



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9193		
Country/Region:	Kazakhstan		
Project Title:	Conservation and Sustainable Management of Key Globally Important Ecosystems for Multiple Benefits		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5696 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3 Program 4; BD-2 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$8,069,178
Co-financing:	\$24,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$32,219,178
PIF Approval:	March 11, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Maxim Vergeichik

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	07/23/2015 UA: Yes. However, the outcome indicators of the FA objectives that the project is aligned to, need to be made explicit. Please also see comments in box #5. Aichi targets have been articulated.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	07/23/2015 UA: Yes. In line with the National Concept for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use (2015 - 2022) and with the UNCCD NAP.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	07/23/2015 UA:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>07/22/2015 UA/YW: Not fully. The project is built on a solid baseline of a set of national/regional programs: - Green Economy Concept - Zhasyl Damu Environmental Program - Forestry Development Sub-program (2014-2018) - Strategy for Protected Area System Expansion until 2030 - Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation Program</p> <p>However, it is not fully clear of how the project will achieve the target of 4 million ha of SLM in productive landscapes (as indicated in Table F) in the current design?</p> <p>Furthermore, the justification for the SFM incentive is weak. The GEB table includes benefits under SFM that are mostly BD and LD benefits. Only the GHG benefits may be attributed to SFM. However, which</p>	<p>GEF SEC comments: It is not fully clear of how the project will achieve the target of 4 million ha of SLM in productive landscapes (as indicated in Table F) in the current design?</p> <p>Agency responses:</p> <p>Under Output 1.1.2, the project will revise the territorial plans of six administrative districts that encompass the critically important Tugai, Saxaul and Altai ecosystems. The total area of the districts is 4 mln hectares. The project will identify hotspot areas where conflict exists between the biodiversity, soil and groundwater quality on the one hand and the economic activities on the other hand. For each hotspot a solution will be developed in consultations with the relevant land users, and embedded in the territorial land use plans. Proposed new regimes of the use of agricultural and forest lands in the new plans will remove the threat of exceeding the carrying capacity of ecosystems. The revised plans,</p>

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>concrete SFM activities will generate those benefits. The project does not fully address the SFM-1 indicators that are listed in the RBM framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How many hectares of HCFV will be maintained? - How do the SFM activities build on the baseline above and how do they link concretely to the BD focus of the project? - The project objective also includes improved forest management. Which concrete (SFM) project activities will help to achieve this objective and are they implemented on the ground or only at the policy and enabling framework level? <p>Kazakhstan has already invested in Snow Leopard and its prey species conservation through the GEF Altai Sayan Project and other ongoing initiatives. How would the project build on these experiences, and how would it do differently this time?</p> <p>On the coordination with other ongoing initiatives, strong coordination particularly with the NABU project is expected. Why are these projects not cofinancing partners to this project and establish stronger coordination and linkage?</p>	<p>therefore, will ensure that by the end of the project, economic activities in wider landscape present no threat from BD and SLM perspective, rather contribute to ecosystem resilience and preservation of biodiversity in the long term. Practices that favor BD and SLM will be implemented within the districts: i.e. regulation of cattle grazing regimes (timing and intensity) in grasslands neighboring on forest tracts (important for removal of potential conflicts with Snow Leopard); regulation of fuel wood collection, rehabilitation of degraded riparian forests, managing areas adjacent to roads to facilitate natural re-growth; species conservation measures and agroforestry. The PPG stage will produce a preliminary overview of such hot-spot areas within each administrative district and outline tentative modifications to the land use and forest use regimes in the, that will further be worked on at the full stage of the project.</p> <p>Changes made by the Agency in the PIF: Table B, Component I A.1.3 Proposed Alternative</p> <p>GEF SEC comments:</p> <p>The justification for the SFM incentive is weak. The GEB table includes benefits under SFM that are mostly BD and LD</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>On component 3 in particular, there are number of related initiatives ongoing. Please provide further information on the ongoing activities and their gaps, to better understand the situation and justify incremental investment.</p> <p>MY 8/12/2015</p> <p>Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	<p>benefits. Only the GHG benefits may be attributed to SFM. However, which concrete SFM activities will generate those benefits. The project does not fully address the SFM-1 indicators that are listed in the RBM framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How many hectares of HCFV will be maintained? - How do the SFM activities build on the baseline above and how do they link concretely to the BD focus of the project? - The project objective also includes improved forest management. Which concrete (SFM) project activities will help to achieve this objective and are they implemented on the ground or only at the policy and enabling framework level? <p>Agency's responses:</p> <p>Within each of the 3 ecosystems targeted by the project (Tugai, Saxaul, Altai mountains), forests play a key role and cover significant areas (indicated in Section A.1.1 in PIF). At the same time, the unique nature of these ecosystems is that forest biotopes closely interact with non-forest biotopes (e.g. in the case of Tugai there is close relationship between forests and the water regimes of river channels and floodplain meadows; in the case of Saxaul “ between pasture land and forests; in the case of Altai mountain “ between forests and alpine</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>grasslands). Conservation and sustainable management activities, therefore, may not focused solely either on BD, or LD or forestry; rather a set of similar interventions designed by the project (i.e. the Protected area establishment, the territorial land use planning and implementation, the support to incentives for communities in sustainable forest and land management, etc.) target the ecosystems as a whole and synergistically produce biodiversity, SLM and SFM benefits.</p> <p>With respect to SFM benefits specifically, under Component I (Output 1.1.1) 700,000 ha of Saxaul shrubs, 42,000 Tugai forests, and at least 70,000 of high mountain forests will be re-classified as conservation-important forests and moved under protection ensuring stability of globally threatened species on the one hand and reduction in land degradation phenomena on the other hand. The activity on the establishment of the Protected Areas and changing forest use regimes for the conservation important forests within them will be closely linked to the activities under Output 1.1.2, which will review and revise land use plans outside PAs so that threats to forests that are coming from the outside, are removed and further forest loss (as described in the drivers of degradation section) is avoided within each district. This two-prong</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>approach advanced through Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 is in line with the first program of the SFM-1 Integrated land use planning to reduce pressure on high conservation value forests. The total area of conservation important forests maintained through this, is 812,000 hectares. The resulting improved conservation status of forests at this area will be critical to ensure stability of the populations of threatened species within the Tugai, Saxaul and Altai ecosystems, as described in Section A.1.1</p> <p>Apart from forest conservation, Component II envisages work on improved forest management in wider landscape. Indeed, under Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.2.2 the project envisages full economic valuation of resources and policy adjustment to allow for engagement of communities and private sector in forest management. The work, however, is not limited to policy and enabling environment. Under Output 2.2.2 (renamed as Incentive-based Ecosystem Management Partnership) the project will work on the ground in economic landscape forests, aiming to improve ecosystem resilience and maintain flow of ecosystem services such as optimal hydrology, erosion control, biodiversity protection. It does so through an incentive mechanism described in detail in the main text, which is a public-private partnership</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>benefiting at last 80,000 ha of important forests. This is in essence a type of a payment-for-ecosystem transaction, directly in line with programs (a) (PES) and (b) (local community capacity development) of SFM-2 Enhanced Forest Management: Maintain flow of forest ecosystem services and improve resilience to climate change through SFM.</p> <p>The activities under Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 build on the baseline program for protected area expansion, which is described in the PIF. Protected Area expansion is important priority of the Government, however, given the current financial difficulties, the creation of new protected areas is likely to be slow and not in pace with the threat dynamics. The GEF funding under the said outputs therefore, are critical to assist the government in setting up the protected areas on the ground, and building up their capacities to reduce the threats to Saxaul, Tugai and Altai forest ecosystems.</p> <p>The activities under Component II are in line with the baseline Forestry Subprogram described in the PIF, but as mentioned in the PIF, there is missing know how in setting up private-public ecosystem management models (including “ primarily so “ for forests); therefore, the GEF funding is key to ensure completion of the regulatory basis and testing it on the ground through the</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>Incentive-based Ecosystem Management Partnership.</p> <p>Changes made by the Agency in the PIF: Table A (Focal Area Strategy Framework) Table B (Project Description Summary) A.1.3 Proposed Alternative</p> <p>GEF SEC comments: Kazakhstan has already invested in Snow Leopard and its prey species conservation through the GEF Altai Sayan Project and other ongoing initiatives. How would the project build on these experiences, and how would it do differently this time?</p> <p>Agency's responses:</p> <p>Indeed, Kazakhstan benefited from a GEF project Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of the Kazakhstani Sector of the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion, implemented in 2007-2011. The project had a wide conservation focus, but it indeed benefited the Snow Leopard in the following way: It added or expanded protected areas in Snow Leopard habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ontustyk Altay Zakaznik 197,623 ha “new PA • ecological corridor of 379,800 ha connecting key SL habitats in Altai Sayan mountains • Markakol Zapovednik expanded

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>by 27,931 ha</p> <p>In these PAs the project set up Snow Leopard monitoring systems (camera traps), equipped and trained protected area personnel for monitoring of threats and persecution of crime related to Snow Leopard and its prey. It also did an anti-poaching campaign and public awareness raising.</p> <p>The current project focuses on different geographic areas of Snow Leopard habitat in Kazakhstan. Under Output 1.1.1 it creates protected capacities in site that have not been the focus of international assistance so far. In addition, learning from the past experience of protected area projects, the current project takes on a landscape approach, whereby on top of creating new protected areas, territorial plans of districts adjacent to PAs will also be revised (Output 1.1.2). Together with implementation of incentive-based community resource management scheme (Outcome 2.3) this addresses the threats to Snow Leopard that are emanating from outside the protected areas, which is a new approach that had not been addressed by any GEF work in the area so far. The links to the past Altay Sayan initiative in Kazakhstan will be clarified in further detail at the PPG stage.</p> <p>Changes made by the agency in the PIF: A.5 Coordination</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>GEF SEC comments: On the coordination with other ongoing initiatives, strong coordination particularly with the NABU project is expected. Why are these projects not co-financing partners to this project to establish stronger coordination and linkage?</p> <p>Agency's responses: The project team (Government, UNDP and experts) involved in the preparation of the current PIF are in close communications with NABU and coordinating activities. Through additional consultations recently, NABU confirmed their interest to co-finance the project to the amount of USD 400,000. Generally, at this stage, only the most certain sources of co-financing have been listed, but it is the intention of the project team to continue working with other partners at the PPG stage. Without decreasing the co-financing, it may in fact change or increase the co-financing menu in case other partners prove with certainty the availability of co-financing over the course of the PPG.</p> <p>Changes made by the Agency in the PIF: Co-financing table amended.</p> <p>GEF SEC comments:</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>On component 3 in particular, there are number of related initiatives ongoing. Please provide further information on the ongoing activities and their gaps, to better understand the situation and justify incremental investment.</p> <p>Agency's responses: The project development team has carefully taken stock of all initiatives that relate to Component 3, and updated Section A.5 Coordination accordingly. Most activities under Component 3 relate to international cooperation and capacity building for the Snow Leopard protection, primarily under the aegis of the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation Program, which has its secretariat in Bishkek and units all partners working on Snow Leopard conservation in the countries of the range. Kazakhstan is a full partner for the Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program and is represented in the working bodies of this initiative, primarily by the Institute of Zoology, which is the key relevant research institution in Kazakhstan for the subject. The GEF is supporting this global program through a global UNDP-GEF MSP (currently under development) which will develop international standards for enforcement, monitoring and support coordinating of country activities. The Global MSP, however, is not intended to</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>support internal country actions that are needed to properly implement enforcement and monitoring capacity building on the ground, as it would require additional resources and country specific settings to be taken into account. The current project, therefore, is key to ensure that those framework and standards developed by the Global Snow Leopard MSP are actually fully implemented in Kazakhstan.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are also several other active projects implemented by variety of international and local NGOs as listed in Section A5 Coordination. The Section A.5 has been updated and now describes the project on camera trapping in Almaty Reserve implemented by Kazakh National University in cooperation with British Experts from Cumbria University. The key weakness, that Component 3 of this GEF project has been designed to address is the fact that so far all these initiatives are not well coordinated and in most cases disconnected. The camera trapping data, for example, that is being derived within NGO projects is not available for a comprehensive landscape analysis. Most of these projects focus on one disconnected element, usually with very restricted budget and restricted research capacities and therefore data obtained from them has never been integrated into the statistical analysis or modeling on a</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>landscape level The heavy emphasis at this stage has actually been just on camera trapping (apart from NABU project that addresses the monitoring and PA efficiency issues) and no initiatives actually targeted Snow Leopard landscape management planning, anti-poaching or enforcement. So while important, these projects miss to address some of the key priorities, identified during the last Steering Committee meeting in Bishkek in March 2015, such as economics of ecosystems, capacity building, enforcement, and innovative financing. Such issues as efficient patrolling and law enforcement fall out of the interests of the current initiatives, while being most important for regional efforts in combatting poaching, trade, and trafficking. The proposed project, through Component 3 (and indirectly through the other components) will build the capacities of Kazakhstan to enable its participation in working groups of GSLECP addressing those priority topics listed, it will unite and building research capacity in Kazakhstan and connect them to landscape management planning and protected area management. With respect to enforcement, adapting the international standards developed by the global UNDP-GEF MSP, this project will put in place a new web based spatial program on patrols planning and management, fostering</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>transboundary agreements between customs and transport police, implementing training and awareness activities. Without this project, these activities would not find reflection in any of the ongoing initiatives.</p> <p>Changes made by the Agency in the PIF: A.5 Coordination section updated.</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>07/22/2015 UA/YW: Not fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Comp 1 the indicators to achieve the respective objectives for BD and SFM should be made explicit. Area in ha, METT score, species population, GHG emission reductions and area of HC VF identified/maintained. - Please clarify the status of BD inventory in the region, and what are the gaps that the project will be supporting. - Output 2.2.1 will only "facilitate a dialog" but would need to strive for tangible results in this regard. Please indicate the results to be achieved. - Output 2.2.2 is misleading with regard to the term Community Ecosystem Management "Program", which has the notion of a large undertaking while the PIF text describes it basically as an activity under the component. - Comp 3 indicators should also made explicit on how the development of 	<p>GEF SEC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Comp 1 the indicators to achieve the respective objectives for BD and SFM should be made explicit. Area in ha, METT score, species population, GHG emission reductions and area of HC VF identified/maintained. <p>Responses of the Agency:</p> <p>Thank you. The indicators on the area of expanded PA estate, non-deterioration of key indicator species, and conservation important forests maintained have been added.</p> <p>ON the METT scores, since these areas currently do not exist as official PAs, baseline METT scores can be established only at some point after the PAs have been formally gazetted under the project. Therefore, it is not possible to assign baseline and target values at the PIF stage. PA creation is expected at some in the middle of the project, so additional 1-2 years of project work afterwards might, in UNDP experience in similar cases, bring</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>capacities would result in concrete outcome.</p> <p>- Project Management Costs in Table B need to be reduced by \$1 so that the total adds up.</p> <p>MY 8/12/2015</p> <p>Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	<p>the baseline METT score to at least 30%. This was added as indicator into Component 1, subject to confirmation at the PPG.</p> <p>The indicator on the GHG emission reduction reflects benefits from both Component I and Component II, therefore (upon editing) it was retained in Table A.1.4 Incremental Cost Matrix, column 3.</p> <p>Changes made by the Agency in the PIF: Table B, Annex 1</p> <p>GEF SEC comments:</p> <p>- Please clarify the status of biodiversity inventory in the region, and what are the gaps that the project will be supporting.</p> <p>Responses of the Agency:</p> <p>For the project regions the last inventory for Saxaul forest was in 1994, for floodplain forests “ in 1994, and for the mountain forests “ 2013-2014. Since most of these ecosystems fall under the Committee on Forestry, the key parameters inventoried are the forest productivity, distribution of trees, their height, number of alive and dead trees per unit. Inventory of soil, vegetation and biodiversity as such had not been done for the areas in question. There is no procedure for regular inventories apart from the cadastral estimations done by hunting companies with the strong focus on hunting species. Some limited data on</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>individual species is available from ad hoc researchers or NGO projects, e.g. data on bird populations from NGOs working on IBAs, or data collected at the time when areas were described under Ramsar Convention. At the moment there is no complete picture for any of the areas proposed under Component I of the project, and hence the project, when working towards finalizing the feasibility studies to establish protected area under Component I will need to collate all available data and undertake up-to-date inventories on threats and status of key species, the summary of which is given in Annex I. The project does not intend to create a new separate system of inventory or monitoring, it intends to revise/amend the methodology and adding extra variables to the national forest inventories so that it can provide description of biodiversity in comprehensive terms, which is the essence of the first bullet under Output 1.1.2 (Full biodiversity, soil and landscape diversity inventories). Under the modified inventory approach, the forestry inspectors will be obliged to take stock of the habitats and characteristics of the landscape as potential bases for stratification and making decisions on resource use. At the PPG stage the project will look at the potential of remote sensing and spectral analysis of satellite images.</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>Changes made by the Agency in the PIF: A.1.1, A.1.3</p> <p>GEF SEC comments: - Output 2.2.1 will only "facilitate a dialog" but would need to strive for tangible results in this regard. Please indicate the results to be achieved.</p> <p>Agency's responses: Indeed, the dialog is an important step, we rearrange the description as it should go first, before policy adoption. The idea is that after wide discussion of issues (which is an important element of participatory policy development in itself) the policies will be drafted and indeed submitted to relevant authorities for adoption.</p> <p>Changes made by the Agency in the PIF: Table B</p> <p>GEF SEC comments: - Output 2.2.2 is misleading with regard to the term Community Ecosystem Management "Program", which has the notion of a large undertaking while the PIF text describes it basically as an activity under the component.</p> <p>Agency's responses: Corrected, now called Incentive-based</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>ecosystem management partnership and explained in the text of the PIF (details subject to a feasibility analysis at PPG stage).</p> <p>Changes made by the Agency in the PIF: Throughout the PIF</p> <p>GEF SEC Comments: - Comp 3 indicators should also made explicit on how the development of capacities would result in concrete outcome.</p> <p>Agency's responses: We have added the indicators for Component 3, noting that the final set of indicators is subject to further analysis at the PPG stage.</p> <p>GEF SEC comments: - Project Management Costs in Table B need to be reduced by \$1 so that the total adds up.</p> <p>Agency's responses: Corrected in Table B.</p> <p>Changes made by the Agency in the PIF: Table B.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>07/22/2015 UA/YW: - Please clarify any involvement and impact on indigenous peoples through the project.</p>	<p>GEF SEC comments: - Please clarify any involvement and impact on indigenous peoples through the project.</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- Considering potential strong linkage with gender issues, please clarify "how" the project intends to develop appropriate project design and approach, including gender analysis, consultation, etc.</p> <p>MY 8/12/2015</p> <p>Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.</p>	<p>Agency responses: There are no indigenous people in Kazakhstan. Changes in the PIF: Footnote 7</p> <p>GEF SEC comments: - Considering potential strong linkage with gender issues, please clarify "how" the project intends to develop appropriate project design and approach, including gender analysis, consultation, etc.</p> <p>Agency responses: The project, at the design stage will develop special surveys and gender indicators, which will enable quick and correct quantification of gender benefits resulting from implementation of the project activities. The surveys will investigate the following criteria: i, · Vulnerability of women in the context of deficiencies of vital natural resources and natural resources consumption rights; i, · Access to land resources by individuals, marginal groups and households; i, · Estimation of productive capital owned/used by women and related impacts on economic rights and income; i, · Educational level, access to information and new technologies; i, · Rights and opportunities of women to</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>participate in management bodies in relation to Protected Areas, public forests, water users and land users associations etc.</p> <p>For completing the survey the project will use UNDP based gender analysis tools, common qualitative methods for data collection and analysis, such as on-site observations, questionnaires/interview, key informant interview, and focused group discussions followed by descriptive statistical analysis.</p> <p>Changes in the PIF: A.3 Gender Considerations.</p>
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	07/22/2015 UA: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	07/22/2015 UA: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	07/22/2015 UA: Yes for SFM.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>07/22/2015 UA: No. Please address comments.</p> <p>MY 8/12/2015</p> <p>Yes. All comments were addressed,</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>issues were cleared, and the PIF was revised. The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p> <p>4/22/2016 UA:</p> <p>The PIF needs to strengthen the rationale for the SFM investment to fully justify investment of \$3 million. It does not include adequate SFM outputs in Table B, or at least they are not emphasized.</p> <p>Component 1 is the same like in the Tajikistan project. Switzerland criticized at that time that only by establishing PAs no tangible outcomes will be achieved. What means "delivered and implemented for six districts surrounding the newly established PAs (app. 4 mln ha)" ? It sounds like very soft activities for a \$4.3 million GEF grant. Will 4 million ha be covered by the 6 plans?</p> <p>If component 1 works on HCFV than please indicate this. "Reduced pressure on 812,000 ha of conservation important forests" – How to achieve this – through which outputs?</p> <p>Where are the activities to achieve the</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>GEBs listed in the PIF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SFM-1: Maintaining positive status and reduced pressure on conservation-important forests at 812,000 ha: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 700,000 ha of Saxaul forests o 42,000 Tugai forests o 70,000 Mountain forests - SFM-2: Maintained flow of forest ecosystem services and improved resilience to climate change at 30,000 ha of forests outside protected areas. <p>The carbon figures need to be entered in Table F.</p> <p>Some minor editorial suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Take out the reference to "Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation Program" out of Part I. This is not a child project of a PFD and it may be misleading. Please insert the reference as well as the footnote in the section A5: Cooperation. - Do not use brackets in the project objective. - Submit a clean version (w/o yellow highlights – the highlights version may be forwarded to Germany at request). 	
Review Date	Review	July 23, 2015	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 12, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 22, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		