

Response to Comments from Germany to CIF AU
January 2011 Revised Tajikistan SPCR
February 15, 2011

Comment from Germany (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.*

Response: The Tajik PPCR team believes it most unfortunate that the 21st December comments were apparently misdirected and not received by the team until February 3rd. While this meant the concerns could not be addressed by the Tajik MDB and Government partners on a point-by-point basis in the revised SPCR, we are pleased that many of them were clarified in the revision. Additional comments can be taken into account in the implementation of Phase 1 and 2 and we do hope the following responses suffice in the areas noted.

Comment from Germany:

(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”.

Response:

As noted in the revised SPCR, consultations with civil society and other organizations leading to the Phase 1 and 2 proposals were quite extensive, though we do recognize that due to limitations on PPCR preparation budgets and logistical factors, it was not possible to reach all interested stakeholders. We do not feel that this compromises the basic elements of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 work plan. On the specific point on the level of consultation on the agriculture and land management component – the Phase 1 activities are designed to ensure that there is ample opportunity to learn from the experience of the many stakeholders who have extensive understanding of these issues in Tajikistan. We also note, however, that the implementation of capacity assessment and awareness raising elements to build long-term climate resilience into development planning (which is the essence of the PPCR goals) is slated to only begin in the coming 2 months but last for the life of the PPCR. These efforts will target both Dushanbe-based entities and stakeholders. We do look forward to seeing how GTZ can offer expertise and support in this process.

Earlier Comment from Germany #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.

Response:

The sustainable land management (SLM) effort will address a number of critical questions: from the need for improved rangelands and pasture management; to better agricultural land policy; to needed technical and institutional reforms on irrigation; and yes -- to needs in the forest sector that relate to SLM. We do not feel that the comparatively shorter length of text in the SPCR specifically on forestry means that it is given lesser weight in consideration for PPCR investment. The objective of Phase 1 is to provide guidance on a small number of pilot activities

to be implemented through Phase 2 that have potential to provide high value for the rural populations in building resilience to climate change impacts.

The WB and other development partners have supported SLM work which clearly includes forest components. Financing for extensive tree planting -- mostly fruit and nut orchards, but also woodlots and trees for windbreaks -- has already proven beneficial. Related support for nurseries, beekeeping and other activities may be found in Phase 1 to be very critical for enhancing livelihoods under greater climate stress. These investments are selected by the farmers from a wider range of options, and because they are demand driven and farmers directly contribute to the investment, there is a greater likelihood for maintenance and long term sustainability. We can also now confirm that a consultant team with a strong background in tackling land degradation in Tajikistan has been selected through international competition to support the SLM Phase 1 review. We will ensure the team meets with GTZ, and gains knowledge from bilateral efforts supported by Germany.

We do wish to note, however, that the approved Phase 2 budget for SLM activities is less than \$10 million, and not all good ideas for piloting will be able to receive PPCR funding. Despite this limitation, the results from the Phase 1 review, can be helpful for guiding parallel investments from the Government and other development partners.

Earlier Comment from Germany #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.

Response:

As described in the SCPR document (sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.9, and Annex 5), the PPCR Secretariat will play a pivotal role to ensure practical coordination and synergies between all PPCR activities and effective communications amongst all relevant stakeholders. The PPCR Secretariat will facilitate the establishment of coordination mechanisms (Figure 4 in section 3.9), comprising:

- an Inter-Ministerial Committee, which would ensure engagement of senior policy-makers of the government of Tajikistan
- a Technical Expert Group, which would provide technical input to proposed activities
- a Steering Committee, that would provide overall guidance and direction.

The PPCR Secretariat (and coordination mechanisms) will serve the coordination and learning needs for the whole program, not just the energy component. It is not the case that the PPCR Secretariat will be predominantly preoccupied with the energy sector activities. A key role of the PPCR Secretariat will be to ensure that results from each component are communicated widely and effectively, and to facilitate the dissemination of innovative lessons learned amongst stakeholders, and to a wider international audience.

The PPCR Secretariat is in the process of being set-up. It is anticipated that a launch event will take place towards the end of March. Once established, the PPCR Secretariat will develop a Work Plan in collaboration with the GoT, MDBs, international organisations, donors, civil society, and other stakeholders to provide strategic direction. This will include the formulation of annual and long-term objectives, coordination plans and appropriate learning activities and climate risk management/resilience knowledge products. In particular, learning mechanisms (including events and a dedicated website) will be developed to disseminate adaptation experiences, good practices, and tools. These will be linked, for example, to existing mechanisms such as the UNDP *Adaptation Learning Mechanism* (ALM), and other international learning networks.