



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

GEF ID:	6958		
Country/Region:	Kyrgyz Republic		
Project Title:	Conservation of Globally Important Biodiversity and Association Land and Forest Resources of Western Tian Shan Forest Mountain Ecosystems and Support to Sustainable Livelihoods		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5411 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$121,013	Project Grant:	\$3,988,575
Co-financing:	\$16,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$20,609,588
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Maxim Vergeichik

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

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

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	08/21/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	08/21/2014 UA: Yes for SFM incentive. Cleared	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	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. Aichi targets addressed: 5, 11, 15. 09/11/2014 UA: Has been addressed in the re-submission. Cleared	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	08/21/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to	08/21/2014 UA: Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Cleared	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (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>	
	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>	

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	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 innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>08/21/2014 UA: Innovativeness is being addressed thorough 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>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits?		
Project Financing	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. 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	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	08/21/2014 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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>08/21/2014 UA: No. Please address clarification requests.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>09/11/2014 UA: 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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 21, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 11, 2014	
	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.**