

# Integrated Community-based Management of High Value Mountain Ecosystems in Southern Kyrgyzstan for Multiple Benefits

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10692

**Countries**

Kyrgyz Republic

**Project Name**

Integrated Community-based Management of High Value Mountain Ecosystems in Southern Kyrgyzstan for Multiple Benefits

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

9/28/2020

**Review completed by PM**

10/15/2020

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Not fully.

- As the project includes restoration activities please align also with LD-1-3 as appropriate.

- Further, if the restoration activities will lead to carbon benefits, please consider selecting Rio Marker for CCM "1" and providing a tentative estimate for the carbon mitigation benefits in the core indicator 6.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

Thank you. For restoration, LD-1-3 is now listed in Table A, with appropriate allocation.

Indeed, there will be some carbon benefits. These have been calculated using the FAO Exact application, and Rio Marker CCM was changed to "1".

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Not fully.

- The fund allocation for the components appears to be slightly out of sync with the objectives indicated in Table A where only a small amount is budgeted for BD-1-1. Table B seems to suggest otherwise?

- Under component 1, the mainstreaming target of 2.5 million ha for BD is not reflected under core indicator 4.1 in the core indicator table. Please make that consistent.

- Output 3.3 needs to be formulated in a way that it reflects and actual output.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### **UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

Thank you. Table A, Component I is dedicated to the integrated land use planning. Its total amount of USD 781,947 is composed of inputs from two relevant GEF programs: BD-1-1 (Biodiversity Mainstreaming; some USD 200,000) and LD-1-4 (integrated land use planning, the remainder). Component II is dedicated to key biodiversity areas; its GEF value of USD 1,500,000 comes solely from the BD-2-7 (protected areas) allocation.

With respect to the targets for biodiversity mainstreaming, we have reviewed the project tentative targets/ambitions juxtaposing those with GEF guidance to focus primarily on direct impacts. Admittedly, the project indirectly aims to improve biodiversity management practices across the entire Pamir-Alai landscape, which is roughly estimated at 3,000,000 hectares, of which approximately 500,000 ha are PAs, or potential PAs. Under Output 1.1 the project will be working to develop a landscape-level integrated management plan, and will take initial steps for implementation of this plan; however, it is not expected that the project will influence land management practices throughout the entire landscape prior to project completion. Thus, the indirect BD mainstreaming target may be figures at 2,500,000 ha. However, in terms of the most direct project impact that the GEF project is going to help achieve tangibly, it is estimated that the project will improve management practices for biodiversity in 100,000 ha of critical habitat pasture zones (which falls under Core Indicator 4.3), 100,000 hectares of critical habitat HCVF zones (Core Indicator 4.4), and 35,000 hectares of wildlife corridors (Core Indicator 4.1). Together this sums up to 235,000 ha of direct impact under BD mainstreaming reported under Core Indicator 4. These figures will be confirmed during the PPG stage, however, for now we have listed 235,000 ha as a target for Core Indicator 4. We have made appropriate corrections in Table B and in the text, for clarity and consistency.

**Correction made on phrasing of Output 3.3.**

#### Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Not fully.

- District governments should not be listed as beneficiaries. Even the lower level of government benefits from the project, it is still a government entity.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

**Thank you. The status of the local governments has been corrected in the Co-financing table.**

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Not fully.

- In Table B in the PIF it states "Biodiversity mainstreamed in land use at 2.5 million ha" but I do not see this in the core indicators. Please make sure that this is captured in the core indicators under core indicator 4.1.

- Please provide an estimate for carbon sequestered through restoration.

- Please make reference in the PIF to the estimated number of direct beneficiaries and how it has been derived at. The PIF text (e.g. in the section on replication and scaling-up) seems to imply that the project will have a larger number of beneficiaries, which needs to be made clearer.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### **UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

With respect to the Core Indicator 4.1, as previously discussed, we have decided away from listing 2.5 mln as a direct target, even though this is indeed the landscape that will indirectly benefit from the project. We have retained the direct BD mainstreaming target (Core Indicator 4) at 235,000, consisting of 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4, the rationale for which has been explained in response to one of the previous comments.

The carbon benefits have been calculated and provided in the Core Indicator Table.

With respect to direct beneficiaries, the project will have direct beneficiaries through multiple project activities. However, the most conservative and "most direct" assessment of beneficiaries at the PIF stage is simply the number of rural inhabitants who will benefit from the project's support to approximately 3 Pasture User Associations, in order to improve pasture management and reduce wildlife conflicts (especially with livestock). Pasture User Associations can consist of more than one village, but typically this is the case for an aggregation of smaller villages. Hence the average size of a Pasture User Association is similar to the size of an average village across the Pamir-Alai landscape. With 300,000 rural inhabitants in 63 villages, this equates to an average village size of approximately 4,500 people. Therefore, four villages equals 18,000 people. The actual number of expected direct beneficiaries will be confirmed during the PPG phase, when it is determined exactly which Pasture User Associations (and which villages) will be most directly cooperating with the project. To explain this, we have added a subsection in Section 2. Stakeholders.

The sustainability and replication sections discuss potential project benefits that span in time beyond project's direct impact, and therefore are largely interpreted as "indirect" benefits in line with GEF guidance. We have reviewed and slightly edited the text on beneficiaries in the above mentioned section to clarify that these sections focus on indirect, long-term perspective.

**Project/Program taxonomy**



**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Clarification requested.

- Is the threat of shepherd dogs on wildlife so serious that it is prominently mentioned in the threat analysis? If so, what will be the mitigation measures?

- The climate change threat and the countries vulnerability analysis are important. Please make a link as to why the Rio Marker "1" for adaptation was selected. What measures will the project support and what co-benefits it may create for adaptation (this could also be included in the GEB benefits section)? Please also make a link/reference between the assessment and the climate risk analysis in the later part of the PIF, so that it becomes clear that the project has taken this into full consideration during the design and will continue to do so in the PPG and implementation.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

Thank you. Upon careful consideration, the shepherd dog issue has been removed from the text.

Indeed, climate change adaptation and ecosystem resilience is going to be a co-benefit. We have clarified this in various parts of the text, including in the Section on global environmental benefits.

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Not fully.

- The baseline should mention and build on previous work on snow leopard protection and also include baseline projects in this regard. There might be a more solid baseline on these efforts on which the proposed project can build?

- In the table with the baseline projects: (1) The World Bank project is a joint WB/GEF project. (2) Please clarify if the GIZ project is a technical assistance project, the description in the table is only stating the objective.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

Thank you. Ongoing initiatives related to Snow Leopard Conservation have been added and described in the baseline table (excluding GEF-supported initiatives which are discussed in the Coordination section). The reference to the World Bank-GEF project has been moved to the coordination section.

The text on the GIZ program has been expanded, with additional information on the focus of these technical assistance activities.

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Not fully.

- As earlier mentioned, restoration may lead to some carbon benefits, please include as appropriate.

- Please consider inclusion of adaptation benefits as co-benefits.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

Reviewed and revised as proposed. References to the project's adaptation co-benefits have been included at various points in the PIF, and the carbon benefits have been preliminarily calculated.

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

10/15/2020: Please include a map (lower resolution if necessary) in the portal so that it becomes of the document that will be submitted to Council for Work Program approval.

10/26/2020: Map has been included in the portal and additional maps uploaded in the Documents section as an Annex.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Not fully.

While the descriptive text is adequate, the usual table with stakeholders and their role is missing. Please provide a table with all relevant stakeholders. Consider inclusion of mentioned Pasture User Associations and live stock businesses, etc.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

The Stakeholders table has been added, covering pasture user associations, private sector / local farmers, government agencies, civil society organizations, and other relevant stakeholders.

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Not fully.

- Please elaborate further on the potential ways of involvement of mentioned private sector entities and how this could lead to positive outcomes. Also include the relevant entities in the in the stakeholder analysis as appropriate.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

Potential partnerships and cooperation with the private sector has been further elaborated, identifying the specific types of private sector companies that the project could partner with, and the positive outcomes that could result in terms of benefits for sustainable livelihoods and for nature conservation. Private sector companies have also been mentioned in the stakeholder analysis table. Details on engagement with the private sector will be further elaborated during the PPG phase.

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

(Edits required for truncated sentences and words in paragraph 4 of this section)

10/15/2020: Corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

**UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

**Previous typos have been resolved, and spelling and grammar checked.**

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Not fully.

As a BD/LD project, the first and foremost alignment should be made with the national CBD and UNCCD agendas and related plans and targets. There is some description in the PIF, which needs to be elaborated on and put up front in this section. Please elaborate on how and in as much the project will contribute to national plans and targets. The SESP is very informative in this regard, the key information in the SESP in view of contribution to Aichi targets and LDN can be included in this PIF section as well.

10/15/2020: Addressed.

Cleared



Agency Response

**UNDP Response 13 October 2020 (to GEF Sec comment on 10/02/2020)**

Thank you for drawing attention to this point. This section of the PIF has been re-organized and strengthened to further clarify the project's contributions to national plans and targets. The information from the SESP has been included in the PIF.

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/02/2020: No. Please address comments made in this review.

10/15/2020: No. One outstanding request: Please include a map (lower resolution if necessary) in the portal so that it becomes of the document that will be submitted to Council for Work Program approval.

10/26/2020: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO clearance.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Review Dates**

|   | <b>PIF Review</b> | <b>Agency Response</b> |
|---|-------------------|------------------------|
| <b>First Review</b>                     | <b>10/2/2020</b>  |                        |
| <b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b> | <b>10/15/2020</b> |                        |

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**10/26/2020**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

The UNDP/GEF project GEF ID 10692 “Integrated Community-based Management of High Value Mountain Ecosystems in Southern Kyrgyzstan for Multiple Benefits” has the objective to safeguard globally significant biodiversity of high value Pamir-Alai mountain ecosystems in, restore degraded lands, and ensure maintenance of critical ecosystem services for sustainable livelihoods in the Kyrgyz Republic. Sustainably managing land (especially pastures and forests), while conserving biodiversity of the Pamir-Alai requires an integrated landscape-level approach that reconciles the livestock-based local livelihoods in the Pamir-Alai with the needs of wildlife, and the conservation of their critical habitats. The core strategy of the proposed project works to holistically improve conservation areas by taking wildlife from being a problem for local communities and making it an asset (that can attract investments) that delivers benefits. The project strategy also recognizes that local and multi-stakeholder engagement is critical for establishing the ownership of resource users in securing wildlife populations. This will be achieved in the Pamir-Alai landscape, which is part of the “Mountains of Central Asia” biodiversity hotspot, specifically in 6 Key Biodiversity Areas, 7 existing and 3 newly established Protected Areas, and the sustainable use landscapes that interlink them. The project will establish and improve management in 504,000 ha of Protected Areas, restore 20,000 ha of land, and improve management on 235,000 ha in the targeted landscape, with direct benefits for 18,000 local people.