

GEF-8 PPG REQUEST FOR GBFF PROJECTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION3

 Indicative Project Overview4

PROJECT COMPONENTS4

PROJECT CONCEPT DESCRIPTION.....7

 Core Indicators.....12

ANNEX A: PROJECT FINANCING TABLES14

 GEF Financing Table14

 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)15

 Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation16

 Indicative Action Area Elements16

 Indicative Co-financing17

ANNEX B: ENDORSEMENTS17

 GEF Agency(ies) Certification17

 Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):.....17

General Project Information

Project Title:

Mountain Ecosystems in Central Asia –Results-based Financing Mechanism Development

Region:

Europe and Central Asia

GEF Project ID:

12241

Country(ies):

Regional

Kazakhstan

Tajikistan

Uzbekistan

Type of Project:

GBFF

GEF Agency(ies):

World Bank

GEF Agency Project ID:

TBD

Anticipated Executing Entity(s):

Forestry and Wildlife Committee under the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Kazakhstan

Center for Implementation of Investment Projects under the Committee for Environmental Protection of Tajikistan

Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change of Uzbekistan

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Anticipated Executing Type:

Government

Government

Government

GEF Agency

GEF Focal Area (s):

Biodiversity

Submission Date:

12/17/2025

Project Sector (CCM Only)

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Biodiversity, Species, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Climate Change, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Stakeholders, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Gender Equality, Demonstrate innovative approach, Communications, Private Sector, Local Communities, Beneficiaries, Gender Mainstreaming, Capacity Development, Innovation, Knowledge Exchange, Learning, Knowledge Generation

Type of Trust Fund:

GBFF

Project Duration (Months)

36

GEF Project Financing: (a)

4,951,422.00

GEF Project Non-Grant: (b)

0.00

Agency Fee(s) Grant: (c)

470,384.00

Agency Fee(s) Non-Grant: (d)

0.00

Total GEF Financing: (a+b+c+d)

Total Co-financing:

5,421,806.00	38,000,000.00
PPG Amount: (e)	PPG Agency Fee(s): (f)
0.00	0.00
PPG total Amount: (e+f)	Total GEF Resources: (a+b+c+d+e+f)
0.00	5,421,806.00

Project Tags:

GBF Target 22, GBF Target 5, GBF Target 10, GBF Target 1, GBF Target 2, GBF Target 3, GBF Target 4, GBF Target 8, GBF Target 19, GBF Target 20, GBF Target 21, GBF Target 23

Indicative Project Overview

The specific objectives are to (i) develop and pilot community-led models for ecosystem restoration and threatened biodiversity recovery in snow leopard range areas in Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan; and to (ii) mobilize financing from philanthropic and private sector sources at scale that can be used to support community-led ecosystem restoration and biodiversity conservation over the medium and long-term.

Project Components

Component 1. Baseline development and monitoring for key montane species and ecosystem parameters

Component Type	Trust Fund
Technical Assistance	GBFF
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
2,400,000.00	10,000,000.00

Project Outcomes:

1.1 Improved data and capacity for monitoring and managing key montane species and ecosystems changes

Project Outputs:

1.1.1 Gap analysis of sites lacking monitoring and restoration interventions in high-biodiversity value areas.

1.1.2 Baselines established for key montane ecosystems and habitats at key monitoring sites

Component 2. Livelihoods and community-based interventions in targeting mountain areas

Component Type	Trust Fund
Investment	GBFF
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
1,800,000.00	10,000,000.00

Project Outcomes:

2.1 Community-led ecosystem and biodiversity restoration and monitoring underway in targeted areas

Project Outputs:

2.1.1 Guidelines for montane ecosystems and biodiversity restoration

2.1.2 Livelihood-linked stewardship agreements piloted

2.1.3 Increased areas of montane and alpine habitats under sustainable land management

Component 3. Feasibility assessment for Results-Based financing for restoration of montane biodiversity and ecosystems

Component Type	Trust Fund
Technical Assistance	GBFF
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
300,000.00	10,000,000.00

Project Outcomes:

3.1 Increased potential for mobilizing non-traditional sources of financing (e.g. private sector and philanthropic) for ecosystem and biodiversity restoration.

3.2 Increased availability of resources for the sustainable management and restoration of montane ecosystems and the key biodiversity they support - through resource mobilization from private and philanthropic sources

Project Outputs:

3.1.1 Viability assessments & outline designs for Species Recovery and Ecosystem Restoration Bonds.

3.2.1 Proposals and performance frameworks for bond issuance for Species Recovery and Ecosystem Restoration Bonds.

3.2.2 Lower risk barriers to investment from private and philanthropic entities

Component 4: Knowledge Management and Analytics

Component Type	Trust Fund
Technical Assistance	GBFF
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
200,000.00	5,500,000.00

Project Outcomes:

4.1 Improved institutional coordination and knowledge sharing across countries and mountain landscapes

Project Outputs:

4.1.1 Knowledge sharing events, rapid evaluations of pilots, and best practice guidance for monitoring and community-based livelihoods restoration

M&E

Component Type	Trust Fund
Technical Assistance	GBFF
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
50,000.00	500,000.00

Project Outcomes:

Robust M&E system in place and operational

Project Outputs:

M&E reports, data validation, surveys, MTR report, TE report

Component Balances

Project Components	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Component 1. Baseline development and monitoring for key montane species and ecosystem parameters	2,400,000.00	10,000,000.00
Component 2. Livelihoods and community-based interventions in targeting mountain areas	1,800,000.00	10,000,000.00
Component 3. Feasibility assessment for Results-Based financing for restoration of montane biodiversity and ecosystems	300,000.00	10,000,000.00
Component 4: Knowledge Management and Analytics	200,000.00	5,500,000.00
M&E	50,000.00	500,000.00
Subtotal	4,750,000.00	36,000,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)	201,422.00	2,000,000.00
Total Project Cost (\$)	4,951,422.00	38,000,000.00

Please provide justification

PROJECT CONCEPT DESCRIPTION

Project Concept Description (No more than seven pages total, including 5 pages of text maximum. Concepts longer than 7 pages will be returned. Please note the portal entry will be limited to up to 19,400 characters of text and up to two figures.)

PROJECT RATIONALE

Global Ecological Significance of the High Mountains of Central Asia. The high mountains of Central Asia – including the Tian Shan and Pamir ranges that straddle Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, stand-out as a recognized biodiversity hotspot, hosting around 3,000 species—including the snow leopard *Panthera uncia* and 144 Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs - globally significant sites for conservation) covering ~149,000 km²— serving as a global center of origin for natural and agro-biodiversity. The area represents one of the world’s most critical “water towers”. Their extensive glacier systems feed the Syr Darya, Amu Darya, and numerous tributaries, underpinning water security for an estimated 40–100 million people. Together, these high-altitude systems regulate regional climate and downstream water flows and support endemic species. These mountains include 4 biodiversity hotspots and numerous KBAs in the three countries included for support under this proposal. Much of Tajikistan is inside a hotspot, dominated by the Pamir and Pamir-Alai systems. The Central Pamir-Alai global biodiversity hotspot supports around 4,300 plant species and ~1,400 endemics (Nowak, et al., 2020). KBA clusters include the Tajik National Park (Pamir Mountains) – and habitats along the Vakhsh River and which supports extremely high plant endemism.

Threats, Climate Change Pressures, and Declining Mountain Ecosystem Resilience. Central Asia’s mountain ecosystems are experiencing significant biodiversity loss, which profoundly impact the livelihoods of local communities, and the crucial corridors for connecting snow leopards between landscapes and countries. Key threats are poaching/illegal trade, depletion of wild prey, human–wildlife conflict over livestock, habitat loss and fragmentation because of over grazing, and climate change impacts on high-mountain ecosystems. The High-Level International Conference on Glaciers’ hosted in May 2025 by the Government of Tajikistan highlighted the impact of climate change on glacial melting and its consequences on mountain biodiversity. Climate models project that by 2070 snow leopard habitats will decline by 8–23% and become increasingly fragmented (Forrest et al., 2012; Li et al., 2016).

Conservation Importance, Key Biodiversity Areas, and Opportunities for Landscape-Scale Action. The Tian Shan and Pamir Mountains hold exceptional global significance as one of the world’s largest contiguous habitats for the snow leopard. These mountains also hold a suite of iconic high-mountain species, including Argali *Ovis ammon*, Siberian ibex *Capra sibirica*, and threatened alpine carnivores. Their vast elevation gradients and intact wilderness create a uniquely resilient refuge for cold-adapted biodiversity at a time when suitable habitats are shrinking elsewhere due to climate change. These mountain corridors also enable cross-regional wildlife movement from Siberia to the Himalayas, making them critical to maintaining genetic diversity and long-term species survival.

Snow leopards are the flagship species of this proposal. They are the apex predators of Central Asia’s high mountain ecosystems and are of global conservation significance. The three countries involved in the proposal include 5 of the 23 snow leopard priority landscapes, and support more than 10% of the global population. Efforts to protect snow leopards so far are limited to patrols, camera-trap deployment, and awareness campaigns, and are largely constrained by financial resources in the absence of a more comprehensive approach. Whilst NBSAPs in each of the participating countries recognize the need to raise additional private financing, this has yet to happen at scale.

Financing landscape-level species and ecosystem restoration. With access to concessional finance declining for Central Asian states, Results-based Financing (RBF) like Impact Bonds, payments for emissions reductions and ecosystem services, offer potential to mobilize substantial private capital for achieving nature and biodiversity outcomes. Under such arrangements, investor returns are tied to measurable results, transfer performance risk to private investors, and success payments are only made for verified outcomes—improving efficiency and accountability. For RBF to work, robust baseline data and monitoring systems are needed. These are not yet in place for snow leopards, their prey species nor for the habitats on which they depend. Work is also needed to assess the feasibility of linking performance payments to population changes for a broader basket of montane species and for montane ecosystem/habitat quality through a performance framework, and to assess whether institutional, legal and policy framework are appropriate for RBF. The work proposed will represent the first systematic attempt to link RBF to snow leopard conservation outcomes, providing a globally-significant pilot for snow leopard range countries.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project objectives. This project will focus on community-led restoration of montane ecosystems and threatened biodiversity in the Central Asian mountains. The specific objectives are to (i) develop and pilot community-led models for ecosystem restoration and threatened biodiversity recovery in snow leopard range areas; and to (ii) mobilize financing from philanthropic and private sector sources at scale that can be used to support community-led ecosystem restoration and biodiversity conservation over the medium and long-term.

Outcomes. Medium and long-term outcomes are to increase populations of key montane species, restore their habitats using community-led intervention models that increase areas of montane habitats under improved management, strengthen monitoring systems and knowledge sharing across stakeholders in Central Asia. In the medium to long-term, improved ecosystem management of these areas will require mobilization of substantial financing, including from private and philanthropic sources. Therefore, this project will advance resource mobilization (circa US\$100 million) from private and philanthropic sources. The Theory of Change for this proposed project is below.

Figure 1. Theory of change



Components and activities to deliver outcomes

Component 1: Baseline development and monitoring of key species and ecosystems/habitats. This component will establish a systematic monitoring system for populations of threatened montane species and habitats. Target species may include snow leopard, argali, Siberian ibex, Tien Shan brown bear (*Ursus arctos isabellinus*), markhor (*Capra falconeri*), and Menzbier’s marmot (*Marmota menzbieri*). Monitoring will deploy camera traps extensively, supplemented by genetic sampling (fecal swabs, scat, DNA analysis), field observations, and community monitoring, including participation by women from surrounding communities. This approach builds local capacity and ownership, fosters inclusive participation, and supports long-term stewardship of mountain ecosystems. The objective is to generate robust baselines for ecosystem planning and results-based financing. Specific activities include:

- Site selection: Conduct a gap analysis to identify critical sites lacking systematic monitoring, leveraging existing RESILAND CA+ investment sites. Select sites with high-value montane biodiversity where communities are willing to engage in community-led initiatives and monitoring.
- Establish biodiversity baselines and monitoring systems for key montane species and habitats in selected sites to track population changes needed for results-based financing.
- Baselines and monitoring of habitat quality in montane and alpine habitats—especially heavily used summer pastures and mid-mountain forests/shrublands—using remote sensing, field surveys, and community-level monitoring and reporting.

Component 2: Livelihoods and community-based interventions. This component will launch 24-30 community-led learning pilots that generate livelihood benefits and restore ecosystems and biodiversity in

targeted areas. Selection of pilot sites (see Component 1 site selection) will be informed by existing experience and data. Sub-projects will be co-designed with communities to ensure ownership, drawing on lessons from ongoing RESILAND CA+ projects. The program will emphasize measuring results and translating experience into practitioner guidance (see Component 4). In all three countries, the number of pilots will be scaled-up through the RESILAND CA+ program.

- Community-based habitat restoration to reduce grazing pressure, targeting overgrazed summer pastures and alpine/sub-montane forests.
- Reduction of human–wildlife conflict (HWC) by protecting livestock with corrals (these can reduce attacks by around 90% and lower retaliatory killing of snow leopards).
- Community-based tourism to create jobs and income from ecotourism activities (e.g. homestays and guiding).
- Engaging women in conservation through income-generation and skills-building, fostering empowerment and stewardship. Livelihood activities will aim to boost local incomes and jobs and have been effective in reducing snow leopard killings.

Component 3: Development of results-based biodiversity financing options. This component will advance design of a results-based impact bond for mountain biodiversity and ecosystem restoration in Central Asia. This will link investor returns to measurable conservation outcomes—such as increased populations of key montane species and restoration of montane habitats. Bondholders would finance restoration through parallel financing (e.g., foregone coupon payments), and a third party (identified during design) would make a performance payment if agreed thresholds are met, as defined in a performance framework. Establishing sufficiently robust baselines for an outcome bond will take at least three years due to the need for extensive monitoring across wide landscapes. All other project activities will proceed in parallel with species and habitat monitoring.

The project will assess the bond’s technical, legal, and policy viability; identify environmental and social risks; and consult potential contributors and investors. A performance framework with indicator targets for species and habitat changes will guide release of performance payments. By project close, key design and documentation for bond issuance will be prepared to the extent possible. Activities will include:

- Technical assessment of results-based financing feasibility for population recovery of snow leopards, other threatened species, and their habitats in the high mountains of participating countries.
- Policy, institutional, and legal assessments to ensure future bond issuance aligns with national frameworks.
- Assessment of investor interest among private and philanthropic entities.
- Social and environmental assessments to identify and manage risks and optimize benefits.
- Development of a performance framework that sets thresholds for performance payments based on results.

Component 4: Knowledge management and analytical work. The project will invest in analytical research and knowledge resources to support mountain ecosystem management and restoration. Key activities include: (i) practical guidance for mountain biodiversity and habitat restoration (drawing on Components 1 and 2), and (ii) knowledge exchanges among Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and other Central Asian countries. Activities will be undertaken in close collaboration with GSLEP.

M&E, PMC: The project will support M&E and project management costs to ensure coordination and effective implementation, monitoring and reporting of project implementation.

STAKEHOLDERS. KZ: Forestry and Wildlife Committee, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources will be the main implementing agency. The Ministry of Finance will be the focal point for bond issuance. TJ: Committee for Env Protection will implement the project, with the Ministry of Finance focal point for bond issuance discussions. UZ: The National Committee on Env and Climate Change proposes execution via the IUCN. IUCN has extensive experience in biodiversity and protected areas and is already active in the West Tien Shan. The Ministry of Economy and Finance will be the focal point for discussions on bond issuance.

Regional: The Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program (GSLEP) - of which all three supported countries are members. GSLEP addresses high mountain development issues using the snow leopard as a flagship species and convenes range states, NGOs, intergovernmental organizations, and the private sector—making it a key stakeholder throughout design and implementation.

Communities and Civil Society: Especially those adjacent to protected areas and corridors—will benefit. IPLCs will help design community monitoring at each site and, through participatory design, select and implement sub-projects under Component 3. NGOs will also be engaged.

Private Sector and Philanthropy Private and philanthropic entities will be engaged during detailed design to assess investment appetite and inform the viability assessment and performance framework.

Country level coordination: Project Implementation Units (PIUs) of RESILAND CA+ countries. UNDP will submit a parallel proposal for the Kyrgyz Republic. WB and UNDP will coordinate to ensure activities are aligned across all four countries.

SUPPORT FOR GBFF ACTION AREAS. The proposed project contributes to the following GBF Fund action areas:

Action Area One (1,2,3): Biodiversity conservation, restoration, land/sea-use and spatial planning. Specifically on ensuring sufficient and predictable financing is available from a future Impact Bond. If successful, this could serve as a model for future results-based financing in other range countries.

Action Area Two (22): Support to IPLC stewardship and governance of lands, territories, and waters. Specifically, by supporting inclusive and participatory community biodiversity stewardship arrangements linked to livelihoods support, reducing Human Wildlife Conflicts and engaging local communities in ecosystem restoration and monitoring programs. It is expected the project will support around 24 pilot interventions in strategically-selected high value biodiversity areas. At least 16 of these pilot interventions will be ‘area-based’ with an estimated coverage for land under improved management of 160,000ha.

Action Area Four (19): Resource Mobilization. Advancing the mobilization of private and/or philanthropic financing from non-traditional financing sources is an explicit goal of this proposed project. The project will establish the necessary baselines, capacity and design for an Impact Bond in the region of US\$100m to finance biodiversity and ecosystem restoration within snow leopard range areas. GBF grant resources will leverage an additional estimated US\$4.45m of co-financing from the RESILAND CA+ Program. It is envisaged the proceeds from the bond will be used to finance, on a performance basis, activities that reduce Human Wildlife Conflicts (HWC), support inclusive and participatory community stewardship interventions that help restore fragile high-biodiversity value ecosystems.

Action Area Five (5): Sustainable use of wild and native species from terrestrial ecosystems.

Potential to generate GEBs. The project contributes directly to GBF Targets. Project co-financing will bring an additional 3m ha of high ecological integrity protected areas and corridor areas in snow leopard range areas under improved management, involving local communities (CI1.2; Targets 1, 3). It will contribute by restoring 160,000 ha of degraded high mountain ecosystems and habitats through participatory and community-led interventions at selected sites (CI4.1; Target 2) and targets threatened species of conservation concern – including through the management of human wildlife conflicts as part of these efforts (CI4.1; Target 4). It will build more resilient ecosystems that buffer glacial melt and extreme events (Target 8) and help maintain ecosystem functions and services (Target 10). It will also help mobilize substantial public financing (\$38m in grant, loan and in-kind contributions) and will put in place monitoring baselines, a viability assessment, proposal and a performance framework for an Impact Bond that could mobilize around

\$100m from private and philanthropic investors (Target 19). It will strengthen south-south cooperation between range states – particularly on species and habitat monitoring, approaches to high mountain habitat restoration and developing innovative financing instruments that could help close the biodiversity financing gap in other snow leopard range states (Targets 20, 21). All activities, particularly those under Comp 2 will promote gender equality and gender responsive approaches in the design and implementation of livelihoods sub-projects (Target 23). The project expects to benefit directly approx. 15,000 people (50% women) (CI11).

ALIGNMENT WITH GBFF PROGRAMMING AREAS.

Alignment of the project with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and/or National Biodiversity Finance Plans. The proposal is consistent with emerging National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) - the draft for Kazakhstan calls for improved management of snow leopard range and expanded species monitoring, specifically in the areas targeted under this proposal. The Tajikistan NBSAP (2016-2025) and the Uzbekistan NBSAP (2019-2028) identify improved management, monitoring and restoration of snow leopard range as priorities.

Policy coherence. At regional level, coordination will use the GSLEP platform which already performs this role for high mountain development issues using the snow leopard as a flagship species. The project will improve and strengthen policy coherence for snow leopard protection in Central Asia which requires aligning national and regional policies, institutions, and investments around a shared, landscape-scale agenda, with strong transboundary coordination and locally grounded implementation.

Resources mobilization from the private sector and/or philanthropies: The project will leverage resources from RESILAND CA+ projects and in-kind contributions, estimated at around \$38 million and establish baselines, project designs, performance framework and proposal for an Impact Bond. The size of this Bond will be known when the viability assessment (Component 3) is completed, anticipated in the range of US\$100 million.

Engagement with IPLCs/ communities. Under Component 2, local communities will be consulted, integration of local knowledge, and ‘learning’ pilot interventions that promote community-led ecosystem and biodiversity restoration in targeted areas. The activities are focused mostly on livelihood and community-based interventions that also offer the potential for generating positive impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem restoration. GBFF grant financing of \$1.8 million under component 2 is earmarked for IPLCs, comprising 36% of the project grant. This is expected to reach 15,000 people (depending on village sizes following site selection). Co-financing from the RESILAND CA+ program has the potential to reach approximately 150,000 beneficiaries.

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
3036922	0	0	0

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0	0	0	0

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	---------	---------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
3036922	0	0	0

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Aksu-Zhabagly	1671	Strict Nature Reserve	132,000.00						
Gissar Mountain Juniper Reserve	11829	Strict Nature Reserve	80,986.00						
Karatau	555705869	Strict Nature Reserve	34,300.00						
Sairam Ugam	555705862	National Park	149,000.00						
Tajik National Park	1252	National Park	2,611,674.00						
Zaamin National Park	1766	National Park	26,536.00						
Zarafshan National Park	22518	National Park	2,426.00						

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
160000	0	0	0

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
160,000.00			

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	7,500			
Male	7,500			
Total	15,000	0	0	0

Explain the methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels for Core and Sub-Indicators (max. 250 words, approximately 1/2 page)

Core indicator 1.2 (Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness) includes all protected areas in snow leopard range areas supported under RESILAND CA+ Program - 3 million ha. METT scorecards will be prepared as baselines, and at MTR and terminal evaluation stage. Core indicator 4.1 (Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity) includes only the figure for anticipated GBFF financed activities under Component 2 - 160,000 ha. RESILAND CA+ financing will bring much larger areas under improved management. Core indicator 11- "Number of people benefitting directly from GBFF financing" under component 2 is estimated at 15,000 (50% women). RESILAND CA+ co-financing for livelihoods will be leveraged in snow leopard-range corridors and it is estimated this could reach and additional 150,000 beneficiaries. Targets for indicators 3.1 to 3.3 will be populated once Component 2 sites are identified.

ANNEX A: PROJECT FINANCING TABLES

GEF Financing Table

Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	GEF Project Grant(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total GEF Financing (\$)
World Bank	GBFF	Kazakhstan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 1	400,000.00	38,000.00	438,000.00
World Bank	GBFF	Tajikistan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 1	300,000.00	28,500.00	328,500.00
World Bank	GBFF	Uzbekistan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 1	300,000.00	28,500.00	328,500.00
World Bank	GBFF	Kazakhstan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 2	400,000.00	38,000.00	438,000.00
World Bank	GBFF	Tajikistan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 2	300,000.00	28,500.00	328,500.00
World Bank	GBFF	Uzbekistan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 2	300,000.00	28,500.00	328,500.00
World Bank	GBFF	Kazakhstan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 4	800,000.00	76,000.00	876,000.00
World Bank	GBFF	Tajikistan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 4	600,000.00	57,000.00	657,000.00
World Bank	GBFF	Uzbekistan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 4	600,000.00	57,000.00	657,000.00
World Bank	GBFF	Kazakhstan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 5	610,292.00	57,978.00	668,270.00
World Bank	GBFF	Tajikistan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 5	170,564.00	16,204.00	186,768.00
World Bank	GBFF	Uzbekistan	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 5	170,566.00	16,202.00	186,768.00
Total GEF Resources (\$)					4,951,422.00	470,384.00	5,421,806.00

Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

Is Project Preparation Grant requested?

false

PPG Amount (\$)

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Grant / Non-Grant	PPG (\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total PPG Funding(\$)
Total PPG Amount (\$)						0.00	0.00	0.00

Please provide justification

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation

(Only for Multi-Trust Fund projects where GEF TF is included)

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Sources of Funds	Total(\$)
Total GEF Resources					0.00

Indicative Action Area Elements

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-financing(\$)
GBFF Action Area 1	GBFF	1,000,000.00	10,000,000.00
GBFF Action Area 2	GBFF	1,000,000.00	10,000,000.00
GBFF Action Area 4	GBFF	2,000,000.00	12,000,000.00
GBFF Action Area 5	GBFF	951,422.00	6,000,000.00
Total Project Cost		4,951,422.00	38,000,000.00

Amount of resource allocated to support actions by IPLCs for the conservation, restoration, sustainable use and management of biodiversity:

Amount

1,800,000.00

Indicative Co-financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
GEF Agency	World Bank	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	National Committee on Environment and Climate, Uzbekistan	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, Kazakhstan	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	14,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Committee for Environmental Protection, Tajikistan	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,000,000.00
GEF Agency	World Bank	Loans	Investment mobilized	3,000,000.00
Total Co-financing				38,000,000.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

Expected co-financing figures include in-kind contributions from the Project client countries (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan) and co-financing from the Central Asia Regional Resilient Land Restoration (RESILAND) Program in Tajikistan (IDA grant) and Uzbekistan (IBRD/IDA loan). One objective of this proposed project is to lay the foundation for leveraging additional grant resources from the private sector and philanthropic entities, anticipated to be around US\$100 million. This figure is not included as bond issuance would take place after the grant period.

ANNEX B: ENDORSEMENTS

GEF Agency(ies) Certification

GEF Agency Type	Name	Date	Project Contact Person	Phone	Email
GEF Agency Coordinator	Elif Kiratli	12/16/2025			ekiratli@worldbank.org
Project Coordinator	Ross Hughes	12/16/2025			rhughes@worldbank.org
Project Coordinator	Asferachew Abate	12/16/2025			aabate@worldbank.org

Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):

Name	Position	Ministry	Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
Sheralizoda Bahodur Ahmadjon	Chairman	Committee for Environmental Protection of Tajikistan	9/6/2025

Saule Sabieva	Director, Climate Policy Department	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Kazakhstan	9/27/2025
Jakhongir Talipov	GEF OFP	Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change of Uzbekistan	12/15/2025