PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

Submission date: 12 December 2012

GEF PROJECT ID: 5104
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4430
COUNTRY(IES): Russia
PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable land management and ecosystem-based climate change mitigation in the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion
GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP
GEF FOCAL AREA(s): MULTI FOCAL AREA

A. PROJECT PREPARATION TIMEFRAME

Start date of PPG	1st February 2013
Completion date of PPG	1st September 2014

B. PROPOSED PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES

Describe the PPG activities and justifications:

The PPG process will engage stakeholders and will support activities that will inform the preparation of the full project document and CEO Endorsement Request for the Full-Size Project (FSP) "Sustainable land management and ecosystem-based climate change mitigation in the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion". This document will be submitted to the GEF following further information gathering and stakeholder consultation, and will be accompanied by co-financing letters in line with pledges made in the PIF. The SFM funding sought for the PPG will be used exclusively to prepare the studies on the multiple environmental benefits and ecosysem value of forests. The respective executing agencies and co-financers will be fully engaged in the project design phase; one-on-one consultations, working group meetings, and project development workshops will be convened for the purpose. The project partners listed as co-financiers to the PIF have ensured proportional co-funding for the PPG, and will fully participate in the preparation of the full-size project documentation. In this way, the involvement of co-funding partners will be fully ensured. The PPG activities will consolidate and supplement the existing information supplied in the PIF on the state of ecosystems in Altai-Sayan area of Russia. The PPG activities will take into account the lessons learnt from the past and ongoing UNDP-GEF initiatives as indicated in the PIF's section on project coordination. The project will also establish contact with the the GEF Carbon Benefits Project to test chances for using this sofrware as carbon-benefit measuring tools in project implementation. The project's technical feasibility and economic viability will be assessed as will the risks associated with its implementation. In order to achieve these objectives, the PPG has been organized into the following components and activities:

Component 1. Detailed assessment of the policy and regulatory setting of the project. Preparatory activities under this component will result in the following outputs: (i) policy gaps defined in the sustainable land and forest planning and management arena: analysis of the relevant policies, laws and regulations, and programmes related to land degradation (LD), GHG emissions mitigation and sustainable forest management (SFM), taking into account best international practices; (ii) confirmation of policy and regulatory gaps to be addressed by the project in view of the SLM and forestry-sector MRV which is to be developed by the project jointly with Government; (iii) defined entry points for the catalysis of an integrated approach to sustainable forest and land management; (iii) detailed definition of the baseline programs, (iv) details about the content and legal status of the Integrated Land and Forest Use plans (PIF Output 1.1), and their place in local legislation and the approval procedures for them, (v) detailed list of amendments and their preliminary content for new or amended legislation on HNVF and other SFM mechanisms as mentioned in PIF Output 1.2.

Activities to achieve the above PPG outputs include:

- Quantified analysis of the current use of forests and steppe by sectors / sub-sectors / users. Forecast of forest area use into the future under the baseline scenario (20 years from now).
- Detailed description (with quantified data) of current / baseline pressures from human activities on forests and steppe in Altai Sayan. Quantification of current / baseline LD impacts (with impact on concrete SLM parameters such as erosion, loss of organic carbon, compaction, etc.), and carbon loss, stemming from :
    - Forest overexploitation
    - Fires

    - Overexploitation of steppe areas
- Assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the legal and regulatory framework for forest and steppe management, programmes and plans. Development of a check list of legal and regulatory activities that need to be undertaken at the FSP stage in order to implement legal amendments envisaged under PIF Output 1.2, namely i) regulatory framework that adopts the avoid-reduce-offset principle in municipal territorial planning; (ii) Amendments to Forestry Plans in order to protect High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF); (iii) Resolution of regional governments to adopt methodologies and criteria for assessing forest and agricultural land condition[1] for the purposes of subsequent land use decision making. Definition of the strategic entry points for adopting new regulations and standards required: monitoring requirements, enforcement mechanisms, etc.
- Detailed description of national baseline programs, relevant to the project and serving as its co-financing, and presentation of this analysis in a detailed table, using the table in PIF Section B.2 as a starting point.
- For PIF Output 1.1 define details about the content and legal status of the Integrated Land and Forest Use plans and their place in local legislation and the approval procedures for them,
- Detailed critical review of the current status (availability, completeness, content, what is covered what is not covered, who implements and who funds) of forest inventory system in Altay Sayan. Identifying of gaps that need to be filled in the current forest inventory system to turn it into a full forest ecosystem monitoring, reporting and verification system (relevant for Output 2.5). Specifically,
    - What carbon pools are measured and how at the moment. What regulatory and legal amendments needs to be put in place to measure full ecosystem carbon in forests.
    - Analyze which software is currently used under the Forest Inventory of Rosleskhoz and recommend a software solution that will be implemented in the full GEF project, with the purpose for it to be applied to maintain the forest inventory and carbon monitoring system of AS, so that reports generated by this system are available for decision makers and reporting to UNFCCC. Analyze if the GEF Carbon Benefits Project software can be used to implement the MRV under the project. Analyize other available fortware, discuss weakness and strengths of each, define which software will be used in the FSP stage.
    - Define which instrumental on-site measurements are needed to cover the gaps in the foreest carbon monitoring and draw a costed plan to imlement them at the FSP stage.
    - Seek agreement from the Government on the implementation of the MRV in Altai Sayan forests at the FSP stage. Agree on time line, rolees and budget (GEF, cofinancing).
    - Describe in detail the system (methods, approaches, protocols, software requirements) for measuring the carbon pools and fluxes in the steppe areas.
    - Based on the above, prepare an Annex to the FSP outlining the future carbon monitoring, reporting and verification system for the project.

Component 2. Assessment of the capacity of different agencies to support the implementation of project activities. This PPG component is relevant for all PIF outcomes, and is designed to ensure that implementation arrangements, partnership strategies and capacities are in place and adequate for the successful project implementation and its sustainability. Funding support from the PPG will be used to conduct an assessment of the capacity of the national and regional government agencies in respect of: (i) capacity constraints (including NGOs, CSOs and local communities) in supporting and/or implementing LD/CC/SFM activities and capacity building needs and measures to address these needs. Further, the focus of this assessment will be on the gender aspects of the project, and on identifying potential incentives and the capacity development needs, to be covered by the project, of the various stakeholder groups to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the project interventions and results beyond the term of the project.

The activities will inlcude:
- Analysis of the roles, functions and responsibilities of different players with respect to regulating, planning, implementing activities affecting sound management of forests and steppe areas in Altay Sayan;
- Definition of the capacity of the key national stakeholders to implement and sustain the proposed project activities, including recommendations for building capacity integration into the project design;
- Analysis of the level of interest and support/resistance from the main stakeholders for introduction and implementaiont of Integrated Land and Forest Use plans.. This will contribute to the risks management strategy of the project, among other things. Windows/opportunities will be sought to alleviate the resistance.
- Feasibility analysis of different options for the implementation of the project activities and project governance. This will include the selections and detailed description of the preferred implementation and governance arrangements for the project. A stakeholder involvement plan will be developed and agreed;
- Develop action plan for incorporation of gender aspects in the project, with quantifiable baseline and target indicators, as per GEF and UNDP guidance.
- Describe the capacity buildng and training needs to implement the ILFUPs concept (Output 1.1.).
- Develop plan of activiteis to improve the monitorign and enforcemetn of legisation (PIF output 1.3).
- Describe the staffing and training requirements (and financing) for the new conservation areas (Output 2.3)

Component 3. Specfics of on-the-ground action (Component II) designed in detail. The focus under this component will be on confirming the selection of pilot areas, and designing the implementation measures for the selected pilot sites. The outputs

[1] Condition of land will be assessed based on criteria determining its resilience, provisioning of ecosystems services and economic value of land.

will be: (i) selected and described target forest and steppe areas where the GHG mitigation and LD measures will take place; (ii) clarified details of each LD or GHG mitigation or carbon sequestration activity, clarifying institutional roles, time-tables, budgets, community engagement , (iii) finalized plan for the establishment of conservation set aside forests; (iv) defining the baseline and project scenarios for each relevant mitigation activity: quantified carbon benefits, carbon measurement protocols and methodologies that will be employed to measure carbon benefits, (v) completed relevant tracking tools (LD, CC and SFM/REDD+), including respective baselines, indicators and targets to measure project progress; (vi) established socio-economic baseline, indicators and targets with respect to alternative use of forests by local communities. Specifically, the activities here will include:

- Confirm selection of targeted 4 municipal districts where Integrated Land and Forest Use Plans is going to be undertaken in line with Output 1.1. Develop an Annex to CEO Endorsement Request (can be in matrix form) in which each such district will be described in detail:
    - Size, population, social and economic characteristics,
    - Current ecosystem map of the district (not necessarily detailed resolution). Past ecosystem maps provided if relevant (to indicate shifts in steppe or forest size for example)
    - Current land use (map, main use types, land users/owners),
    - General description of key current economic threats to ecosystems within the destricts. Assessed against LD and CC indicators as in the GEF Tracking Tools.
    - Key measures that would need to be planned under ILFUPs aimed at alleviating the threats (changing land use matrixes, ecosystem restoration, change of management regimes in forests or steppe, etc.): measures, organisations involved, sequence of activities
    - Place outside the area (though within the borders of the country) where a similar problem is observed and which will benefit from the acquired project experience (ha). This is important to identify the replication potential
- Confirm selection of the 12 target sites for improved management of steppe and pasture land at 600,000 ha which is envisaged under PIF Output 2.1. Integrate into the above-mentioned Annex to CEO Endorsement Request the following information relevant to these 12 sites under Output 2.1:
    - Location and size, provide map,
    - Detailed description of current land use and threats to LD and climate stemmig from current land use at each particular site (for description of threats use, as minimum, the LD and CCM and SFM indicators from the GEF Tracking Tools)
    - Listof technologies that will be tested in the project developed: for each such technology describe activities sequence, actors, budget, cofinancing, time-table, monitoring of success, replication potential. Tentative list includes (i) seasonal rotational grazing to maintain pasture quality covering all kinds of rangelands; (ii) decrease stocking rate in moderately degraded pastures; (iii) repair and maintenance of key pasture use infrastructure (wells and barns) and optimized stocking pressure in remote rangelands; (iv) increased stocking rate in formerly un-grazed pastures to optimize steppe ecosystem state and functioning.
    - Define the financing mechanism for the implementation of the above technologies, as per Output 2.1a:
        - Undertake a feasibility study to condiser which funding mechanism is best suited to support the above activity, giving preference to a self-sustianable funding mode, such as revolving micro-credit fund or municipal subsidy scheme.
        - In case a self-sustianable funding mechanims is proved to be feasible, reach agreement with municipal administrations / micro-credit facility on hosting and cofinancing the scheme.
        - Identify and agree the capitalization size, the activities to be supported, the terms of crediting or subsidizing, disbursement and collection systems, the re-payment, non-repayment stipulations, marketing and success monitorign mechanisms to be shared between the GEF project and the host institution.
    - Quantify (forecast) the LD impact from the implementatino of the above activities: reductionof erosion and rise in productivity as a result of implementaiton of the above measures.
- Confirm selection of pilot areas under Output 2.2 - **Restoration of app. 40,000 hectares of degraded forest and pasture land** adjacent to productive forest and farmland:
    - describe the restoration methods, Tentative menu includes restoration of vegetation cover in steppe, assisted natural regeneration and reforestation in forests, to counteract on-going and past land degradation (e.g. burnt forests, past clear-cut felling sites; ploughed pastures; abandoned pastures).
    - costs,
    - activity sequence.
    - Quantify carbon benefits in detail using Annex A to PIF as a start, and clarify the methodology that will be used during the project for monitoring carbon stocks and fluxes relevant here. Apply Carbon Benefits Project to calculate the carbon benefits of this activity, or similar software that would prove to be more feasible.
- Confirm selection of areas for the set-aside (300 ha) at High Nature Value Forests, under Output 2.3:
    - Define location and delineate the boundaries on tentative maps,
    - agree on change of regime in the areas with forest management authorities,
    - sequence of the activities for establishment of the protected areas,
    - budget and management of areas after change of forest use regime.
    - Action plan for non-exhaustive forest use (tourism, sustainable hunting) allotted for management in cooperation with local communities and private sector
    - Quantify carbon benefits in detail using Annex A to PIF as a start, and clarify the methodology that will be used during the project for monitoring carbon stocks and fluxes relevant here. Pay special attention to quantifying the non-harvested wood

products. Apply Carbon Benefits Project to calculate the carbon benefits of this activity, or similar software that would prove to be more feasible.

- Define activity plan and budget for fire management at steppe areas. Define the methodology to calculate the baseline and project carbon release, and the methodology to monitor and report on the success of the fire reduction.
- In addition to controlled burning, test the feasibility of other means to reduce the frequency of fires in grassland ecosystems, such straw harvesting for briquettes or construction materials instead of burning. If proved feasible, design activity and budget.
- Define the activity plan and budget for the introduction and operation of muncipal voluntary fire prevention brigades.
- Prepare all the relevant tracking tools (LD, CC and SFM/REDD+). This will include detailed description of the baseline and setting the respective indicators for each of the tracking tools;

Component 4. Feasibility analysis and budget. The three key outputs of these component can be summarized as: (i) detailed project strategy, including incremental cost analysis, cost-effectiveness, and risks; (ii) detailed budget, and (iii) detailed monitoring and evaluation plan. The activities will include:

- Detailed incremental-cost analysis as per GEF guidance: precise definition of baseline projects, activities, budgets, goals and co-financial links to GEF outcomes; definition of GEF incremental value per outcome and output; presentation of results of the incremental cost-analysis in matrices;
-
- Detailed assessment of related projects, activities, and reports relevant to the subject matter of the project.
- Assessment of the social, economic and financial sustainability of proposed project activities, including gender aspects;
- Quantification of community and gender benefits,
- Quantification and detailed presentation of the global environmental benefits of the project;
- Thorough risk analysis and development of risk mitigation strategy for the project;
- Quantified presentation of global environmental benefits for climate change mitigation, land degradation and sustainable forest management;
- Definition of the replication strategy for project activities;
- Development of the project monitoring and evaluation plan, and budget;
- Costing the expected project outcomes and outputs, identify co-financing sources and secure co-financing commitments (letters).
- ToRs for the key consultants/contracts to be employed by the project.
- Finalized project logical framework.

Proposed Project Preparation Activities	**Outputs of the PPG Activities**	**Trust Fund**	**Grant Amount** (a)	**Co-financing** (b)	**Total** c = a + b
Component 1. Detailed assessment of policy and regulatory settings of the project.	(i) policy gaps defined in the sustainable forest planning and management arena: analysis of the relevant policies, laws and regulations, and programmes related to land degradation (LD), GHG emissions mitigation and sustainable forest management (SFM), taking into account best international practices; (ii) confirmation of policy and regulatory gaps to be addressed by the project in view of the forestry-sector MRV which is to be developed by the project jointly with Government; (iii) defined entry points for the catalysis of an integrated approach to sustainable forest management; (iii) detailed definition of the baseline programs, (iv) details about the content and legal status of the Integrated Land and Forest Uste plans (PIF Output 1.1), and their place in local legislation and the approval procedures for them, (v) detailed list of amendments and their preliminary content for new or amended legislation on HNVF and other SFM mechanisms as mentioned in PIF Output 1.2.	GEFTF	41,000	81,000	122,000
Component 2. Assessment of the capacity of different agencies to support the implementation of project activities.	(i) capacity constraints (including NGOs, CSOs and local communities) in supporting and/or implementing LD/CC/SFM activities and capacity building needs and measures to address these needs. Further, the focus of this assessment will be on the gender aspects of the project, and on identifying potential incentives and the capacity development needs, to be covered by the project, of the various stakeholder groups to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the project interventions and results beyond the term of the project.	GEFTF	35,000	63,000	98,000
Component 3. Specfics of on-the-ground action on GHG mitigation (Component II) and protected areas, buffer zones and restoration	(i) selected and described target forest and steppe areas where the GHG mitigation and LD measures will take place; (ii) clarified details of each LD or GHG mitigation or carbon sequestration activity, clarifying institutional roles, time-tables, budgets, community engagement , (iii) finalized plan for the establishment of conservation set aside forests; (iv) defining the baseline and project scenarios for each relevant mitigation	GEFTF	59,000	216,000	275,000

designed in detail (Component III).	activity: quantified carbon benefits, carbon measurement protocols and methodologies that will be employed to measure carbon benefits, (v) completed relevant tracking tools (LD, CC and SFM/REDD+), including respective baselines, indicators and targets to measure project progress; (vi) established socio-economic baseline, indicators and targets with respect to alternative use of forests by local communities.				
Component 4. Feasibility analysis and budget.	(i) detailed project strategy, including incremental cost analysis, cost-effectiveness, and risks; (ii) detailed budget, and (iii) detailed project monitoring and evaluation system;	GEFTF	60,000	20,000	80,000
Total Project Preparation Financing			**195,000**	**380,000**	**575,000**

C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT: ($)

	Project Preparation	**Agency Fee**
Grant Amount	195,000	18,525
Co-financing	380,000	
Total	575,000	18,525

D. PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)[1]

Trust Fund	**GEF Agency**	**Focal Area**	**Country Name/ Global**	**(in $)**		
				PPG (a)	**Agency Fee** (b)	**Total** c = a + b
GEFTF	UNDP	Land Degradation	Russia	78,000	7,410	85,410
GEFTF	UNDP	Climate Change	Russia	83,000	7,885	90,885
GEFTF	UNDP	Multi-focal area	Russia	34,000	3,230	37,230
Total PPG Amount				**195,000**	**18,525**	**213,525**

[1] No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

E. PPG BUDGET

Cost Items	**Total Estimated Person Weeks for Grant (PW)**	**Grant Amount ($)**	**Co-financing ($)****	**Total($)**
Local consultants *	153	121,200	51,800	173,000
International consultants*	16	48,000		48,000
Travel		21,000	45,000	66,000
Other**		4,800	283,200	288,000
Total PPG Budget		**195,000**	**380,000**	**575,000**

* Annex A for Consultant cost details was prepared first before completing this table. This table is the sum of all local and international consultants presented in Annex A.

** The category "Other" under co-financing covers cash and in-kind inputs from project partners (including from Government and UNDP), associated with: subcontracts to institutions issued for: (1) the studies on the set aside areas, (2) preparatory work on the forest inventory and MRV, (3) feasibility study on the financial incentive scheme, (4) 5 stakeholder workshops/conferences on SLM and SFM, which will at the same time serve as wide stakeholder consultations on the project, (5) procurement of mapping materials. GEF input under the category "Other" will cover the costs of translation and interpretation for the purposes of the PPG.

F. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund criteria for project identification and preparation.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date *(Month, day, year)*	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Deputy Executive Coordinator		12 Dec 2012	Maxim Vergeichik	+421 359 428 152	Maxim.vergeichik@undp.org

Annex A

Consultants Financed by the Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

Type of Consultant	Position / Titles	$/Person Week[1]	Estimated PWs[2]	Tasks to be Performed
Local	Sustainable forest management expert	900	30	- Analysis of current forest management pattern for the project intervention area, including quantified analysis of the current use of forests by sectors / sub-sectors / users. Forecast of forest area use into the future under the baseline scenario (20 years from now); - Detailed description (with quantified data) of current / baseline pressures from human activities on forests in Altai Sayan. Quantification of current / baseline forest ecosystem degradation and carbon loss, stemming from forest overexploitation and forest fires; - Detailed description of national baseline forest management programs, relevant to the project and serving as its co-financing; - Analysis of the roles, functions and responsibilities of different players with respect to regulating, planning, implementing activities affecting sound management of forests areas in Altay Sayan; - Definition of the capacity of the key national stakeholders to implement and sustain the proposed project activities, including recommendations for building capacity integration into the project design; - Staffing and training needs assessment (as well as financial requirements) for the new conservation areas (Output 2.3); - Development of a stakeholder involvement plan; - Coordication of project preparation with all relevant partners in the SFM field; - Feasibility analysis of different options for the implementation of the project activities and project governance. This will include the selections and detailed description of the preferred implementation and governance arrangements for the project; - Prepare the relevant tracking tools (CC and SFM/REDD+). This will include detailed description of the baseline and setting the respective indicators for each of the tracking tools; - Provide expert input to costing the expected project outcomes and outputs, identify co-financing sources and secure co-financing commitments (letters); - Provide input to drafts ToRs for the key consultants/contracts to be employed by the project.
Local	Expert on pasture and steppe ecosystems and SLM	900	30	- Threat analysis for grassland ecosystems in Altai Sayan, description of steppe use by sectors / sub-sectors / users; - Quantification of current / baseline LD impacts related to unsustainable use of steppe areas and steppe fires; - Detailed description of national baseline programs in SLM area, relevant to the project and serving as its co-financing; - Analysis of the roles, functions and responsibilities of different players with respect to regulating, planning, implementing activities affecting sound management of steppe areas in Altay Sayan; - Confirm selection of the 12 target sites for improved management of steppe and pasture land at 600,000 ha which is envisaged under PIF Output 2.1. Integrate into the above-mentioned Annex to CEO Endorsement Request the following information relevant to these 12 sites under Output 2.1: o Location and size, provide map, o Detailed description of current land use and threats to LD and climate stemmig from current land use at each particular site (for description of threats use, as minimum, the LD and CCM and SFM indicators from the GEF Tracking Tools) o Listof technologies that will be tested in the project developed: for each such technology describe activities sequence, actors, budget, cofinancing, time-table, monitoring of success, replication potential. Tentative list includes (i) seasonal rotational grazing to maintain pasture quality covering all kinds of rangelands; (ii) decrease stocking rate in moderately degraded pastures; (iii) repair and maintenance of key pasture use infrastructure (wells and

				barns) and optimized stocking pressure in remote rangelands; (iv) increased stocking rate in formerly un-grazed pastures to optimize steppe ecosystem state and functioning. o Define the financing mechanism for the implementation of the above technologies, as per Output 2.1a: o Undertake a feasibility study to condiser which funding mechanism is best suited to support the above activity, giving preference to a self-sustianable funding mode, such as revolving micro-credit fund or municipal subsidy scheme. o In case a self-sustianable funding mechanims is proved to be feasible, reach agreement with municipal administrations / micro-credit facility on hosting and cofinancing the scheme. o Identify and agree the capitalization size, the activities to be supported, the terms of crediting or subsidizing, disbursement and collection systems, the re-payment, non-repayment stipulations, marketing and success monitorign mechanisms to be shared between the GEF project and the host institution. o Quantify (forecast) the LD impact from the implementatino of the above activities: reductionof erosion and rise in productivity as a result of implementaiton of the above measures. - Prepare the LD tracking tool, including the detailed description of the baseline and setting the respective indicators; - Provide expert input into costing the expected project outcomes and outputs, identify co-financing sources and secure co-financing commitments (letters); - Provide input to drafts ToRs for the key consultants/contracts to be employed by the project.
Local	SFM and SLM policy and regulatory framework assessment expert(s)	800	13	- Detailed baseline analysis for SLM and SFM federal and regional legal and regulatory framework in Russia. - Assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the legal and regulatory framework for forest and steppe management, programmes and plans. Development of a check list of legal and regulatory activities that need to be undertaken at the FSP stage in order to implement legal amendments envisaged under PIF Output 1.2, namely i) regulatory framework that adopts the avoid-reduce-offset principle in municipal territorial planning; (ii) Amendments to Forestry Plans in order to protect High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF); (iii) Resolution of regional governments to adopt methodologies and criteria for assessing forest and agricultural land condition[2] for the purposes of subsequent land use decision making. Definition of the strategic entry points for adopting new regulations and standards required: monitoring requirements, enforcement mechanisms, etc. - For PIF Output 1.1 define details about the content and legal status of the Integrated Land and Forest Use plans and their place in local legislation and the approval procedures for them. - Develop plan of activiteis to improve the monitoring and enforcement of legisation (PIF output 1.3).
Local	Forest inventory, carbon monitoring and carbon assessment expert	800	16	- Detailed critical review of the current status (availability, completeness, content, what is covered what is not covered, who implements and who funds) of forest inventory system in Altay Sayan. Identifying of gaps that need to be filled in the current forest inventory system to turn it into a full forest ecosystem monitoring, reporting and verification system (relevant for Output 2.5). Specifically, o What carbon pools are measured and how at the moment. What regulatory and legal amendments needs to be put in place to measure full ecosystem carbon in forests. o Analyze which software is currently used under the Forest Inventory of Rosleskhoz and recommend a software solution that will be implemented in the full GEF project, with the purpose for it to be applied to maintain the forest inventory and carbon monitoring system of AS, so that reports generated by this system are available for decision makers and reporting to UNFCCC. Analyze if the GEF

[2] Condition of land will be assessed based on criteria determining its resilience, provisioning of ecosystems services and economic value of land.

				Carbon Benefits Project software can be used to implement the MRV under the project. Analyize other available fortware, discuss weakness and strengths of each, define which software will be used in the FSP stage. o Define which instrumental on-site measurements are needed to cover the gaps in the foreest carbon monitoring and draw a costed plan to imlement them at the FSP stage. o Seek agreement from the Government on the implementation of the MRV in Altai Sayan forests at the FSP stage. Agree on time line, rolees and budget (GEF, cofinancing). o Describe in detail the system (methods, approaches, protocols, software requirements) for measuring the carbon pools and fluxes in the steppe areas. o Specify a set of carbon sequestration and GHG emission reduction indicators for the FSP including baseline and target values. Based on the above, prepare an Annex to the FSP outlining the future carbon monitoring, reporting and verification system for the project.
Local	Forest ecosysem value expert	800	7	- Confirm selection of areas for the set-aside (300 ha) at High Nature Value Forests, under Output 2.3: o Define location and delineate the boundaries on tentative maps, o agree on change of regime in the areas with forest management authorities, o sequence of the activities for establishment of the protected areas, o budget and management of areas after change of forest use regime. o Action plan for non-exhaustive forest use (tourism, sustainable hunting) allotted for management in cooperation with local communities and private sector o Quantify carbon benefits in detail using Annex A to PIF as a start, and clarify the methodology that will be used during the project for monitoring carbon stocks and fluxes relevant here. Pay special attention to quantifying the non-harvested wood products. Apply Carbon Benefits Project to calculate the carbon benefits of this activity, or similar software that would prove to be more feasible.
Local	ILFUP feasibility experts (4 in each of the preselected municipal districts)	600	4*9	- Provide reliable and comprehensive data for the targeted 4 municipal districts where Integrated Land and Forest Use Plans are going to be developed: o Size, population, social and economic characteristics, o Current ecosystem map of the district (not necessarily detailed resolution). Past ecosystem maps provided if relevant (to indicate shifts in steppe or forest size for example) o Current land use (map, main use types, land users/owners), o General description of key current economic threats to ecosystems within the destricts. Assessed against LD and CC indicators as in the GEF Tracking Tools. o Key measures that would need to be planned under ILFUPs aimed at alleviating the threats (changing land use matrixes, ecosystem restoration, change of management regimes in forests or steppe, etc.): measures, organisations involved, sequence of activities o Place outside the area (though within the borders of the country) where a similar problem is observed and which will benefit from the acquired project experience (ha). This is important to identify the replication potential o Identify the level of interest and support/resistance from the main stakeholders for introduction and implementaiont of Integrated Land and Forest Use plans. This will contribute to the risks management strategy of the project, among other things. Windows/opportunities will be sought to alleviate the resistance.
Local	Forest restoration expert	800	7	- Confirm selection of pilot areas under Output 2.2 - **Restoration of app. 40,000 hectares of degraded forest and pasture land** adjacent to productive forest: o describe the restoration methods, Tentative menu includes assisted natural regeneration and reforestation in forests, to counteract on-going and past land degradation (e.g. burnt forests, past clear-cut

				felling sites). o costs, o activity sequence o Quantify carbon benefits in detail using Annex A to PIF as a start, and clarify the methodology that will be used during the project for monitoring carbon stocks and fluxes relevant here. Apply Carbon Benefits Project to calculate the carbon benefits of this activity, or similar software that would prove to be more feasible.
Local	Grassland restoration expert	800	7	- Confirm selection of pilot areas under Output 2.2 - **Restoration of app. 40,000 hectares of degraded forest and pasture land** adjacent to productive farmland: o describe the restoration methods, Tentative menu includes restoration of vegetation cover in steppe, to counteract on-going and past land degradation (e.g. ploughed and abandoned pastures). o costs, o activity sequence. o Quantify carbon benefits in detail using Annex A to PIF as a start, and clarify the methodology that will be used during the project for monitoring carbon stocks and fluxes relevant here. Apply Carbon Benefits Project to calculate the carbon benefits of this activity, or similar software that would prove to be more feasible.
Local	Fire management expert	800	7	- Define activity plan and budget for fire management at steppe areas. Define the methodology to calculate the baseline and project carbon release, and the methodology to monitor and report on the success of the fire reduction. - In addition to controlled burning, test the feasibility of other means to reduce the frequency of fires in grassland ecosystems, such straw harvesting for briquettes or construction materials instead of burning. If proved feasible, design activity and budget. - Define the activity plan and budget for the introduction and operation of muncipal voluntary fire prevention brigades.
International	SLM&SFM project development specialist	3,000	16	- Compiles and shares with the national PPG team and stakeholders the international best experience in policy development, legal and regulatory frameworks and enforcement systems related to land degradation, GHG emissions mitigation and sustainable forest management (SFM), including analysis of any relevant GEF projects, - Based on the inputs from national experts and in close cooperation with the key national stakeholders compiles final baseline/situational analysis for the FSP. This will include a precise definition of baseline projects, activities, budgets, goals and co-financial links to GEF outcomes; definition of GEF incremental value per outcome and output; presentation of results of the incremental cost-analysis in matrices. - Based on the inputs from national experts and the best international practice, prepares a quantified assessment of global environmental benefits for climate change mitigation, land degradation and sustainable forest management; - Analyses the socio-economic benefits of the proposed interventions at national and local levels; - Based on the national experts' inputs, undertakes feasibility assessment and confirm selection of the targeted 4 municipal districts where Integrated Land and Forest Use Plans are going to be developed; - Based on the international experience, assists in reconfirming/specifying the project strategy, finalizing project sections on: (a) An assessment of the social, economic and financial sustainability of proposed project activities; (b) Assessment of alternatives to the project strategy and establishing the cost effectiveness of the preferred strategy and suite of activities; (c) A replication strategy for project activities; (d) Assessment of the risks to the proposed project activities and identifying measure to mitigate these risks; (e) incremental cost analysis; - Based on national experts inputs, develops project monitoring and evaluation system for the FSP including the completed tracking tools for LD, CC and SFM/REDD+, including a set of indicators, baselines and targets. - Elaborates a Logical Framework of the project; - Prepares M&E plan and budget;

				- Based on national experts input, elaborates Public Participation plan; - Develops action plan for incorporation of gender aspects in the project, with quantifiable baseline and target indicators, as per GEF and UNDP guidance. - Based on national experts inputs, drafts ToRs for the key consultants/contracts to be employed by the project.

[1] Dollar amount per person week.

[2] Person weeks needed to carry out the task