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:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$950,000**
Co-financing:	**$4,966,666**	Total Project Cost:	**$5,966,666**
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.	14 March 2013 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.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	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.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
Resource	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

	• the STAR allocation?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	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.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes. Aligned with BD-1.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	BD-1	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.	14 March 2013 UA: Please provide clarification on the project's linkage and coherence with:1) National Strategy Snow Leopard Conservation (2013-2023), which was just adopted by the President; 2) Global Snow Leopard Survival Strategy that was prepared by experts in 2003; 3) ongoing discussion on the snow leopard conservation initiative at both national and regional levels; and 4) whetehr the project features and is in line with the new NBSAP, for which the country has received GEF support. The presented proposal does not mention the first two strategies, which is critical for coordination and alignment with related national strategies.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Capacity building is not a major focus of this MSP. In general	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.

		addressed within the institutional framework.	
Project Design	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.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	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?		14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	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 March 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments At PIF stage.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	14 March 2013 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.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	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.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.

	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Considered adequate at PIF stage.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	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.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	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.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		14 March 2013 UA: Yes. The project fully in line with what has been presented at PIF stage.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Within ceiling for a MSP.	14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	13 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	14 March 2013 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.	14 March 2013 UA: Co-financing has increased compared to PIF stage and is confirmed.
	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	14 March 2013 UA: Yes. See comments at PIF stage.

Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• Council comments?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
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?		14 March 2013 UA: Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		14 March 2013 UA: No. Please clarify question #9. 22 March 2013 UA: Program Manager recommends the project for CEO approval.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 12, 2012	March 14, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		March 22, 2013
	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
	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.