Parties (COP.5) in Geneva, Switzerland, in 2001. In 2003, SPA membership was expanded to include the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC), and the International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas (ICARDA). In 2005, UNDP joined SPA, and in 2006, the World Bank also joined.

18. The main objective of SPA is to enhance collaboration between the CACs and their external partners, for effective UNCCD implementation. The SPA benefits from the comparative advantage of each member, and fosters the development of collaborative projects both nationally and at subregional levels. Members work together to find ways of making more efficient use of scarce external and domestic resources, at the same time avoiding duplication, overlapping activities, and contradictory policy guidance. Members of SPA are encouraged to share knowledge and experience acquired in the process of implementing the UNCCD, so that holistic responses can be developed that address local, national, and subregional priorities.

19. In July 2003, the SPA sponsored a meeting in Tashkent titled the “Subregional Partnership Building Forum for the Central Asian Republics: Confronting Land Degradation and Poverty through Enhanced UNCCD Implementation.” The main outcome of the Forum was the establishment of the *Tashkent Joint Platform of Action for CCD Implementation*, which called for: (i) the mainstreaming of land degradation issues into both national sustainable development planning and external funding agencies cooperation frameworks; (ii) facilitating intersectoral coordination for harmonized implementation of land degradation initiatives; (iii) the launching of a process for developing a resource mobilization strategy, capitalizing on new opportunities presented by the GEF's OP 15; and (iv) an agreement to establish *Working Groups on Partnership Development for UNCCD Implementation* (subsequently referred to as national working groups) in each CAC.

20. The Tashkent Forum provided the initial impetus for each country to address land degradation issues in a more comprehensive and integrated manner. Subsequently, following letters of request from the UNCCD and GEF Focal Points in each country, a multidonor mission comprising ADB, GM, and the UNCCD project of the German Technical Cooperation Agency (GTZ) conducted extensive country consultations and convened a regional workshop in Almaty, Kazakhstan, in February 2004. The Workshop produced a protocol signed by each country and

resulted in the setting up of a task force, comprising country representatives and donor agencies, to facilitate the development of an appropriate development initiative with the national working groups taking the lead role in their respective countries. ADB, as the lead agency for the initiative, was requested to chair the task force.

2. Consultative Process for CACILM Formulation

21. As recommended by the Tashkent Forum, the GM undertook consultations with SPA members and the CACs for formulating a resource mobilization strategy; the strategy needed to meet both immediate as well as long-term financing needs to reverse the trends of land degradation. The consultations concluded with the request for ADB to spearhead the formulation of this strategy. It was a logical choice to identify a SPA member; also ADB had already gained experience in this field by concluding the GEF – China Partnership on Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystems.

22. Furthermore, new opportunities presented by the GEF were timely, with the development of OP 15 and the elaboration of the GEF CPP initiative. Given the extent of land degradation and the establishment of the SPA, Central Asia was selected as one of the regions where the GEF CPP initiative would be undertaken.

23. In early 2004, a SPA-sponsored and ADB-led joint mission visited all the CACs and undertook an extensive stakeholder consultation to identify the key elements for formulating the *Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM)*. The joint mission was followed by a GM- and ADB-sponsored workshop that sought to reach a consensus on the vision of CACILM and the necessary steps to move the process forward. In total, 70 participants from Central Asian Countries took part in the meeting, with country delegations including diverse government and civil society representation. The international community was represented by all the SPA members and representatives from the Central Asian Regional Environmental Center (CAREC), GEF, Islamic Development Bank (IDB), Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), UNCCD secretariat, UNDP, USAID, and other international organizations. The vision of CACILM was widely endorsed by the participants and actions were taken subsequently by ADB to elaborate the CACILM proposal for submission to the GEF secretariat.

24. A further series of consultations was conducted by electronic mail with the countries and the CACILM task force members for finalizing the CACILM Concept Note, which was duly submitted to the GEF secretariat. In May 2004, the GEF secretariat entered the Concept Note into the GEF Pipeline and ADB initiated the drafting of the PDF-B proposal. Subsequent to consultations via electronic mail, the GM and ADB cofinanced a workshop to finalize the PDF-B proposal in August 2004, which, upon revision, was submitted to the GEF secretariat and was approved for funding in February 2005. The PDF-B design phase was launched in April 2005 in Dushanbe, Tajikistan.

3. CACILM Design

25. CACILM, as a CPP, employs a programmatic approach, which is relatively new in the design of GEF projects, particularly in the land degradation focal area. This approach, however, has been recognized and recommended in program studies of various GEF focal areas. For instance, the Biodiversity Program Study recommended a “move from the existing approach that led to the currently loosely woven, bottom-up collection of projects ... to a situation of programmatic integration and coherence”. This recognizes the advantages of programmatic

approaches in terms of managing knowledge and in facilitating its exchange and uptake. Beyond knowledge management, the programmatic approach is: a) able to mobilize investments more effectively, particularly in areas that have been historically underprioritized in developing countries, such as in land degradation; b) improve coherence of enabling environments across countries; and c) facilitate coalition building among governments and other stakeholders that increasingly take on subregional geographic remit.

26. ADB has been one, if not the first to employ the programmatic approach to address land degradation issues, in the People's Republic of China (PRC). The ongoing implementation of the Country Programming Framework in the PRC-GEF Partnership on Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystems has allowed a more cost-effective use of GEF resources as it has served as a coherent framework for prioritizing and sequencing interventions to integrate land degradation control, biodiversity conservation and sequestration within government planning frameworks. Similarly, CACILM is designed to improve the effectiveness of both Government and external resources in addressing land degradation issues at the local, national and global levels. It is envisioned that the lessons to be learned from the forthcoming implementation of CACILM will allow for cross-fertilization in the development and implementation of Country Partnership Programs (CCPs) that are being initiated and developed in various countries (e.g., Burkina Faso, Cuba, Namibia, and Viet Nam).

27. The International Waters (IW) focal area is where multicountry programmatic approaches have been employed most extensively and from which the CACILM design has benefited. Among the notable IW programs are the Strategic Partnership on the Danube River/Black Sea and the Strategic Partnership in the Large Marine Ecosystems of Sub-Saharan Africa. The Danube River/Black Sea Partnership consists of two basic elements – a regional capacity building and technical assessment for both the Black Sea and Danube River basin and a Partnership Investment Fund focusing on single country nutrient reduction investments. The Strategic Partnership for Sub-Saharan Africa has a similar design; it has also two basic components – a Partnership Investment Fund, i.e., a Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund providing cofinancing for country-level investments and a Regional Coordination, Communications and Capacity Building Component that promotes learning, information exchange and capacity building at the regional level. The structure of the CACILM program is essentially similar to these two IW programs.

28. The design phase of CACILM produced NPFs for each country, including a prioritized program of projects and technical assistance, and related concept papers; (ii) the CMPF and supporting GEF documentation prepared in accordance with GEF guidelines on the programmatic approach (this document); (iii) established mechanisms for consultation and coordination within and amongst 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 and funding agencies stakeholders.

29. The CMPF spans a 10-year period (2006–2016) to support implementation of the NPFs for more comprehensive and integrated approaches to sustainable land management directed toward the overall objective of combating land degradation and improving rural livelihoods. CACILM is being implemented by ADB under the direction of the CACILM task force, which is composed of the SPA members and UNCCD Focal Points from the five CACs. The CACILM design phase was cofinanced by the GEF, \$700,000; the GM, \$50,000; and ADB, \$500,000.

4. National Working Groups

30. The underlying focus of the CACILM approach is to maintain a 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 the national working groups. The *Working Groups on Partnership Development for UNCCD Implementation* were established in 2003 at partnership building forum in Tashkent. They are the principal entry points; they actively coordinate and monitor activities in consultation with the consultants and ADB; and through their membership, broaden the participation of all stakeholders in CACILM. Their role includes guiding the consultants and endorsing their reports, coordinating various workshops and meetings, and facilitating approvals by government of official documents. Under CACILM, the national working groups are directly responsible for preparation of the NPFs.

5. National Programming Frameworks

31. The NPFs are the essence of CMPF. The preparation of the NPFs involved completion of a situational analysis, which identified the root causes and assessed the nature and extent of land degradation. This analysis examined the ecological, institutional, and economic dimensions of land degradation in each country. A synthesis of the main observations and results of the situational analysis was fed into an options analysis, which generated an integrated set of priorities for sustainable land management. .

32. As part of the NPF preparation process, national multi-stakeholder workshops were held in each country. After the first national workshops, the national working groups, along with consultants, prepared the first draft of the NPFs. The draft NPFs were reviewed at a second national workshop in each country during October and November 2005 and subsequently finalized.

33. The national programming frameworks are directed at combating land degradation to ensure livelihood improvement, social and environmental security, and poverty reduction. The formulations include a program logical framework, which outlines the goal, outcomes, activities, risks and assumptions. The national programs include activities for: capacity building, sustainable agriculture, sustainable forest and woodlot management, sustainable pasture land management, targeted research, integrated resource management, and protected area management and biodiversity conservation. In Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, additional activities are proposed for Aral Sea Basin remediation. The NPFs also provide for program coordination and monitoring and evaluation activities.