



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

GEF ID:	4844		
Country/Region:	Kyrgyz Republic		
Project Title:	Improving the coverage and management effectiveness of PAs in the Central Tian Shan Mountains		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4934 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$950,000
Co-financing:	\$4,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,150,000
PIF Approval:	March 27, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Maxim Vergeichik

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Letter dated 5 Dec 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. UNDP has a long-standing track record with this type of projects.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. UNDP has a unit with 8 permanent staff in the country. Also in line with UNDAF.	
Resource	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Aligned with BD-1.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	BD-1	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Consistent with National Environment Report and Mid-term Development Plans. In line with NPFE.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Capacity building is not a major focus of this MSP. In general, sustainability of capacity built is addressed within the institutional framework.	
	11. 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?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Baseline program is the national investment into the PA network as a whole.	

Project Design			
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Incremental costs arise from expanding the PA network and ensuring representation of endangered ecosystems and species.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Based on incremental cost reasoning matrix.	
	16. 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?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Considered adequate at PIF stage.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Considered adequate at PIF stage.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Major risks are taken into account. Risks are low to moderate.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Coordinated with Central Asia Eco-Net. Close contact with CACILM.	

	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Within ceiling for a MSP.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	13 Mar 2012 UA: Co-financing stems from different sources and is considered adequate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. UNDP provides a grant of \$1.6 million.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	26 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends the PIF for CEO approval.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Kyrgyzstan has applied for GEF support to its NBSAP revision. It is expected that this project will feature and be in line with in the new NBSAP.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 12, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	03 April 2012 UA: Yes. Activities are considered appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	03 April 2012 UA: Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	03 April 2012 UA: Yes.
	4. Other comments	03 April 2012 UA: Please note that we expect the submission for CEO endorsement well within 12 months of CEO approval, which was in March 2012.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 03, 2012

* 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.