



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5886		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Transboundary Cooperation for Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5413 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$70,000	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$4,196,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,336,000
PIF Approval:	June 12, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Doley Tshering

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	This is a global project. The snow leopard range countries in central asia, east and south asia area all eligible for GEF BD finance.	Based on the discussion during the PIF development, this project is now a regional project, focused in the four countries of Central Asia. Please revise and indicate the participating countries.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	n/a as this is a global project.	N/A as this is a regional project. However, please verify and indicate that the GEF OFPs from the four countries are consulted and concur with the project design and arrangements.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a	N/A

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, the proposal is with the GEF-5 BD focal area allocation.	Yes, the project is financed from the GEF-5 BD set aside funding and consistent with the PIF.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	N/A
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	As noted above, the proposed amount is within the BD FA allocation.	Yes, as noted above.
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	Yes, the project is well aligned with BD1 and BD2.	Yes alignment with the BD 1 and 2 is confirmed. However, the target amount/contribution to the BD 1 and 2 targets are missing in table A of the CEO endorsement request. Please clarify.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes, the project design is consistent with CBD biodiversity strategy and national strategies/NBSAP of the concerned countries.	Yes, as confirmed at PIF approval.
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes, sufficient information has been provided on the ongoing baseline initiative based on the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program and various national initiatives.	No. Please clarify the selection criteria of the pilot site (Sarychat/Northern Tien Shan landscape and the baseline activities that are ongoing. The provided annex only identify NBSAP as baseline, and this is not sufficient.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes, the project framework is sufficiently robust and clear. Baseline and targets should be further clarified by the time of MSP approval.	<p>The project framework is sufficiently robust.</p> <p>Please revise the project objective and clarify this project is focused on Central Asia region.</p> <p>Please provide further information on the sustainable financing mechanism for snow leopard conservation. What are the concrete financing opportunities that the project could focus and pursue further? Moreover, 15% increase in funding seems rather modest, particularly considering the limited baseline. Please provide further information and revise as necessary.</p> <p>Please clarify on component 3 that the Snow Leopard meetings/summits will be largely financed by cofinance and partners, not by the GEF. Further GEF finance should be focused on the participation of the central Asian countries.</p>
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, the GEB of conserving the globally threatened snow leopard and its habitat (transboundary landscapes, particularly mountain ecosystems) is clear.	<p>No. Please revise the section based on below comments:</p> <p>1) Please clarify the GEB under section A5, not B2 of the CEO endorsement request form.</p> <p>2) Item 3 of the Identified GEB seems beyond the scope of the project.</p> <p>3) item 5 of the identified GEB requires further clarification, I.e. contribution to which CBD obligation/Aichi target? This information maybe more relevant</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			as conformity with GEF and national strategies, rather than as GEB.
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		No, both socio-economic benefits and gender approaches are too general and lack specificity. Please provide tangible benefit to the communities, particularly at the pilot site. On gender, in addition to considering gender balance for training, what kind of tangible gender results are expected from the project. Please clarify and incorporate relevant gender-responsive indicators and targets in the project results framework.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes, many INGOs and national and local NGOs are involved in the GSLEP, which the project will be closely working with in partnership. Sufficient information provided on the role of IP and gender at this point. Issue on IP and gender needs to be further clarified by the time of MSP approval.	Involvement of CSOs are very high in the project, as cofinancier and partners for implementation. It was clarified that there are no indigenous peoples in the targeted project sites.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes, sufficient information has been provided at this stage. Further detail analysis needs to be provided by the time of MSP approval.	Yes, adequate information provided.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is closely coordinated with both global and national initiatives on snow leopard conservation.	1) Please update the information on the relationship/role of the World Bank/World Bank Institution under the stakeholder section. 2) Please clarify further the role and coordination of GTI Council as well as

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>GSLEP Secretariat for the implementation of this project.</p> <p>3) Please clarify coordination with the baseline initiatives at the pilot sites.</p> <p>4) Please clarify the options that were considered for project institutional arrangement, particularly on the project executing agency. Why is it UNDP direct execution? Why not a NGO or regional institution playing the role? The GEFSEC has major concern on this issue and requires further clarification and reconsideration.</p> <p>5) Please also clarify possible coordination and relationship with the GEF-6 Programmatic. Approach on Illegal Wildlife Trade.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Yes. the focus on transboundary landscapes for snow leopard and its ecosystem conservation at the global scale is innovative in enhancing cooperation among countries for effective wildlife and ecosystem management. Sustainability of the initiative is also promoted through development and implementation of capacity development and sustainable financing initiatives.</p>	<p>Yes, sufficient information provided.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Please refer to the review comments and provide further information/revision.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		No, further tangible information is required. In particular, please provide further information on the cost-effectiveness of the administrative set-up. Currently it argues that it will use the existing institution, however, the project institutional arrangement seems otherwise.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, the cofinancing ratio is 1 to 4.5 and considered adequate.	Yes, however, overall co financing has reduced about 300k. Particularly, UNDP's contribution has decreased significantly.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes. \$2m cash cofinancing is identified by UNDP.	Co financing letters have been submitted. However, please provide further clarification/revision on below: 1) Governments co financing at e noted as in-kind in the letters. Please revise table C accordingly. 2) NGOs contribution does not specify grant or in-kind in the letters. Please clarify and note them specifically in the footnote or other adequate ways.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes it is identified as 10% of the project grant and considered appropriate.	Yes, relevant. On the communication and visibility requirements, please further emphasize full compliance with the GEF communication and visibility guidelines by having this upfront, considering that la rest funding is coming from the GEF, not UNDP.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from	Yes, PPG in the amount of \$70000 is requested. It is considered appropriate	Yes, appropriate report provided.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	considering consultation with 12 countries and various other stakeholders in further designing the project and institutional arrangement in particular.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Adequate BD2 tracking tool has been part of the Project document. What about the BD1 tracking tool?
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, appropriate information provided.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		N/A
	• The Council?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		N/A On the GEFSEC comments, please note that the PIF comments were not provided by UA. Please delete or replace by YW.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Yes, the PM recommends the PIF for CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>No. Please refer to the comments made above and resubmit a revised CEO approval package.</p> <p>30 March 2016 No. The GEFSEC received a revised CEO endorsement package that address most of the earlier comments besides two issues: 1) GEFSEC can agree that this project has a global reach and impact, but please clarify in both CEO endorsement request form and Project Document that direct GEF funding will only go to the four Central Asian countries. 2) Please further review and explore the institutional arrangement, particularly on the project executing agency. Please further examine and review possibility to work with relevant global or regional NGO or organization.</p> <p>17 June 2016 Yes, the GEFSEC received a revised CEO endorsement package that address all the remaining issues. The PM recommends the project for CEO endorsement.</p>
	First review*	June 12, 2014	January 20, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		March 30, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		June 17, 2016

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**