



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM-SIZE PROJECT

THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: 10 December 2007

Re-submission Date: 8 January 2008

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3192

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3217

COUNTRY(IES): Kyrgyzstan

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity into fishery sector

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): State Agency on Environment and Forestry

GEF FOCAL AREA(S): Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD-SP4

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: NA

Expected Calendar	
Milestones	Dates
Work Program (for FSP)	NA
GEF Agency Approval	Feb 2008
Implementation Start	April 2008
Mid-term Review (if planned)	Apr 2011
Implementation Completion	Mar 2013

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To strengthen the policy and regulatory framework to integrate requirements for endemic fish conservation into the fishery management regime								
Project Components	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing*		Indicative Co-financing*		Total (\$)
				(\$)	%	(\$)	%	
1. Improved Capacity for biodiversity friendly fisheries	TA	Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for biodiversity friendly fisheries management regime	- Biodiversity friendly fishery management regime (BDFMR) developed as a policy for sustainable fisheries in the country; - Capacities to deliver and implement the BDFMR strengthened; - Financial mechanism for the implementation of the BDFMR in place; - Awareness and support raised for the BDFMR;	680,000	35.84	1,217,200	64.16	1,897,200
2. Sustainable fishery regime demonstrated	TA	Sustainable fisheries demonstrated which contribute to the conservation of endemic fish species and improving livelihoods	- Alternative supplies to meet market demands and propagation for re-stocking of lakes with endemics; - A strategy to control the introduction of alien species demonstrated for lake Issyk Kul; - Alternative Livelihood program launched; - Direct assistance to support conservation of the endemic fish species; - A knowledge management system on conservation of endemic ichthyofauna put in place.	182,000	10.14	1,612,800	89.86	1,794,800
Project management				88,000	23.28	290,000	76.72	378,000
Total project costs				950,000	23.34	3,120,000	76.66	4,070,000

B. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	Project preparation: pre-RAF PDFA	Project	Agency Fee	Total at CEO Endorsement	For the record: Total at PIF
GEF	24,901	950,000	97,500	1,072,401	1,072,500
Co-financing	17,270	3,120,000		3,137,270	3,131,150
Total	42,171	4,070,000	97,500	4,209,671	4,203,650

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING, including co-financing for project preparation for both the PDFs and PPG.

<i>Name of co-financier (source)</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Amount (\$)</i>	<i>%*</i>
CAREC	NGO	In kind	1,690,000	53.87%
ALIFSD		In kind (PDF A)	2,100	0.07%
UNDP	GEF Agency	Grant	430,000	13.71%
		Grant (PDF A)	15,170	0.48%
Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Processing Industry	Government	Grant	335,000	10.68%
		In kind	665,000	21.20%
Total Co-financing			3,137,270	100%

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY FOCAL AREA(S), AGENCY(IES) OR COUNTRY(IES)

The project is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project, and therefore this section is omitted.

E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

<i>Cost Items</i>	<i>Total person weeks</i>	<i>GEF (\$)</i>	<i>Other sources (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
<i>Local consultants*</i>	780	78,000	49,140	127,140
<i>Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications**</i>		6,000	217,200	223,200
<i>Travel***</i>		4,000	23,660	27,660
Total	780	88,000	290,000	378,000

* Detailed information on all consultants is provided in Annex C.

** Covers from the GEF element:

- Office utilities and stationary: USD 100 per 12 months per 4 years = USD 4,800
- A laptop for project office: USD 1,200

** Covers from other sources:

- Equipment (2 field cars, 1 boat, informational center with 40 sitting places, 2 computers with GIS systems as in-kind contribution of Biosphere Reserve under SAEF): USD 150,000
- Premise for project office on territory Issyk-Kul bio-station in Cholpon-Ata as well as laboratories and scientific boat (as in-kind contribution from Biology-soil Institute of KR National Scientific Academy): USD 50,000
- Communications subsidy for project office (UNDP): USD 150 per 12 months per 4 years = USD 7,200
- Vehicle (UNDP): USD 10,000

*** Covers travel of project manager: USD 6,915 per 4 years = USD 27,660. Of this amount, only USD 4,000 is requested from GEF; the remainder is co-financed.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF(\$)</i>	<i>Other sources (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
<i>Local consultants*</i>	558	112,400	7,000	119,400
<i>International consultants*</i>	62	127,000	20,000	147,000
Total	620	239,400	27,000	266,400

* Detailed information on all consultants is provided in Annex C.

G. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

1. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of the project will follow the UNDP Program Manual and GEF M&E procedures and will be conducted by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) with support from UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Bratislava. The Logical Framework Matrix in Annex A provides impact and outcome indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. These will form the

basis for the project M&E System. The Tracking Tool for BD 2 projects is going to be used as one of the main instruments to monitor progress. The M&E plan includes: inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly operational reports, a mid-term and final evaluation. The project's Monitoring and Evaluation Plan will be presented and finalized at the Project's Inception Meeting following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

Monitoring and reporting

Project Inception Phase

2. A Project Inception Workshop will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit. A fundamental objective of this Inception Workshop will be to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal, objective and outcomes, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan on the basis of the project's logframe matrix. This will include reviewing the logframe (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise finalize the Annual Work Plan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project. Additionally the purpose and objective of the Inception Workshop (IW) will be to: (i) introduce project staff with the UNDP-GEF expanded team which will support the project during its implementation, namely the CO and responsible Regional Coordinating Unit staff; (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, with particular emphasis on the harmonized Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs)/Annual Project Report (APR), Steering Committee Meetings, as well as mid-term and final evaluations. Equally, the IW will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget rephasings. The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff and decision-making structures will be discussed again, as needed, in order to clarify for all, each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase.

Monitoring responsibilities and events

3. The day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the project manager, whose work will be based on the project's annual work plan and its indicators. Annual monitoring will be carried out by the Project Board (including Government, UNDP, and key beneficiaries of the project), which is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve months following the inception workshop. A detailed schedule of Project Board's meetings to review project progress will be developed by the project management, in consultation with project national executing agency and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Such a schedule will include: (i) tentative time frames for Project Board's meetings and (ii) project related Monitoring and Evaluation activities. For each Project Board meeting the project manager will prepare annual project report and submit it to the PB members at least two weeks prior to the meeting for review and comments. In addition, ad-hoc meetings can be scheduled between the Government, project manager, the Implementing Agency and other pertinent stakeholders as deemed appropriate and relevant to allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities. An additional monitoring tool for Outcome 1, which is dealing with policy development, will be the Fisheries Advisory Committee (FAC): this will be selected and adopted once a formal Fisheries Management Regime has been adopted by the government. This FAC may, if appropriate and if the all project stakeholders concur, effectively take on the functions of an expanded Project Board.

4. Day to day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the Project Coordinator, assisted by experts as deemed necessary based on the project's Annual Work Plan and its indicators. The Project Team will inform the UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion. Periodic monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP-CO through quarterly meetings with the National Executing Agency, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities.

Project Reporting

5. The Project Coordinator in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF extended team will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process:

6. A Project Inception Report will be prepared immediately following the Inception Workshop. It will include a detailed First Year/Annual Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. This Work Plan would include the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the UNDP-CO or the Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) or consultants, as well as time-frames for meetings of the project's decision making structures. The Report will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the Annual Work Plan, and including any monitoring and evaluation requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months time-frame. The Inception Report will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may effect project implementation. When finalized the report will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to this circulation of the IR, the UNDP Country Office will review the document. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. These technical reports will represent the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national and international levels.

7. The UNDP/GEF PIR/APR will be prepared on an annual basis prior to the PB meeting to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project's Annual Work Plan and assess performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work. The PIR/APR will include the following: (i) An analysis of project performance over the reporting period, including outputs produced and, where possible, information on the status of the outcome; (ii) The constraints experienced in the progress towards results and the reasons for these; (iii) The three (at most) major constraints to achievement of results; (iv) AWP and other expenditure reports (ERP generated); (v) lessons learned; and (vi) Clear recommendations for future orientation in addressing key problems in lack of progress.

8. Short reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF regional office by the project team.

9. During the last three months of the project the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements and outputs of the Project, lessons learnt, objectives met, or not achieved, structures and systems implemented, etc. and will be the definitive statement of the Project's activities during its lifetime. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's activities.

Independent evaluations

10. The project will be subject to two independent external evaluations as follows. An independent Mid-Term Evaluation will be undertaken at the mid point of project implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the terminal tripartite review meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The final evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities, and

the report will feature management response to the issues raised. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

Audit clause

11. The Government of Kyrgyzstan will provide the Resident Representative of UNDP Kyrgyzstan with certified periodic financial statements, and with an annual audit of the financial statements relating to the status of UNDP (including GEF) funds according to the established procedures set out in the Programming and Finance manuals. The Audit will be conducted by the legally recognized auditor of the Government, or by a commercial auditor engaged by the Government.

Learning and knowledge sharing

12. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums. In addition, the project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNDP/GEF sponsored networks, organized for Senior Personnel working on projects that share common characteristics. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Identifying and analyzing lessons learned is an on-going process, and the need to communicate such lessons as one of the project's central contributions is a requirement to be delivered not less frequently than once every 12 months. UNDP/GEF shall provide a format and assist the project team in categorizing, documenting and reporting on lessons learned.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team Staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop (IW)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF 	\$3,000	Within first two months of project start up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager ▪ UNDP CO 	None	Immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Cost to be covered by targeted survey funds.	Start, mid and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by Project GEF Technical Advisor and project manager ▪ Measurements by regional field officers and local IAs 	TBD as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Cost to be covered by field survey budget.	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR and PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager ▪ UNDP-CO ▪ UNDP-GEF 	None	Annually
TPR and TPR report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government Counterparts ▪ UNDP CO, project manager ▪ UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) 	None	Every year, upon receipt of APR
Periodic status reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager 	None	TBD by project manager and UNDP CO
Technical reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager 	3,000	TBD by project manager and UNDP-CO
Mid-term evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager ▪ UNDP- CO ▪ UNDP-GEF RCU ▪ External Consultants (evaluation team) 	40,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.

Final External Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager, ▪ UNDP-CO, UNDP-GEF RCU ▪ External Consultants (evaluation team) 	40,000	At the end of project implementation
Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager ▪ UNDP-CO ▪ External Consultant 	None	At least one month before the end of the project
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager ▪ UNDP-GEF RCU (formats for documenting best practices) 	4,400	Yearly
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP-CO ▪ Project manager 	4,000 (average \$1000 per year*)	Yearly
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST <i>Excluding project staff time, UNDP staff and travel expenses.</i>		US\$ 94,400	

** Audit cost is estimate is based on local rates applied for typical UNDP projects of this budget size in Kyrgyzstan*

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE THE PROJECT RATIONALE AND THE EXPECTED MEASURABLE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS:

1. The Republic of Kyrgyzstan's diverse range of landscape types and microclimates leads to a corresponding diversity of ecosystems. Anthropogenic systems occupy about 7% of the Republic's territory while the remaining 93% is represented by undisturbed or only moderately disturbed natural ecosystems. Despite its size, the Kyrgyz Republic has a relatively high species-richness; possessing nearly 1% of all known species in just 0.13% of the world's land mass¹. However, recent declines in many species have become evident, and 9.5% of bird species and 18.1% of mammal species are now considered to be at risk of extinction. Furthermore, a number of rare and valuable ecosystems have now nearly disappeared.

2. Kyrgyzstan has over 900 mountain lakes and in most of them the native fish species are seriously threatened by alien species and over fishing. Lake Issyk Kul is the second largest high altitude lake in the world lying at 1,608 m above sea level. Lake Issyk-Kul is a Ramsar site of globally significant biodiversity and forms part of a Biosphere Reserve. The lake contains highly endemic fish biodiversity, and some of the species, including four endemics, are highly endangered. In recent years catches of all species of fish have declined markedly, due to a combination of over-fishing, heavy predation by two of the introduced species and the cessation of restocking of the lake with juvenile fish from hatcheries. At least four commercially targeted endemic fish species are sufficiently threatened to be included in the Red Book of the Kyrgyz Republic. Seven other endemic species are almost certainly threatened as either by-catch or are indirectly impacted by fishing activity and changes to the structure and balance of the fish population within the lake as a result of poor fishery management. The primary root causes to the predicted loss of endemic species and the associated threat of extinction are: (i) a massive increase in unregulated fishing over recent years; (ii) a virtual cessation of the artificial restocking of the lake with juveniles of the 4 commercially endemic species; and (iii) the introduction of alien predatory species that are currently not subject to any control or eradication activities².

3. The Government of Kyrgyzstan is trying to provide a long-term prospect in promoting the sustainable development of national resources, and fisheries development in particular. However, the following barriers constrain the attention that can be paid to integrating the requirements for endemic fish conservation into the fishery management regime: (i) Systemic and institutional: Existing fisheries management and administration are disorganised, poorly integrated and duplicative. The laws regulating the fishery management are numerous and overlapping and don't take into account the requirements for biodiversity conservation. There is no 'regulated' fishing as such within the lake due to the almost total absence of any management strategy or resources. Subsistence fishing which forms a significant part of the illegal fishing, is not just fishing for food. Much of the fish is sold in order for the fishers to have some sort of income and to buy basics such as clothes and fuel. Fishery management and enforcement falls under the control of a number of different organizations which leads to either repetition or, in some cases, contradiction. Regulations are complex and lack transparency and in many cases do not reflect or are not relevant to current fishery practices. In many cases the salaries of enforcement officials and other department staff are taken from fines levied on offenders (not necessarily always through formal process or even through the legislative or judicial system). This provides no incentive for a reduction in the level of illegal fishing and actually creates a positive disincentive thereby exacerbating this problem. The issue of granting permits and licences is complex and open to malpractice, and as a consequence many people sidestep this issue, preferring to pay their contributions by other means; (ii) Absence of Alternatives to Illegal Fishing: The high level of poverty-related illegal subsistence fishing is a reflection of the lack of alternative sources of income and livelihoods. Dependence on fisheries is essential regardless of any penalties and disincentives. Absence of options and/or lack of awareness of options serves to promote and continue this situation. Consequently any opportunity to provide food or money will not be missed, whether legal or not, particularly if there is little chance of being caught by the enforcement authorities or if the penalties are less than the value of the catch; (iii) No strategies on re-stocking of Endemics and Controlling Alien Introductions: and there is generally little awareness of the interaction between aliens and endemics and the problem this is causing within the lake. This situation is made worse by the fact that there has been a reduction in government support to the state-owned breeding plants that used to re-stock the lake with endemics. Furthermore, where the commercial fishing operations use to invest in the lake by way of breeding and re-introduction

¹ For more background information and a more elaborate project justification please refer to the UNDP Project Document, sub-sections A.1 through A.4 „Environmental context“, „Socio-economic context“, „Institutional context“, and „Policy and legislation context“.

² A detailed discussion of the threats to lake biodiversity in Kyrgyzstan is the subject of sub-section A.5 “Threats and root-causes” in the UNDP Project Document.

programmes, this has now ceased due to lack of sufficient profits from a dwindling fishery. As a consequence fewer endemics are being introduced through re-stocking programmes while more are falling to predation by uncontrolled alien species³.

4. Kyrgyzstan has committed to a two-pronged approach to conserving the Issyk Kul lake biodiversity. One is to establish and strengthen the Issyk Kul Biosphere Reserve and the other is to mainstream biodiversity conservation into the fishery sector. This proposal addresses the later of these two approaches, as the first one has been addressed over the past ten years in cooperation with GTZ. The project strategy is to address the overall concerns relating to fisheries management in Kyrgyzstan by demonstrating a new fishery management regime within Lake Issyk Kul as it relates to: (i) the conservation of globally significant biodiversity (endemic fish species); and (ii) within the context of socio-economic concerns, especially poverty and livelihoods. The project will create the mechanism to ensure that the lessons learned in this project will be captured and replicated initially to other large lakes in Kyrgyzstan with high economic values for fisheries. The targeted lakes are Son-Kul, Chatyr-Kul and Sary Chelek, covering 500 km².

5. One of the key elements of the project is the Biodiversity Friendly Fisheries Management Regime (BDFMR) which will be a package of national laws, by-laws and regulations developed and enforced with the objective of stabilizing the endemic fish species in the lake within the framework of a viable, sustainable and enforceable commercial fishery. Stabilization will be achieved through limiting current fishing, controlling the size of invasive species, as well as restocking native species. The BDFMR will be elaborated by Fisheries Advisory Group (FAG) - a working group of national and international experts, as well as lawyers, legislators, fish breeders and representatives of the fishing communities⁴. The elaboration will be highly participatory and once the new fishery management regime for Lake Issyk Kul is cleared by the key stakeholders (governmental, private, local communities) it will be presented to the Kyrgyz Parliament for adoption. The BDFMR will provide for an adaptive management framework based on ecosystem approach to remove the pressures on the endemic fish species. This will consider:

(i) establishing new set-aside areas to protect spawning grounds of the endemic fish species, where fishing will be prohibited. The total area to be set-aside is 56,000 ha. Specifically, in Issyk-Kul this will envisage a five-year fishing moratorium for spawning areas in: (i) the western bank shallow area (current fishing plots ## 1-10) in the vicinity of the Balytchy town; and (ii) in the eastern bank shallow area (current fishing plots ## 31, 33, 35, 37, 40) in the vicinity of the Tup village. These areas used to be characterized by the highest natural productivity of endemic fish species (catches of up to 40 – 50 t of chebak/ month) and in the past decades experienced an alarming drop in number of endemic fish, as a result of high fishing quotas set in 1940s.

(ii) developing the fishing licensing scheme initially for the 12 fishing plots along the south-western and northern banks where the productivity of endemic species has dropped substantially and further extended to include the spawning grounds after the end of the moratorium. The license will be given for at least 10 years, thus creating a long-term interest of the user in conservation of the endemic species and preventing short-term poaching interests. The licenses will be different for the commercial and for the subsistence fishing. This will enable smaller fishermen to participate in the competition for licensing as it should eliminate the current discrimination when fishing license can only be obtained by an entity which is engaged in commercial restocking. Many local fishermen can maintain the population using traditional knowledge or by partnering with restocking specialists, but because such schemes do not qualify as commercial restocking, local fishermen are currently barred from participating in the official license procurement process, and poverty drives them into poaching as a result. For commercial fishing, the license should include requirements for re-stocking based on the calculated ratio between the desired population size of endemics/introduced species and the desired state of lake ecology. The licensing framework will incorporate a system for assessing the bidder's fishing qualification record, including the assessment of local knowledge and will further assess the capacity of the user to maintain the endemic species' populations at a stable or increasing level through the 10 year period, through restocking, biological and ecological plot improvement works, etc;

(iii) regulating fishing practices across the lake: The current fishing regulation prescribes the maximum permissible mesh size for all species (including endemics), and the maximum quantity of nets to be used by one fishermen. Currently, fishing regulations do not prescribe the length of the net. Nets up to 100 m long have come to be used by poachers, and while invasive species have not suffered a substantial loss (due to their higher population size) the

³ Barriers to achieving a normative solution for sustainable fisheries are discussed in more detail in Part B "Strategy" of the UNDP Project Document.

⁴ Please see Annex C for the outline of the Terms of Reference of the national and international consultants.

endemics have been put under real threat. The BDFMR will establish a limit for the net length, probably 25 m per net. In parallel to standardizing the net length, appropriateness of the mesh size (currently 17 mm for Chebachok and 32 mm for Chebak) will be re-considered given the disappearance of these species.

(iv) institutional assignment, training and enforcement mechanisms: At present there are 7 bodies which have some interest in regulation of fisheries in Kyrgyzstan. The project will develop a legal proposal on restructuring, refinancing and retraining of whichever bodies are finally going to be responsible for the overseeing of the BDFMR. The proposal will be based on a thorough legal review and a selection of country-tailored mechanisms for the enforcement of the BDFMR at the national and site levels.

6. The key expected biodiversity impacts of the BDFMR are: (i) the ratio of endemic fish species to non-endemic species will be at least 60/40 by 2009, and 90/10 five years after project completion; and (ii) the productivity of key endemic species should be Naked Osman and Marinka 40 tons per lake each; Chebak 150 tons per lake. Further indicators, the details on the management tools, and the expected impact of the BDFMR on the Kyrgyz lakes' biodiversity are outlined in Annex E *Project tracking tool* and Annex A *Project results framework*.

7. The project is expected to result in global environmental benefits through stabilisation and long-term conservation of identified endemics within the productive landscape of the Kyrgyz lakes, such as Chebak *Leuciscus schmidtii*, Chebachok *Leuciscus bergi*, Marinka *Schizothorax issyk-kuli*, Sheer or Naked Osman *Diptychus dybovskii*, and 7 more endemic fish species. For these species, the project strives to demonstrate effective management of an altered ecosystem incorporating breeding and re-stocking, as well as the transfer of livelihoods away from exploitation and impact of endemics toward continuing market supply under a sustainable management regime. Replicable lessons and best practices for fisheries management reform will be gathered within the discrete, over-exploited fishery which is threatening the survival of endemic species and disseminated across the country, or similar situations particularly in other countries in transition which are attempting to embrace good governance practices and more effective management of their natural resources⁵.

B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:

8. The project is fully in line with the national economic priorities in the sphere of fisheries and fish stock conservation. The country's NBSAP6 stipulates that 'Commercial fisheries are legally obliged to protect habitats, breeding requirements and migration routes of fish. Further, water users are legally required to put in place mechanisms to protect fish populations, and ensure minimum water levels in accordance with ecological and environmental standards'. Strategic component C of the NBSAP6 ("Sustainable Use") defines institutional responsibilities and budget to ensure "development of management structures and practices within the State Commission on Forestry, Hunting and Fisheries to promote activities compatible with biodiversity conservation." The policy documents of the fish industry put priority on: (i) poverty alleviation through food security, with availability of food with animal (fish) protein; (ii) the provision of employment in fish culture organized in reservoirs with poor fish stocks (lakes, basins); (iii) redistribution of a part of national income from exploitation of mineral and natural resources into food production, in particular fish and fishery products; (iv) natural fish resources conservation; (v) improvement of fish species genetic pools; (vi) stocking fish farms in reservoirs by means of acclimatization and use of nutritionally valued fish species; and (vii) encouraging production of genetically improved fish forms and species for commercial fish culture.

C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH GEF STRATEGIES AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS :

9. By mainstreaming the requirements for the conservation of endemic freshwater fish species into the fishery production sector, the project is consistent with the BD-SP4 – Mainstreaming biodiversity into productive landscapes/seascapes and sectors - Strategic Program 4 on Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity. The SP-4 clarifies that GEF resources under this SP are to be used "to support projects that (i) remove critical knowledge barriers, (ii) develop institutional capacities, and (iii) establish the policies, and the legislative and regulatory frameworks required to integrate biodiversity conservation objectives into the actions of the

⁵ Further elaboration of the project design is the subject of Part B "Strategy" of the UNDP Project Document. This part of the UNDP Project Document also contains a detailed discussion of project sustainability and replication.

⁶ http://www.undp.org/bpsp/nbsap_links/NBSAP%20Kyrgyz%20EngV.pdf

production sectors (agriculture, fisheries, forestry, extractive industries-oil and gas, mining, etc.)”.⁷ Responding in full to the above SP-4 guidance, the project will:

- Develop and validate a new policy – the biodiversity friendly fishery management regime which will help to stabilize and ensure long-term conservation of identified endemics within a productive landscape (Output 1.1.). Develop a financial mechanism to support the policy (Output 1.3) The project will demonstrate a model of effective management of an altered ecosystem incorporating breeding and re-stocking of endemics, as well as the transfer of livelihoods away from exploitation and impact of endemics toward continuing market supply under a sustainable management regime (Outcome 2);
- Develop the institutional capacities within the Government to deliver and implement the above policy (Output 1.2.); and
- Build up the knowledge base for sustainable fishery management in the country and develop replicable lessons and best practices for fisheries management reform within a discrete, over-exploited fishery which is threatening the survival of endemic species. The lessons and best practices could be extended to other fisheries within the Kyrgyz Republic. Furthermore, they would be transferable to similar situations particularly in other countries in transition which are attempting to embrace good governance practices and more effective management of their natural resources. (Output 1.4).

10. As a result of the project, specific biodiversity issues (protection of highly endemic fish species) will be incorporated into sector policy and plans, supported by appropriate regulations and implementation procedures. Also in line with GEF guidance, this approach will further demonstrate improved livelihoods within local communities directly linked to a more sustainable use of biodiversity elements. Overall, the project outputs and activities have been therefore carefully designed in line with the specific guidance of the SP-4.

D. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES :

11. Extensive consultations were held with GTZ, CAREC and GEF funded projects in the region to learn from their experience and avoid duplication. Over the past ten years significant amount of effort was made by the Government with the financial and technical support for GTZ to establish and strengthen the Issyk Kul Biosphere Reserve. Lessons learnt will be used in preparation and implementation. In addition, the project team initiated discussions with the World Bank office in Bishkek in order to maximize synergies and learn from the Bank’s experience in implementation of GEF – funded projects in the region.

E. DESCRIBE THE INCREMENTAL REASONING OF THE PROJECT:

12. Under the ‘business-as usual’ scenario, fishing in Kyrgyzstan would continue at the current rate with little by way of increased surveillance and enforcement and without a clear strategy for management. While the political will to develop biodiversity friendly management regimes at fisheries is there, it is tempered by the fact that for any such management regime to be effective there would need to be considerable effort put into reforming institutional arrangements, building capacity, strengthening data collection and information management, and raising awareness at all levels. Under business-as-usual efforts to improve the status of the fish populations will remain limited due to ever decreasing re-stocking. Two privately owned fishery plants will retain the responsibility for fish reproduction and re-stocking as part of their license agreement to fish the lake. Their efforts will remain limited without resolving the problem of the dropping financial returns related to reduced catches. The Department of Fishery is will continue to support limited fish reproduction through the State-owned Ton fishery plant, however funds for monitoring of the fish populations within the largest Kyrgys lakes will remain limited.

13. Limited and localized assistance is likely to continue from the side of the international community. Thus, UNDP will continue its Community Based Rangeland Management Project in Temir Village (Issyk-Kull area) – which is CIDA funded project in Issyk-Kul province integrating sustainable livelihood practice in the area where illegal fishing is present. Recovery of traditional livestock breeding with mainstreamed environmental sustainability and promoted alternative sustainable livelihood should serve to reduce poverty and reduce illegal pressure on fish population of Issyk-Kull Lake. (Total project budget including local co-financing is USD 220,000). UNDP project on Promotion of Micro HydroPower Generation (MHPG) for rural development will contribute itself for pilot application of such MHPG units in Issyk-Kul region and has attracted the interest of private gold mining company to credit local farmers including those

⁷ Source: *Focal area strategies and strategic programming for GEF-4. GEF/C.31/10.*

working on pound fish breeding for MHPG around the Issyk-Kul Lake. This company is also ready to credit local farmers for development of biogas installations around the Lake. Total credit facility of this company available to locals for MHPG and biogas development is to amount USD 300,000 for the next three-four years.

14. Under the business-as-usual, the NGO community is likely to remain the main driving force for change in the fisheries management. ALIFSD (The Alliance of Local Initiatives and Facilities for Sustainable Development of Communities and Livelihoods) is a local NGO whose mission is to facilitate the local and international initiatives directed for sustainable development of local communities and environment. Its current priority objectives are to strengthen the livelihoods capacities of rural and urban communities. It aims to do this through environmentally sustainable income generation projects and initiation of dialogue between the communities, public organizations, business groups, authorities in the sphere of sanitary, hygiene, urban ecology, biodiversity conservation, protection of quality of the international waters, mitigations of consequences of climate changes, prevention of land degradation and desertification. ALIFSD is likely to remain particularly involved in the capacity building of itself and other NGOs to fulfil this mission and objectives. The NGO has an annual budget based on its membership fee which it uses to run its website and to publish bulletins and provide consultative support to its members. The NGO also implements various grants as part of its activities. ALIFSD was responsible for proposing the initial concept for this GEF Medium Size Project. Another NGO (CAREC) will also remain active in promoting sustainable use of natural resources, specifically focusing on the country’s lakes.

15. Overall, the absence of an effective biodiversity-friendly management policy environment in the fisheries sector will continue to allow a ‘free-for-all’ scenario fish catch scenario in the country’s lakes. It will remain difficult to predictively manage fisheries in the absence of monitoring and data assessment, and the current evidence is strong that populations of certain species (especially endemics) are collapsing under both fishing pressure and competition/predation, posing high risk of extinction for 4 endemic species at least. Other symptoms of the baseline-as-usual will be: continued ignorance of the threat to livelihoods around the lake associated with continued over-exploitation and the inevitable collapse of certain commercial populations of fish; continued lack of knowledge and understanding regarding the exact status of the fish populations in the Lake; and insufficient awareness of the linkage between these fish populations and the welfare of the local communities.

F. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES :

Risk		Mitigation strategy
Political will is insufficient to adopt Fishery Management Regime (FMR) in an effective framework	L	Relevant national and local authorities responsible for FMR adoption will be actively involved in project implementation through participation in the Steering Committee and awareness raising campaigns.
Alien species are not easily removable or controllable.	M	Sound scientific basis is used for the design of measures aimed at alien species removal and control within the project. Robust ecological monitoring will enable timely response to adjustment of species control activities. Highly qualified project staff and experts (local and international) will be carefully selected.
Impossibility to target non-endemics without endemic by-catch	L	Promotion of selective breeding of endemic and non-endemic species through pond culture.
Level of cooperation with various entities (media, schools, communities, etc) is not sustained	L	The project specifically addresses maintenance of regular close links with the appropriate institutions and media and delivery of targeted awareness-raising campaigns.

G. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN :

16. The project’s approach involves three stages: (i) developing a draft policy, mechanisms and approaches to biodiversity integration; (ii) validating policies and conservation mechanisms in the field; and (iii) setting the ground for national replication”. With less than USD 1 million of GEF resources, the project believes to create a cost-effective ecologically sustainable model of integrating biodiversity into fisheries in Kyrgyzstan.

17. The project represents a cost-effective model for landscape level management that can be applied throughout the Kyrgyz Republic once tried and proven. The cost benefits are also realised if and when the foundations laid down by the MSP are scaled up to the other key lakes in Kyrgyzstan facing the same threats. Effective lessons and best practice capture will provide GEF and other agencies with a highly replicable model that can be replicated in other countries further ensuring a cost-effective investment from GEF and from UNDP. The initiatives within the project that address transition to alternate livelihoods provide support to individuals and businesses. This would be done by an experienced agency (UNDP) on the basis of credits and soft loans and would therefore be reimbursed. This will provide the necessary capital to realise the changes in occupation and to create new job opportunities without placing this strain on the GEF grant process. The following alternatives were considered as possible options for addressing the barriers and achieving an objective but were rejected for the reasons given.

18. Comprehensive capacity building for the Issyk-Kul Biosphere Reserve staff: This was considered to be both unrealistic and beyond the scope of a Medium-Sized Project. The Biosphere Reserve covers a much greater area than Lake Issyk-Kul and is dealing with a multitude of environmental and biodiversity related issues well beyond the scope of a fisheries project. Any attempt at such a larger scale strengthening and capacity building exercise would greatly risk diluting the GEF-assisted effort and could quite possibly end up with little or no sustainable achievements and lessons. It is also unlikely at this stage that sufficient in-country resources could be identified that would make such an initiative sustainable and any realistic time-frame for achieving the required delivery would run in to several years and beyond the scope of a single GEF project. On the other hand, the proposed Project has a much more focussed approach which builds the capacity only within the fisheries sector, and initially resolved fisheries related issues within the context of biodiversity management and conservation. This will aim to build a strong foundation for cooperation and sustainability which can act as a demonstration and as a possible foothold for further efforts toward the sustainable management of biodiversity and to address barrier removal within the Biosphere Reserve and throughout the country as a whole.

19. Addressing fisheries as an overall national issue without validating the proposed policies and approaches in Issyk-Kul. The project could limit itself to just policy drafting, without validating the policies in the field, and with limited capacity building. Although this might be an overall “cheaper” alternative, this would risk creating a new management regime for the country’s fisheries would become purely a paper exercise resulting in very little on-the-ground improvements while nurturing a fall sense of security that ‘something has been done’. This risk could only be mitigated if the draft policy could be demonstrated in the field. And it is recognised that there are many other lakes, reservoirs and rivers in the Kyrgyz Republic where issues of over-fishing and lack of effective management are also a problem. However, if the project chose to embrace all of these areas would once again stretch the credibility of what can be achieved and would introduce other issues and concerns (e.g. irrigation issues and farming) which would add another level of complication to the proposed activities and deliverables. Apart from going beyond the financial limits of an MSP, this would, once again, threaten the sustainability of the project and its outcomes. Given all the above, focussing on Lake Issyk-Kul as a demonstration for a fisheries approach that could be transferred and replicated to other water bodies, and thus possible form the foundation for a national fisheries management regime is both practical and justifiable. In this context Lake Issyk-Kul is a logical choice for the following reasons:

- It has the highest number of endemic species of all national water bodies and these are under the highest perceived threat of extinction.
- The presence of the Biosphere Reserve provides opportunities for exploring sustainable funding options. The Reserve is already collecting revenues from access fees. The rationalisation of governance that is happening within the country and the removal of one tier of government (the oblast) should also strengthen such options as currently the oblast takes 40% of the revenues.
- The proximity of a number of fish ponds and fish breeding stations around the lake shore gives the Project greater options in terms of alternative livelihoods and ecosystem manipulation that would simply not be conceivable in the majority of other national water bodies due to their remote nature.
- Such a Project focussing on one water body provides opportunities for the development of an ecosystem-based approach to the development of fisheries management within the country.
- Proximity to Bishkek and ease of communications and travel for staff between the project site and the national administrative centre.
- Lake Issyk-Kul is held in very high regard by the national population, almost to a level of reverence. Demonstrating sustainable resource management linked to economic improvements (especially alternate livelihoods) within this water body will act as an inspiration and will raise awareness greater than if undertaken at alternative site.

20. In short, focussing on Lake Issyk-Kul will address the important issue of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation requirements into the fisheries management (as a demonstration for national replication), and will also serve to build a foundation for biodiversity management than can act as a platform for further initiatives in support of the Biosphere Reserve, initiatives which could be funded by the Government of Kyrgyzstan. If this approach is chosen, then the overall cost per hectare per year amounts to \$0.56 of which GEF is paying \$0.30 (30 cents).

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:

21. The national executing agency for the Project is the State Agency on Environment and Forestry. At the local level, the EA will be represented by its Directorate General of the Issyk-Kul Biosphere Reserve (DGBR), and the DGBR will be the key partner in administering the Fisheries Regime. The Fisheries Department (under the Ministry of Agriculture) will also be a key partner in the administration of the Fisheries Regime. The State Agency will provide accommodation and facilities to support the Project and time and availability of PD for overall project coordination. This arrangement takes advantage of the fact that the Directorate General of the Biosphere Reserve: (i) has the mandate to control much of the activity within the Reserve (including the Lake); (ii) already has the necessary legislative provisions to collect fees (which will make sustainable funding measure easier to adopt); and (iii) has direct linkages to the government Agency which is primarily responsible for activities in and around the lake.


22. UNDP will act as the GEF Implementing Agency for this Project. The project builds on strong UNDP experience in Kyrgyzstan and in the region on environmental finance, mainstreaming environment, supporting democratic governance and poverty reduction initiatives. UNDP's National Governance Programme for the Kyrgyz Republic aims at supporting the country to establish an effective and transparent system of national government. UNDP has helped the Kyrgyz parliament to open its processes to the public, and advised on reforming of its procedures and structure. UNDP works closely with the parliament to ensure that the beneficial changes in process are retained, and to help the parliament to plan appropriate internal structure and procedures, and introduce mechanisms to implement effectively its oversight function, especially over state budget. The project conforms with UNDP's agreed strategies to support good governance including: (i) Policy advice and technical support; (ii) Capacity development of institutions and individuals; (iii) Advocacy, communications, and public information; (iii) Promoting and brokering dialogue; and (iv) Knowledge networking and sharing of good practices. UNDP is also committed to assisting countries in the integration of biodiversity, ecosystem services, protected areas (and other commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity) into national policies and programmes, including in such key sectors as fisheries. As Implementing Agency, UNDP brings to the table a wealth of experience working with governments in the arena of reform, and is well-positioned to assist in both capacity building and institutional strengthening. As always, the UNDP Country Office will be answerable as the agency responsible for transparent practices, appropriate conduct and professional auditing. Staff and Consultants will be contracted according to the established Rules and Regulations of the United Nations and all financial transactions and agreements will similar follow the same Rules and Regulations.

23. The project manager will be hired for the duration of the project. Project office will be provided (co-funded) by the Executing Agency (SAEF) at the offices of the Directorate General of the Biosphere Reserve. The project manager will be responsible for the day-to-day management and administration of all project activities, staff, consultants, disbursements, etc and for ensuring that M&E requirements are met in a timely fashion. Consultants, will be hired as required (based on pre-agreed ToRs and selection processes) by a selection committee which will include the IA, EA and the Lead Government Agency. Selection will be by unanimous agreement. The primary stakeholders in this Project at the national level are the lake fishermen and fishing industry, the fishing regulatory bodies (government agencies) and the Biosphere Reserve administration. The stakeholder participation plan

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:

24. The project proposal for CEO endorsement is fully aligned with the approved PIF. No changes have been effected to the project objective, outcomes, and GEF financing requests. In relevant sections, this proposal provides further details on the expected global benefits, incremental reasoning, cost-effectiveness, implementation arrangements. It also clarifies co-financing, and, as requested, develops the terms of reference for project management and technical assistance consultancies.

PART V: AGENCY CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.	
 John Hough UNDP-GEF Deputy Executive Coordinator a.i.	Adriana Dinu, Regional Technical Advisor, Project Contact Person
Date: January 8, 2008	Tel. and Email: Adriana.dinu@undp.org Tel: + 421 2 59 337 332

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

PROJECT STRATEGY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS				
Goal	The goal of the project is to conserve the globally significant biodiversity of Kyrgyz lakes				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective of the project : To strengthen the policy and regulatory framework to integrate requirements for endemic fish conservation into the fishery management regime	Productivity/Population size of endemic fish species(<i>Leuciscus schmid,i Leuciscus bergi, Schizothorax issyk-kuli, Diptychus dybovskii</i>) showing continuing trend of significant increase by end of project.	Low numbers of 4 endemics - unable to quantify	At Issyk Kul: Nike Osman 40 tons per year per lake; Chebak 150 tons per year per lake; Marinka 40 tons per year per lake.	Monitoring records and data analyses of fish populations and species distributions.	No other factors impacting sustainability of endemics (i.e. water quality, disease, etc). Monitoring is accurate.
	Ratio of endemic to non-endemic species: significantly reduced number of alien species by end of project, particularly those in direct competition or predating on endemics.	Over 60 percent non-endemic species in the lake	60/40 endemic to non-endemic population size ration by project end, 90/10 ration 5 years after project completion	Catch statistics. Reports from Biological Station	Alien species are removable or controllable. Alien species may now be an important component of an altered ecosystem.
	Newly established set aside area (fishing moratorium)	0 ha	56,000 ha	Lake Issyk Kul management plan	The decision for setting area aside might face opposition from fishermen, especially involved in poaching. The strategy of wider stakeholder consultations will be applied to mitigate the risk.
	Reduced fishing effort directly attributable to changes in livelihoods within fishers	1,500 persons fishing in lake.	1000 (reduced by 1/3)	Fisheries Management statistics. Reports to SteerCom	Fishers willing to stop fishing. May be difficult to evaluate.
Outcome 1 Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for biodiversity friendly fisheries	Effectiveness of policies and mechanisms for biodiversity friendly fishing	Absence of fisheries management plans	FMR adopted by the Gov. and providing for sustainable management targeting endemics	Steering Committee minutes. A formally endorsed and gov't-adopted FMR document.	Political will to adopt FMR in a form that does not compromise its effectiveness Other agencies willing to relinquish responsibility (and associated budgeting)

PROJECT STRATEGY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS				
Goal	The goal of the project is to conserve the globally significant biodiversity of Kyrgyz lakes				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
management regime	Effectiveness of a management bodies (esp. Fisheries Advisory Committee) to deliver the biodiversity friendly regime in the long-term perspective.	Institutional fragmentation	FAC established and implementing effective policy	Minutes of FAC meetings. Project represented on FAC	Appropriate members selected. Assumes need for separate Committee. Role might be filled by SteerCom
	Percent of fisheries under control and monitoring	90% fishing illegal. Catches uncontrolled and unmonitored	90% of fishing legally licensed. Illegal fishing routinely prosecuted.	Database of licences. Records of prosecutions. Reports from Fisheries Officers. Independent assessment.	Government prepared to act to eradicate corruption in ranks. Transparent enforcement procedures adopted and applied. Support from legislative arm and Courts
	Percent endemic lake fish species harvested	Endemics targeted as preferred catches	Reduced % of endemics in catches. Reduced overall fisheries catch from lake.	Catch statistics published by Management Body. Fisheries database established and accessible. Survey of markets.	Possible to target non-endemics without endemic by-catch. Can change market demand or provide alternate supply of popular endemic food fish (through pond culture)
Outcome 2 Sustainable fisheries demonstrated which contribute to the conservation of endemic fish species and to improve	The degree of the effectiveness of the breeding and restocking programs in sustain the viable endemic fish population	Captive breeding programmes failed	Re-stocking rates: Marinka <i>Schizothorax issyk-kuli</i> – 500,000 per year Naked Osman <i>Diptychus dybovskii</i> – 240,000 per year	Project records. Reports from Biological Stations. Records of breeding plants	Possible to successful breed and release all spp. of endemics. Knowledge of number of individuals required.

PROJECT STRATEGY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS				
Goal	The goal of the project is to conserve the globally significant biodiversity of Kyrgyz lakes				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
livelihoods	Average license period for fishing rights for a particular plot, assigned to one user/fishermen	Non-existing	At least 10 years	BDFMR document	Local fishermen may oppose establishment of long tenure. There is a need for a transparent bidding process behind the distribution of long-term fishing rights, and the process should incorporate assessment of the fishing experience and qualifications. These are the risk mitigation measures the project will incorporate
	Volumes of commercial fish supply produced from artificial ponds (higher volumes will contribute to reduction in required fishing effort).	Little to no pond culture	10 ponds producing commercial spp. for market (>500 mt)	Project records. Site visits by Evaluators. Pond operator's records.	Suitable ponds available. Pond cultured fish are acceptable to market. Cost-effective alternative to wild-caught fish
	The trend of changes in the levels of introduced alien fish species showing significant results.	No control or attempts to reduce alien species	Active control. Alien species number and sizes reduced	Field monitoring. Reports from Biological Station. Catch records.	Accurate information available on existing numbers and life-cycle/habitats. Control is feasible.
	The trend of employment of local people in livelihood fishing (a dropping trend will signify a relaxation of the catch loads)	Heavy concentration on fishing for livelihood. Ltd opportunities for other employment	Increase in other forms of employment. Decrease in fishing effort.	Fishing licences. Independent survey. Local record of businesses and employment.	Other livelihoods are available and attractive alternative. Fishers willing to work in other trades

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

No comments have been made at the PIF submission stage.

- Response to GEFSEC Review sheet dated 13 December 2007

RAF compliant OFP letter endorsing project grant, PPG and fees has now been included in the submission package.

- Response to GEFSEC Review sheet dated 8 January 2008

The project cost table and work plan are now attached as Annex F.

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT

Positions marked with * are supported only from co-financing

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks over 4 years</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
For Project Management		780	
<u>Local</u>		<u>780</u>	
Project Manager (PM)	250	208	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervise overall implementation of the project for its total duration to ensure project performance in accordance with the approved project document; • Is responsible for the day-to-day management and administration of all project activities, staff, consultants, disbursements, etc and for ensuring that M&E requirements are met in a timely fashion; • Manage the administrative assistant and the logistics clerk/driver. • PM will be answerable to the UN Country Office but will be expected to work in close collaboration and cooperation with the Project Director on behalf of Executing Agency. • PM will coordinate his work with UNDP CO Environment Programme Officer. • Organize the project inception workshop; Organize the project tri-partite meetings; • Assist in the preparation of feasibility studies for problems solution and its presentation for stakeholders; • Analyze results attained by the project, and take into account the successful projects and experience of previous projects; improve key stakeholders' awareness about project activities; • Facilitate the activities of the Fisheries Advisory Group; • Ensure coordination of the project activities with other relevant activities and initiatives of the Government; • Contract and closely work with the team composed of a national and international specialists with expertise in financial mechanisms for fisheries; • Support breeding and growth studies at fish plants and associated ponds; • Provide assistance to the pond culture sector by supporting ten pilot ponds around the lake; • Support a technical contract to identify additional alternative livelihood opportunities. • Hire of specialized expertise to design the most cost-effective strategy for the control of the alien fish species • Provide expert advisory services in the field of fishery legislation to draft Fisheries Management Regime for further dissemination to other 900 lakes, rivers and water reservoirs of Kyrgyzstan. • Regularly provide information on project progress on the portal www.caresd.net for the benefit of all stakeholders.
Project administrative assistant	125	208	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist the project officers in maintaining close contacts with the Government, Executing Agencies, donors and other counterparts through direct contacts, collection and summarizing of information, proposals, incoming and outgoing documents, drafting letters, organizing meetings under supervision of PM. • Provide operational support to project activities implementation as well as to project management; • Collect data and other information on project development and subject-matter activities (e.g. maintain, log, file and update records in prescribed format for subsequent use); • Contribute to the preparation of status and progress reports by collecting

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks over 4 years</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
			<p>information, preparing tables and drafting selected sections of it. Prepare background material to be used in discussions and briefing sessions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrange for the recording and processing of government requests for assistance; • Assist in identification and formulation of development co-operation projects and in preparation of draft project documents; • Assist in monitoring project/project activities by reviewing a variety of records, including correspondence, reports, activities, project inputs, budgets and financial expenditures in accordance with UNDP requirements. Prepare and file correspondence and materials relevant to the above; • Assist in translation and organization of preparation of Terms of Reference for national and international experts; • Assist in the organization and logistical preparation for workshops, seminars, visiting missions, field trips and etc; • Assist on financial and administrative matters; • Prepare unofficial translations and may act as interpreter if necessary.
Project logistics clerk and driver*	75	208	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driving the Project Manager and other project staff on a daily basis; • Maintaining vehicle in a good shape and order on a daily basis; • Delivering official correspondence as requested; • Assisting the Finance/Administrative Assistant in day-to-day running of the office; • Doing simple cash withdrawal and handling as authorized by Project Manager; • Maintaining office equipment as authorized by the Project Manager.
Co-financing national expert on cross-project coordination, monitoring and evaluation*	215	156	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold monitoring and assessment of sister/co-financing projects and programmes, • Develop sample forms of monitoring and assessment, efficient indicators of assessing activities as well as introducing modern tools of monitoring the project results, • Analyze information on monitoring and assessment results and hand in for placement on web-site www.caresd.net and for mass media. Provide entering and renewal of information based on this and sister projects. • Provide technical consultative support to project staff on the issues of monitoring and evaluation, and/or develop ToRs for technical assistance as well as develop ToRs for trainings on capacity building and strengthening aiming to fill the gaps of knowledge and skills of personnel. • To carry out assessment of the GEF projects and other donors to ensure sustainability of results and needs of their involvement and reflect them in the draft strategy on external resources mobilization. • Introduce best international and sub-regional practice through UNDP, GEF and other donor projects; • Promote imbedding of the project results in other projects and programmes that are under development within UNDP, or by other agencies/donors.
For Technical Assistance		620	
<u>Local</u>		<u>558</u>	
FAG: Expert group (7 national specialists) for the elaboration and validation of the biodiversity-	220	350	<p>This expert group will consist of 7-9 different specialists, and the main functions of the group will be to oversee the elaboration of all modules of the BDFRM, as described in paragraph 11. In addition to that, the FAG will ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of the current existing fisheries policy, legislation, monitoring, control and surveillance procedures. - Arranging for the stakeholder consultations on the draft policies/laws, - Analysis of the leading international experience in BDFMR with assistance from the international experts,

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks over 4 years</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
friendly fisheries management regime			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of the up-to-date guidelines and processes that would ensure that BDFRM volumes, boundaries and techniques are environmentally safe, - implementation of biological monitoring of fish stocks and catches during the life of the project. - Facilitating the stakeholder consultations/workshops, chairing meetings to lobby for the adoption and endorsement of BDFRM by Parliament
Expert group on development of the sustainable fishing training modules	175	16	<p>The functions of this 4 experts' group will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working out the training development and implementation schedule, to be approved by PM and facilitate/manage its implementation; • Develop a specific module for a 3 days training "For responsible agencies in Monitoring, Control and Surveillance"; • Develop a specific module for a 3 days training "Fish population and catch data monitoring and presentation" • Develop a specific module for a 3 days training "For Fisheries Management personnel and related government officials " • Develop a specific module for a 3 days training "For fishers and communities to share Monitoring, Control and Surveillance requirements" • Develop and conduct training of trainers (TOT) on the selected topics; • Probate developed module on TOT and update it accordance with the comments and additions obtained during the first set of trainings; • Further develop the capacities of trainers to conduct training on developed modules
Training facilitators (trainers) for seminars and workshops	100	40	<p>The 4 trainers will be responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participating in the training of trainers, before and after the trainings; • 3 days training "For responsible agencies in Monitoring, Control and Surveillance"; • 3 days training "Fish population and catch data monitoring and presentation" • 3 days training "For Fisheries Management personnel and related government officials " • 3 days training "For fishers and communities to share Monitoring, Control and Surveillance requirements"
Expert group on awareness raising	300	70	<p>The group of experts/NGOs on awareness and support of BDFRM will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop initial guidelines on target groups and types of awareness-raising materials , • Facilitate consultations/workshops with government and NGOs, to review the target group and products; present them at the tri-partite committee, • Finalize and produce the materials , • Implementation of distribution and awareness raising campaigns, media presentations and publications • Reaching agreements with media representatives (TV, Radio and Newspapers) on the promotion of sustainable fishery policies.
Technical expert on endemic species breeding	175	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and support the implementation of the specifications on the conservation of the endemic fish species of Issyk Kul, elaboration of guidance and standards for native species breeding, reintroduction, protection from introduced species, • Support the expert group on elaboration of trainings in matters related to the scientific knowledge on native species breeding and reintroduction; co-facilitate the workshops, • Assistance in development and analysis of documentation for the procurement and installation of the support equipment for pond culture and breeding programmes, • Assistance in development and analysis of documentation for the procurement and deployment of mobile breeding stations.
National project evaluation	200	10	<p>The role of the national project evaluation consultant will be to participate, alongside with the international consultants, in the mid-term and final evaluation of the project, in order to assess the project progress, achievement of results and impacts. The project</p>

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks over 4 years</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
consultants			evaluation specialists will develop draft evaluation report, discuss it with the project team, government and UNDP, and as necessary participate in discussions to realign the project time-table/logical framework at the mid-term stage. The standard UNDP/GEF project evaluation TOR will be used.
Experts on the financial mechanism to support the sustainable fisheries policy*	175	40	Two national experts on identification of financial mechanism for the implementation of the BDFRM will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of potential funding mechanisms to support various needs and activities of the BDFRM; develop a corresponding proposal and sensitize government toward adoption of a selected financing mechanism, • Facilitate stakeholder meeting to discuss funding mechanisms , • Lobby for / facilitating the adoption of the funding mechanisms into FRM operations, including taking care of the necessary formalities that might be required under the national legislation for the adoption of such mechanism.
<u>International</u>		<u>62</u>	
International consultants for mid-term evaluation	3,000	10	The main objective of the mid-term international evaluation team will be to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction to strengthen the chances for the delivery of the expected results. The team will test and confirm the key hypotheses underlying the project, reassess risks and assumptions, focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document.
International consultants for final evaluations	3,000	10	The main task of the final evaluation team will be - in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance - to focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The final evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities, and the report will feature management response to the issues raised.
Fishery policy advisor	2,000	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical guidance of the national team on sustainable fishery policies, through the whole period of elaboration of the BDFRM; ensuring that this policy is developed using a participatory approach; • Provide monitoring of, and mentoring to hired trainers rolling-out capacity-buildings training to rural communities, local government and decision-makers. Co-facilitating the trainings. • Arrange and conduct the field survey and production of guidelines for pond culture and captive breeding, • Facilitating the stakeholder workshop for discussion and review of guidelines for pond culture and captive breeding; supporting the initial start-up process for the launching of the pond culture and captive breeding, • Arrange and conduct the field survey and production of guidelines for the alien species management, • Facilitating the stakeholder workshop for the discussion and review of guidelines for alien species management, • Supervise the initiation of the alien species management programme in Kyrgyzstan.
Advisor on the knowledge management	2,375	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present the international experience to develop an information capture and knowledge management mechanism on Kyrgyz sustainable fisheries, • Work with the local experts on the feasibility study for creating a Kyrgyz knowledge

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks over 4 years</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
platform			<p>management platform on sustainable fisheries; draft terms -of-reference, staffing rules, standards and other guidance for the expected knowledge portal, present and discuss it at the stakeholder workshop,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance to the project staff in following items for further knowledge platform implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder meetings to discuss and capture lessons and best practices, - Transfer of lessons and best practices to UNDP and GEF.
Alternative livelihoods consultant*	2,000	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present the international experience on sustainable livelihood opportunities, which supports the transition of individuals and businesses away from activities that threaten endemics toward activities in support of sustainable fisheries management • Work with the local experts and international consultants within the outcome 1 and output 2.1-2.2 to study and discuss with them the alternative income and employment opportunities as well as creation of incentives for alternative income and employment generation, • Conducting a cost-analysis (SWOT) of alternative livelihoods opportunities, • Presentation of draft Alternative Livelihoods Programme to Stakeholders and to the tri-partite committee.

Note: positions marked with * are funded from co-financing.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.

All PDF A activities have been achieved in full. As a result, a PIF and an MSP have been prepared for CEO endorsement. The proposal reflects all comments made at the PDF A stage.

B. DESCRIBE IF ANY FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.

No major concerns that might impact negatively on the MSP implementation have been identified at the PDF A stage.

C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To-date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
1. Household survey	Completed	10,000	5,000	0	0	
2. Consultation process	Completed	1,050	4,500	0	0	
3. Draft fishing regime	Completed	3,000	3,000	0	0	
4. Missions	Completed	8,500	9,612	0	0	12,831
5. MSP preparation	Completed	2,450	1,733	0	0	
project management	Completed		1,056	0	0	4,439
Total		25,000	24,901	0	0	17,270

ANNEX E: PROJECT TRACKING TOOL

I. Project General Information

1. Project name: Strengthening policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity into fishery sector
2. Project type: MSP
3. Project ID (GEF): 3192
4. Project ID (IA): 3217
5. Implementing Agency: UNDP
6. Country (ies): Kyrgyzstan

Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	Title	Agency
Work Program Inclusion	Zharas Takenov	Environmental Focal Point	UNDP CO - Kyrgyzstan
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project completion			

7. Project duration: *Planned* 4 years *Actual* _____ years

8. Lead Project Executing Agency (ies): State Agency of Environment and Forestry – the General Directorate of Lake Issyk Kul Biosphere Reserve

9. GEF Operational Program:

coastal, marine, freshwater (OP 2)

10. Production sectors and/or ecosystem services directly targeted by project:

10.a. Please identify the main production sectors involved in the project. Please put “**P**” for sectors that are primarily and directly targeted by the project, and “**S**” for those that are secondary or incidentally affected by the project.

Agriculture _____

Fisheries P _____

Forestry _____

Tourism S _____

Mining _____

Oil _____

Transportation _____

Other (please specify) _____

10.b. For projects that are targeting the conservation or sustainable use of ecosystems goods and services, please specify the goods or services that are being targeted, for example, water, genetic resources, recreational, etc

1. Food resources

2. Genetic resources

3. Recreation facilities

II. Project Landscape/Seascape Coverage

11.a. What is the extent (in hectares) of the landscape or seascape where the project will directly or indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation or sustainable use of its components?

Targets and Timeframe	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Project Coverage			
Landscape/seascape area <u>directly</u> covered by the project (ha)*	623,600 ha (lake area)		
Landscape/seascape area <u>indirectly</u> covered by the project (ha) **	4,311,588 ha (area of biosphere reserve surrounding the largest Kyrgyz lake Issyk-Kul)		

Clarification of the biological impact:

* The biodiversity-friendly fisheries regime (BDFMR) is expected to envisage establishment of new set-aside areas where fishing will be prohibited. Specifically, in Issyk-Kul the BDFMR, subject to additional scientific research and stakeholder consultations, will envisage a five-year fishing moratorium for:

- area in the western bank shallow area (current fishing plots ## 1-10) in the vicinity of the Balytchy town,
 - area in the eastern bank shallow area (current fishing plots ## 31,33,35,37,40) in the vicinity of the Tup village.
- The total area is 56,000 ha.

** The entire Issyk-Kul lake area is 623,600 ha. While directly, the project sets aside only a small area of the lake, the BDFMR will bring about positive legal, institutional, and capacity changes relevant to the whole lake and its buffer zone, and even broader – for the rest of the key Kyrgyz lakes.

11.b. Are there Protected Areas within the landscape/seascape covered by the project? If so, names these PAs, their IUCN or national PA category, and their extent in hectares.

	Name of Protected Areas	IUCN and/or national category of PA	Extent in hectares of PA
1.	Issyk-Kul Biosphere Reserve	MAB and State Nature Reserve	4,311,588 ha
2.	Issyk-Kul Ramsar Site	Ramsar Site RDB Code 2KG001	633,600 ha

III. Management Practices Applied

12.a. Within the scope and objectives of the project, please identify in the table below the management practices employed by project beneficiaries that integrate biodiversity considerations and the area of coverage of these management practices? Note: this could range from farmers applying organic agricultural practices, forest management agencies managing forests per Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) guidelines or other forest certification schemes, artisanal fisherfolk practicing sustainable fisheries management, or industries satisfying other similar agreed international standards, etc.

Targets and Timeframe Specific management practices that integrate BD	Area of coverage foreseen at start of project	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
1. Re-stocking of native lake fish species and limiting proliferation of invasive species*	Total Project Area (623,600 ha) but wrong species and insufficient numbers		
2. Increasing the fishing license duration for a particular plot, assigned to a particular fisherman **	Issyk-Kul fishing plots along the south-western and northern banks, total area: 70,000 ha		
3. Standardizing fishing gear types***	Total Project Area (623,600 ha)		

Clarifications:

* The following restocking plan applies for Issyk-Kul to support endemic species:

Marinka *Schizothorax issyk-kuli* – 500,000 per year

Naked Osman *Diptychus dybovskii* – 240,000 per year

** The productivity of endemic species at about 12 plots along the south-western and northern banks (other than those discussed in 11a above), has dropped substantially (area about 70,000 ha). A particular biodiversity management tool that the BDFMR will initiate for such area will be a law and by-laws to establish the license duration given out to a particular user as at least 10 years, thus creating a long-term interest of the user in conservation of the endemic species and preventing short-term poaching interests. Such license will be established for plots where productivity of the endemics drops below certain scientifically established levels. In parallel to the regulation, a transparent license distribution/assigning process will be developed, to enable smaller fishermen participate freely in the competition for the license. The final law, by-laws, and final bidding process will be developed during the project (as they require serious consultations and legal work); the law and processes will incorporate a system for assessing the bidder's fishing qualification record, including the assessment of local knowledge. The assessment system will further assess the capacity of the user to maintain the 4 endemic species' populations at the stable or increasing level through the 10 year period, through restocking, biological and ecological plot improvement works, etc. The new by-law should eliminate the current discrimination when fishing license can only be obtained by an entity which is engaged in commercial restocking: many local fishermen can maintain the population using traditional knowledge or by coupling with restocking specialists, but because such schemes do not qualify as commercial restocking, local fishermen are currently barred from participating in the official license procurement process, and poverty drives them into poaching as a result.

*** The current fishing regulation prescribes the maximum permissible mesh size for all species (including endemics), and the maximum quantity of nets to be used by one fishermen. Currently, fishing regulations do not prescribe the length of the net. Nets up to 100 long have come to be used by poachers, and while invasive species have not suffered a substantial loss (due to their higher population size), the endemics, with their difficult-to-quantify populations, have been put under real threat. The BDFMR will discuss and establish a limitation for the net length, probably 25 m per net. However, this is subject to further research and consultations. In parallel to standardizing the net length, appropriateness of the fishing gear for endemic species and the mesh size (currently 17 mm for Chebachok and 32 mm for Chebak) will be re-considered given the disappearance of these species. Increasing the net mesh size for these species will be discussed during the elaboration of the BDFMR.

12.b. Is the project promoting the conservation and sustainable use of wild species or landraces?

Yes

Species (<i>Genus sp.</i> , and common name)	Wild Species (please check if this is a wild species)	Landrace (please check if this is a landrace)
<i>Leuciscus schmidti</i>	Wild Species	
<i>Leuciscus bergi</i>	Wild Species	
<i>Schizothorax issyk-kuli</i>	Wild Species	
<i>Diptychus dybovskii</i>	Wild Species	

12.c. For the species identified above, ***or other target species of the project not included in the list above (E.g., domesticated species)***, please list the species, check the boxes as appropriate regarding the application of a certification system, and identify the certification system being used in the project, if any. An example is provided in the table below.

Certification	A certification system is being used	A certification system will be used	Name of certification system if being used	A certification system will not be used
Species				
<i>Leuciscus schmidti</i>				X
<i>Leuciscus bergi</i>				X
<i>Schizothorax issyk-kuli</i>				X
<i>Diptychus dybovskii</i>				X

IV. Market Transformation and Mainstreaming Biodiversity

13. a. ***For those projects that have identified market transformation as a project objective, please describe the project's ability to integrate biodiversity considerations into the mainstream economy by measuring the market changes to which the project contributed. The sectors and subsectors and measures of impact in the table below are illustrative examples, only. Please complete per the objectives and specifics of the project.***

Name of the market that the project seeks to affect (sector and sub-sector)	Unit of measure of market impact	Market condition at the start of the project	Market condition at midterm evaluation of project	Market condition at final evaluation of the project
Sustainable Fisheries – Conservation of endemics	Number of wild-caught endemics as a percentage of the overall catch for marketing	90		
Sustainable Fisheries- Targeting of introduced species	Number of wild-caught introduced species (as targeted by project) as percentage of overall catch for marketing	60		
Sustainable Fisheries – Overall reduction in fishing effort	Numbers of persons working in fishing industry	1500 fishermen		

13. b. Please also note which (if any) market changes were directly caused by the project.

V. Improved Livelihoods

14. For those projects that have identified improving the livelihoods of a beneficiary population based on sustainable use /harvesting as a project objective, please list the targets identified in the logframe and record progress at the mid-term and final evaluation. An example is provided in the table below

Improved Livelihood Measure	Number of targeted beneficiaries (if known)	Please identify local or indigenous communities project is working with	Improvement Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Alternative Employment either in sustainable fisheries-related work or other work that is not significantly impacting endemic fish species or the lake ecosystem	Total number of fishermen targeted: 1500	Fishermen	At least 500 engaged in alternative employment schemes by project end		

VI. Project Replication Strategy

15.a . Does the project specify budget, activities, and outputs for implementing the replication strategy? **Yes**

15.b. Is the replication strategy promoting incentive measures & instruments (e.g. trust funds, payments for environmental services, certification) within and beyond project boundaries? **Yes**

Assistance to Alternative Livelihood Transition through credits and loans to assist in the use of lessons and best practices for pond culture being adopted so as to provide an alternate source of endemics (cultured, not wild-caught) and to provide juveniles for re-stocking and enhancing the wild population. This Trust Fund will also be used to replicate proposed examples for alternative livelihoods arising from a Project-assisted review and assessment activity.

15.c. For all projects, please complete box below. Two examples are provided.

Replication Quantification Measure (Examples: hectares of certified products, number of resource users participating in payment for environmental services programs, businesses established, etc.)	Replication Target Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
1. Number of endemics being raised to re-stock the wild lake population	5,000 per endemic species per annum		
2. Number of endemics being propagated as an alternative (non-wild) source of endemics for market	300 mt		
3. Number of fishermen moving out of fishing into livelihoods that are non-threatening to the endemic fish population of the lake	500		

VII. Enabling Environment

16. Please complete this table at **work program inclusion for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.

Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector	Agriculture	Fisheries	Forestry	Tourism	Other (please specify)	Other (please specify)
Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.						
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy		Yes		Unknown		
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation		Yes				
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation		No				
The regulations are under implementation		No				
The implementation of regulations is enforced		No				
Enforcement of regulations is monitored		No				

VIII. Mainstreaming biodiversity into the GEF Implementing Agencies' Programs

17. At each time juncture of the project (work program inclusion, mid-term evaluation, and final evaluation), please check the box that depicts the status of mainstreaming biodiversity through the implementation of this project with on-going GEF Implementing Agencies' development assistance, sector, lending, or other technical assistance programs.

Time Frame	Work Program Inclusion	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
Status of Mainstreaming			
The project is not linked to IA development assistance, sector, lending programs, or other technical assistance programs.			
The project is indirectly linked to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.			
The project has direct links to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.			
The project is demonstrating strong and sustained complementarity with on-going planned programs.	YES		

IX. Other Impacts

18. Please briefly summarize other impacts that the project has had on mainstreaming biodiversity that have not been recorded above.

ANNEX F: Project Costs and Work plan

SECTION III: TOTAL BUDGET AND WORKPLAN

Award ID:	00048448
Award Title:	PIMS 3192 BD MSP Kyrgyzstan Fisheries
Business Unit:	KGZ10
Project ID	00058610
Project Title:	PIMS 3192 Strengthening Policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity into the fishery sector in Kyrgyzstan
Implementing Partner	State Agency on Environment and Forestry under the Government of Kyrgyz Republic

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Total (USD)	See Budget Note:		
Outcome 1 Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for biodiversity friendly fisheries management regime	UNDP	62000	GEF	71300	Local Consultants	64,500	12,500			77,000	1		
				72100	Contractual services	21,000				27,800	2 and 3		
				71600	Travel	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000			
				74500	Misc.	7,200	2,000	2,000	2,000	13,200	4		
				72200	Equipment	70,000	80,000	100,000		250,000	5		
				72600	Micro-capital grants	30,000	70,000	70,000	68,000	238,000			
						Subtotal GEF	228,900	180,500	189,600	81,000	680,000		
				00012	UNDP	71300	Local Consultants		7,000			7,000	
						72100	Contractual services		10,000			10,000	
						72600	Grants to Institute and other Beneficiaries		30,000			30,000	
						74500	Misc.		2,000	1,000	1,000	4,000	
						Subtotal UNDP	0	49,000	1,000	1,000	51,000		
				Total Outcome 1	228,900	229,500	190,600	82,000	731,000				
Outcome 2 Sustainable fisheries demonstrated which contribute to the conservation of endemic fish species and to improve livelihoods	UNDP	62000	GEF	71200	International Consultants	67,000	30,000		30,000	127,000	6		
				71300	Local Consultants		6,600		1,000	7,600	7		
				72100	Contractual services	6,000	3,000			9,000	8		
				71600	Travel	500	500	500	500	2,000			
				72200	Office equipment	10,000	9,400			19,400	9		
				74500	Misc.	3,000	3,000	2,000	2,000	10,000	10		
				74200	Audio, video and print production costs	3,000	2,000	1,000	1,000	7,000			

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Total (USD)	See Budget Note:
					Subtotal GEF	89,500	54,500	3,500	34,500	182,000	
		00012	UNDP	71200	International Consultants	16,000				16,000	
				72200	Equipment		59,580	90,000	38,580	188,160	
				72600	Micro-capital grants			30,000	40,000	70,000	
				72100	Contractual services		22,000	10,000	10,000	42,000	
				72145	Training and Education Services		8,000	7,580		15,580	
							Subtotal UNDP	16,000	89,580	137,580	88,580
					Total Outcome 2	105,500	144,080	141,080	123,080	513,740	
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	UNDP	62000	GEF	71300	Local Consultants	19,500	19,500	19,500	19,500	78,000	11
				71600	Travel	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000	
				72205	Equipment	1,200				1,200	12
				73100	Rent	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	4,800	
					Subtotal GEF	22,900	21,700	21,700	21,700	88,000	
		00012	UNDP	71300	Local Consultant	3,900	3,900	3,900	3,900	15,600	
				71610	Travel	2,100	7,520	7,520	6,520	23,660	
				72215	Transportation Equipment	8,000				8,000	
					Subtotal UNDP	14,000	11,420	11,420	10,420	47,260	
							Total Management	36,900	33,120	33,120	32,120
					PROJECT TOTAL	371,300	406,700	364,800	237,200	1,380,000	

Budget notes

1. The expert group will consist of 7 different specialists for 350 person-weeks, and the main functions of the group will be to oversee the elaboration of all modules of the BDFRM (USD 77,000)
2. Cost of group of experts/NGOs (70 person-weeks) on awareness and support of BDFRM (USD 21,000)
3. Expert group (4 persons) on development of the sustainable fishing training modules (16 person-weeks) – USD 6,800
4. Contingency expenditure related to BDFMR development: stationary consular services in case of visa applications, unexpected changes in communication costs
5. Laboratory, surveillance and monitoring equipment and software for the lake Issyk Kul specialists to ensure the implementation of the BDFMR.
6. Includes:
 - a. 24 person-weeks of fishery policy adviser – USD 48,000
 - b. 8 person-weeks of advisor on the knowledge management platform under output 2.5 – USD 19,000
 - c. 10 person-weeks of international consultants for mid-term evaluation – USD 30,000
 - d. 10 person-weeks of international consultants for final evaluation - USD 30,000
7. Includes:
 - a. 10 person-week of national project evaluation consultants – USD 2,000
 - b. 32 person-weeks of technical expert on endemic species breeding – USD 5,600
8. Cost of a local company (USD 9,000) for the implementation the Information and Knowledge Product Management System
9. Office equipment (computer, copier and printer) for stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Information Capture and Management Mechanism.
10. Contingency costs: translation of documents, purchase and subscription for peer-reviewed publications in support of the proposal, visa costs, unexpected change in the communication costs.

11. Includes:
 - a. 208 person -weeks of project manager (USD 52,000)
 - b. 208 person -weeks of project administrative assistant (USD 26,000)
12. One laptop for project manager

Summary of Funds:

	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Total
GEF	341,300	256,700	214,800	137,200	950,000
UNDP	30,000	150,000	150,000	100,000	430,000
Government	150,000	450,000	300,000	100,000	1,000,000
NGOs	690,000	350,000	350,000	300,000	1,690,000
TOTAL	1,211,300	1,206,700	1,014,800	637,200	4,070,000