



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

GEF ID:	4584		
Country/Region:	Kazakhstan		
Project Title:	Improving Sustainability of PA System in Desert Ecosystems through Promotion of Biodiversity-compatible Livelihoods in and Around PAs		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4855 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; Project Mana; LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,364,000
Co-financing:	\$15,310,000	Total Project Cost:	\$19,674,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Maxim Vergeichik,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. Endorsement letter signed by M. Turmagambetov, dated August 5, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	08-16-2011 UA: UNDPs expertise in PA management and expansion, as well as specific experience in Kazakhstan is acknowledged.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. Fits with UNDAF and in-country capacity is adequate.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

Resource Availability			
	• the STAR allocation?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	08-16-2011 UA: To be discussed. The project clearly focuses on BD-1. However, component 2, output 2.1 also relates to LD-3.  08-29-2011: Revised to BD-1, LD-3.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	08-16-2011 UA: BD-1 LD-3 to be considered (see above).  08/29/2011 UA: BD-1, LD-3	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. Consistent with government strategies and NPFE.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	08-16-2011 UA: n/a - Capacity building is not a main component of this project.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. The baseline is solid and appropriate	

Project Design	sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. Incremental reasoning has been applied.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	08-16-2011 UA: Not fully.  The project objective as currently formulated reflects only the expected outcome of component 1, which in fact has the smallest amount of GEF funding. The project objective does not reflect the landscape approach pursued through component 2 or the innovative elements to be introduced through component 3. Please consider to formulate the project objective in a way that the impact of the other components is reflected as well.  Above comment applies in particular to the project title. In its present form, the title gives the wrong impression of reneating a blueprint approach to	

area. However, if the project is to be understood as one element of CACILM, the objective should clearly reflect the upscaling of investments into sustainable resource management with larger impact. Please consider revising the project title in a way that emphasizes the innovative elements of the project. One suggestion would be: "Improve sustainability of the PA system through promoting biodiversity compatible livelihoods in and around PAs".

Furthermore, some of the expected outputs give the impression that the project's impact might be of small scale, despite the considerable investments proposed. For example, the listing of 300 ha wetlands, 500 ha Tsugai forests, 3,000 ha rangelands, etc. It is especially unclear why the micro-credit scheme will only reach 10 communities with 300 recipients but will be funded with in total \$6.1 million? GEF is very interested in this innovative element of the project but only if it can be introduced at a meaningful scale and with cost effectiveness. If the project can be designed in such a way, the majority of the GEF resources should be invested into this component and less into management, coordination, and institutional capacity building (which are some of the elements of component 2).

Please also check the 'grant type' in table B, which only mentions 'TA'. Please include 'INV' if there are investive lements and estimate the allocation to

		08/29/2011 UA: Issues and clarification requests have been addressed.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. socio-economic benefits of local communities are a major output of the project.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. Engagement of NGOs is envisaged (WWF, ACBK, RSPB, and others to support the micro-credit schemes). Further details will be required at CEO endorsement stage.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	08-16-2011 UA: Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. The linkage and consistence with the CACILM platform is acknowledged. GEF therefore suggests to consider the proposed project as one element of a programmatic approach in support of CACILM.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes, but further information will be required at CEO endorsement stage.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. PMC are at 5%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	08-16-2011 UA: Please refer to above comments to #14. A stronger GEF focus on investive elements to provide incentives to local land users on the ground for better resource management should be considered.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	08-16-2011 UA: Indicative cofinancing is \$12.2 million, a ratio of 1 : 3.5.  08/29/2011 UA: Revised to \$15.3 million, still a ratio of 3.5.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	08-16-2011 UA: Yes. UNDP provides a \$700,000 grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	08-16-2011 UA: No. Please address issues and clarification requests.  08/29/2011 UA: Yes. PM recommends PIF for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 16, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 29, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.