



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

GEF ID:	<b>6958</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Kyrgyz Republic</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Conservation of Globally Important Biodiversity and Associated Land and Forest Resources of Western Tian Shan Forest Mountain Ecosystems to Support Sustainable Livelihoods</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5411 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$121,013</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,988,575</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$24,519,183</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$28,749,784</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 28, 2015</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 04, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Maxim Vergeichik</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	08/21/2014 UA: Yes.  Cleared	10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	08/21/2014 UA: Yes. Letter dated 08/11/2014.  Cleared	10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	08/21/2014 UA: Yes.	10/07/2016 UA: Yes.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	08/21/2014 UA: Yes.  Cleared	10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	08/21/2014 UA: Yes for SFM incentive.  Cleared	10/07/2016 UA: Yes for SFM incentive.  Cleared
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>08/21/2014 UA: Not fully. SFM-4 concerns regional/global co-operation and cannot be accessed by individual national projects. Please revise Table A and B accordingly.</p> <p>Aichi targets addressed: 5, 11, 15.</p> <p>09/11/2014 UA: Has been addressed in the re-submission.  Cleared</p>	<p>10/07/2016 UA: Not fully. Please provide clear indication that BD-1 funds are targeted towards KBAs.</p> <p>11/04/2016 UA: Additional information has been provided in the re-submission. Refer to p. 45 of pro doc.  Cleared</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>08/21/2014 UA: Yes.  Cleared</p>	<p>10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared</p>
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to</p>	<p>08/21/2014 UA: Yes.</p>	<p>10/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Cleared	Cleared
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>08/21/2014 UA/YW: Not fully. Activities under component 3 that are concerned with regional and global cooperation should not duplicate activities of the global UNDP-GEF project.</p> <p>The coherence between component 3 and other components are rather weak. Component 3 could be approached and described in a way to improve transboundary landscape management that concerns to snow leopard beyond the national boundary. In this way, component 1 could be focused on PA, component 2 on corridors and bufferzones beyond PAs at the landscape scale, and component 3 on transboundary landscape management.</p> <p>Output 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 on activities related to the GSLEP and Working Secretariat requires further clarification at this point, in order to be specific and targeted. Please clarify.</p> <p>09/11/2014 UA: Has been addressed in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>10/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>08/21/2014 UA: Not fully.</p> <p>Please provide the entire Table F- ts a part of the template. Please provide CO2</p>	<p>10/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>mitigation estimates, which is a requirement for SFM funding. Do provide numerical figures (not "0.28 mln ha but "280,000").</p> <p>09/11/2014 UA: The PIF still has wrong numbers, however, I have corrected the figures in PMIS.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>08/21/2014 YW: Gender dimension and approach are adequately described at this point. Further details are expected at CEO endorsement.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>08/21/2014 UA/YW: Please clarify any involvement of indigenous peoples in the project area.</p> <p>09/11/2014 UA: There are no IP in the project area.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>10/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>08/21/2014 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>10/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>08/21/2014 UA: Yes. However, as mentioned above, duplication of efforts needs to be avoided.</p>	<p>10/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Describe coordination with other ongoing initiatives related to snow leopard conservation in the country, including ones supported by WWF, USAID, and others.</p> <p>09/11/2014 UA: Has been addressed and clarified in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>08/21/2014 UA: Innovativeness is being addressed through the involvement of the private sector and micro credit program. Sustainability and Replication is being addressed within the context of the regional/global efforts of the Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>10/07/2016 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>10/07/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar</p>		<p>10/07/2016 UA: Not fully. 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,</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits?		<p>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> <p>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>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>Based on the revised budget, additional justification maybe be required by the reviewer. The budget notes in the budget are not sufficient to justify some of the larger expense items such as equipment and workshops.</p> <p>11/03/2016 UA: Budget has been slightly revised by incorporating \$100,000 UNDP TRAC contribution for equipment. All budget lines have been further explained and justified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	08/21/2014 UA: The TA for component 3 appears to be high compared to the investive components. Please explain budget calculation and adjust as appropriate.	10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing		09/11/2014 UA: Has been adjusted.  Cleared	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	08/21/2014 UA: No. The UNDP contribution to this project is not in line with its role in this particular undertaking. Please explain and/or mobilize adequate UNDP co-financing.  Cleared	10/07/2016 UA: No. 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.  11/04/2016 UA: Has been clarified and additional resources made available by UNDP.  Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	08/21/2014 UA: Yes.  Cleared	10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	08/21/2014 UA: Yes. PPG requested within thresholds.  Cleared	10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant		10/07/2016 UA: BD TTs and LD TT have been submitted.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	indicators, as applicable?		Please submit the SFM TT as well.  11/04/2016 UA: SFM TT has been submitted.  Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		none received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		10/07/2016 UA: Yes.  Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		none received
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	08/21/2014 UA: No. Please address clarification requests.  NOTES: Table A: GEF financing figures do not add up to the total. Table B: GEF financing and co-financing figures do not add up to the total. Table D: Figures do not add up to the total(s). Please correct all figures.  09/11/2014 UA:	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		All clarification requests have been addressed in the re-submission. The PIF is technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming WP. Please note the items to be considered at CEO endorsement.  Cleared	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Further clarify detail coordination mechanism and activities with the related snow leopard projects at the regional level, in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and other countries.  Further clarify details on the GEF support towards the Working Secretariat, and ensure there are sufficient cofinancing for the activities from national and international partners.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		10/07/2016 UA: No. Please address comments.  11/04/2016 UA: Yes. Program manager recommends CEO endorsement.
	First review*	August 21, 2014	October 07, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 11, 2014	November 04, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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