

Tajikistan: Strategic Programme for Climate Resilience – Revised Version

Preliminary Note

Owing to the relatively short time available for commenting, we will mainly focus on examining the response to our earlier written comments 9. and 10., provided to the sub-committee in November. We would also like to point out, that we send in detailed comments on 21st December (please find attached), which might have been overlooked.

Earlier comment: 9. *We feel that the details of what will be done on the agriculture and & sustainable land management activity, are currently lacking, and yet the budget is quite large.*

The revised version of the programme document does provide somewhat more detail on the nature of the investments envisaged in agriculture and sustainable land management. However, the precise nature of the planned investments will only be elaborated during the phase 1 analytical / feasibility studies, which are now on-going.

Various stakeholders, especially civil society organisations and development partners assisting Tajikistan but not immediately involved in the PPCR process have expressed concerns about not having been consulted sufficiently.

They feel the necessity for an increased level of technical consultation in order to ensure that lessons learned through successful bilateral projects in Tajikistan will not be overlooked, and that the PPCR truly achieves its set objective of promoting a participatory approach towards development of a broad-based strategy to achieving climate resilience.

Before this background, it will be crucial to ensure an increased level of technical consultation during the ongoing phase 1 analytical / feasibility studies. This is a matter of some urgency, because some study reports are already due around mid 2011. Ideally, the programme document should therefore set out clearly, how and with whom consultations between the consultants now preparing the phase 1 analytical / feasibility studies and the stakeholders will be held, and how their results will be integrated into the programme design.

As we do not intend to prolong the programming phase unduly, we suggest that a timetable of consultations be drawn up and provided to interested members of the committee.

Due to our long-standing engagement in the sector in the country, , GIZ could possibly provide comments during such a technical consultation process in particular on the studies on “Institutional arrangements and capacity needs”, “Sustainable land management”, and “River basin approaches to climate resilience”.

Earlier Comment: 10. Forestry should be considered.

Contrary to the reported “changes made”, forestry has **not** been considered in section 3.4 of the programme document. The investment proposal “Agriculture and sustainable land management” touches upon “restoring productive natural resources” only in very broad terms. In the investment proposal “Building climate resilience in the Pyanj River Basin”, addressing forestry issues is limited to just one brief mention of “reforestation to prevent mud slides”.

The investment template “Agriculture and sustainable land management” in Annex 5 does contain one reference to “improving the management and use of forest resources”. However, the weight given to forestry remains rather limited compared to the importance attached to various other land management issues in the investment template.

Forestry is a key economic factor in rural areas. According to a forest sector analysis study recently completed by GIZ, forest cover was as much as one fifth of the country during the Soviet era, and forest resources were depleted only recently. Thus, the country has a significant and so far largely untapped potential for revenue generation from restoring forest areas. Models under which rural households lease and restore degraded forest land have been piloted successfully, and income thus generated has been shown to significantly increase household revenue and thus overall resilience. Furthermore, restoring the country’s forest cover will contribute more than most other measures towards buffering the impact of weather extremes. Therefore, forestry needs to be given more attention and prominence in the programme document and in particular in the upcoming phase 1 analytical / feasibility studies.

Earlier Comments 5 (*Is SPCR a truly coherent programme?*) and (to some extent) 12 (*Consider merging the two TA projects*).

While these were not comments made from our side, we feel that coherence between the components and in particular learning mechanisms have not been addressed sufficiently in the present version of the SPCR.

Section 3 does emphasize that “activities developed under the capacity building component will be strongly coordinated with activities and outputs of other PPCR components.” However, the programme document does not detail how such coordination will take place, other than through the yet to-be-established PPCR Secretariat. Among the investment templates, the PPCR Secretariat features most prominently in the template on “Enhancing the climate resilience of the energy sector”. It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that the PPCR Secretariat will mostly be occupied with matters related to this largest of the six investment proposals.

Which would leave the question of how coordination between the other components would be taken care of, in particular how learning loops between the capacity building component and the other five components would be established and maintained. The programme document would benefit from discussing options for involving other institutions, such as universities, the CEP (Committee for Environmental Protection) or others.