



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conservation of globally important biodiversity and associated land and forest resources of Western Tian Shan mountain ecosystems to support sustainable livelihoods			
Country(ies):	Kyrgyzstan	GEF Project ID: ¹	6958
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	5411
Other Executing Partner(s):	State Agency for Environment Protection and Forestry (SAEPF)	Submission Date:	October 21, 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Parent Program	[if applicable]	Agency Fee (\$)	\$378,915

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-1 Program 2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in area of terrestrial and marine ecosystems of global significance in new protected areas and increase in threatened species of global significance protected in new protected areas	GEFTF	1,104,071	6,859,435
BD-4 Program 9	Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management.	GEFTF	190,000	1,163,234
LD-3 Program 4	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities based on gender sensitive needs	GEFTF	1,364,979	8,356,786
SFM-1 Program 2	Outcome 1: Cross-sector policy and planning approaches at appropriate governance scales, avoid loss of high conservation value forests	GEFTF	480,000	2,938,696
SFM-2 Program 5	Outcome 3: Increased application of good management practices in all forests by relevant government, local community (both women and men) and private sector actors.	GEFTF	390,000	2,387,690
SFM-3 Program 7	Outcome 5: Integrated landscape restoration plans to maintain forest ecosystem services are implemented at appropriate scales by government, private sector and local community actors, both women and men.	GEFTF	459,525	2,813,342
Total project costs		GEFTF	3,988,575	24,519,183

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#).

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: <i>To promote a landscape approach to protection of internationally important biodiversity, and land and forest resources in the Western Tian Shan mountains in Kyrgyzstan</i>						
Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
Component 1. Conservation and sustainable management of Key Biodiversity Areas within landscape	Inv	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The extent of the functional IUCN Category I and II PA network operational in the Western Tian Shan increases from a baseline of 198,777 ha to 298,099 ha. - The conservation values of 87,323 ha of globally important biodiversity, including snow leopard and prey habitats, are secured, monitored and enforced in the two newly established PAs of Alatai and Kan-Achuu. - The average METT scores for the Alatai and Kan-Achuu SNP increases from an average score of 17 to >50; - HCVF forest management approach legally recognized in Kyrgyzstan - HCVF management measures incorporated in forest management plans of two forest management authorities covering 34,382 ha; - Average number of hectares covered per week by anti-poaching patrols reaches 1000 hectares per week; - Rural communities adjacent to the Alatai and Kan-Achuu SNP are increasingly involved in (from a 	<p>Output 1.1. Expanded operational SPNA network in the Western Tian Shan region through support to operationalize the two new State Nature Parks of Alatai and Kan-Achuu, including: development of new management plans, new maps, database management systems, new infrastructure and equipment for PA management, training programs for PA staff, biodiversity research and monitoring program, business plan, communications program, and education and awareness program.</p> <p>Output 1.2. Upgraded status of HCVF, and sustainable forest management involving local communities, including: proposal and recommendations for integration of HCVF principles into existing policies and legislation, implementation of JFM Boards, revised and updated forest and SNP management plans incorporating HCVF principles, updated and revised local development plans incorporating HCVF principles, certification pilot activities, and assessment of existing forest zakazniks in Western Tian Shan</p>	GEFTF	1,600,000	10,183,816

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		<p>baseline of less than 100 individuals to more than 2,0000 individuals, of whom at least 600 are women), and financially benefit from (from a baseline of less that 10 individuals to more than 150, of whom at least 50 are women) the planning and management of Alatai and Kan-Achuu SNP.</p>	<p>Output 1.3. Enhanced management and conservation capacities of Western Tian Shan PAs in Jalal-Abad Province, and strengthened HCVF management, including: training program and activities for staff of existing Western Tian Shan PAs, PA financial management and planning training, piloting of private sector partnerships for tourism, capacity strengthening for unified national information system on PAs, capacity strengthening on PA monitoring data collection and reporting to national unified information system, training for Western Tian Shan leskhozoes on HCVF implementation, awareness raising activities on HCVF and SFM, workshops to improve existing Western Tian Shan PA management plans and business plans, strengthened PA public relations programs, training of hunting service providers, updated and revised game management plans for hunting concessions in Western Tian Shan.</p> <p>Output 1.4. Strengthened participatory patrolling, enforcement and surveillance systems of new and existing PAs through the Local PA Management Board and joint patrol groups to enforce anti-poaching, including: organization</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			of PA public management boards, establishment of joint patrolling groups, dissemination of best practices on community involvement in patrolling and wildlife law enforcement, workshops to improve system of patrolling and law enforcement, equipping of joint patrol groups in pilot PAs, agreements on cooperation between PAs and hunting concessions, financial incentives program for reporting poaching and other illegal uses of natural resources.			
Component II. Ecosystem resilience and habitat connectivity in Western Tian Shan are enhanced by regulating land and forest use in buffer zones and corridors and support to sustainable livelihoods	Inv	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - About 50,000 ha of buffer zones and wildlife corridors connecting PAs of the Western Tian Shan identified, corresponding land use regimes and plans developed and implemented involving all the stakeholders. - The territorial development plans covering the area of 1,218,175 ha of two target districts of Toktgul and Toguz-Toro, including those of target local communities of Cholpon-Ata, Kyzyl-Ozgorush, Kok-Irim, and Atai aligned with the biodiversity conservation, SLM and SFM objectives. - A total of 147,268 ha of pastureland under SLM, including 65,361 ha of degraded pastures put under better management regimes for rehabilitation. 	Output 2.1 Identified and designated buffer zones for new SPNAs and wildlife corridors between relevant SPNAs, including: regulations and legislation fully reflecting requirements for buffer zones and corridors, agreements on buffer zones and corridors between all relevant local stakeholders, assessments for sustainable use of resources in buffer zones and corridors, revised and updated resource use management plans for buffer zone and corridor areas, electronic database of hunting violations, awareness raising activities about buffer zones and corridors, joint raids for enforcement of buffer zones and corridors, and analysis of hunting licensing to ensure alignment with conservation goals.	GEFTF	1,608,576	10,206,033

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Productivity of pastures improved from baseline 0.13 t of dry fodder mass to 0.57 t. - At least four modern pasture management plans are implemented by targeted Pasture Management Committees. - 4,886 ha of degraded forests are under active restoration and/or rehabilitation; - Almost 3 million tons of CO² equivalent emissions are avoided or sequestered as project lifetime benefits from SFM and SLM; - At least 2 Joint Forest Management Boards, including all local stakeholders are actively involved in the ongoing planning, management, rehabilitation and monitoring of HCVF; - A total of more than 23,939 people, including more than 11,702 women, benefit indirectly from reduced land degradation; and - At least 50 local households benefit from technical and grant funding support for sustainable livelihoods program, leading to at least a 10% increase in income. 	<p>Output 2.2. Territorial development plans of Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts and communities aligned with biodiversity conservation, SFM and SLM objectives, including: analysis of resource management and spatial plans, training for local government and resource users on SFM and SLM, establishment of working groups for integration of good resource management practices into spatial and development plans, assessment of infrastructure development and mining plans for potential biodiversity conflicts, identification and incorporation of mitigation measures in infrastructure and mining development, workshops on sustainable development planning, coordination workshops on pasture management, assessment of valuation of ecosystem services including feasibility of development of PES schemes.</p> <p>Output 2.3. Degraded rangelands important both for livelihoods and wildlife, including snow leopard prey species in the target districts, rehabilitated through improved local pasture management plans, including: detailed assessment of pastures to be rehabilitated, creation of relevant maps to</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>support grazing management plans, research on interaction between livestock grazing and biodiversity conditions, training on implementation of best practice pasture management tools, implementation of e-Pasture Management System in targeted pilot communities, research on impacts of climate change on pasturelands, revised and updated forest pasture management plans in neighboring leskhozoes.</p> <p>Output 2.4: Restoration of degraded forests important for wildlife, including snow leopard prey, and livelihoods of local communities, including: geo-botanic and economic analysis for reforestation in Western Tian Shan, analysis of ecosystem services opportunities in relation to reforestation and rehabilitation, reforestation and rehabilitation management plans for agreed 4,886 ha in buffer zones and corridors of PAs, reforestation activities for 500 ha, assisted natural regeneration in 4,000-4,500 ha.</p> <p>Output 2.5. Alternative livelihoods program for local communities designed jointly with the local micro-crediting institutions, and launched to support target communities, including: establishment of micro-grant support program with local committees</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			and all procedures and rules, informational campaign about qualifying activities, provision of micro-grants, systematic monitoring and controlling of projects, assessment and reporting on results, publishing of best practices.			
Component III. Strengthened national capacities for snow leopard conservation, promoting Kyrgyz regional and global cooperation, and setting the scene for up-scaling	Inv	<p>The capacity for collaboration and coordination between international, national and local institutions in the conservation of snow leopard, their prey and their ecosystems is significantly improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of illegal snow leopard trafficking incidents is reduced - the National Strategy and Action Plan for Snow Leopard Conservation is under implementation; - At least one international regional agreement adopted on key issues of border control / law enforcement or monitoring data sharing; <p>A strong scientific base for the conservation of snow leopard and their prey is established:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a national snow leopard monitoring and reporting information management system is established and operational, drawing on data collected via application of the GSLEP snow leopard and prey monitoring framework; 	<p>Output 3.1. Law enforcement capacities of relevant stakeholders enhanced through trainings on wildlife protection aimed at identification and prosecution of wildlife crime, including: advanced training on wildlife related law enforcement including identification and prosecution, training on canine-assisted wildlife crime monitoring, integration of training modules into law enforcement agency action plans, inter-agency cross-sectoral cooperation mechanism or MOUs at national and sub-national levels, capacity strengthening of field-based wildlife law enforcement, unified reporting system on wildlife crime, feasibility studies on field-based DNA analysis and trophy micro-chipping</p> <p>Output 3.2. Capacities for deployment of international standards for long-term monitoring of parameters critical for snow leopard conservation in national priority landscapes developed, based on international GSLEP monitoring framework,</p>	GEFTF	590,068	3,721,534

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the national estimate for snow leopard population has a confidence level of 60% or greater, and is produced annually; and - Kyrgyzstan's participation in the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation Program events is assured, also involving field staff. - the Second Summit of the Snow Leopard Range Countries conducted in Bishkek. - at least 20 managers, scientists, researchers participate in regional snow leopard conservation initiatives, and at least 10 attend and participate in regional monitoring and report-back meetings of the GLSEP. 	<p>including: development and implementation of a national snow leopard monitoring program in accordance with international standards, training for relevant national institutions on snow leopard and prey monitoring in accordance with international standards, PA staff training on snow leopard and prey monitoring, snow leopard monitoring database, MOUs on snow leopard and prey monitoring between relevant institutions and PAs, joint expeditions for monitoring and training, MOU with a genetics laboratory in a snow leopard range state for species-level identification from physical samples.</p> <p>Output 3.3 Kyrgyzstan participation in the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Programs supported, aimed at synergies and coordination of national, transboundary and regional level activities, including: presentations and papers on best practice approaches for snow leopard conservation for international meetings and workshops, regional conference (with three countries) on cross-border monitoring data sharing, 2nd Global Snow Leopard summit, information materials on snow leopard conservation in Kyrgyzstan.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			Output 3.4. Implementation of Kyrgyzstan's NSSLC supported in nationally identified priority landscapes provided, in alignment and coordination with GSLEP and other relevant initiatives, including: presentations and workshops on global snow leopard conservation best practices in Western Tian Shan and Gissar-Alai priority landscapes, national education and awareness raising activities on snow leopard conservation, publications using snow leopard monitoring data, updated maps on snow leopard range and habitat, recommendations for revisions to national hunting policies for snow leopard prey species, contributions to implementation of Kyrgyzstan NSSLC.			
			Subtotal		3,798,644	24,111,383
			Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴	GEFTF	189,931	407,800
			Total project costs		3,988,575	24,519,183

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grants	5,527,383
Recipient Government	State Agency for Environment and Forestry	Grants	13,800,000
		In-kind	500,000
Recipient Government	State Inspectorate on Environmental and Technical Safety	In-kind	364,800
Recipient Government	Kyrgyz Republic Fund for Nature Protection and Forestry Development	Grants	200,000
Recipient Government	Toktogul District	Grants	3,100,000
Recipient Government	Toguz-Toro District	Grants	100,000

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

Donor Agency	GIZ ⁵	Grants	627,000
CSO	Panthera	Grants	300,000
Total Co-financing			24,519,183

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) ²	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Kyrgyzstan	Biodiversity		1,294,071	122,937	1,417,008
UNDP	GEF TF	Kyrgyzstan	Land Degradation		1,364,979	129,673	1,494,652
UNDP	GEF TF	Kyrgyzstan	n/a	SFM	1,329,525	126,305	1,455,830
Total Grant Resources					3,988,575	378,915	4,367,490

a) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

⁵ For Table C, the GIZ co-financing letter is denoted in euros, and an exchange rate of 0.91 euros per 1 dollar has been applied, which was the approximate exchange rate on July 22, 2016, the date of the letter.

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁶

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	435,367 hectares*
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	923,410 hectares**
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO _{2e} mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	5,696,548 metric tons***

*The project will improve the management of 286,099 ha of PAs, including 87,322 ha of PAs created during the PPG phase; improve the management of 34,382 ha of HCVF outside of protected areas; institute SLM in 110,000 ha of pastureland including integrating biodiversity considerations. The project will implement 50,000 ha of biodiversity corridors, but this is likely to include significant portions of the HCVF and pastureland already indicated, and so is not added in order to avoid double-counting.

** The project will ensure adoption of SLM and SFM practices in territorial, forest, and pasture management plans of two districts with a total area of 1.16 million ha, less the area already covered in these two districts under point 1 above.

*** As per FAO EX-ACT tool for the 5-year project duration plus 20-year post-project "lifetime" benefits, including both biomass and soil carbon for avoided forest degradation and afforestation, and soil carbon for reduced degradation in grasslands.

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? NO

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund) in Annex D.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁷

A.1. *Project Description.* Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁸ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

A.1.1. The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed

SECTION I, PART 1 Situation Analysis ('Context and global significance') of the UNDP PRODOC describes in more detail: the geographical context of Kyrgyzstan; the biodiversity significance of, and conservation status of snow leopard and wild prey conservation in Kyrgyzstan; a socio-economic profile of Kyrgyzstan and current development planning system; forest, land tenure, forest and pasture resources, and PAs system in Kyrgyzstan; and the institutional, policy and

⁶ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

⁷ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

⁸ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

legislative context for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as well as local context of the on-the-ground project implementation sites.

SECTION I, PART I Situation Analysis ('Threats, Root Causes and Impacts') of the UNDP PRODOC provides a more detailed description of the threats, the root causes of these threats and the impacts of these threats, on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, including high conservation value forests and snow leopard, snow leopard native prey species and snow leopard-and prey-dependent habitats. In response to the GEF German Council comments requesting additional explanation on "decline in the practice of moving livestock between summer and winter pastures" further elaboration and clarification has been added. In response to the GEF German Council comments about poaching as a threat to wild ungulates, a section has been added discussing "Legal and Illegal Hunting of Ungulates".

SECTION I, PART I Situation Analysis ('Long-term solution and barriers to the solution') of the UNDP PRODOC describes the main barriers to improving the biodiversity conservation, including capacity development of the PAs management, upgraded status of the HCVF, protection status of snow leopards, their wild prey, and their ecosystems across the snow leopard range in Kyrgyzstan. These are: (i) "Weak management of Key Biodiversity Areas"; (ii) "Unsustainable management of land and forests in the wider landscape"; and (iii) "Low uptake of and capacity to implement international best practices for snow leopard conservation and management of its habitat". A more detailed description of each barrier, with relevant examples, is further elaborated in this section.

A.1.2. The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

The description of the baseline scenario and the associated baseline projects has been significantly enhanced and strengthened. These improvements are briefly summarized as follows:

SECTION I, PART I Situation Analysis ('Baseline Analysis') of the UNDP PRODOC provides more details of the resources, capacity and financing that are committed by a range of national and international organizations – over the five-year time frame of the project - to address, in part, the key barriers to the conservation and sustainable use of the biodiversity including snow leopard, wild prey and their habitats in the Kyrgyzstan. The baseline analysis also focuses on the baseline investments that are targeting improvements in the planning, management, use, control and monitoring of SPNAs, pastures, forests, snow leopards and snow leopard wild prey across the snow leopard range. The baseline analysis updates and expands coverage of the relevant baseline projects and activities in Kyrgyzstan, including covering activities under a longer time horizon for the anticipated five-year implementation period of the project. This includes: Additional details about the baseline financing from the government; additional details on baseline activities in relation to the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation Program (GSLEP); additional details on baseline activities of key multilateral and bilateral partner organizations, including the World Bank, IFAD, FAO, and GIZ; and international NGO partners including Panthera, WWF, FFI and NABU. The further elaboration of activities of key international NGO partners is responsive to the relevant STAP and Germany council comments on this issue.

A.1.3. The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

SECTION I, PART II Strategy ('Rationale and summary of the GEF alternative') of the UNDP PRODOC has been significantly improved in response to STAP and German Council comments. These improvements are briefly summarized as follows:

The strategic context for this GEF-funded project is provided by multiple ongoing policy initiatives and priorities in Kyrgyzstan: (i) the expansion of the national protected area system to increase PA coverage to the stated international target objective of at least 10% of national territory; (ii) the national forest sector reform process, currently underway until at least the end of 2018; (iii) ongoing national enhancement of local resource user groups' capacities to effectively implement the Law on Pastures, including SLM elements; and Kyrgyzstan's strong support for the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program, including Kyrgyzstan's own National Strategy for Snow Leopard Conservation.

Project outputs and activities are spatially contained to a planning domain for the project. There are multiple levels to the planning domain for this project. At the landscape scale, the project focuses on Kyrgyzstan's Western Tian Shan mountains; the great majority of this alpine ecosystem is within the boundaries of Kyrgyzstan's Jalal-Abad province. The primary project planning domain comprises the two areas of Toktogul and Toguz-Toro Districts of Jalal-Abad Province.

The project's rationale primarily focuses on strengthening biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest and land management in the vicinity of two newly established protected areas – Alatai SNP and Kan-Achuu SNP. Alatai SNP is located in Toktogul District, while Kan-Achuu SNP is located in neighboring Toguz-Toro District. At the local level the project targets four key communities that border the two newly established PAs – Cholpon-Ata and Kyzyl-Ozgorush in Toktogul District, and Kok-Irim and Atai in Toguz-Toro District. In addition to the two newly established PAs, the project also targets four older PAs (Besh Aral, Padysch-Ata, Sary-Chelek and Saimaluu-Tash), which form the corner stones for biodiversity conservation in this World Heritage landscape. The project also targets the HCVF and pasture zones between PAs, which serve as key biodiversity areas linking together the PA network in the Western Tian Shan, including the natural dispersal and migration routes for snow leopard and their prey. Finally, at the national level, the project also provides possible support for critical snow leopard conservation activities in Kyrgyzstan's identified priority national snow leopard conservation landscapes – the Gissar-Alai range on the south western border with Tajikistan, and the Sarychat landscape in the Central Tian Shan in eastern Kyrgyzstan.

The project strategy is focused around four strategic areas of intervention within this planning domain, as follows:

Conservation areas: Improving the conservation tenure and conservation security of national parks and other protected areas by developing systemic, institutional and individual capacities to implement effective PA management;

Forest areas: improving the ecological integrity of forests in the Western Tian Shan by: (i) identifying and enhancing the status of HCVF, including ensuring ecologically sensitive approaches to wood harvesting, ensuring the sustainability of NTFP use, and establishing joint forest management mechanisms; and (ii) rehabilitating degraded forests;

Livestock pasture areas: (i) improving sustainable pastures management across the targeted critical Western Tian Shan key biodiversity areas, by development of the institutional and individual capacities of the community-based Pasture Management Committees, catalyzing changes to unsustainable practices by means of participatory development of pasture management and grazing plans; and (ii) reducing the risk of conflicts between pastoralists and wildlife, including snow leopard and their prey, by inclusion of wildlife ecological considerations into pasture management plans, as well as involvement of Pasture Management Committees into SPNA public boards;

Development of national scientific monitoring and law enforcement capacities for snow leopard conservation: Expanding the reach of research, monitoring and planning efforts about snow leopard, its prey, and their habitats by building institutional capacities, resources and partnerships between the PAs, academia, law enforcement bodies, hunting service providers and local communities on the national and local levels. Targeted support will be directly aimed to develop national capacities and set the scene for international cooperation on snow leopard to contribute to implementation of Kyrgyzstan's NSSLC. Cross-sectoral and multi-level awareness raising campaigns targeting different focus groups, which range from parliament to local communities dwellers will contribute to the behavioral change and social mobilization as well as lobbying enabling frames improvement.

The project is structured into three components, with each component comprised of four to five outputs which will collectively contribute to realizing the targeted outcome for the component.

The first component will be focused on conservation and sustainable management of Key Biodiversity Areas within landscapes supporting the national PA network for increased representation of vulnerable species habitat, including snow leopards, in the PA system habitat, and avoided loss of *High Conservation Value Forests* through official recognition (Outcome 1). For this the work will focus around four areas of support: Output 1.1: Expanded operational SPNA network in the Western Tian Shan Region through the support to operationalize the two new State Nature Parks of Alatai and Kan-Achuu; Output 1.2: Upgraded status of HCVF, and sustainable forest management involving local communities; Output 1.3: Enhanced management and conservation capacities of Western Tian Shan PAs in Jalal-Abad Province, and strengthened HCVF management; Output 1.4 Strengthened participatory patrolling, enforcement and surveillance systems of new and existing PAs through the Local PA Management Board and joint patrol groups to enforce anti-poaching.

The second component will focus on ecosystem resilience and habitat connectivity in Western Tian Shan enhancement by regulating land and forest use in buffer zones and corridors and supporting sustainable livelihoods (Outcome 2). For this, the project will work in five areas: Output 2.1 Identified and designated buffer zones for new SPNAs and wildlife corridors between relevant SPNAs, and species management plans drafted and implemented; Output 2.2: Territorial development plans of Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts and communities aligned with biodiversity conservation, SFM and SLM objectives with needed modifications; Output 2.3: Degraded rangelands important both for livelihoods and

wildlife, including snow leopard prey species, in the target districts rehabilitated through improved local pasture management plans; Output 2.4: Restoration of degraded forests important for wildlife, including snow leopard prey, and livelihoods of local communities; and Output 2.5: Alternative livelihoods program for local communities designed jointly with the local micro-crediting institutions, and launched to support target communities.

The third component will aim to strengthen national capacities for snow leopard conservation, promoting Kyrgyz regional and global cooperation, and setting the scene for up-scaling (Outcome 3). The work on this component will be concentrated of four areas: Output 3.1: Law enforcement capacities of relevant stakeholders enhanced through trainings on wildlife protection aimed at identification and prosecution of wildlife crime; Output 3.2: Capacities for deployment of international standards for long-term monitoring of parameters critical for snow leopard conservation in national priority landscapes developed, based on international GSLEP monitoring framework; Output 3.3: Kyrgyzstan participation in the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Programs supported, aimed at synergies and coordination of national, transboundary and regional level activities; and Output 3.4 Implementation of Kyrgyzstan's National Strategy on Snow Leopard Conservation supported in nationally identified priority landscapes provided, in alignment and coordination with GSLEP and other relevant initiatives.

SECTION I, PART II Strategy (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC more fully details the full suite of project outcomes, outputs and activities as well as the specific implementation arrangements for the outputs and activities.

The table below summarizes the adjustments made to the strategic focus of the components and the changes made, and the rationale for these changes, to the outputs in the PIF.

Components	Key comments on the strategic focus of the component	Strategic Adjustment
<p><i>1. Conservation and sustainable management of Key Biodiversity Areas within the Western Tian Shan landscape.</i></p>	<p>STAP: Component 1 is well conceptualized, establishing two new PAs and strengthening the management of four existing PAs. Obviously, this needs to be carefully budgeted in the PPG.</p> <p>Germany Council: - The Protected Areas system in Kyrgyzstan suffers from a lack of funding. Protected Areas support their operations largely from formal and informal land and natural resource use in the areas actually to be protected. The expansion of the economically already not viable Protected Area system into new areas bears the risk of creating more parks that only exist on paper, not improving the conservation status. Given the economic situation of existing Protected Areas, the expectation of achieving Sustainability of new Protected Areas, established under the project, through state budget allocation, seems barely realistic and would need further explanation (A.1.6).</p>	<p>The STAP review confirmed the validity and good conceptualization of this component, and encouraged appropriate budgeting for this component during the PPG phase. The budget for this component was developed in detail in close collaboration with the State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) (the main project executing partner), which is responsible for PA management and forestry activities in Kyrgyzstan.</p> <p>The Germany GEF Council constituency drew attention to the important issue of funding of protected areas in Kyrgyzstan. This concern is fully valid; the two newly established protected areas that form the main focus of the project have been established by the government without any additional budget allocation for the SAEPF. To address this concern the project will be assisting in strengthening the financial management and business planning of the new PAs, so that at the end of the project period they are well-positioned to continue increasing their financial resource base. This will be done in collaboration and coordination with other initiatives ongoing at the national level in relation to overall financing for the PA system, such as the UNDP BIOFIN project. The project's linkage to the BIOFIN initiative is highlighted at multiple points in the Prodoc. Considering that few PAs in the world are in a position to be financially self-sustaining, the project will work with SAEPF and other relevant stakeholders to continue developing the long-term financial sustainability of Kyrgyzstan's PA system through diversified revenue streams, of which central government financing is only one source. In the short-term, a key result of the project will be to provide preliminary resources to develop and strengthen the management of the newly established PAs.</p>

Components	Key comments on the strategic focus of the component	Strategic Adjustment
<p><i>2. Ecosystem resilience and habitat connectivity in Western Tian Shan are enhanced by regulating land and forest use in buffer zones and corridors and support to sustainable livelihoods.</i></p>	<p>STAP: - Component 2 needs to be further developed in the PPG, especially the practical details involved in establishing buffer zones and corridors, as this may be more complex than envisioned.</p> <p>Germany council: - The mentioned “decline in the practice of moving livestock between summer and winter pastures”, which is definitely problematic in terms of local pasture degradation, has positive impacts on the habitat of snow leopard and its prey. Respectively it should be better explained, why an intensified use of pastures in snow leopard and wild ungulate habitats should be fostered by a GEF project aiming at conservation of snow leopard and its prey (Activity 2.2.1 and 2.2.2). Improved access will lead to pasture competition with wild ungulates, conflict (predation on livestock), accidental and intentional killing of snow leopards and poaching on its prey (including predation by herders’ dogs).</p> <p>STAP: - The alternative livelihoods activities are not well analyzed, and are based more on hope than a targeted strategy, stating merely that 20% of communities will be assisted to implement alternative livelihoods through micro-credit, with a possibility that this includes ecotourism. The PIF/PPG need to be much clearer on</p>	<p>Establishment of buffer zones (Output 2.1) – The potential establishment of buffer zones was discussed with local stakeholders during the PPG process, and there is a broad understanding of the need to implement these types of biodiversity-sensitive landscape management approaches. The actual establishment of buffer zones will build on the successful legal model established in neighboring Kazakhstan (also through UNDP-GEF projects). The practical means of implementing buffer zones and corridors will be done through a.) the incorporation of SFM approaches in forest management plans for forest lands in the vicinity of the PAs; b.) the development of pasture management plans incorporating SLM approaches and biodiversity sensitive approaches (replicating other successful models developed by UNDP in Kyrgyzstan); c.) the identification and incorporation of Key Biodiversity Areas outside of PAs into district territorial land-use and development planning; and d.) the strengthening of hunting regulatory monitoring and enforcement in the areas surrounding the PAs.</p> <p>Improved access to pastures (Output 2.2) – The council’s valid concern has been addressed in a variety of ways. First, the threats section of the project document has an expanded and improved section describing the issue of undergrazing, by which optimum ecosystem and forage conditions are lost as invasive woody shrubs and “weed” species that are not palatable for livestock – or snow leopard prey species – are increasing due to reduced usage of higher altitude “summer pastures” due to lack of access and the general decrease of this practice within communities. Recent scientific research in Kyrgyzstan has shown this to be a significant concern, and this is referenced in the project document. At the same time, the specific project activity 2.2.1 in the PIF on the “restoration and maintenance of access roads” has been removed. The project will work closely with scientific experts, local resource users, and partner organizations (e.g. ARIS) to ensure the development of pasture management plans (including grazing plans, and pasture infrastructure development) that appropriately reflect the ecological requirements of snow leopards, their prey species, and other globally significant species targeted by the project. In addition, the project document clarifies that currently in the Western Tian Shan there are few issues with snow leopard predation on livestock, or other types of conflicts. This will need to be closely monitored in the future, but for now it is not anticipated to be a major concern even if there is some increased use of higher altitude summer pastures.</p> <p>Alternative livelihoods (Output 2.5) – During the PPG process a feasibility assessment regarding alternative livelihoods was carried out, and is included as an annex to the project document. The project’s strategy with respect to alternative livelihoods is not necessarily to increase income from alternative sources, but to demonstrate, pilot and implement livelihood practices that are biodiversity friendly and support SFM/SLM approaches. If proven successful under local</p>

Components	Key comments on the strategic focus of the component	Strategic Adjustment
	<p>how an alternative livelihoods strategy will be operationalized. What is the evidence base that alternative livelihoods reduces pressure on biodiversity, noting that the assumption that increasing income from new enterprises leads to reduced degradation through normal agricultural/livestock practices is highly questionable; in fact, people may use increased profits to expand these activities. The PPG should be much clearer on how micro-credit will improve land use, and perhaps should consider a more targeted approach to people using marginal habitats that are important for biodiversity, such as wildlife-based CBNRM?</p>	<p>circumstances, these approaches can then be further replicated and scaled-up within the community to improve biodiversity conservation, SFM, and SLM.</p>
<p><i>3. Strengthening national capacities for Kyrgyz regional and global cooperation and setting the scene for scaling-up snow leopard conservation.</i></p>	<p>STAP: Component 3 is standard, but given the relatively limited budgets the PPG should seek to be innovative in terms of monitoring.</p> <p>Note that the need to involve stakeholders is mentioned in the narrative, but the Project Description for Component 3 is largely focused on PA agencies. This needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>In terms of ecological monitoring, the project aims to support the Government of Kyrgyzstan to implement a variety of innovative monitoring approaches that are being developed for snow leopards and their prey. These are described in detail in the draft “Planning and Monitoring Framework for Snow Leopard Conservation Programs”, which is being developed by scientists supported by the Snow Leopard Trust and GSLEP, and which was shared with the PPG team during the project development phase. Monitoring approaches are expected to use the latest innovative technologies, including potential DNA-based species identification; camera traps; GPS collars; and a geo-referenced online national snow leopard monitoring database.</p> <p>In terms of law enforcement monitoring the project also aims to utilize innovative approaches, including canine-assisted wildlife crime monitoring, and potential micro-chipping of trophy specimens from trophy hunting.</p> <p>Identification of key partners and stakeholders other than the PA agency have been expanded and improved. This has been done partially in the description of the component and its activities, but also in the stakeholder analysis earlier in the project document.</p>
<p><i>Additional information</i></p>	<p>STAP: - Finally, overall the PIF is well presented. However, it would be much easier to follow and much stronger with the inclusion of appropriate maps.</p>	<p>Based on the STAP review comments about the inclusion of maps, numerous maps have been included in the project document, as well as in annexes. This includes, in particular, the following GIS-based geo-referenced maps: 1. A map showing estimated wildlife corridors among PAs in the Western Tian Shan landscape (Figure 7 of the project document); 2. A map showing Toktogul District with the newly established PAs, and nearby forest and pasturelands (Figure 8 of the project document); 3. A map showing Toguz-Toro District with the newly established PAs, and nearby forest and pasturelands (Figure 9 of the project document).</p>

Components	Original outputs in the PIF	Changes made to outputs at GEF CEO ER stage ⁹	Rationale for changes to outputs
Component 1 (Outputs)	<i>1.1.1 Two new National Parks established (Alatai 65,705 ha and Kanattuu 36,780 ha) in Western Tian Shan region</i>	Output 1.1. Expanded operational SPNA network in the Western Tian Shan region through support to operationalize the two new State Nature Parks of Alatai and Kan-Achuu	Output wording adjusted to reflect the fact that the targeted PAs were successfully formally established by the government during the PPG phase, in preparation for implementation of the full project. This does not significantly change the substantive focus of the activities under this output.
	<i>1.1.2 Upgraded status of High Conservation Value Forests (genetically important Wild Walnut and Fruit forests): reserve boundaries demarcated, management plans drawn and under implementation. Community engagement in forest management launched</i>	Output 1.2. Upgraded status of HCVF, and sustainable forest management involving local communities	Output wording shortened for clarity. The focus of activities under the output remains the same, although at the current stage it is not foreseen that new “reserves” of HCVF will be established, but rather the identified HCVF within PAs and within the territories of Toktogul and Toguz-Toro leskhozoes (local forest management units) will be managed in accordance with HCVF principles, as a result of their identification, the integration in forest management plans of appropriate management measures, and the strengthening of enforcement of forest use regulations. This will be accomplished with the introduction of the Joint Forest Management approach, in-line and linked with the process of forest sector reform that is ongoing at the national level. The project also aims to introduce generally the HCVF concept at the national level in Kyrgyzstan (it is not currently introduced or in use), and achieve the adoption of government regulations recognizing the HCVF approach, and adapting its implementation to the Kyrgyz national context.
	<i>1.2.1 Strengthened capacities (budget management, financial controls; financial performance management; and financial governance and accountability) of the Protected Area Department of the SAEPF</i>	Output 1.3. Enhanced management and conservation capacities of Western Tian Shan PAs in Jalal-Abad Province, and strengthened HCVF management	Output wording modified to more accurately reflect the focus of the output on overall management capacity strengthening of four key existing PAs, rather than just a focus on budget and financial management. The focus of the project activities will also be primarily at the level of the individual PAs, rather than at the national institutional level, although some approaches supported by the project (i.e. biodiversity monitoring data collection and data management) will be linked to national level initiatives as well. The shift in this output also reflects the project’s approach to link with and leverage other partner efforts and initiatives. For example, the UNDP BIOFIN project will also be working on strengthening the financial management and sustainability of the national PA system, and a UNDP project on Rio Conventions’ reporting will be addressing biodiversity data management and reporting at the national level. The strengthening of capacities for implementation of HCVF was integrated with this output to reflect the logical focus of the overall first component on the

⁹ Note that the format of output numbering has changed due to differences in document template formats and standard project activity planning approaches during different phases of the UNDP-GEF project development cycle.

Components	Original outputs in the PIF	Changes made to outputs at GEF CEO ER stage ⁹	Rationale for changes to outputs
			strengthening of management of Key Biodiversity Areas within the broader production landscape.
	<i>1.2.2 Foresters trained in HCVF regime application; environmental inspectors trained in enforcement</i>	Merged with current Output 1.3 above.	This output from the PIF has been integrated with the above-described current output 1.3, as indicated. The strengthening of management of HCVF has been integrated into current output 1.3 to reflect the overall strategic focus on strengthening the management capacities government stakeholders responsible for management of Key Biodiversity Areas within the broader production landscape.
	<i>1.2.3 Management and business plans of key existing Protected Areas in Western Tian Shan revised</i>	Merged with current Output 1.3 above.	This output from the PIF has been integrated with the above-described current output 1.3, as indicated. The strengthening of management of existing PAs has been integrated into current output 1.3 to reflect the overall strategic focus on strengthening the management capacities government stakeholders responsible for management of Key Biodiversity Areas within the broader production landscape.
	<i>1.2.4 Participatory patrolling, enforcement and surveillance systems of new and existing PAs strengthened through Local PA Management Board (joint with local communities) and joint ranger groups to enforce anti-poaching.</i>	Output 1.4. Strengthened participatory patrolling, enforcement and surveillance systems of new and existing PAs through the Local PA Management Board and joint patrol groups to enforce anti-poaching	The output of the wording was slightly modified to reflect the fact that some participatory patrolling and management participating does currently exist. However, additional efforts are required to strengthen community engagement in conservation and management of biodiversity resources, particularly with respect to the newly established PAs.
Component 2 (Outputs)	<i>2.1.1 SFM and SLM management objectives are better aligned with territorial and forest land use plans of Toktogul and Toguztorous districts, with modifications being made to the latter as needed.</i>	Output 2.2. Territorial development plans of Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts and communities aligned with biodiversity conservation, SFM and SLM objectives	The output wording has been simplified for clarity and conciseness. The substantive focus of the activities under the output has not changed.
	<i>2.1.2 Buffer zones for Alatai and Kanattuu and wildlife corridors (50,000 ha) between relevant PAs identified and designated; species management plans drafted and are under implementation; forest and land use regime in them is regulated accordingly.</i>	Output 2.1 Identified and designated buffer zones for new SPNAs and wildlife corridors between relevant SPNAs	The output wording has been simplified for clarity and conciseness. The substantive focus of the activities under the output has not changed, other than the fact that the project is no longer going to focus on the development of specific “species management plans”. During the PPG phase it was determined that specific species management plans do not have a clear institutional home or legal basis in Kyrgyzstan, and therefore are not considered to be an effective conservation approach. The management of all species and ecosystems will be carried out in a holistic and integrated manner through PA management plans and other relevant national biodiversity conservation legislation. Certain game species are specifically managed by the Department for the Rational Use of

Components	Original outputs in the PIF	Changes made to outputs at GEF CEO ER stage ⁹	Rationale for changes to outputs
			Natural Resources, and in this case hunting regulations for specific species will be updated and implemented to reflect principles of sustainability and ecological integrity.
	<i>2.2.1 Restoration and maintenance of access roads to raise the mobility of livestock and balance livestock grazing pressure in mountain ecosystems</i>	Removed.	Based on the feedback from the Germany GEF Council constituency and further consultations during the PPG phase, this output has been removed. There remains some scientific justification for increasing access to remote pastures to balance grazing pressures and address the issue of undergrazing, but it was determined during the PPG phase that this project will not have the resources or the appropriate scope to undertake the restoration of infrastructure to improve access to pastures. This is partially being addressed by other stakeholders (i.e. the IFAD-ARIS project) in relevant parallel initiatives.
	<i>2.2.2 Rehabilitation of degraded rangelands (65,000 ha in Toktogul and Togustorous districts) through improved local pasture management plans. Based on geo-botanic studies, economic and ecosystem service assessment. Pasture management plans designed and implemented jointly with communities, using GIS technologies mapping feeding grounds and migrating routes (and timing) of Snow Leopard (SL).</i>	Output 2.3. Degraded rangelands important both for livelihoods and wildlife, including snow leopard prey species in the target districts, rehabilitated through improved local pasture management plans	The output wording has been simplified for clarity and conciseness. The substantive focus of the activities under the output has not changed. It was determined during the PPG phase that the project will employ the e-Pasture Management tool piloted successfully through previous UNDP projects in Kyrgyzstan to implement SLM in 147,268 ha of pastures used by the Pasture User Associations of the four targeted communities (and managed by their respective Pasture Management Committees), including the specific figure of 65,361 ha of degraded pastureland. This includes pasturelands owned by the communities, and pasturelands of the State Land Reserve that are used by the communities.
	<i>2.2.3 Forest restoration of 5,000 ha of degraded forests important for SL migration</i>	Output 2.4: Restoration of degraded forests important for wildlife, including snow leopard prey, and livelihoods of local communities	Output wording revised for clarity. As per the feedback of the Germany GEF Council constituency, the term “migration” in relation to snow leopards has been revised throughout the project document. The specific target figure for forest restoration was determined during the PPG phase to be 4,886 ha.
	<i>2.3 Alternative livelihoods program for local communities designed jointly with the local micro-crediting institutions, and launched to support alternative livelihoods</i>	Output 2.5. Alternative livelihoods program for local communities designed jointly with the local micro-crediting institutions, and launched to support target communities.	The wording of the output has not changed, but the focus of the output was strategically clarified in the project document.
Component 3 (Outputs)	<i>3.1.1 Enhanced enforcement capacities of environmental</i>	Output 3.1. Law enforcement capacities of relevant	The output wording has been simplified for clarity and conciseness. The substantive focus of the activities under the output has not changed. The activities under

Components	Original outputs in the PIF	Changes made to outputs at GEF CEO ER stage ⁹	Rationale for changes to outputs
	<i>inspectors, police, border guards and customs officers through trainings on wildlife protection aimed at identification and prosecution of wildlife crime [in coordination with global UNDP-GEF project on SL and INTERPOL Programme].</i>	stakeholders enhanced through trainings on wildlife protection aimed at identification and prosecution of wildlife crime	this output will significantly draw on and build on existing and previous efforts by other partner organizations.
	<i>3.1.2 Capacities created for deployment of the International System for long-term regular monitoring of Snow Leopard (based on Genetic Laboratory of NAN), applying common internationally certified standards (habitat quality, population status, prey species and threats – indicators to be elaborated under global UNDP-GEF project) [in coordination with global UNDP-GEF project on SL].</i>	Output 3.2. Capacities for deployment of international standards for long-term monitoring of parameters critical for snow leopard conservation in national priority landscapes developed, based on international GSLEP monitoring framework	It was determined during the PPG phase that scientists supported by SLT/GSLEP are developing a standardized monitoring framework and protocol for snow leopard conservation efforts throughout the snow leopard range states. The monitoring framework is currently undergoing final draft revisions. The project aims to support Kyrgyzstan in implementing snow leopard, snow leopard prey, and ecosystem monitoring approaches consistent with the international standards and protocols outlined in the monitoring framework elaborated by SLT/GSLEP. The output will be linked with output 3.3 under this component related to regional cooperation, to support Kyrgyzstan in establishing snow leopard monitoring data sharing approaches with neighboring countries, since many snow leopard individuals may inhabit border areas and have transboundary home ranges. The project document also further clarifies that a focus of support under this output will be in the GSLEP priority Gissar-Alai landscape; snow leopard monitoring in the Western Tian Shan will also be supported by this project, but under Component 1, and snow leopard monitoring in the Central Tian Shan (Sarychat priority landscape) will be handled by other partners and initiatives (WWF, FFI, and the UNDP-GEF Central Tian Shan project).
	<i>3.1.3 Targeted support provided to participation of Kyrgyzstan in the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation Programs aimed at synergies and coordination of national, transboundary and regional level activities.</i>	Output 3.3 Kyrgyzstan participation in the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Programs supported, aimed at synergies and coordination of national, transboundary and regional level activities	The output wording has been simplified for clarity and conciseness. The substantive focus of the activities under the output has not changed.

Components	Original outputs in the PIF	Changes made to outputs at GEF CEO ER stage ⁹	Rationale for changes to outputs
	<p>3.1.4 <i>National coordination mechanism is established and functional under the Working Secretariat. Business plan is developed for WS GSLCP long-term functioning. Which will include budget, roles and responsibilities, taking stock of and learning from the results of the GEF project. Based on a digital map of SL habitat in Kyrgyzstan, with annotated recommendations for land use regimes in key areas of importance for SL. Amended policies on hunting of SL's food base.</i></p>	<p>Output 3.4. Implementation of Kyrgyzstan's NSSLC supported in nationally identified priority landscapes provided, in alignment and coordination with GSLEP and other relevant initiatives.</p>	<p>Based on feedback received from SLT, GSLEP and national partners during the PPG phase, the focus of this output has shifted slightly to focus primarily on the latter part of the output as articulated in the PIF. This is to say that the project will work to support implementation of conservation management plans for the identified priority national snow leopard conservation landscapes in Kyrgyzstan. This will support and contribute to the overall GSLEP goal of securing 20 landscapes important for snow leopards by 2020.</p>
	<p>3.1.5 <i>Training on assessment of PA management using WWF/USAID methodology for staff from the new and existing PAs, to ensure that they can effectively fulfill management objectives. Curriculum coordinated with the relevant activities of the Global UNDP-GEF project on SL.</i></p>	<p>Removed.</p>	<p>This activity has been dropped. During the PPG phase it was determined that it was not sufficiently strategically linked with the rest of the project's scope. In addition, the assessment of management of key PAs in the Western Tian Shan will be addressed through application of the GEF METT Tracking Tool. The project will contribute to other ongoing efforts to implement this tool as a standardized approach for PA management in Kyrgyzstan.</p>

A.1.4 [Incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and [co-financing](#); and

A.1.5. [Global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF)

SECTION I, PART II *Strategy* ('Rationale and summary of GEF Alternative') of the UNDP PRODOC has been significantly improved in response to STAP and GEF Council comments. These improvements are briefly summarized as follows:

Without the GEF investment in the proposed project, the 'business-as-usual scenario' for the conservation biodiversity (including snow leopards and their prey species), and the sustainable management of forest and land resources is one where:

- (i) The Western Tian Shan alpine forest and pasture landscape will not be managed as an integrated whole, as management approaches will remain uncoordinated and un-cohesive, without buffer zones, wildlife migration corridors, HCVPs and other high-biodiversity value landscape elements identified and managed appropriately;
- (ii) Newly established protected areas in the Western Tian Shan remain mostly as “paper parks”, as authorities have low capacity to effectively manage established protected areas, with little ability to monitor biodiversity or monitor and enforce regulations, leading to ongoing declines in threatened species;
- (iii) Tens of thousands of forest resources in the Western Tian Shan, including HCVP, are not sustainably managed for biodiversity benefits or other ecosystem services, are continuously degraded by livestock intrusion and unmanaged domestic use, with little expansion in forest coverage as livestock hampers natural regeneration and forest managers have low capacity to carry out reforestation;
- (iv) Hundreds of thousands of pasturelands in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts, including alpine pasturelands, continue to degrade from over- or under-grazing, as PMCs do not have capacity or data to effectively implement SLM measures in accordance with the Law on Pastures; and
- (v) Kyrgyzstan is only able to implement its national snow leopard and ecosystem conservation plan at a basic level, without comprehensive national monitoring of snow leopards or their prey species, and without effective wildlife trade monitoring and enforcement.

The ‘alternative scenario’ that the project seeks to contribute to is characterized by: (i) preventing the further fragmentation of key biodiversity landscapes and degradation of forest and land resources in Kyrgyzstan that provide critical ecosystem services; (ii) ensuring habitat connectivity across the Western Tian Shan landscape for key species, including snow leopard and prey; (iii) improving the conservation status, and sustainability of pasture and forest use in mountain ecosystems; (iv) implementation of snow leopard and prey monitoring and conservation measures, and reduction of direct threats, in the Western Tian Shan and other Kyrgyzstan priority snow leopard conservation landscapes. The total cost of investment in the project is estimated at \$ 28,507,758 USD of which \$3,988,575 USD constitutes grant funding from GEF and \$24,519,183 USD comprises co-financing from national government (SAEPF and SIETS), local governments (Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts), the Kyrgyz Republic Nature Protection and Forestry Development Fund, UNDP, NGOs (Panthera) and other development partners (GIZ).

The incremental value of the alternative scenario is summarized in the table below:

Baseline	GEF Alternative	Benefits
<i>Biodiversity</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With current funding priorities under the baseline Governmental Program and Action Plan on Transition to Sustainable Development for 2013-2017, funding will be sufficient to cover only basic support to existing PAs, but insufficient to implement management of newly established PA. There will be no integration of PAs in the wider landscape in Western Tian Shan. There will be no financial support for communities living near the PAs in Western Tian Shan to establish biodiversity-friendly businesses and land management practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA system in Western Tian Shan offers improved representation for threatened species notably by improving habitat coverage of snow leopard and other threatened species. Effective management for at least 286,099 ha habitat of under-represented globally threatened species and globally significant ecosystems under protection by 2021, with strengthened PA management units, and developed management plans. • Improved monitoring and enforcement of hunting regulations in game reserves and other hunting areas beyond PA borders in two target districts. • Recognition in local development and resource-use planning of the establishment of a landscape-level approach to biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthened Kyrgyzstan PA system with improved management for 286,099 ha of PAs in the Western Tian Shan, including 87,323 ha in two recently established PAs, and 198,776 ha in four previously established PAs in the Western Tian Shan. • Increased PA coverage of the range of snow leopards in Western Tian Shan. • Management effectiveness of the existing (198,776 ha) and newly established (87,323 ha) PAs in Western Tian Shan is increased by an average of 45% over the baseline (measured by METT). • Migration corridors and buffer zones covering >50,000 ha. • Biodiversity conservation principles integrated in territorial plans of two administrative districts (1,218,175 ha), including

Baseline	GEF Alternative	Benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About 17% of the currently unprotected alpine grassland ecosystems and 25% of the relict spruce forest ecosystems and walnut and fruit forests in the Western Tian Shan are predicted to degrade in the next 10 years, due to excessive grazing by increasing numbers of livestock, unmanaged arable farming, and unregulated wood cutting. • Populations of threatened species are likely to decrease in the Western Tian Shan landscape, including snow leopard (<i>Panthera uncia</i>), Tian Shan argali (<i>Ovis ammon karelini</i>), Tian Shan Maral (<i>Cervus elaphus</i>), Turkestan lynx (<i>Lynx lynx isabellinus</i>), Tian Shan white clawed bear (<i>Ursus arctos isabellinus</i>), Menzbier's marmot (<i>Marmota menzbieri</i>) Tian Shan Fir (<i>Abies Semenovii</i>), Siever's Apple (<i>Malus sieversii</i>), Niedzvedzky's apple (<i>Malus niedzwetzkyana</i>), Knorring Hawthorn (<i>Crataegus knorringiana</i>), cinereous vulture (<i>Aegypius monachus</i>), and Saker falcon (<i>Falco cherrug</i>). 	<p>conservation for the Western Tian Shan with established connectivity to PAs through buffer zones, corridors, and other Key Biodiversity Areas (i.e. HCVF stands).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key biodiversity areas in forest and pasturelands outside PAs are identified, recognized in management documents, and resource use is managed in accordance with biodiversity requirements. • Under-represented biodiversity is studied and monitored on a systematic basis. 	<p>the State Forest Fund territory managed by leskhozoes and municipal pastureland territory in the two districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of threats (15% reduction in illegal wood cutting; 100% reduction in poaching) through increased protection of globally threatened species listed in IUCN Red Data List and associated prey species - snow leopard (<i>Panthera uncia</i>), ibex (<i>Capra sibirica</i>), argali (<i>Ovis ammon karelini</i>), Turkestan lynx (<i>Lynx lynx isabellinus</i>), Tian Shan white clawed bear (<i>Ursus arctos isabellinus</i>), Tian Shan fir, and wild apple and hawthorn forest stands. • The project results contribute to CBD PoWPA (expansion of PAs, integration of PAs in wider landscapes, and community engagement schemes) and Aichi targets.
<i>Sustainable Land Management</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pasture Management Committees do not have capacity or data to implement sustainable grazing and land management practices in their respective pasturelands • Overgrazed pastures: exceeding carrying capacity by 1.5-2 times resulting in reduced provision of ecosystem services, leading to reduced economic and ecological 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecosystem services valued and incorporated in territorial planning based on multi-stakeholders engagement; • Dynamic pasture quality inventory integrated annually into grazing plans; • Sustainable pasture management practices implemented: rotational grazing to maintain soil upper layer; stimulate grasses for vigorous growth and healthy root systems through pasture watering and setting additional watering places and wells; increased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competitive pressures between land uses in mountain pasture and forest landscapes reduced in productive lands of two administrative districts (1,218,175 ha, including 663,431 ha of alpine pasturelands, and 34,383 ha of forested state forest fund land); • Improved vegetation cover, fodder productivity and pasture regeneration throughout 147,268 ha of pastureland of four target communities; • Decrease in grazing pressure and improved condition of mountain

Baseline	GEF Alternative	Benefits
<p>productivity, and diminished livelihoods;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock numbers continue to increase beyond ecological carrying capacity; • Increased extent of less palatable grass and plant species, indicating degradation of pasturelands; • Pasturelands in forest territory are not managed in a coordinated and cohesive manner; • Poor agricultural land management near protected areas; • Wildlife is negatively impacted by livestock presence in key biodiversity areas at critical times of year. 	<p>investments in repair and maintenance of key pasture infrastructure (bridges) allows greater flock mobility; using the grazing process to feed livestock through maintaining soil cover and managing plant species composition to maintain feed quality; hay farming in support of intensive pastures established on appropriate lands to remove loads on natural meadows and fodders during the winter period; regeneration of the natural pasture covers using natural pasture seeds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLM best practices are applied across sectors and integrated management approaches are applied across different land use sectors in wider Tian Shan as result of replication. • Micro grants are offered to establish alternative livelihoods, serving as a lasting financial support mechanism for funding alternative livelihoods and could benefit over 1,000 recipients in the 7-10 years immediately after the project. 	<p>grassland ecosystems over 65,361 ha;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-functioning ecosystem services, such as forage productivity at mountain pastures, stable water flows, and reduced erosion; • Enhanced security of agricultural livelihoods for 23,939 rural inhabitants, including 5,138 rural poor; • Increased incidence of SLM approaches applied by small-scale holders leading to soil and vegetation quality improvements; • Avoided loss and increased sequestration of organic carbon content in forest soils by 729,246 tCO₂; increased sequestration of organic carbon content in pastureland soils by 2,732,090 tCO₂ (based on Tier-1 FAO EX-ACT model).
<i>Sustainable Forest Management</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued degradation of endemic fir, ecologically important juniper, and genetically important walnut-fruit forests in Western Tian Shan resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Illegal logging in forests in valuable ecosystems for fuel wood and local construction; – Poorly managed grazing in forests causing low natural regeneration of forests; – Forest lands encroachment for agriculture, settlements and mining; – Unsustainable harvesting of non-timber forest products. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable use principles integrated in forest management plans for 40,839 ha of forests designated as <i>High Conservation Value Forests</i>; • Adjustment of volume, timing and mode of sanitary cutting to ensure ecological principles, and harvesting of non-timber resources in Juniper and wild nut forests, in line with ecosystem carrying capacity principles and wildlife migration corridors; • Reforestation of degraded forests; • Sustainable management of grazing in forest pastures to support natural regeneration; • National codification of the applied HCVF approach in Kyrgyzstan; • Training of foresters and communities in forest management planning and enforcement of HCVF standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40,839 ha of HCVF designated and put under SFM insuring stability of ecosystem functions, such as genetic reserves, habitat for biodiversity and avoided GHG emissions of 1,171,205 tCO₂. • 4,886 ha of degraded forests regenerated, sequestering 1,079,098 tCO₂ (based on Tier-1 FAO EX-ACT model). • Key biodiversity areas in forest zones identified, demarcated, and managed appropriately as corridors and buffer zones to ensure ecosystem cohesiveness and good habitat quality for threatened and globally significant wildlife, including snow leopard and prey.
<i>Capacity Development and Knowledge Management</i>		

Baseline	GEF Alternative	Benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pasture Management Committees do not have capacity to implement sustainable land management in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts; • Forest managers in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro do not have knowledge and capacity to apply HCVF approach to forest management in State Forest Fund lands; • Protected area managers in the Western Tian Shan do not have capacity for effective PA management; • Baseline information on the distribution, abundance, seasonality and recruitment rates of snow leopards and prey remains incomplete; • No national mechanism in place to coordinate the monitoring of snow leopard and prey; • National Strategy and Action Plan on the Conservation of Snow Leopard in place, but underfunded and not fully under implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide data and knowledge management tools to support implementation of SLM; • Raise awareness of HCVF approach, and train foresters on implementation; • Provide equipment and training for PA managers in Western Tian Shan to improve management of PAs; • Develop, implement and maintain a consolidated national snow leopard monitoring, reporting and information management system; • Host training sessions for researchers, scientists, academics, volunteers, students, NGO staff, government field staff, etc. on biodiversity, including snow leopard monitoring and reporting and the relevant biodiversity information management system; • Increase the coverage of camera traps, aerial surveys and aerial photography for monitoring and reporting on snow leopard and/or medium-sized ungulate populations; • Facilitate the opportunistic fitting of radio collars to individual cats and evaluate the cost-effectiveness of fecal DNA analysis for species identification; and • Facilitate the participation and involvement of national scientists, researchers, managers and academics in regional/international snow leopard conservation initiatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four Pasture Management Committees responsible for management of 147,268 ha of pasturelands have capacity to implement SLM in pasture management plans; • Increase capacity for effective PA management for six Western Tian Shan PAs, involving more than 150 PA staff; • A strong scientific base for the conservation of snow leopard and their prey is established; • A national snow leopard monitoring and reporting system, and a national snow leopard information management system, is established and operational, improving timeliness and quality of snow leopard population estimation to an annual estimate with greater than 50% certainty; • The national coverage (as a % of the total snow leopard range) of snow leopard and prey monitoring activities increases from a baseline of less than 10% for snow leopard, and 5% for snow leopard prey, to more than 25% and 20 % respectively; and • At least 15 managers, scientists, researchers or academics participate in regional snow leopard conservation initiatives, and at least 10 attend and participate in regional monitoring and report-back meetings of the GSLEP.

A.1.6. Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

Innovativeness: The project is innovative in multiple aspects. The project objective is itself innovative in Kyrgyzstan, as there are no other effective examples of landscape scale biodiversity conservation, employing the mechanisms of PAs, buffer zones, corridors, HCVF and other environmental management approaches to address biodiversity conservation at the truly landscape scale – in this case, the entire Western Tian Shan mountain ecosystem. The project strategy is forward looking in that it seeks to apply a fully integrated landscape management approach to address the interdependent and complementary issues of biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest management, and sustainable land management. The fact that the project will focus on these three integrated environmental issues primarily within the context of two districts in Kyrgyzstan will allow the project to actually carry out on-the-ground activities in a truly integrated manner, rather than as separate and disparate activities. In addition, with respect to biodiversity monitoring, including snow leopard and prey monitoring, the project expects to apply the latest and most current technological approaches available, including camera traps, GPS tracking, DNA analysis, and other similar technologies. In addition, the project will carry out feasibility assessments for multiple innovative environmental management approaches, including the re-introduction of argali in the

Alatai SNP (never previously attempted in Kyrgyzstan), the potential for trophy hunting in the project area (trophy hunting is not currently undertaken in this area), and the potential for wildlife passages over/under/around major infrastructure developments (i.e. national highways), and the potential for Payments for Ecosystem Services schemes to support Kyrgyzstan's many hydropower facilities (e.g. supporting SFM/SLM within the watersheds of hydropower facilities). An final innovative approach worth mentioning in the project's aim to expand the use of the e-Pasture Management system, which was previously developed in Kyrgyzstan with UNDP support, but which is as yet very limited in usage.

SECTION I, PART II *Strategy* ('Sustainability and replicability') of the UNDP PRODOC has been updated to reflect the revision of project outputs and activities, as follows:

The critical aspect of **sustainability** for any project is the sustainability of the project's results, not of the project itself. Sustainability is dependent on many factors, and is a dynamic state that can never be guaranteed in perpetuity, as the likelihood of sustainability at any given time can increase or decrease depending on individual events or changing conditions over time. Experience has shown in UNDP-GEF projects that sustainability is critically dependent on stakeholder ownership of the process and project results. This project in the Western Tian Shan has effectively cultivated the ownership of – and been driven by – stakeholders at the local, district and national levels. Throughout implementation the project will continue to work closely with all stakeholders to ensure the strong engagement and ownership by stakeholders is carried on past the life of the project. The GEF has identified four key elements to sustainability, which are discussed in further detail below.

Financial Sustainability: There are a number of key aspects of the project where financial sustainability of results is a consideration. First is the financial sustainability of the newly established protected areas. These protected areas were established without significant additional national budget allocations from the government, and the staff for these protected areas are being drawn from existing government bodies, including the rest of the protected area system. Some staff are also being shifted from the relevant leskhozoes, whose forest lands were allocated for the PAs. In this way the core function of the PAs will be sustained through current on-going government budget allocations, in combination of the capacity strengthening investments to be made by the project. Global practice has shown that few individual PAs are able to be financially self-sustaining, and it is the financial sustainability of Kyrgyzstan's entire national PA system that must be considered and assessed, rather than the specific PAs targeted in this project. The project is partially addressing this at the level of the individual PAs, and the financial sustainability of the PA system is also being more broadly addressed through initiatives of other partners and initiatives. At the national systemic level, the UNDP Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BioFin) is kicking off in 2016, and will be working closely with the national government partners to strengthen the financial sustainability of Kyrgyzstan's PA system. At the individual PA level, as part of the project's PA capacity development activities the project will work with the newly established Alatai and Kan-Achuu SNPs to develop their long-term financial planning, and draft business plans to be integrated with the PA management plans that will be developed. This will include SWOT financial analysis for the PAs, and consideration of opportunities such as ecotourism, and the feasibility of trophy hunting in surrounding hunting reserves (not within the PAs themselves). Similar financial management and planning capacity strengthening will also be carried out for the other targeted Western Tian Shan PAs in Jalal-Abad province. In relation to sustainable forest and pasture management, the project will strengthen the financial health of the relevant bodies (leskhozoes, PMCs) through the introduction of more cost-effective and accretive management approaches, such as the E-Pasture Management system, which allows the efficient and transparent collection of revenues from pasture users. Other financially sustainable approaches will also be piloted, including the financially self-sustaining forest restoration fencing approach developed by GIZ.

Institutional Sustainability will be promoted in the project by strengthening and expanding the current capabilities of the key institutions that are directly responsible for the planning and management of protected areas, natural habitats, pastures and forests in Kyrgyzstan's Western Tian Shan ecosystem. It will assist in building a professional corps of well-trained, adequately resourced and properly equipped management, monitoring, enforcement, community liaison and pastoral extension service personnel in targeted PAs, leskhozoes, PMCs, and district administrations. In particular, the project will strengthen the PA management capacities of the six key alpine PAs in the Western Tian Shan, as well as the planning and management capacity of the departments relating to PA management within SAEPF. The project will also work with local development and spatial planners in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts to ensure biodiversity conservation, SFM, and SLM practices are mainstreamed into the long-term land-use plans for the targeted districts. The project will also

contribute to national efforts to establish, operationalize, and develop key national databases relating to ecosystem management, including biodiversity databases (and including the national snow leopard monitoring database), and pasture management databases. The project will also build the capacity of state agencies for wildlife monitoring and regulatory enforcement, and strengthen border and customs controls to address illegal wildlife trade. At the end of the project an exit strategy will also be developed that will specifically articulate the means by which institutional sustainability will be assured for key project results.

Socio-economic sustainability is already expected to be strong for the project in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts, as the local communities have proactively supported the establishment of the two new SNPs in this region by contributed and forfeiting land under their own local control. Local community representatives have also actively participated in project development, including the district government heads, and local community heads (e.g. the head of Cholpon-Ata community, the nearest and largest community to Alatai SNP). During project implementation socio-economic sustainability will be enhanced in the project by improving the living conditions of rural communities. This will be achieved through strengthening local capacity to implement sustainable pasture management, and support biodiversity conservation objectives in areas surrounding PAs. The project will specifically: (i) facilitate the economic benefits to communities living around targeted SPNAs (from direct employment, contractual work, provision of services, income from hunting concessions, etc.) which will contribute to a reduction in illegal activities in the SPNAs; (ii) provide small grants to help rural communities pilot diversified livelihood activities with net positive economic and environmental benefits; and (iii) provide technical and financial grant support to pastoralists to support shifting to more sustainable pasture management practices. The project will primarily work through (and assist in establishing, where these have not yet been constituted) local governance structures, including local district administrations and local community governance units, PA Management Boards, Pasture User Associations and Participatory Forest Management committees. Through this collaborative approach the project will improve the communication, collaboration and cooperation between rights holders, i.e. tenure holders, natural resource users and the relevant duty-bearers, i.e. state, regional and local administrations. The project will also support the identification and implementation of viable income-generating opportunities (e.g. income from hunting fees, income from pasture tax, specialist tourism services, income from fines, etc.) to further augment the current budgets of the responsible institutions.

Environmental sustainability will be enhanced by the strengthening of the ecological network of the Western Tian Shan, with improved management of the core zone PAs, and sustainable resource management in buffer zones and identified corridors. The project will result in reduced degradation of forests and pasturelands, which will also contribute to improved water quality in the region. In addition, the conservation of biodiversity will be secured as a result of increased enforcement of regulations. This will include improving the status of snow leopard and prey habitats, and reducing direct threats to snow leopards and their prey in the Western Tian Shan. The project will also work to increase the environmental awareness and understanding of local communities.

Each project output will include the documentation of lessons learnt from implementation of activities under the output, and a collation of the tools and templates (and any other materials) developed during implementation. The Project Coordinator will ensure the collation of all the project experiences and information. This knowledge database will then be made accessible to different stakeholder groups in order to support better future decision-making processes in snow leopard conservation and more consistent adoption of best practice.

A.2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.3. Stakeholders. Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes /no)? and indigenous peoples (yes /no)? ¹⁰

¹⁰ As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.

Note: There are no defined groups of indigenous peoples in Kyrgyzstan.

During the project preparation stage, a stakeholder analysis was undertaken in order to identify key stakeholders and assess their prospective roles and responsibilities in the context of the proposed project. The table below lists the key stakeholder organisations, and broadly describes the anticipated role of each of the stakeholder organisations in supporting or facilitating the implementation of project activities:

Stakeholder	Role
Government Agencies	
State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) and WS GSLECP	Main implementation partner hosting the Department on Protected Areas, the key stakeholder for the elaboration of the National PA planning framework, WS GSLECP, ensuring organization of new PA; as well as managerial and financial sustainability of the national PA system.
Ministry of Agriculture, Processing Industry and Melioration	Key partner in the development and implementation of the pasture management plans at target areas. (Output 2.3.)
State Registration Service of the Kyrgyz Republic (SRS)	SRS will coordinate and control the registration of land property rights in the vicinity of the project sites. Within its mandate, it is responsible for the following: 1) regulating of land relations (state registration deed, land cadastre) in the new PA, corridors and buffer zone (Output 2.1); and 2) topography survey and mapping of the PA to prepare state registration deed for land users (ibid)
State Agency on Local Self-Governance and Interethnic Relations	Integration of SLM and biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management issues into local development plans and their further implementation (Output 2.1., 2.2.)
Province and District administrations	Support to the establishment of the new PAs and integration of biodiversity conservation into corresponding administrative level development strategies and plans (Output 2.2.)
Local Communities	
Local Self Governance Bodies	These bodies are responsible for the elaboration and implementation of local communities' development strategies including local environment issues. They will be among the main project implementing partners at the local level in integrated land use planning, buffer zones and corridors (Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.3)
Associations of Pasture and Water Users	They are the users of ecosystem services regulating access of local communities to natural resources and sustainable use of biodiversity and they will provide inputs to the development of the landscape level management plan for Tian Shan that defines buffer zones and conservation-friendly uses in sensitive areas, as well as play a role in the development and implementation of alternative sustainable livelihoods (Outputs 2.3.)
Communities of the PA buffer zones	Active users of ecosystem services and to be involved in PA management and sustainable use practices to be promoted by the project. (Output 1.4., Outputs 2.1., 2.2., 2.3.)
Non-government Organizations	
Snow Leopard Trust	Foundation implementing snow leopard conservation project in Central Tian Shan aimed at habitat range monitoring, promoting anti-poaching and livelihoods for local communities, will be a partner in the project for relevant activities
Kyrgyzstan Association of Forest and Land Users, CAMP Alatoo, and RDF	These NGOs will be involved to advocate for sustainable biodiversity conservation and use and to promote Joint Forest Management practice and HCVF concept and SFM certification piloting, as well as joint patrolling (Outputs 1.11, 1.2, 1.4.). They will be also involved into development of the pasture management plans and land use plans in buffer zones and corridors jointly with local communities and state administrations (Outputs 2.1., 2.2., 2.3.).
Research and Expertise	
Two institutes of the National Science Academy of the Kyrgyz Republic: Biology and Soils Institute; Forest Research Institute	Based on their experience and expertise, these institutes will play a role in elaboration of the scientific grounds for biodiversity monitoring, improving participation in biodiversity inventory, development of biodiversity sustainable use norms, identification of the areas under strong pressure, PA management effectiveness assessment (Outputs 1.1., 1.2., 1.3.). Additionally they will be also involved into fostering Kyrgyzstan participation in GSLEP activities on snow leopard monitoring and research (Component 3 all Outputs).

Stakeholder	Role
Private Sector	
Kyrgyz community based tourism association (KCBTA)	To be involved in training of local communities to develop ecological tourism facilities and infrastructure for PAs financial sustainability as well as marketing of such community-based tours (Output 1.2 and 2.5).
Ayil Bank and micro-credit companies	The bank has experience in supporting agriculture and rural development and is considered one of the key potential partners of the implementation of the Micro Credit Alternative Livelihoods Facility (Output 2.5).

A.4. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment*. Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes /no)?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes /no)?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women 48.9%, men 51.1%)? ¹¹

In 2015, the total population of Kyrgyz Republic of 5,895,000 persons included 2,978,000 women and 2,917,000 men. The population gender distribution across the country differs. In urban areas the share of women is higher than men and makes up 52.6 %, and in rural areas, where the birth rate is higher, the ratio of men is a majority at 50.6%.

In the 2014 edition of the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI), Kyrgyzstan reportedly has medium levels of discrimination against women in social institutions (SIGI score of 0.1598). It has low category of discrimination in family code, medium - in restricted civil liberties and physical integrity and high – in son bias and access to resources and assets. In 2014, the ratio of female to male primary education enrolment was 96%. The ratio of female to male secondary school enrolment was 97%. The share of women, who graduated higher educational institutions in 2015, was 54.7%. In the same year, women constituted 40.8% of the total employed population of Kyrgyzstan.

In general, statutory law provides a foundation for equal rights and protections for women and men and for women's rights to land and property. However, traditional strict stereotypes of men and women's roles in society and in household remain. It is believed that men should play the role of breadwinner and household leader, while women should confine themselves to domestic and children care work within the home. The Kyrgyz Constitution prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex. It provides that everyone is equal before the law and that men and women are accorded equal opportunities and freedoms. The constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic incorporates into its legal system international treaties that the Kyrgyz Republic is party to.¹² In 1997, Kyrgyzstan has ratified Convention on Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW),¹³ which puts an affirmative obligation on State Parties to take appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women and ensure, among other things, the same rights for both spouses in respect of the ownership, acquisition, management, administration, enjoyment and disposition of property (CEDAW).

The Kyrgyz National Strategy for Gender Equality by 2020 and National Action Plan for Achieving Gender Equality for 2012-2014 were adopted in June 2012. The law “On the Basics of the State Guarantees for Ensuring Gender Equality”¹⁴ prohibits explicit and implicit gender discrimination and does not support norms of common law, tradition and culture that discriminate against gender. It guarantees equal rights to ownership of property, provides for equal use rights to land, where rights are granted in this way, and provides equal protection of rights to land for men and women.

The Family Code of the Kyrgyz Republic governs family relations. It provides that the family is the basic social unit in Kyrgyzstan, only registered marriages are recognized, and family relations are regulated in accordance with principles of equality of the spouses'. Under the Family Code, a marriage can end in two ways, (a) by the death of one spouse, or (b) by petition for termination (divorce) of one spouse; in each case the end of the marriage must be registered. ¹⁵

¹¹ Same as footnote 8 above.

¹² Put into force by the Law of the Kyrgyz Republic as on June 27, 2010.

¹³ Adopted by the Law of the Kyrgyz Republic as on February 10, 1997.

¹⁴ Adopted on March 12, 2003, № 60.

¹⁵ Family Code of the Kyrgyz republic as of August 30, 2003, № 201.

The Family Code also provides that all property acquired by the spouses during their marriage is considered joint property, and joint property is managed with the consent of both spouses. Any property that belonged to a spouse before the marriage or gifts or inheritance received by one spouse during the marriage is considered personal property of the spouse. At divorce, joint property of the spouses is divided equally among them, unless otherwise stated in a marital agreement. Inheritance. Kyrgyz formal law governing succession permits both sons and daughters the right to inherit.

The Family Code and the inheritance legal provisions apply to private land, and do not apply to pastures, which are categorized as state land, with their responsibility and management devolved to the Pasture Users Associations. Instead, women's and men's rights to pastures are based on being resident in a locality and thereby member of a pasture users association. In practice, women's use of pastures and role in pastures management are governed by customs.

Women in Kyrgyzstan experience rather limited access to economic opportunities. Women's independent economic activity has decreased almost two times within the decades since the country's independence. Women are highly represented in the informal labor market and in certain service and trade sectors, which are high risk and lack social guarantees. Women in Kyrgyzstan spend three times more time on housework than men (18.8 and 6.5 hours, respectively). This number is higher in rural areas where women perform an additional 2 hours of housework¹⁶. In 2012, women headed 27 per cent of households nationwide.

During PPG stage, UNDP employed an inclusive approach for local communities' consultations (e.g. focus group discussions with different social groups, including women, to capture their views and aspirations) and this has contributed to broad community consultations and better sense of inclusion, including women. Through inclusive community-based institutions for pasture management, small holding farmers owners will benefit from improved access to pastures, as pasture committees will be assisted in grouping and organizing herding of animals of small-scale animal owners, including women, by herders who are issued pasture tickets. While it was reported by IFAD that women's participation in decision-making bodies for community-based pasture management is rather limited and there may be maximum 2-3 female members in a pasture committee which normally has the membership of about 15-18¹⁷. The UNDP-GEF project will try to improve women representation in all community-based bodies in the targeted communities up to 25%.

The issue of gender and women's empowerment, including issues such as their participation and role in community based natural resource management bodies and workload balance will be in focus of UNDP project gender equality promoting strategy. The inclusive social mobilization approach to enhanced women's participation in consultation process and access to land, pasture and forest resources of rural communities, including women, as well as project activities on alternative livelihoods support that directly contributing to women's economic empowerment will be duly addressed by the project.

Under the Land Code, women and men have equal rights to access and manage land with no specific gender related provisions. Likewise the Civil Code does not elaborate separately on women's rights to have access to property other than land and to enter into contracts in their own names. However, property is routinely registered in the name of husbands or male relatives, as property ownership is seen as a male prerogative. In addition, most married couples live in property belonging to the husband's parents, meaning that the wife often has no legal claim on the property at all. Many women are still unaware of their rights and the opportunities available to them as a result of the land reform processes that began in the 1990s. Even when they do know their rights, registering a farm is a complex administrative process. When women are allocated land in their own right, it is often of poor quality for farming, and they are often denied access to land belonging to their husbands in the event of divorce or widowhood.¹⁸

Woman lack education, access to productive resources, and technical training that would enable them to increase productivity above subsistence levels, and increase wealth. Under the Family Code and the Civil Code, within registered marriages, spouses have equal property rights, but this does not apply to unregistered, religious marriages, leaving many women unable to claim their property rights when the relationship breaks down. Women and men have the same rights to access bank loans and credit. Many women apply for loans; however, many of them not fully understand their rights and the procedures involved. The fact that most property is registered to men rather than women makes it difficult for women to secure credit, as they cannot provide collateral for loans. High bank charges and rates of interest also hamper

¹⁶ National Statistics Committee, Women and Men of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2015.

¹⁷ IFAD, Kyrgyz Republic Agricultural Investments and Services Project Performance Assessment, 2016.

¹⁸ Land Code of the Kyrgyz Republic as of June 1999, № 45 (last amendments as of 28.07.2015).

women's access to credit. However, conducted interviews with local financial institutions findings proved that women are more responsible in paying back credits and interests.

The project activities have been designed to address some of these gender-related issues, as follows:

The project will facilitate the employment, training and equipping of woman as targeted PAs staff (Output 1.1), joint patrol trainers and community rangers (Output 1.4), community mobilizing officers (Output 1.4), and leskhoz forest enforcement staff (Output 2.3). The project will actively encourage the equitable use of women labor and supervisors from local rural villages in: identifying and designating wildlife corridors near the targeted PAs (Output 2.1), the planning and implementation of pasture management plans and restoration of degraded pastures (Output 2.3); and the planning and restoration of high conservational value forests (Output 2.4).

The project will ensure that women-owned and/or managed businesses participate equitably in the procurement of project-funded equipment and infrastructure (all outputs). In some instances, the project may adopt a preferential procurement approach to the provision of minor services and supplies (e.g. supply of rations for park rangers, accommodation) from local women-led businesses.

The project will ensure that the reach of project-funded education/awareness-raising programs, and skills training in the targeted communes of Cholpon-Ata, Kyzyl-Ozgorush, Kok-Irim and Atai close to Alatai and Kan-Achuu SNPs will include both male- and female-headed households from the targeted villages (all outputs).

The project will ensure that the interests of women and women-headed households are adequately represented on SNP Steering Committees (Output 1.4), Pasture Committees (Output 2.3) and JFM Boards (Output 2.4); and are actively involved in the planning of protected areas, pastures and forests in the project planning domain. The project will ensure that the reach of project-funded sustainable livelihood development support in will equitably include both male- and female-headed households from the targeted villages the targeted communes of Cholpon-Ata, Kyzyl-Ozgorush, Kok-Irim and Atai close to Alatai and Kan-Achuu SNPs (all outputs). The project will actively assist women-headed households living in the targeted communes of Cholpon-Ata Kyzyl-Ozgorush, Kok-Irim and Atai close to Alatai and Kan-Achuu SNPs to access: (i) micro-financing for sustainable livelihoods; and (ii) technical and financial support from project for more sustainable pasture management practices and agriculture (Output 2.5).

The project will commit dedicated financial and technical support to addressing the significant knowledge constraints in pasture users from women-headed households. The project will ensure that the National Strategy on Snow Leopard Conservation includes strategies, activities and budgets that will enable and finance the equitable involvement of women in the implementation of the action plan. The project will advocate for an increase in the number of women involved in research and monitoring of snow leopard and prey populations. The project will collaborate with the project-contracted businesses and international experts to continually develop and implement mechanisms that may further strengthen the capacities of local women and women-headed households across the project's planning domain. The project has targeted the involvement of at least 30% of women participation in all the project activities and events, and direct benefits for women of at least 30% project micro-financing of sustainable livelihoods program.

A.5 Risk. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

Project risks and risk mitigation measures have been significantly improved. The revised risks and risk mitigation measures are described in the table below:

Identified Risks and Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Mitigation Measures
State and municipal institutions responsible for the administration of protected areas, pastures and forests do not have adequate capacity to support, maintain and	High	Moderately likely	High	The project will seek to significantly strengthen and expand the current

Identified Risks and Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Mitigation Measures
enforce working agreements with communities, pasture users' groups, forest users' groups living adjacent to SPNAs				capabilities of the key institutions, ¹⁹ that are directly responsible for the planning and management of protected areas, natural habitats, pastures and forests across the snow leopard range in the Western Tian Shan region of Kyrgyzstan. More specifically, it will assist in development of a well-trained and properly equipped management, monitoring, enforcement, community liaison and pastoral and forest groups staff in the targeted SPNAs, leskhozoes, local state administrations and self-governance bodies of the communities. UNDP PMU will iteratively develop an institutional sustainability plan to ensure that the different project investments in building the capacity of the targeted institutions are maintained (and scaled-up, if feasible and affordable) beyond the project. The project will also support the implementation of SPNA 'business planning' on income-generating opportunities (e.g. income from tourist fees, pasture tax, forest use and leasing fees, income from fines, etc.) to further augment the current budgets of the responsible institutions.
Low levels of compliance with environmental legislation, and a reluctance to adopt more sustainable natural resource use practices, leads to the further degradation of, and loss of productivity in, snow leopard and prey habitats.	High	Moderately likely	Medium	The project has adopted the following approaches to addressing this risk. The project will seek for <u>compliance</u> with environment enabling frames to expand the area of biodiversity and snow leopard and prey protection, as well as to improve the monitoring and enforcement capabilities across the snow leopard range in the Western Tian Shan. The project will specifically: support operationalization of two targeted PA; upgrading HCVF and SFM (Output 1.1., and 1.2 enabling framework); enhance PA staff capacities on PA and HCVF effective management (Output 1.3.); and implementation of a joint patrol system in (Output 1.4); as well as strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities (knowledge, training, skills, equipment and staff) in the responsible state agencies (Output 3.2); build the capacity of border and customs officials to improve the detection of illegal wildlife trade (Output 3.1); and facilitate the establishment of a

¹⁹ State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry and its branches on the national and local levels, Department of Pasture under the Ministry of Agriculture, Processing Industry and Melioration, Ministry of Internal Affairs, State Customs Service, Public Prosecutor Office, Border Guard Service, judges, local State administrations of the Jalal-Abad Province and moreover of the Toktogul and Toguz –Toro Districts, Local Self-Governance Bodies, etc.

Identified Risks and Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Mitigation Measures
				<p>coordination mechanism of different state institutions in combatting wildlife crime (Output 3.1-3.2). To address <u>reluctance</u>, the project will seek to incentivize an incremental shift to more sustainable land use (focused on grazing and forest use) practices. The project will specifically: align target districts' and communities' development plans with biodiversity conservation, SLM and SFM provisions (Output 2.2.); facilitate the economic beneficiation of communities living around target parks in return for a reduction in illegal activities by rehabilitating degraded pastures and restoration of degraded forests promoting participatory SLM and SFM provisions (Output 2.3 and 2.4); and conduct an ecosystem services valuation of target PAs (Output 1.1); as well as provide small grants to assist rural communities and local governments to shift to environmentally sustainable livelihoods (Output 2.5). Additionally, to address the risk, the project will seek to improve the <u>awareness</u> of rural communities living in the snow leopard range on the importance of conserving snow leopard, their prey and their habitats. The project will specifically: support new PAs to develop and implement communication strategy (Output 1.1); strengthen the knowledge and awareness of sustainable pasture management in the Pasture Management Committees (Output 2.3); strengthen the knowledge and awareness of sustainable forest management in JFM Boards of the targeted leskhozoes (Output 1.2);</p>
<p>Low levels of coordination and cooperation between public institutions, tenure holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users leads to conflicts over any changes in use rights in SPNAs and high altitude pastures and forests</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Moderately likely</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>The project is building on the lessons learnt from the previous UNDP experience on cooperation with communities and local and regional authorities in the implementation of project interventions on democratic governance, poverty reduction, disaster risks reduction and environment. It suggests that a high level of engagement and local ownership among local stakeholders will be maintained in this project, with careful attention given to stakeholder consultation, participation and conflict resolution. The project will work closely with the administration of the targeted SPNAs, leskhozoes, local state administrations, local self-governance bodies, Pasture Management Committees, JFM Boards and other CBOs in ensuring the effective involvement of all affected stakeholders in</p>

Identified Risks and Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Mitigation Measures
				<p>the implementation of project activities. The project will specifically work through (and assist in establishing) the coordinating structures of Park Public Councils, Pasture Committees and JFM Boards as an institutional mechanism to improve the communication, collaboration and cooperation between tenure holders, rights holders, natural resource users and the relevant state, regional and local administrations. The project will also strengthen the knowledge and skills of protected area staff, pasture and forest users and managers in order to facilitate a more collaborative approach in the planning, implementation and enforcement of sustainable forest and pasture management practices. A stakeholder participation plan will be prepared as the project is further developed.</p>
<p>The increasing aridization of mountainous habitats, as a result of the adverse effects of climate change, leads to more intensive and extensive grazing pressures on pastures, and potentially leading to forest vertical boundaries shift and species change as well as the local extirpation of snow leopard and medium-sized prey.</p>	Moderate	Unlikely	Low	<p>The effects of climate change are likely to exacerbate the effects of the existing threats to snow leopard, their prey and their habitats. They are however not likely (under current climate change scenarios) to result in the emergence of new, potentially catastrophic threats. The project has thus been developed to improve the capacity of the country to proactively and more effectively address the current threats in anticipation of a future increase in the extent and intensity of the threats as a result of changing climate.</p> <p>Snow leopards and their prey have large home ranges and should – assuming safe access to available habitats - be able to move in response to the projected effects and impacts of climate-change. The project has thus adopted a landscape-scale approach, with a strong emphasis on maintaining viable and secure movement corridors between formal protected areas.</p> <p>However, the project will contribute to implementation of the sectoral adaptation program adopted by SAEPF according to the Governmental Climate Change Adaptation Priorities. A study on the impact of climate change on the key species of the Western Tian Shan biodiversity will be conducted (Output 1.3) with the involvement of PAs, leskhozoes, scientists, researchers in more rigorously monitoring the effects of climate change, especially on snow leopard and prey and collaborating in regional initiatives to develop strategies to mitigate and manage these effects.</p>

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

i. Institutional Arrangements

This project will be implemented within the context of the UN programming frameworks driven by the Government, particularly the UN Development Assistance Framework for 2011-2016 (UNDAF) and the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan for 2011-2016 (CPAP). In turn, these frameworks are congruent with the Government priorities outlined in the National Strategy of Sustainable Development for 2013-2017 recently approved by the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, and the country's Programme on Transition to Sustainable Development for 2013-2017.

According to the DIM Authorization for the Kyrgyzstan Country Programme for the period 2012-2016, granted by Ms. Kori Udovichki, UNDP RBEC Regional Director on January 11th, 2012, the project will be executed by UNDP. The project organization structure will consist of a Project Board, Project Assurance, Project Management and Implementation Units (PMU and PIU) and at the national level, will be part of UNDP's National Project Management Unit in the Kyrgyz Republic. Roles and responsibilities are described below.

Project Board: The Project Board (PB) will be responsible for making management decisions for the project, in particular when guidance is required by the Project Coordinator. It will play a critical role in project monitoring and evaluations by assuring the quality of these processes and associated products, and by using evaluations for improving performance, accountability and learning. The PB will ensure that required resources are committed. It will also arbitrate on any conflicts within the project and negotiate solutions to any problems with external bodies. Based on the approved Annual Work Plan (AWP), the PB can also consider and approve the quarterly plans and approve any essential deviations from the original plans. The project will be subject to PB meetings at least twice every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first six months of the start of full implementation. At the initial stage of project implementation, the PB may, if deemed advantageous, wish to meet more frequently to build common understanding and to ensure that the project is initiated properly.

To ensure UNDP's ultimate accountability for project results, PB decisions will be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition. In case consensus cannot be reached within the PB, the final decision will rest with the UNDP.

Members of the PB will consist of key national government and non-government agencies, and appropriate local level representatives. UNDP will also be represented on the PB, which will have appropriate representation in terms of gender. Potential members of the PB will be reviewed and recommended for approval during the Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meeting. In addition, PB meetings will be open to observer organizations, which can comment and provide input on project activities, and potential decisions, although only PB members will have decision-making powers. The PB will contain three distinct roles:

Executive Role: This individual will represent the project "owners" and will chair the group. It is expected that SAEPF will appoint a senior official to this role who will ensure full government support of the project.

Senior Supplier Role: This requires the representation of the interests of the funding parties for specific cost sharing projects and/or technical expertise to the project. The Senior Supplier's primary function within the PB will be to provide guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project. This role will rest with UNDP-Kyrgyzstan represented by the Resident Representative.

Senior Beneficiary Role: This role requires representing the interests of those who will ultimately benefit from the project. The Senior Beneficiary's primary function within the PB will be to ensure the realization of project results from the perspective of project beneficiaries. This role will rest with the other institutions (key national governmental and non-governmental agencies, and appropriate local level representatives) represented on the PB, who are stakeholders in the project.

Project Assurance: The Project Assurance role supports the PB Executive role by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. The Project Assurance role will rest with the Programme and Policy Analyst

in charge of Environment/Energy and Disaster Risk Management of UNDP Kyrgyzstan, and its Programme Oversight and Support Unit (POSU.)

National Project Management (PMU) Unit: This project will be part of the National Project Management Unit of UNDP stationed in capital Bishkek in the Kyrgyz Republic, whose main function is to provide everyday technical level implementation support to projects of which is it comprised. The project Coordinator (SC-8) will be based in Bishkek and hosted by the PMU, and will be in charge of the overall project implementation with a an implementation function of the Component III of the project at the national level aimed at improving national biodiversity legal framework, promoting regional and global cooperation on snow leopard and ecosystem protection, and working closely with the GSLEP Secretariat which is based in Bishkek and other Snow Leopard network partners. The PC will also be directly overseeing implementation of project components I and II, which will be implemented by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) in the Toktogul area of Jalal-Abad province. The Project Coordinator will have the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the PB. The Project Coordinator's prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The PC will be recruited in accordance with UNDP regulations and will have a direct reporting line to UNDP Dimension Chief on Sustainable Development and the PMU Manager, with overall thematic and quality assurance guidance from the UNDP CO Environment/Energy and DRM Programme and Policy Analyst. The PC will be responsible for overall project coordination and implementation, consolidation of work plans and project papers, preparation of quarterly progress reports, reporting to the project supervisory bodies, and supervising the work of the project experts and other project staff. Under direct supervision of the PC, the Project Assistant will be responsible for administrative and financial issues, and will get support from the UNDP CO and National PMU Operations units as appropriate. The PMU will assist SAEPPF in performing its role as implementing partner, and will also play a coordinating role to maximize efficiency of standalone projects and avoid possible duplication, in line compliance with country development priorities, global environment trends and UNDP's corporate policy.

Project Implementation Unit (PIU): A PIU will be established in the Toktogul district of Jalal-Abad province comprising two regular Field Specialists (SC6) and the Project Driver (SC3.) The Project Driver will provide transportation and other logistical services to the project staff to achieve project's goals and objectives. The PIU, with the programmatic support and guidance from the Bishkek based PMU, following UNDP procedures on implementation of DIM projects, will identify national experts and consultants, and international experts as appropriate to undertake technical work. The national and international companies may also be involved in project implementation. These consultants and companies will be hired under standard prevailing UNDP procedures on implementation of DIM projects. Project field specialists and related staff will spend a large portion of their time in the field, and will be directly guided by the PC, with thematic guidance from the DC and CO PPA on Environment, Energy and DRM. National UNV's (United Nations Volunteers) will be based in both project localities (Toktogul and Toguz-Toro), and will aid the project with community mobilization, public information and education activities and other outreach activities.

In addition and as mentioned above, the UNDP Country Office and National PMU in capital Bishkek will provide specific support services for project realization through its Programme Oversight and Support" and "Operations" Units as required.

To mainstream UNDP Kyrgyzstan publicity at the local and national level, the project will provide information and communication support to all projects and initiatives implemented in Kyrgyzstan through its support staff, which will include Project Communication/PR Specialist and ICT specialists. When required, operational and project related support to the project will be carried out by the Project Assistant of the Environment for Sustainable Development Programme (ESDP), and will benefit from the UNDP PMU transportation services. The project, based upon the need, will also hire long and short-term local and international experts. In-depth ToR's for the project posts will be drafted by UNDP to outline duties and functions of project personnel in more detail, and hires for both the principal staff and project experts will be conducted in line with UNDP rules and procedures.

ii. Coordination

Implementation of the proposed project will be fully coordinated with a number of on-going relevant GEF-financed initiatives, in order to avoid duplication and increase synergies and effectiveness. At regional level, strong coordination will be sought with the regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan) UNDP-GEF medium-sized

project “*Transboundary Cooperation for Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation.*” The implementation phase of the regional project (2015-2018) will overlap with the implementation phase of this project (2017-2021). This project will, thus, seek to adopt and operationalize, at the national level, the relevant tools and guidelines that will be developed under the regional project particularly concerning snow leopard monitoring techniques and law enforcement bodies training on wildlife crime. The implementation of this project will, in particular, benefit significantly from the effective coordination of efforts, and sharing of knowledge between the projects using existing on-line platforms created under initiatives such as NBSAP Forum and BES-Net led by UNDP. The coordination will be established with SLT implementing the regional project

There are two GEF financed biodiversity conservation projects in snow leopard landscapes and ecosystems, implemented by UNDP in Central Asia: in Tajikistan UNDP/GEF Project “*Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir-Alay and Tian Shan ecosystems for Snow Leopard protection and sustainable community livelihoods*” and Uzbekistan UNDP/GEF Project “*Sustainable natural resource and forest management in key biodiversity areas important for Snow Leopard*”. The proposed project will work closely with each of these projects seeking opportunities to establish synergies and experience sharing between them. Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan submitted an application for inclusion of the mountains of the Western Tian Shan to the UNESCO World Heritage List, and the nomination was approved July 17, 2016. In this regards, this snow leopard-related project would contribute to the promotion of transboundary cooperation in Western Tian Shan.

On the national level the project will use the lessons from implemented UNDP/GEF Project “*Improving the coverage and management effectiveness of PAs in the Central Tian Shan Mountains*” in improving organization of work of joint anti-poaching group to protect snow leopard and other endangered species in Sarychat-Ertash GSLEP Landscape and capacity building for PA staff protecting snow leopard habitat in the Tian Shan Ridge.

In order to strengthen an Environmental Information Monitoring and Management System and policy frameworks for implementation of CBD, including protection of snow leopard, the proposed project will collaborate with UNDP/GEF project “*Strengthening of institutional and legal capacities to enable improvement of the national monitoring system and management of environmental information*”. An Environmental Information Monitoring and Management System will be the basis for adoption of a standard Snow Leopard Ecosystem Monitoring System. This project will contribute the system with the monitoring data compiled from the research and biodiversity inventory, as well as further monitoring updates from the newly established Alatai and Kan-Achuu PAs and targeted communities, thus contributing for the regular country reporting to three Rio Conventions.

The UNDP Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BioFin) will conceptually contribute to the long-term financial sustainability of this GEF project targeted PAs, through the support to drafting PA business plans complementary to PA management plans, as well as to valuation of ecosystem services in targeted PAs.

The Coordination and Consultative Council on piloting of institutional reform in the forest sector led by SAEPF brings together the donors and national and international stakeholders implementing the forest related projects. The key actors there are the World Bank, FAO and GIZ, which together with, SAEPF has initiated the piloting the sector reform in six leskhozoes. During the course of reform, the pilot leskhozoes will test different approaches to sustainable forest management involving local communities. These approaches will form the basis of a new forestry sector reform concept. The GEF-UNDP project will join the Coordination and Consultative Council in order to identify and develop opportunities for collaboration with other relevant development agencies. The plans and experiences on promotion of HCVF, Joint Forest Management and restoration of degraded forests and pastures will be duly shared and coordinated on this dialogue platform.

The World Bank \$16 million USD project “*Integrated Forest Ecosystems Management*” is starting up in Kyrgyzstan in the 2nd half of 2016. The project aims to support (i) Forest Sector Institutional Reform, (ii) Strategic Investments and Piloting of Sustainable Management Approaches in 12 pilot leskhozoes and (iii) the National Forest Inventory and Forest Management Informational System operationalization. The UNDP GEF supported project will seek to collaborate with this project on promotion of participatory forest management approaches, rehabilitation of degraded forests, as well as in elaboration of sectoral enabling framework on HCVF.

The project team will communicate and coordinate activities within Components 1 and 2 with the GIZ project “*Biodiversity Conservation and Poverty Reduction through Community-based Management of Walnut Forests and*

Pastures in Southern Kyrgyzstan”, which is financed out of the German Energy and Climate Fund and implemented by GIZ/UNIQUE Forest and Landuse GmbH in Jalal-Abad province, supporting the conservation of biodiversity in walnut-fruit forests in five leskhozoes, two of which are considered as contributing to the national process of piloting in forest reform.

The GEF funded FAO implemented project “*Sustainable Management of Mountainous Forest and Land Resources under the Climate Change conditions*” has accumulated considerable experiences on forest rehabilitation as well as land degradation improvement, also in terms of climate change mitigation research in forestry sector. The new GEF-UNDP project will build on the FAO experiences with degraded forests restoration and national forest policy improvement.

On pasture management the project team will cooperate with the IFAD-funded project “*Livestock and markets development*” under the Ministry of Agriculture, Processing Industry and Melioration implemented by Agency for Rural Investments Support (ARIS) to improve local pasture management plans and practices. A particular focus of this alignment of efforts will be on harmonizing the financial and technical support provided to rural communities in implementing more sustainable pasture management practices in high altitude grasslands.

The project will also seek to develop collaborative agreements with key international NGO partners (SLT, Panthera, NABU, SLF, WWF) and national and international research institutions to support the implementation of selected project activities (e.g. snow leopard and prey surveys and monitoring, specialized training, public awareness-raising, forest and grassland restoration planning, smart patrol system development, etc.). The project will, within the framework of these collaborative agreement/s, then assist in reimbursing the costs of NGOs and academic institutions in the direct implementation of activities that fall directly within the ambit of the project outputs.

The project will specifically seek to build on the substantial foundational work already undertaken by Panthera and other partners in setting up community-based conservancies in the country. The Panthera project in Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan “*Study of snow leopard spatial ecology and monitoring of snow leopard populations and its prey species*” for 2015-2018 supports training of local communities in snow leopard monitoring and a snow leopard telemetry study.

While implementing this project UNDP will continue collaboration with UN Volunteers engage into various community mobilization projects. Two UN Volunteers will be engaged to mobilize targeted communities in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 Benefits. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

Socio-economic benefits will be enhanced in the project by incentivizing an incremental shift to more sustainable land use (focused on grazing and forest use) practices. The project will specifically: (i) facilitate economic benefits (from direct employment, contractual work, provision of services, income from hunting concessions, etc.) to communities living around targeted SPNAs, jointly within an overall community-based approach to reduce illegal activities in the SPNAs; (ii) help local governments to plan, source funding for and implement alternative livelihoods; (iii) provide technical and financial grant support to pastoralists as part of a joint management effort to shift to more sustainable pasture management practices; and (iv) provide small grants to assist rural communities and local governments to pilot land use and livelihood approaches that are aligned with SFM, SLM and biodiversity conservation principles. The project will primarily work through (and assist in establishing, where these have not yet been constituted) the coordinating structures of PA local Steering Committees, Pasture Management Committees and Joint Forest Management Boards, as means of improving the communication, collaboration and cooperation between tenure holders, rights holders, natural resource users and the relevant state, regional and local administrations.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form

(e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

Each project output will include the documentation of lessons learned from implementation of activities under the output, and a collation of the tools and templates (and any other materials) developed during implementation. The Project Coordinator will ensure the collation of all the project experiences and information. This knowledge database will then be made accessible to different stakeholder groups in order to support better future decision-making processes in snow leopard conservation and more consistent adoption of best practice.

Replication of good practices developed by the project will be achieved through the direct replication of selected project elements and practices and methods, as well as the scaling up of experiences. The following activities have preliminarily been identified as suitable for replication and/or scaling up: (i) implementation of joint patrol systems in SPNAs; (ii) demarcation of SPNA boundaries; (iii) formalizing and implementing co-management agreements with SPNA-adjacent village communities; (iv) rehabilitation and restoration of degraded high altitude pastures; (v) local demonstration sites for SFM and SLM activities; and (vi) new snow leopard and prey population monitoring technologies (e.g. camera traps, DNA analysis, and GPS collars). The lessons learnt in project implementation will be incorporated into the National Action Plan for Snow Leopard Conservation. The sharing of best practices and lessons learned in project implementation with other GSLEP member countries will be facilitated through regional GSLEP meetings and regular communications through the GSLEP Working Secretariat.

- B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1 *Consistency with National Priorities.* Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:

In addition to being in-line with and supportive of the relevant legislation and national programs indicated in the section of the project document on policy context, the project supports one of the key elements of the *2013-2017 Kyrgyzstan National Sustainable Development Strategy and Action Plan* which stipulates that restoration and conservation of natural resources must become one of the priorities of the country, as natural resources guarantee the future of next generations. Support of the Sustainable Forest Management activities under this project contribute to the implementation of yet another Sustainable Development Goal, which aims at reaching 5.62% forest cover of the country by 2017.

The project is an extension of the *Recommendations on Preservation of Snow Leopards and Their High Mountain Ecosystems* that were adopted at the international meeting on conservation of snow leopards held in Bishkek on December 3, 2012. Overall, the project proposal is consistent with the recommendations of the Global Snow Leopard Survival Strategy and has been a direct response to the request of the Government of Kyrgyzstan for assistance in the implementation of this Strategy. The entire set of recommendations has been reflected in the project document, and they all have been adapted to the situation in Kyrgyzstan. It is obvious that, by implementing these activities it is possible to create conditions for preservation and increase of snow leopard population in Western Tian Shan. The project is closely linked to the Action Plan on implementation of the “*National Strategy for Snow Leopard Conservation in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2013-2023*”, specifically on the following items under the National Strategy: II) Improving the institutional base; III) Study of snow leopards, its habitat and the food bases; IV) Training employees of public bodies and PAs; and V) Environmental education and increasing of awareness among local population.

The project is consistent with the *National Forestry Sector Development Concept (2004 – 2025)*, which classifies mountainous forests (including wild fruit and relict coniferous forests) as highly valuable and requires appropriate management, conservation, and rehabilitation. The *National Forest Program 2005 - 2015* further stipulates activities with respect to appropriate monitoring and improvement of high value forests. The *National Programme on Walnut-Fruit Plantations till 2025*, which is currently implemented in the southern Kyrgyzstan, envisages wide engagement of local communities forest management units in the walnut and fruit forest management.

The project focuses on the highland areas of the Western Tian Shan, and thus conforms to the *National State of Environment Report* (approved by the Government Resolution effective as of 07.08.2012), which confirms that the high

mountains are islands of biological wealth amid relatively poor plains and that protected areas play a key role in maintaining biodiversity. It is in line with Kyrgyzstan's *National Mid-Term Development Plan* that emphasizes the importance of protected areas, especially in mountain regions.

Recently, the Kyrgyz Republic has adopted the NBSAP (entitled *Priorities on Biodiversity Conservation in the Kyrgyz Republic*) for 2014-2023. Creation of PAs in snow leopard habitat is one of the key activities envisioned by the process. Furthermore, the experts who participated in elaboration of this project document were also involved in NBSAP development. Thus, this GEF project will contribute at the policy level to formulation of PA policies and standards that would be subsequently shared with the team working on the NBSAP so that these can be duly incorporated into national legislation.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) activities.

Project Start-up

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first four months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, the UNDP Country Office (CO) and, where appropriate/feasible, regional technical policy and program advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO, SAEPF and the UNDP-GEF Regional Service Centre (RSC) vis-à-vis the project team. Discuss the 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 will be discussed again, as needed.
- b) Based on the Project Results Framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool, if appropriate, finalize the first Annual Work Plan (AWP). Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and re-check assumptions and risks.
- c) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- d) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- e) Plan and schedule project Steering Committee (SC) meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organization structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first SC meeting should be held within the first six months following the inception workshop, if it is not held jointly with the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop Report is a key reference document and must be prepared within 3 months of the Inception Workshop, and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high.
- Based on the information recorded in ATLAS, a Project Progress Report (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period. The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual)
- Lesson learned/good practice
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR)
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through Site Visits

UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF RSC will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Steering Committee may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RSC and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Steering Committee members.

Mid-term of Project Cycle

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Review (MTR) at the mid-point of project implementation. The MTR will determine progress being made toward 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 MTR will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this MTR will be prepared by the UNDP CO, based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RSC. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term review cycle.

End of Project

An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Steering Committee meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The terminal evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the MTR, if any such correction took place). The terminal evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO, based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RSC.

The terminal evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP ERC.

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the terminal evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. 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 results.

Learning and Knowledge Sharing

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project through existing information sharing networks and forums.

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.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and Visibility Requirements

Full compliance is required with UNDP’s Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP logo can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is required with the GEF’s Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the “GEF Guidelines”). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf. Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Costed M&E Work Plan, with Roles, Responsibilities and Timing

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Timeframe
Inception Workshop and Report	PM UNDP CO UNDP-GEF RSC	Indicative cost: \$10,000	Within first four months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	PM will, with support from the UNDP-GEF RSC, oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	PM	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
Project Steering Committee Meetings	PM UNDP CO	Indicative cost: \$10,000 (\$2,000 annually)	Annually, at the end of the calendar year for approval of following year’s workplan and budget
ARR/PIR	PM UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP ERC	None	Annually
Quarterly implementation reports, including risk monitoring and lessons	PM	None	Quarterly
Completion of relevant GEF Tracking Tools	PM UNDP CO	None	At mid-term (in conjunction with MTR), and at completion (in conjunction with TE)


Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Timeframe
Independent External Mid-term Review (MTR)	PM UNDP CO UNDP RSC External Consultants	Indicative cost: 25,000	At the mid-point of project implementation, prior to completion of the 2 nd PIR.
Independent External Terminal Evaluation (TE)	PM UNDP CO UNDP RSC External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: 25,000	Within the last three months of project implementation.
Project Terminal Report, including Lessons Learned	PM UNDP CO local consultant	None	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	UNDP CO Project manager and team	Indicative cost: 10,000	Twice: at mid-term and as late as possible before project completion
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RSC (as appropriate) Government representatives	For GEF-supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget.	Annually
TOTAL indicative COST <i>Excluding project staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>		US\$ 80,000	

Note: Costs included in this table are part and parcel of the UNDP Total Budget and Work Plan (TBW) in the PRODOC, and not additional to it.

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies²⁰ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP- GEF Executive Coordinator.		October 21, 2016	Maxim Vergeichik Regional Technical Advisor, EBD	+ 90 850 2882 607	maxim.vergeichik@undp.org

²⁰ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-Dec2015

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Program Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:	UNDAF Pillar C, Outcome 2: By end of 2016 sustainable management of energy, environment and natural resources practices operationalized. UNDAF Pillar C, Outcome 2 Indicators: % of people living in ecosystems resilient to climate change; % increase in agricultural production for markets and households; Country Program Outcome A.2.9: Environment and climate change integrated into pro poor (socio-economic) development policies and programs
Country Program Outcome Indicators:	% of people who have equitable access to ecosystem services by province; % of water use efficiency for agricultural and energy production; % of population benefiting from non-carbon energy sources
Applicable GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategic Objectives, Programs, Outcomes, Indicators:	BD-1, Program 1, Outcome 1.2, Indicator 1.2 BD-1, Program 2, Outcome 2.2, Indicator 2.2 BD-4, Program 9, Outcome 9.1, Indicator 9.1
Applicable GEF-6 Land Degradation Strategic Objectives, Programs, Outcomes, Indicators:	LD – 3, Program 4, Outcome 3.2, Indicator 3.2
Applicable GEF-6 Sustainable Forest Management Strategic Objectives, Programs, Outcomes, Indicators:	SFM – 1, Program 2, Outcome 1, Indicator 1 SFM – 2, Program 5, Outcome 3, Indicator 3 SFM – 3, Program 7, Outcome 5, Indicator 5
Project Goal:	Improve the status of globally significant biodiversity, and improve the provision of ecosystem services from forest and land resources in Kyrgyzstan’s Western Tian Shan mountains, supporting sustainable livelihoods.

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
<i>Objective: To promote a landscape approach to protection of internationally important biodiversity, and land and forest resources in the Western Tian Shan mountains in Kyrgyzstan</i>	1. Trend in population levels of globally significant fauna (Red List, ecosystem indicator or keystone species) in Jalal-Abad province: - Snow leopard (<i>Panthera uncia</i>) - Ibex (<i>Capra sibirica</i>)	Negative trend over the past 25 years of individuals that are present at least sometime during the year in Jalal-Abad province. Number of individuals and annual rate of change: - Snow leopard (<i>Panthera uncia</i>): 49; <0% - Ibex (<i>Capra sibirica</i>): 4116; <3%	Population trend is at least stable over a rolling five-year period. Number of individuals and annual rate of change: - Snow leopard (<i>Panthera uncia</i>): 49; >0% - Ibex (<i>Capra sibirica</i>): 4839; >3%	Consensus of annual monitoring data from: - Department of Rational Use of Natural Resources (SAEPF) - National Academy of Sciences - Department of Protected Areas (SAEPF) - Non-government sources	Assumptions: - Economic and political stability allows local resource users to invest in long-term planning and conservation of resources - Populations of key species are still at self-sustaining levels, or can be sufficiently augmented by

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Golden eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>) - Tian Shan white clawed bear (<i>Ursus arctos isabellinus</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Golden eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>): 31; <1% - Tian Shan white clawed bear (<i>Ursus arctos isabellinus</i>): 197; <4% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Golden eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>): 40; >1% - Tian Shan white clawed bear (<i>Ursus arctos isabellinus</i>): 256; >5% 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - colonization from other regions - Wildlife and biodiversity requirements in landscape buffer zones and corridors are not fully incompatible with local economic land uses
	<p>2. Status of globally significant flora in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Semenov's fir (<i>Abies Semenovii</i>) - Juniper (<i>Juniperus sp.</i>) - Relict spruce (<i>Picea schrenkiana</i>) 	<p>Index of area and forest quality of globally significant flora in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts (ha):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Semenov's fir (<i>Abies Semenovii</i>) – Total = 4,281.8 ha: Ha - Category 1: 2,025.1 (47%) Ha – Category 2: 1,728.3 (40%) Ha – Category 3: 528.4 (12%) Ha – Category 4: 0 (0%) - Juniper (<i>Juniperus sp.</i>) – Total = 6,847.3 ha: Ha - Category 1: 694.4 (10%) Ha – Category 2: 4,254.9 (62%) Ha – Category 3: 1,898 (28%) Ha – Category 4: 0 (0%) - Relict spruce (<i>Picea schrenkiana</i>) – Total = 2,125.5 ha: Ha - Category 1: 850.6 (40%) Ha – Category 2: 1,048.8 (49%) Ha – Category 3: 226.1 (11%) Ha – Category 4: 0 (0%) 	<p>Index of area and forest quality of globally significant flora in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Semenov's fir (<i>Abies Semenovii</i>) – Total = 4,281.8 ha: Ha - Category 1: 2,225.1 Ha – Category 2: 1,956.3 Ha – Category 3: 100.4 Ha – Category 4: 0 - Juniper (<i>Juniperus sp.</i>) – Total = 7,171.8 ha: Ha - Category 1: 1289.1 Ha – Category 2: 4,701.7 Ha – Category 3: 1,181.0 Ha – Category 4: 0 - Relict spruce (<i>Picea schrenkiana</i>) – Total = 4,202.6 ha: Ha - Category 1: 1,745.7 Ha – Category 2: 2,456.9 Ha – Category 3: 0 Ha – Category 4: 0 	<p>Consensus of annual monitoring data from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Department (SAEPF) - Toktogul and Toguz-Toro leskhozoes - National Academy of Sciences - Department of Protected Areas (SAEPF) - Non-government sources 	<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – State institutions responsible for the administration of protected areas, pastures and forests do not have adequate capacity; – Low levels of compliance with environmental legislation, and a reluctance to adopt more sustainable natural resource use practices; – Low levels of coordination and cooperation between public institutions, tenure holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users; – Increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change.
	<p>3. Area of degraded pastureland in four target A/As in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts - Cholpon-Ata</p>	65,361 ha (estimated based on relevant available data)	0 ha (decrease of 65,361 ha)	Assessment at end of project via e-Pasture Management System and rapid assessment of change in degraded area	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of SLM via e-Pasture Management System can

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kyzyl-Ozgorush - Kok-Irim - Atai 			<p>by national experts => GEF-6 PMAT LD TT (sheet 2, cell C17)</p> <p><u>GEF Global RF</u> <u>Linkage:</u> GEF-6 LD Global Indicators: Outcome 3.1: Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established Indicator 3.1: Demonstration results strengthening cross- sector integration of SLM Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities based on gender sensitive needs. Indicator 3.2: Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes</p> <p><u>UNDP IRRF Indicator</u> <u>Linkage:</u> IRRF Indicator 1.1.3: Number of new schemes which expand and</p>	<p>be achieved in lifetime of project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of SLM via dynamic annual grazing plans based on ecological conditions leads to reduced degradation of pastureland - PMCs are able to enforce grazing plans - Key driver of degradation is non- alignment of dynamic annual land carrying capacity with annual stocking levels - Key barriers are insufficient data on pasture conditions, insufficient data management to align annual dynamic carrying capacity with stocking levels, and capacity of PMCs to implement SLM measures based on available information <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PMCs cannot self- sustain the use of the e- Pasture Management System after project completion - Communities continue to increase livestock numbers beyond sustainable levels

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				diversify the productive base, based on the use of sustainable production technologies	
	4. Landscape area under directly improved conservation management	Area of Jalal-Abad province for which improved biodiversity, forest, and land management measures will be <u>directly</u> influenced by project results: - 0 ha	Area of Jalal-Abad province for which improved biodiversity, forest, and land management measures will be <u>directly</u> influenced by project results: - 472,635 ha (SFM in 34,382 ha of forest (the forested area under management by Toktogul and Toguz-Toro leskhozoes), restoration of degraded forest in 4,886 ha, implementation of SLM in 147,268 ha of pasturelands (65,361 ha of which is degraded pasturelands). In addition, 286,099 ha of protected areas, of which 87,322 ha are the two new PAs in the primary target districts.)	GEF-6 BD TT for Program 9 (cell C31) <u>GEF Global RF Linkage:</u> GEF 6 Global Indicators: Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management. Indicator 9.1 Production landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into their management preferably demonstrated by meeting national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) or	Assumptions: - Community and local government stakeholders maintain commitment to mainstream biodiversity considerations in economic activities in the wider landscape Risks: - Land use and natural resource management approaches necessary for biodiversity and ecosystem-integrity considerations are not compatible with local economic land use needs and priorities - Land tenure and usufruct tenure disputes delay implementation of project activities such that management measures are not fully adopted by the end of the project

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				<p>supported by other objective data.</p> <p><u>UNDP IRRF Indicator Linkage:</u> IRRF Indicator 1.5. Hectares of land that are managed sustainably under <i>in-situ</i> conservation, sustainable use, and/or an Access and Benefits Sharing (ABS) regime</p>	
	<p>5. Landscape area under indirectly improved conservation management</p>	<p>Area of Jalal-Abad province for which improved biodiversity, forest, and land management measures will be <u>indirectly</u> influenced by project results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 ha 	<p>Area of Jalal-Abad province for which improved biodiversity, forest, and land management measures will be <u>indirectly</u> influenced by project results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 944,317 ha (Area of two target districts, less the area of the PAs (87,322 ha), SFM land (34,382 ha), afforested area (4,886 ha), and SLM land (147,268 ha) covered in these districts under direct coverage above.) 	<p>GEF-6 BD TT for Program 9 (cell C32)</p> <p><u>GEF Global RF Linkage:</u> GEF-6 Global Indicators: Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management. Indicator 9.1 Production landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into their management preferably</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community and local government stakeholders maintain commitment to mainstream biodiversity considerations in economic activities in the wider landscape <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient data on key biodiversity areas and key species in time to adequately develop and integrate biodiversity considerations in district development plans before the end of the project

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				demonstrated by meeting national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) or supported by other objective data.	
	6. Population of Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts that have derived indirect livelihood benefits from project results (disaggregated by gender)	<p>Toktogul District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 women - 0 men <p>Toguz-Toro District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 women - 0 men <p>Baseline: 2015</p>	<p>Toktogul District communities of Cholpon-Ata and Kyzyl-Ozgorush</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8,979 women - 9,328 men <p>Toguz-Toro District communities of Kok-Irim and Atai</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2,723 women - 2,909 men 	<p>Population in directly targeted project areas, with assessment of livelihood benefits by 3rd party source (i.e. not government, not project team). Source for population figures www.stat.kg.</p> <p><u>UNDP IRRF Indicator Linkage:</u> IRRF Indicator 1.3.2: Number of new jobs and livelihoods created through management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste, disaggregated by sex 1.3.2.A: Number of additional people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods through solutions for</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project will have diffuse economic benefits for communities living closest to new PAs - The economic/livelihood benefits resulting from the project can be identified <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alignment of land and natural resource uses with biodiversity and other ecological considerations results in short-term negative livelihood impacts - Total economic / livelihood benefits may be felt unevenly within the local population

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste	
<i>Outcome 1: Conservation and sustainable management of Key Biodiversity Areas within landscape</i>	7. Management effectiveness of key alpine protected areas in Jalal-Abad province covering 286,099 ha	METT Score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alatai SNP (new PA): 17 - Kan-Achuu SNP (new PA): 16 - Sary-Chelek SBR: 59 - Padysh-Ata SNR: 45 - Besh Aral SNR: 43 - Saimaluu-Tash SNP: 29 	METT Score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alatai NP (new PA): >50 - Kan-Achuu NP (new PA): >50 - Sary-Chelek SNR: >65 - Padysh-Ata SNR: >50 - Besh Aral SNR: >50 - Saimaluu-Tash SNP: >40 	GEF-6 BD TT for Programs 1 and 2 (individual PA sheets, cell C147) <u>GEF Global RF Linkage:</u> GEF-6 Global Indicator: Outcome 1.2: Improved management effectiveness of protected areas. Indicator 1.2: Protected area management effectiveness score. Outcome 2.2: Improved management effectiveness of new protected areas. Indicator 2.2: Protected area management effectiveness score.	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project activities result in improved management of PAs - No new significant threats to targeted PAs emerge Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited capacity of national institutions responsible for PA management - No additional financial means identified to sustain improved PA management after project completion - Inadequate capacity to collect and manage biodiversity and other environmental monitoring data to support improved management - Development and adoption of PA management plans for new PAs requires more time than the project implementation period
	8. Status of HCVF management approach	HCVF management approach not legally recognized, and consequently not regulated	HCVF management approach has legal basis, and relevant regulations are produced,	Legal documents demonstrating adoption of HCVF in regulatory	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National stakeholders willingness to adopt

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	legal and regulatory framework			<p>or other legal documents at national level.</p> <p><u>GEF Global RF Linkage:</u> GEF-6 Global Indicators: Outcome 9.2 Sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations. Indicator 9.2 The degree to which sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations and implement the regulations.</p>	<p>internationally recognized HCVF approach for implementation in Kyrgyzstan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HCVF can be adequately adapted to Kyrgyzstan's unique national forest situation <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited capacity of national institutions responsible for forest management - Time required for formal legal adoption of HCVF approach at national level may take longer than lifetime of project
	9. Existence of HCVF management measures in FMPs and level of implementation in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts	<p>HCVF management measures not incorporated in FMPs in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts</p> <p>0/6 on GEF TT scale: No existence or mention of biodiversity (e.g. HCVF) considerations in sector policy</p>	<p>Implementation is initiated (defined as incorporation of HCVF management practices in approved FMPs) in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts</p> <p>4/6 on GEF TT scale: <i>"Step 4: The regulations are under implementation"</i></p>	<p>Approval of FMPs for leskhozoes in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts that include HCVF management measures in revised FMPs</p> <p><u>GEF Global RF Linkage:</u> GEF-6 Global Indicators: Outcome 9.2 Sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate</p>	

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				biodiversity considerations. Indicator 9.2 The degree to which sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations and implement the regulations.	
	10. Average number of hectares covered per week by anti-poaching patrols (PA rangers, forest rangers, and game wardens) in Alatai SNP (56,826 ha) and Kan-Achuu SNP (30,497 ha), Toktogul (104,860 ha) and Toguz-Toro (57,356 ha) leskhoz territories, and Chychkan Zoological (game) reserve (65,551 territories in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts, out of the 315,090 ha total SNP, leskhoz, and game reserve)	250 hectares patrolled per week in 2016 (10 km covered per day by ranger teams (2+ individuals) for each of five management areas for 5 of 7 days)	1000 hectares patrolled per week in 2021 (baseline * four times the number of anti-poaching ranger team patrols for each location. Assessed as the minimum coverage necessary to ensure effective management, regulatory monitoring, and deterrence of illegal activities)	Patrol records of PAs, leskhoz, and of Department of Rational Use of Natural Resources	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthened capacity for PA management in new PAs results in increased patrol coverage - Financial commitment by department of rational use of natural resources to increase patrol coverage in hunting areas outside of PAs - Increased patrol coverage is considered a PA management priority - Increased patrolling is desirable as a means leading to decreased violations (recorded or unrecorded) of hunting and other conservation regulations - Local community members are also educated and made aware of regulations, as a result of project activities or other

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
					<p>education and awareness initiatives by management authorities</p> <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial requirements for increased patrolling are too great for responsible PA, leskhoz, and game reserve management authorities - Local community members unwilling to participate in joint patrols due to time demands or other economic commitments
<i>Outcome 2: Ecosystem resilience and habitat connectivity in Western Tian Shan are enhanced by regulating land and forest use in buffer zones and corridors and support to sustainable livelihoods</i>	11. Area of sustainably managed forest in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts (broken down by HCVF in PAs, HCVF in leskhoz, and all other forest)	<p>Total 0 ha out of 40,839 ha of HCVF</p> <p>Toktogul HCVF: 31,045 ha (5,658 ha within Alatai PA, 25,387 ha in leskhoz);</p> <p>Toguz-Toro HCVF: 9,794 (799 within Kan-Achuu PA, 8,995 ha in leskhoz);</p>	>40,000 ha	GEF-6 SFM TT (cell E15 + cell E18)	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Toktogul and Toguz-Toro leskhoz remain willing to implement SFM measures, incorporating HCVF approaches in Forest Management Plans - Target PMCs remain willing to implement e-Pasture Management System - Local and national stakeholders are willing to adopt regulations codifying HCVF approach in Kyrgyzstan <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delays in project activities result in missed field
	12. Area of forest resources restored in the landscape (broken down by reforested/afforested area, vs. area under natural regeneration support	0 ha	4,886 ha (500 ha reforestation/afforestation, 4,500 ha supported for natural regeneration)	GEF-6 SFM TT (cell E21)	
	13. Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided	0 tons CO ₂ equivalent	2,979,548 tons CO ₂ equivalent	GEF-6 SFM TT (cell C27)	

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	14. Implementation of e-Pasture Management System (as an SLM mechanism supporting implementation of the Pastures Law) in Toguz-Toro and Toktogul districts	Pasture Management Committees (PMCs) do not have support mechanisms to implement SLM	e-Pasture Management System implemented by 4 PMCs in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts	Signed letter by PMCs validating implementation of e-Pasture Management System in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> seasons for planting and regenerating forest area – Fencing is too costly and time-consuming to procure and install to meet project target objectives for assisted regeneration – Forest pasture users are not willing to implement grazing regimes supportive of natural regeneration
	15. Hectares of alpine grassland and forest ecosystems under improved conservation management	0 ha	186,536 ha - SFM in 34,382 ha of HCVF, restore degraded forest in 4,886 ha, and implement SLM in 147,268 ha of pasturelands	<p>GEF-6 BD TT for Program 9 (cell C31 minus sum of cells D47:D52)</p> <p><u>GEF Global RF Linkage:</u> GEF-6 Global Indicators: Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management. Indicator 9.1 Production landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into their management preferably demonstrated by meeting national or international third-party</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Implementing HCVF approach and meeting project forest restoration targets leads to significant drop in leskhoz revenue – State institutions responsible for the administration of protected areas, pastures and forests do not have adequate capacity; – Low levels of compliance with environmental legislation, and a reluctance to adopt more sustainable natural resource use practices; – Low levels of coordination and cooperation between public institutions, tenure holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users; and

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) or supported by other objective data.	- The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change.
	16. Hectares of pastureland under SLM in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts	0 ha	147,268 ha	GEF-6 LD PMAT TT (sheet 2, cell C17, plus balance of non-degraded community pastureland used targeted for SLM (81,907 ha))	
	17. Number of people whose livelihoods are affected by land degradation in Toktogul and Toguz-Toro districts (with a population number index value fixed set at 100 for 2016 (in case of total population increases or decreases))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Women: 11,702 - Men: 12,237 - Total: 23,939 - Index = 100% <p>Toktogul District Cholpon-Ata Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3,562 women - 3,802 men <p>Kyzyl-Ozgorush Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5,417 women - 5,526 men <p>Toguz-Toro District Kok-Irim Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1,703 women - 1,782 men <p>Atai Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1,020 women - 1,127 men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Women: <11,702 - Men: <12,237 - Total: <23,939 - Index: <100% of total population <p>Toktogul District Cholpon-Ata Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3,562 women - 3,802 men <p>Kyzyl-Ozgorush Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5,417 women - 5,526 men <p>Toguz-Toro District Kok-Irim Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1,703 women - 1,782 men <p>Atai village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1,020 women - 1,127 men 	End of project survey on percentage of the local population whose livelihoods are affected by land degradation (populations of four communities with PMCs that the project will be working with)	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At current levels of land degradation, the livelihoods of all community members are affected, based on the assumption that all households have livestock, and all household livestock use degraded lands at some time during the year - Degradation will be reduced by implementation of SLM measures - Target PMCs remain willing to implement e-Pasture Management System - PUA members abide by PMC grazing plans - Primary driver of pasture degradation is over or

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
					<p>undergrazing at any given point in time</p> <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land degradation does not proceed quickly enough to show demonstrable benefits before the end of the project - Community members continue to increase livestock numbers beyond carrying capacity of pastureland
	<p>18. Herder/farmer income change based on benefits from micro-finance/grant program for individuals participating in the program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Women: N/A - Men: N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Women: 10% increase - Men: 10% increase 	<p>Data to be provided by participants in the program (Note: average per capita income/month in Jalal-Abad province: 3,624 soms (source: www.stat.kg), so 10% on an average micro-loan/grant of \$1000 = 6.4% annual ROI).</p> <p><i>Notes: As per national statistical committee methodology: "labor income," "proceeds from sale of agricultural products, fodder, cattle", and "Property income". Excluding "Social transfers".</i></p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individuals see income changes within lifetime of project - Negligible default rate on micro-finance agreements <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient local absorption capacity to adequately implement micro-finance/grant activity - Implementation of micro-finance /grant program delayed such that benefits are not seen before end of project - Micro-finance /grant institutional partners not suited to support

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
				<p><i>Note: Income generally reported by household, not distinguished within household between men and women – to disaggregate by gender, household income is divided by 50% in households with both men and women.</i></p> <p><u>GEF Global RF Linkage:</u> GEF-6 LD Global Indicator: (b) Improved livelihoods in rural areas (Farmer income – disaggregated by gender)</p>	<p>implementation of program objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alternative livelihoods do not have foreseen environmental benefits
<p><i>Outcome 3: Strengthened national capacities for snow leopard conservation, promoting Kyrgyz regional and global cooperation, and setting the scene for up-scaling</i></p>	<p>19. Level of illegal wildlife trade activity, as indicated by number of snow leopard, snow leopard prey, and other illegal wildlife seizures at border crossings and at Manas international airport, as well as number of arrests related to wildlife trafficking</p>	<p>Annual number of seizures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2015 - On the Tajik-Kyrgyz border - attempted transfer from Tajikistan to Kyrgyzstan of two snow leopard skins and one snow leopard cub - 2015 - one snow leopard skin confiscated in Bishkek (from Talas region) - 2016 - one snow leopard skin confiscated in Issyk-Kul - Zero seizures assisted by specially trained dogs - 4 arrests related to wildlife trafficking 	<p>Annual number of seizures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Snow leopard: <Baseline (at least one seizure assisted by specially trained dogs) - Snow leopard prey: <Baseline (at least one seizure assisted by specially trained dogs) - Other illegal wildlife: <Baseline (at least one seizure by specially trained dogs) - Number of arrests = >baseline - >50% of arrests result in prosecutions 	<p>National customs, border control, and law enforcement data on annual illegal wildlife trade seizures</p> <p><i>Note: baseline breakdown of number assisted by specially trained dogs is not available as program with dogs is beginning only at the time of the finalization of this project document.</i></p>	<p>Assumption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An increasing trend in seizures indicates improved enforcement. However, there is expected to be a negative feedback loop as well: As enforcement improves, illegal wildlife trafficking activity may decrease, leading to a decreasing trend in seizures. It is assumed that this negative feedback loop will not yet set-in before the end of the project.

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		- <50% of prosecutions resulting from wildlife trafficking arrests		<p><i>However, the figure should be broken out in future reporting.</i></p> <p><u>GEF Global RF Linkage:</u> GEF-6 BD Global Indicator: Outcome 3.1: Reduction in rates of poaching of rhinos and elephants and other threatened species and increase in arrests and convictions (baseline established per participating country) Indicator 3.1: Rates of poaching incidents and arrests and convictions.</p>	<p>- An improvement in enforcement will lead to a reduction in actual poaching</p> <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A reduction in the number of seizures resulting from improved secrecy and methods by poachers and traffickers in order to defy improved enforcement - Political interference - Poor coordination and cooperation by various law enforcement bodies - Limited prosecution for detected illegal activities
	20. Level of international cooperation and coordination with Kyrgyzstan border countries regarding illegal wildlife trade, biodiversity management in borderland protected areas, and snow leopard monitoring	No formal international agreement between Kyrgyzstan and neighboring countries related to snow leopard conservation	<p>International agreement between Kyrgyzstan and at least one bordering country under implementation regarding at least one of the below issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cooperation on law enforcement at border points regarding illegal wildlife trade - Illegal hunting by border guards - Data sharing on snow leopard monitoring 	Existence/absence of agreement	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political will exists between Kyrgyzstan and at least one bordering country to cooperate on snow leopard conservation - An agreement can be negotiated and adopted within the life of the project - Cooperation on snow leopard conservation presents the opportunity for a non-politically threatening issue for international cooperation

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
					<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International relations between countries preclude possibility of agreement on sharing of monitoring data, and on cooperation relating to wildlife law enforcement at border points - Countries are unwilling to enforce hunting regulations for border guards
	<p>21. Quality and coverage of snow leopard monitoring data in Kyrgyzstan as indicated by estimated accuracy and timeliness of national snow leopard population estimate</p>	<p>Latest population estimate 15 years prior (2001) with a 30% confidence level (lowest possible estimated population / highest possible estimated population, i.e. $150/500 = 30\%$)</p>	<p>Publishing of annual estimates with a 60% confidence level (the average confidence level among other snow leopard range states in GSLEP population estimate)</p>	<p>Annual national snow leopard monitoring database</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accurately estimating snow leopard population can be done in a single year - It is in the national interest to report an accurate level of snow leopard population on an annual basis - The project, along with other partner initiatives, can provide full national coverage for snow leopard monitoring <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited technical capacity of national institutions responsible for wildlife monitoring, including snow leopard monitoring - Potential lack of coordination and cooperation between

Component	Indicator	Baseline (2016)	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
					institutions responsible for snow leopard monitoring - Application of non-comparable data collection techniques and records from different parts of the country

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
Scientific and Technical Screening of the PIF (STAP Review)		
<p>Given the number of similar Snow Leopard-related projects, the evidence base remains weak in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent and economics of land uses and alternative land uses 	<p>Fully concur; the prodoc has been significantly strengthened during the PPG phase in relation to issues related to the extent and economics of land uses and alternative land uses in the targeted project area. The rationale and justification in relation to snow leopard conservation in Kyrgyzstan has also been further explained.</p>	<p>The “Situation Analysis” section of the project document has been expanded and further developed, including expanded information on socio-economic context, land tenure, forest and pasture land use, and local economic and environmental management context. Even more detailed information on socio-economic context, biodiversity context, and local context has been included as annexes to the project document. In addition, the project rationale and strategy section of the project document has been strengthened and expanded to further clarify aspects related to snow leopard conservation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent of wildlife in the region, and its economic potential through tourism, trophy hunting and so on. For example: How many animals are there? What is their trophy value? How many tourists are there, and how much do they spend? 	<p>Full concur; additions and adjustments made during the PPG phase.</p>	<p>The baseline information in the project document has been greatly expanded and further developed. For example, in the project document includes information that there are an estimated 85 heads of ibex in the territory of the newly formed Alatai SNP, and an estimated 6-8 snow leopards use the area as at least part of their range. There are approximately 120 heads in the territory of the newly formed Kan-Achuu SNP, and an estimated 4-6 snow leopards partially utilize this territory. Tourism in these areas is currently very limited (virtually non-existent). Trophy hunting is currently non-existent in the area surrounding the two newly formed SNP. There is some potential for trophy hunting for ibex in the area, and some potential for trophy hunting for argali in the Kan-Achuu area in Toguz-Toro district, though further research on the argali population is necessary to determine appropriate hunting quotas. The issue of trophy hunting in Kyrgyzstan is currently under debate, particularly in relation to red list related species such as argali. There is currently only a transient minimal population of argali in the Alatai SNP area (if they are present at all) and to develop</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
		<p>trophy hunting in this area would require the re-introduction of argali to build a substantial population before trophy hunting could occur. There are currently four designated hunting territories in Toktogul District (in areas surrounding Alatai SNP, not within the boundaries of the PA), but there are no active commercial hunting operations. One site is under private control, two sites are under control of the Toktogul District Union of Hunters and Fishermen, and one site is still under control of the Dept. of Rational Use of Natural Resources and is waiting completion of hunting management planning procedures. However, the official tendering of hunting grounds in accordance with the 2014 Law on Hunting has not yet been carried out in Jalal-Abad province; the four currently designated sites are controlled based on their status prior to the 2014 law. It is anticipated that the project will contribute to the development of additional tourism opportunities in the areas near the newly established SNPs.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • little mention is made of the benefits provided by protected areas, their associated financial costs and sustainability, and generally the need to make "a case for PAs and biodiversity", 	<p>Full concur; adjustments and additions made during the PPG phase. At the same time, in the case of this project, the national Government of Kyrgyzstan, provincial and district governments, local communities and local resource users all appear to be firmly on-board with the concept of further development of Kyrgyzstan's national PA system through the establishment of new PAs, including the two national PAs established to provide a foundation for this project. The project is fully in-line with the government's national policies and strategies for development of the national PA system. The Prodoc also highlights the project's strong buy-in and support from local communities and stakeholders – the recent establishment of Alatai and Kan-Achuu PAs was strongly supported by the neighboring local communities. The relevant district forest management bodies willingly contributed portions of their forest territories for the establishment of the PAs, and the local pasture user associations also contributed a significant amount – approximately 48,000 hectares - of pastureland under their management for the territory of the new PAs. All of these indications of strong national and local stakeholder support</p>	<p>The Prodoc includes a section on "Protected Areas" which further elaborates the context of Kyrgyzstan's protected area system. The Prodoc also highlights the importance and benefits from PAs.</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
	imply that the “case” for PAs is already well-made in the context of this project in Kyrgyzstan.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the baseline hardly discusses the form and capacity of local institutions and communities, including issues related to individual and collective forms of land use tenure, and land use planning mechanisms, even though the project will clearly need to work through these institutions, and the document later mentions issues of land property rights, local self-governance bodies, and associations of pasture and water uses (stakeholders section). 	Fully concur; adjustments and additions made. However, additional information on these aspects has been included in the “development context” section of the Prodoc, under sub-headings related to “Socio-economic Context” “Land Tenure”, “Institutional Context”, and “Local Context”.	Adjustments and additions made regarding the form and capacity of local institutions and communities, land use tenure, land use planning in the “development context” section of the Prodoc, under sub-headings related to “Socio-economic Context” “Land Tenure”, “Institutional Context”, and “Local Context”.
If this is not covered in some detail by the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation Program (GSLECP), there is justification for specifically developing such an evidence base to support the significant number of Snow Leopard projects that are being developed, including PA economic and financial strategies, wildlife as a land use, land use more generally, and the governance and management of land at individual and collective scales.	Fully concur; various aspects of the project document discussing these subjects have been expanded and further developed during the PPG phase.. In the context of Kyrgyzstan, the evidence base for snow leopard conservation is fully detailed in the Kyrgyzstan national snow leopard conservation strategy, which is included in the GSLEP.	The relevant sections of the project document have been further developed and expanded. This includes the sections on “Socio-economic Context” “Land Tenure”, “Institutional Context”, “Local Context”, “Forests and Pastures”, and “Protected Areas”.
There is clearly an opportunity to use some combination of CBNRM with sustainable trophy hunting and ecotourism, but the information on such options remains sparse. Is this an opportunity that is being missed? Would a regional CBNRM initiative, as worked quite well in southern Africa (Suich and Child 2009), be appropriate for this region?	Full concur; there is this opportunity in the region, though full development and actual realization of this approach will take many years. The wildlife populations and regulatory monitoring and enforcement capacity are not currently sufficient to implement this approach, and current tourism facilities are very limited (especially at the level appropriate for international tourists). The development of such a CBNRM approach is not a direct objective of the project, though it is anticipated this project will help put the conditions in place to facilitate the development of such a CBNRM approach in future years. Kyrgyzstan does have a strong network of community-based tourism operators, though there is not currently an active branch	Trophy hunting and ecotourism have been included in the feasibility assessment for the micro-grants program. However, the focus of the project strategy is in getting the newly developed PAs in the region up and running, in coordination with and with the support of local communities, as well as developing and implementing other key landscape management approaches for biodiversity conservation such as buffer zones and corridors.

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
	<p>in the area targeted by the project. The NGO Panthera is currently developing “community conservancies” in the Gissar-Alai region of Kyrgyzstan to support snow leopard conservation, and there many be some lessons from this experience that could be applied in the Toktogul / Toguz-Toro region as well, although the local conditions in relation to community interaction with snow leopards are slightly different, and the current Panthera approach does not leverage ecotourism.</p> <p>The local Unions of Hunter and Fishermen in the target districts, including local hunters, which releases hunting permits is an important element to elaborate CBNRM in future.</p>	
<p>The section on root causes is adequate, albeit noting concerns about the need for a stronger evidence base.</p>	<p>Fully concur; adjustments made during the PPG phase.</p>	<p>The section on threats and root causes has been further expanded and strengthened. Additional detailed information on the full range of threats has been included as a Prodoc annex.</p>
<p>The section on barriers is also adequate, though an analysis of land management institutions and governance (e.g. planning legislation, community tenure arrangements and rights to use resources, mechanisms/institutions for collective action, especially at the local level) needs to be added, possibly at PPG stage.</p>	<p>Full concur; adjustments and additions made during the PPG phase.</p>	<p>The barriers section of the Prodoc has been expanded and strengthened. In addition the other relevant sections of the Prodoc have been expanded and strengthened, including “stakeholder analysis”, “land tenure”, “socio-economic context”, “local context”, and “forests and pastures”.</p>
<p>The baseline scenario reflects a growing commitment to PA and Snow Leopard conservation, though the PA agency appears to be under-funded with most money allocated to salaries and insufficient to operations (20%). A rule of thumb is that people are paid to sit unless the operational budget exceeds 45% of the total budget.</p>	<p>Fully concur; baseline assessment has been strengthened, updated, and expanded. The project will be working to assist in strengthening the management capacity of the targeted PAs in all respects, including financial sustainability, improved financial management, and financial planning. It is also true that the national PA system is under-funded (as are virtually all PA systems in the world...), but strengthening the financial sustainability of the full national PA system is beyond the scope of this project. This is also an issue that other national initiatives are (or will be) working on, including the UNDP BIOFIN project. This project will coordinate with and build synergies from the BIOFIN project.</p>	<p>Additional information on the financing of protected areas as the national level has been included. Additional details related to specific project activities for PA management capacity strengthening have also been included in Component 1.</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
Component 1 is well conceptualized, establishing two new PAs and strengthening the management of four existing PAs. Obviously, this needs to be carefully budgeted in the PPG.	Fully concur; no changes required.	The budget for this component was developed in detail in close collaboration with the State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) (the main project executing partner), which is responsible for PA management and forestry activities in Kyrgyzstan.
Component 2 likewise needs to be further developed in the PPG, especially the practical details involved in establishing buffer zones and corridors, as this may be more complex than envisioned.	Fully concur; further development of component completed in PPG phase.	Component 2 was further developed in the PPG phase, and details are provided in the Prodoc. With respect to establishment of buffer zones (Output 2.1), the potential establishment of buffer zones was discussed with local stakeholders during the PPG process, and there is a broad understanding of the need to implement these types of biodiversity-sensitive landscape management approaches. The actual establishment of buffer zones will build on the successful legal model established in neighboring Kazakhstan (also through UNDP-GEF projects). The practical means of implementing buffer zones and corridors will be done through a.) the incorporation of SFM approaches in forest management plans for forest lands in the vicinity of the PAs; b.) the development of pasture management plans incorporating SLM approaches and biodiversity sensitive approaches (replicating other successful models developed by UNDP in Kyrgyzstan); c.) the identification and incorporation of Key Biodiversity Areas outside of PAs into district territorial land-use and development planning; and d.) the strengthening of hunting regulatory monitoring and enforcement in the areas surrounding the PAs.
Component 2 - However, the alternative livelihoods activities are not well analyzed, and are based more on hope than a targeted strategy, stating merely that 20% of communities will be assisted to implement alternative livelihoods through micro-credit, with a possibility that this includes ecotourism. The PIF/PPG need to be much clearer on how an alternative livelihoods	Full concur; adjustments and additions made during the PPG phase.	This activity was further developed and clarified during the PPG phase. With respect to the Alternative livelihoods activity (Output 2.5), during the PPG process a feasibility assessment regarding alternative livelihoods was carried out, and is included as an annex to the project document. The project's strategy with respect to alternative livelihoods is not necessarily to increase income from alternative sources, but to demonstrate, pilot and implement livelihood practices that are biodiversity friendly and

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p>strategy will be operationalized. What is the evidence base that alternative livelihoods reduces pressure on biodiversity, noting that the assumption that increasing income from new enterprises leads to reduced degradation through normal agricultural/livestock practices is highly questionable – in fact, people may use increased profits to expand these activities. The PPG should be much clearer on how micro-credit will improve land use, and perhaps should consider a more targeted approach to people using marginal habitats that are important for biodiversity, such as wildlife-based CBNRM?</p>		<p>support SFM/SLM approaches. If proven successful under local circumstances, these approaches can then be further replicated and scaled-up within the community to improve biodiversity conservation, SFM, and SLM.</p>
<p>Component 3 is standard, but given the relatively limited budgets the PPG should seek to be innovative in terms of monitoring.</p>	<p>Full concur; adjustments and additions made during the PPG phase.</p>	<p>In terms of ecological monitoring, the project aims to support the Government of Kyrgyzstan to implement a variety of innovative monitoring approaches that are being developed for snow leopards and their prey. These are described in detail in the draft “Planning and Monitoring Framework for Snow Leopard Conservation Programs”, which is being developed by scientists supported by the Snow Leopard Trust and GSLEP, and which was shared with the PPG team during the project development phase. Monitoring approaches are expected to use the latest innovative technologies, including potential DNA-based species identification; camera traps; GPS collars; and a geo-referenced online national snow leopard monitoring database.</p> <p>In terms of law enforcement monitoring the project also aims to utilize innovative approaches, including canine-assisted wildlife crime monitoring, and potential micro-chipping of trophy specimens from trophy hunting.</p>
<p>Note that the need to involve stakeholders is mentioned in the narrative, but the Project</p>	<p>Full concur; adjustments and additions made during the PPG phase.</p>	<p>Identification of key partners and stakeholders other than the PA agency have been expanded and improved. This has been done partially in the</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
Description for Component 3 is largely focused on PA agencies. This needs to be clarified.		description of the component and its activities, but also in the stakeholder analysis earlier in the project document.
Finally, overall the PIF is well presented. However, it would be much easier to follow and much stronger with the inclusion of appropriate maps.	Full concur; adjustments and additions made during the PPG phase.	Based on the STAP review comments about the inclusion of maps, numerous maps have been included in the project document, as well as in annexes. This includes, in particular, the following GIS-based geo-referenced maps: 1. A map showing estimated wildlife corridors among PAs in the Western Tian Shan landscape (Figure 7 of the project document); 2. A map showing Toktogul District with the newly established PAs, and nearby forest and pasturelands (Figure 8 of the project document); 3. A map showing Toguz-Toro District with the newly established PAs, and nearby forest and pasturelands (Figure 9 of the project document).
In addition, some terms are not defined, e.g. KBAs, aimaks.	Full concur; adjustments and additions made during the PPG phase.	Key terms are now defined appropriately throughout the Prodoc, and in particularly in the acronyms section at the beginning of the document.
Council comments on the PIF (Germany)		
Germany emphasizes that key parts of the logic of the PIF need serious revision during the further project development process, including the title of the PIF which needs further elaboration to be clearly understandable.	Full concur; adjustments and additions made during the PPG phase. The previous draft project title included a typo (“association” instead of “associated”), and was not fully clear. The project title has been revised as indicated to the right.	Previous: “Conservation of globally important biodiversity and associated land and forest resources of Western Tian Shan Mountain ecosystems to support sustainable livelihoods” Revised: “Conservation of globally important biodiversity and associated land and forest resources of Western Tian Shan mountain ecosystems to support sustainable livelihoods”
The importance of the proposed project area for global biodiversity conservation is described inaccurately and should be improved (A.1.1); e.g. Dhole (<i>Cuon alpinus</i>) and <i>Ovis ammon nigrimontana</i> are not found in the KGZ part of Western Tienshan. The same is true for <i>Ovis tarda</i> (not present) and other mentioned species (either not present or area not of special significance).	Full concur; adjustments and additions made during the PPG phase. The PIF was partially based on information produced by a previous (2005) regional GEF project that was active in nearby areas of the Western Tian Shan – the Atlas of Biodiversity of the Western Tian Shan. However, during the PPG phase it was determined that this information source was partly outdated or inaccurate for the specific areas targeted by this currently proposed project. During PPG Phase that species data has been revised with the support of the Botany and Soils	An updated and revised section on “biodiversity context” has been included in the Prodoc, based on the based available current biodiversity information and data. With respect to the specific species mentioned, the Prodoc indicates that the Western Tian Shan was part of the former range of the Dhole, though this species is now probably extinct in Kyrgyzstan. The reference to <i>Ovis ammon nigrimontana</i> has been removed, and <i>Ovis tarda</i> is

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
	and Forest Research Institutes of the National Academy of Science.	only mentioned as among the Red List species that are “virtually unknown in the country anymore”.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Juniper forests are not important for snow leopard migration. The PIF correctly states: “Snow leopards are usually found between 3,000 and 5,400 meters above sea level where the environment is harsh and forbidding, the climate is cold and dry, and the mountain slopes sparsely vegetated with grasses and small shrubs, providing good cover and clear views to help them sneak up on their prey.” The link between Snow Leopard protection and the proposed sustainable forestry measures is not clear. 	<p>Fully concur; clarifications and revisions made during the PPG phase. The logic and strategy relating to snow leopard conservation and sustainable forestry measures has been strengthened during the PPG phase. It should also be emphasized however that the project is not intended strictly as a “snow leopard conservation project”, but rather aims to contribute to the conservation of all of the globally significant biodiversity of the Western Tian Shan, which has been identified as a global biodiversity hotspot, a Global 200 Ecoregion, and a World Heritage site. Forest zones between snow leopard habitats can help provide cover for snow leopards transiting from one part of their home range to another. However, the more relevant linkage is to the conservation of wild ungulates as snow leopard prey species. HCVMF zones are part of a heterogeneous ecosystem complex that support various species, including snow leopard prey species. Snow leopard prey species do migrate between different habitat areas seasonally (e.g. from high altitude summer habitats to lower altitude winter habitats), and forest belts contribute to the integrity and ecological utility of wildlife corridors and buffer zones. Sustainable management of HCVMF areas is therefore critical for the conservation of biodiversity and integrity of the Western Tian Shan ecosystem.</p>	<p>The strategy and logic of the project’s intervention has been expanded, clarified and strengthened in various aspects of the project document. This includes the “Threats” section, “Barriers” section, and “Strategy” section.</p>
<p>Moreover snow leopards do not follow “migration routes”, but rather randomly use large areas as their habitat. This respectively requires a different protection approach.</p>	<p>Fully concur; language corrected. The project’s strategy and approach is fully consistent with the snow leopard’s wide-ranging use of habitat. The project strategy takes a landscape-scale conservation approach, focusing in the improved management of PAs and other key biodiversity areas, while also implementing biodiversity-friendly land-use approaches in identified corridors and buffer zones outside of PAs.</p>	<p>The term “migration” with respect to snow leopards has been revised throughout the project document.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While competition with livestock is correctly identified as key barrier (A1.1) causing wild ungulate and subsequent snow leopard decline, the other (and much more significant) threat to 	<p>Fully concur; poaching is an important issue for wild ungulates – as well as legal hunting that is inappropriately managed. This threat has been included and expanded upon in the full prodoc.</p>	<p>Threat description on “Legal and Illegal Hunting of Ungulates” added to the Threats section.</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
wild ungulates – poaching – is neither mentioned nor properly addressed.		
<p>The mentioned “decline in the practice of moving livestock between summer and winter pastures”, which is definitely problematic in terms of local pasture degradation, has positive impacts on the habitat of snow leopard and its prey. Respectively it should be better explained, why an intensified use of pastures in snow leopard and wild ungulate habitats should be fostered by a GEF project aiming at conservation of snow leopard and its prey (Activity 2.2.1 and 2.2.2). Improved access will lead to pasture competition with wild ungulates, conflict (predation on livestock), accidental and intentional killing of snow leopards and poaching on its prey (including predation by herders’ dogs).</p>	<p>Fully concur; additions and adjustments made the Prodoc during the PPG phase.</p>	<p>The “Threats” section has been expanded and clarified to discuss the issues of both overgrazing and undergrazing. Regarding improved access to pastures (Output 2.2) – The council’s valid concern has been addressed in a variety of ways. First, the threats section of the project document has an expanded and improved section describing the issue of undergrazing, by which optimum ecosystem and forage conditions are lost as invasive woody shrubs and “weed” species that are not palatable for livestock – or snow leopard prey species – are increasing due to reduced usage of higher altitude “summer pastures” due to lack of access and the general decrease of this practice within communities. Recent scientific research in Kyrgyzstan has shown this to be a significant concern, and this is referenced in the project document. Research has shown that the natural production of an optimum level of biomass requires a certain level of grazing pressure. At the same time, the specific project activity 2.2.1 in the PIF on the “restoration and maintenance of access roads” has been removed. The project will work closely with scientific experts, local resource users, and partner organizations (e.g. ARIS) to ensure the development of pasture management plans (including grazing plans, and pasture infrastructure development) that appropriately reflect the ecological requirements of snow leopards, their prey species, and other globally significant species targeted by the project. In addition, the project document clarifies that currently in the Western Tian Shan there are few issues with snow leopard predation on livestock, or other types of conflicts. This will need to be closely monitored in the future, but for now it is not anticipated to be a major concern even if there is</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
		some increased use of higher altitude summer pastures.
<p>• The Protected Areas system in Kyrgyzstan suffers from a lack of funding. Protected Areas support their operations largely from formal and informal land and natural resource use in the areas actually to be protected. The expansion of the economically already not viable Protected Area system into new areas bears the risk of creating more parks that only exist on paper, not improving the conservation status. Given the economic situation of existing Protected Areas, the expectation of achieving Sustainability of new Protected Areas, established under the project, through state budget allocation, seems barely realistic and would need further explanation (A.1.6).</p>	Fully concur; revisions and clarifications made in the project document.	This concern is fully valid - the two newly established protected areas that form the main focus of the project have been established by the government without any additional budget allocation for the SAEPF. To address this concern the project will be assisting in strengthening the financial management and business planning of the new PAs, so that at the end of the project period they are well-positioned to continue increasing their financial resource base. This will be done in collaboration and coordination with other initiatives ongoing at the national level in relation to overall financing for the PA system, such as the UNDP BIOFIN project. The project's linkage to the BIOFIN initiative is highlighted at multiple points in the Prodoc. Considering that few PAs in the world are in a position to be financially self-sustaining, the project will work with SAEPF and other relevant stakeholders to continue developing the long-term financial sustainability of Kyrgyzstan's PA system through diversified revenue streams, of which central government financing is only one source. In the short-term, a key result of the project will be to provide preliminary resources to develop and strengthen the management of the newly established PAs.
<p>• The baseline does not refer to ongoing conservation activities by international NGOs such as WWF, NABU, Snow Leopard Trust Fund, Panthera (A.1.2.).</p>	Fully concur; additions made built on a series of consultations conducted during PPG phase with those INGO in Kyrgyzstan.	Information on the relevant activities of international NGOs has been included in the baseline activities section, including information for Panthera, WWF, FFI and NABU. The Snow Leopard Trust is referenced in relation to the description of the baseline activities related to the GSLEP.
<p>Although crucial for the project success, under A2 the important State and Non-State partners from the hunting sector are missing, – Department of Rational Use of Natural Resources of the State</p>	Fully concur; adjustments and updates including during the PPG phase. During the PPG phase the national team consulted extensively with the Department of Rational Use of Natural Resources, and met with local hunters in the communities. In	The "Stakeholder Analysis" section of the Prodoc has been significantly updated, expanded and improved, to include the stakeholders mentioned. The Prodoc also mentions relevant stakeholders at various points

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p>Agency on Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF), private concession holders, local hunters in the communities, relevant NGO partners, such as WWF, NABU and Panthera. The way of cooperation or coordination with these stakeholders should be clearly described.</p>	<p>addition, consultations were held with NGO partners including Panthera and NABU.</p>	<p>in relation to specific activities that are linked with other ongoing initiatives. Information on baseline activities from international NGO partners is also included in the “Baseline” section of the Prodoc (as mentioned above). The special project document section on coordination with other related initiatives and projects also includes those INGOs.</p>
<p>• Most serious questions arise, concerning the proposed Co-Financing. It remains unclear, how the stated 13,8 Mio USD of Grant Co-financing by the State Agency on Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) should be mobilized. The mentioned State Programs all lack funding and consequently are not or poorly implemented. More detailed explanation on the Co-financing should be provided.</p>	<p>Fully concur; information added and updated during the PPG phase. The co-financing from the government has been discussed and fully confirmed by the government in writing during the PPG phase. In addition, further sources of co-financing have been identified during the PPG phase, with the total amount of co-financing increased to \$24,507,383 USD. The project has an excellent unique opportunity in Toktogul District in relation to co-financing. The district has committed \$3.1 million in cash co-financing, which would typically be an unreasonable sum for a district-level government (for example, the other target district, Toguz-Toro, has committed \$100,000 USD in co-financing over the 5-year project period). However, these funds are available a result of the Toktogul Hydropower facility (which commenced operations in 1974), located in the district. Toktogul District has been accumulating funds in a compensatory local development fund, paid into by the hydropower facility in exchange for the foregone territory covered by the hydropower reservoir. This fund is designated for local development, but has not been fully utilized at present. Within the context of the project Toktogul District will utilize the identified funds for local development initiatives that contribute to the objectives of the project. Details on co-financing are included in the co-financing letters signed by project partners.</p>	<p>Details on co-financing are included in the full Prodoc, including confirmed signed letters of co-financing from relevant partners.</p>
<p>• The description of coordination with ongoing development measures is insufficiently elaborated (A 5.). Different to what is stated in the PIF (p.14: “The project does not overlap either geographically or thematically with the GEF-FAO project Sustainable management of mountainous forest and land resources under</p>	<p>Fully concur; revisions and updates to the Prodoc added during the PPG phase. The initiatives mentioned in the Council comment were not sufficiently identified and discussed in the PIF. Adjustments and revisions have been made to the Prodoc as appropriate. With respect to the GEF-FAO project, the currently proposed project does not overlap geographically, but does have some thematic linkages. The GEF-FAO project is piloting a variety of SFM and SLM measures, some of which</p>	<p>Adjustments and revisions have been made as relevant throughout the Prodoc, but in particular in the section “Baseline Analysis” and in the section “Coordination with Other Related Initiatives”. The initiatives and projects highlighted in the Council comment have been included in these sections as relevant, and linkages to the currently proposed</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p>climate change conditions”), we see clear thematic linkages with the ongoing GEF 5 FAO project on “Sustainable management of mountainous forest and land resources under climate change conditions...”. This project likewise the GEF-6 project proposal by the World Bank on Sustainable Forest and Land Management Project, as well as the GIZ Regional Programme on Sustainable Use of Natural Resources in Central Asia, partner with the SAEPF on piloting a forestry sector reform and supporting efforts for an integrated land management. A Governmental Decree on piloting of the forestry sector reform is expected to be issued in the upcoming weeks and will increase the formal status of the steering committee for coordination of all activities in the forestry sector, which is currently functioning under the SAEPF. The 5 Mio Euro GIZ Programme “Biodiversity Conservation and Poverty Reduction through Community-based Management of Walnut Forests and Pastures in Southern Kyrgyzstan”, which is financed out of the German Energy and Climate Fund and is working in similar Eco-Zones is not mentioned, as many other important partners. During further project development the proposal should be better aligned with ongoing project activities, coordinated by the SAEPF.</p>	<p>are relevant to the currently proposed project. The GEF-FAO project has plans to afforest/reforest almost 8,000 ha; the lessons from the FAO project’s experience will be incorporated in the afforestation/reforestation activities of this project. For example, a key lesson from the GEF-FAO project is that the project must ensure that fencing to protect saplings from livestock must be procured prior to planting. The GEF-FAO project is also working to develop pasture management plans to rehabilitate pasturelands in three districts (Jeti-Oguz, Ak-Tala, and Nooken). The approach in the GEF-FAO project differs on a technical basis from that planned under this project, but there are still numerous lessons that will be integrated in the current project; for example, a lesson from the GEF-FAO project in relation to pasture management is that efforts must be well coordinated with other relevant initiatives such as the IFAD-ARIS project, and capacity to implement Pasture Management Plans must be developed within the Pasture Management Committees.</p> <p>The proposed project will also be appropriately linked with the World Bank project on “<i>Integrated Forest Ecosystems Management</i>”, which will be starting before the end of 2016. The proposed project will be well-integrated with the national forest sector reform process. The forest sector reform process is still in the pilot phase, with six pilot leskhozoes involved in the reform process. However, the currently proposed process will accelerate the reform process for Toktogul and Toguz-Toro leskhozoes, which are not currently part of the reform process, by instituting reform measures such as the adoption of Joint Forest Management. In addition, the currently proposed project will join and contribute to the national Coordination and Consultation Council on forest sector reform (the Secretary of this council also serves as the national SFM expert for this project’s PPG phase.)</p> <p>With respect to the GIZ initiatives, the project will be directly and closely coordinated with GIZ, as outlined in the co-financing letter provided by GIZ. This includes the project on “Biodiversity Conservation and Poverty Reduction through Community-based Management of Walnut Forests and Pastures in Southern Kyrgyzstan”, which is also operating in Jalal-Abad</p>	<p>project have been indicated. References to these initiatives have also been referenced as appropriate in the description of activities for each component as relevant; for example, the project will seek to replicate the approach piloted by GIZ of outsourcing pasture management of leskhoz forest pastures to the relevant local Pasture Management Committees.</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
	Province, but not in the specific areas targeted by the proposed project	

Response to GEF Secretariat Review from October 7, 2016

Comment	Response and Revision Made
1. Please provide clear indication that BD-1 funds are targeted towards KBAs.	Each PA included meets at least one KBA criterion. A table has been added on p. 45 of the Prodoc highlighting the Key Biodiversity Areas characteristics and relevant criteria for each of the protected areas to be supported by the project.
2.a. The budget needs to be revised in view of achieving all stated outcomes and outputs in Table B. As presented, the budget appears to focus too much on equipment, consultants, travel, and workshops. It is not evident how tangible outputs (reforestation, rehabilitation, and sustainable livelihoods will be supported and local stakeholders and communities benefit from GEF grants.	<p>The proposed budget was developed through in-depth discussions with project stakeholders in Kyrgyzstan, including through multiple consultations with local communities. It is based on thorough needs assessment, and budgetary planning to ensure cost effectiveness, clear connection to outputs, taking into account comments received earlier from STAP and GEF Council.</p> <p>The budget notes are provided to facilitate a basic level of insight into how the ATLAS budget categories translate into the planned activities and outputs. For example, budget note 2 explicitly indicates how the budget allocated for local consultants under Component 1 is necessary for the achievement of the planned outputs: “National professional, technical and scientific expertise for: Output 1.1. Activities on PA zoning and biodiversity inventory, appropriate management tools development and staff training (112 local consultant weeks @\$550/week; 2 trainers for 12 training workshops @\$500 per trainer/workshop); Output 1.2 on HCVF status upgrading, on-the-ground HCVF identification and management plans development, as well as leskhoz staff training (164 local consultant weeks @\$US550/week); Output 1.3 on capacity development of other PAs and leskhoz in the region, including PA Steering Boards and leskhoz JFM Board establishment and capacitating for operation (104 local consultant weeks @US\$500/week, 76 local consultant weeks @\$US550/week); Output 1.4. local capacity building for joint patrolling of PAs, buffer zones and corridors (12 local consultant weeks @US\$550, 4 local consultant weeks @US\$500/week).”</p>

Comment	Response and Revision Made
	<p>Most of the consultancy is needed to enable creation of on-the-ground systems that will produce benefits for local people. Similarly, most of the equipment is needed to ensure local-level activities, most of which envisage engagement of (or benefits for) local communities, e.g. local protected areas, reforestation, etc. The ownership of the equipment in most cases will ultimately rest with local stakeholders or specialized institutions involved in monitoring and conservation of Snow Leopard and its prey. Most of the activities under workshops are needed to enable local consultations and active community engagement, directly relevant to the participatory nature of project results. Only those activities and items that cannot be procured by co-financing (due to the nature of the co-financing or the mandate and restrictions of the co-financer) have been proposed for the GEF incremental funding.</p> <p>A new table is provided below (see attached Appendix A, below. Also added as Annex 14 to the Prodoc) to further clarify how the budget, as represented in the official standard UNDP Prodoc ATLAS-format budget, corresponds to the planned activities and expected results. Explanation is given on how the budget allocated in the cost categories relates to the planned activities and results, as well as to the local benefits anticipated from successful implementation of the project.</p>
<p>2.b. Please also clarify which of the confirmed co-finance will be directly utilized for achieving outcomes and outputs as stated in Table B.</p>	<p>An additional table has been developed (see attached Appendix B below), showing the specific breakdown of each source of co-financing's contribution respective to the outcomes and outputs for each component, based on the information provided in the co-financing letters.</p>
<p>2.c. Further, please provide a separate budget table that lists expenses by budget code (not by outcome but for the total) and include percentages of the total amount.</p>	<p>A table (see attached Appendix C. Also included as Annex 15 of the Prodoc) is provided that summarizes the total for each ATLAS budget code used in the project, and the percentage total for each budget code. A brief explanation is provided by each budget category.</p>
<p>2.d. Based on the revised budget, additional justification maybe be required by the reviewer.</p>	<p>We welcome any further inquiry or clarification required.</p>

Comment	Response and Revision Made
<p>2.e. The budget notes in the budget are not sufficient to justify some of the larger expense items such as equipment and workshops.</p>	<p>Additional justification in relation to each budget category is provided adjacent to the original budget notes in the table in Appendix A, developed in response to comment 2.a. above. In addition, the new UNDP TRAC (cash) co-financing of \$100,000 will go directly to the 72200 - Equipment and Furniture budget line under Component 1, which reduces by 17% the GEF's share of planned expenditure for this budget category.</p>
<p>3. All UNDP contributions appear to be parallel co-funding. Please clarify if there are any UNDP resources that will be made available to directly support this project.</p>	<p>The UNDP Kyrgyzstan Country Office has agreed to allocate \$100,000 USD in TRAC funding for direct support to this project. The project co-financing figures and budget in the Prodoc and CEO Endorsement Request have been revised to reflect this. A new co-financing letter from the UNDP Kyrgyzstan Country Office is also attached.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS²¹

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$121,013.00			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Technical review: Baseline study 1 Assessment of policy and legislative instruments on environmental, protected areas and forestry governance	14,500.00	10,715.00	3,529.00
Component B: Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation: Baseline study 2 Assessment of the a new protected areas and buffer zones include flora, fauna, capacity building needs and alternative livelihoods program	21,000.00	19,500.00	1,500.00
Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments: Baseline study 3 Land and forests assessment for the provision of quantitative details, facts and figures to corroborate and expand the section on the drivers of degradation	18,000.00	16,346.00	6,154.00
Component D: Validation workshop: Stakeholder consultations: - Confirmation of specific sites for intervention; - Field level activities validation; - Project implementation arrangements; - Project co-financing; - M&E and sustainability plan	11,513.00	9,813.00	0.00
Component E: Completion of final documentation: Completion of final documentation: - Consolidation of all technical and consultation inputs into a clearly written UNDP-GEF Prodoc document with all relevant sections and annexes; - Address specific technical issues and questions raised by the GEF Sec; Council members and STAP; - Completion of a CEO endorsement request form; - Translation of UNDP-GEF Prodoc document into host country language;	46,000.00	26,660.00	18,896.00
Inception and Validation workshops	10,000.00	7,900.00	0.00
Total	121,013.00	90,934.00	30,079.00

²¹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A