



GEF-6 FULL-SIZED PROJECT FOR ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alay and Tien Shan ecosystems for snow leopard protection and sustainable community livelihoods			
Country(ies):	Tajikistan	GEF Project ID:	6949
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5437
Other Executing Partner(s):	National Biodiversity and Biosafety Centre	Submission Date:	February, 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas Biodiversity ; Land Degradation; Sustainable Forest Management	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	Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Conservation Program	Agency fee (\$)	\$397,230

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-1 Program 2	Outcome 2.2: Improved management effectiveness of protected areas	GEFTF	685,467	2,850,000
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	646,180	3,060,000
LD-3 Program 4	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities based on gender sensitive needs	GEFTF	1,455,933	6,850,000
SFM-1	Outcome 1: Cross-sector policy and planning approaches at appropriate governance scales avoid loss of high conservation value forests	GEFTF	985,990	2,150,000
SFM-3	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	407,800	4,700,000
Total project costs			4,181,370	19,610,000

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alai and Tian Shan ecosystems for snow leopard protection and sustainable community livelihoods						
Project Component	Financing Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
Component 1 Conservation and sustainable management of key biodiversity	Inv	The extent of IUCN Category I and II protected areas in Tajikistan increases from a baseline of 2,777,018ha to 2,837,018ha; The annual government budget allocations to IUCN Category I and II protected areas in Tajikistan increases	<u>Output 1.1:</u> Secure the conservation status and boundaries of protected areas <u>Output 1.2:</u>	GEFTF	1 890 657	4 200 000

areas		<p>from less than US\$250,000/annum to more than US\$450,000/annum; The conservation values of at least 130,000 ha of snow leopard and prey habitats are secured, and effectively monitored and enforced in Sangvor and the Jirgital section of Tajik NP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the average METT scores for the Tavildara (including Sangvor) and Jirgital sections of Tajik NP increases from an average score of 20 to >42; - at least 85% of the Jirgital section of the Tavildara (including Sangvor) and Jirgital sections of Tajik NP, are fully covered by a smart patrol system; and - the number of illegal incidents detected and resolved in the Tavildara (including Sangvor) and Jirgital sections of Tajik NP increases to more than 60/annum, from a baseline of less than 15/annum; <p>Rural communities living in villages adjacent to the Tavildara (including Sangvor) and Jirgital sections of Tajik NP are increasingly involved in (from a baseline of less than 100 individuals to more than 2,000 individuals, of whom at least 1,100 are women), and financially benefit from (from a baseline of less than 10 individuals to more than 150, of whom at least 80 are women) the planning and management of Sangvor and Tajik NP.</p>	<p>Develop the capacity to implement a smart patrolling system in protected areas</p> <p><u>Output 1.3:</u> Improve the equipment and infrastructure to support the implementation of a smart patrol system in protected areas</p> <p><u>Output 1.4:</u> Enhance community involvement in, and beneficitation from, protected areas</p>			
<p><i>Component 2</i> Ecosystem resilience and habitat connectivity in wider landscape outside protected areas</p>	<p>Inv</p>	<p>The extent of high altitude pastures under a more sustainable management regime in the Hissar-Alay and Vaksh-Darvaz areas increases from less than 5,000ha to more than 100,000ha</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the number of days of intensive grazing in high altitude pastures reduces from an average of 88 days in Spring/Autumn and 95 days in summer to 50 days and 65 days respectively; - the productivity of high altitude pastures increases from less than 0.3t/ha of dry fodder mass to greater than 1t/ha; - the % of palatable and edible species in high altitude pastures increases from less than 30% to more than 50%; - at least 10 pasture management plans are under implementation by Pasture User Unions; - at least 40 households benefit from technical and grant funding support for sustainable pasture management practices; and 	<p><u>Output 2.1:</u> Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, livestock pastures</p> <p><u>Output 2.2:</u> Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, forests</p> <p><u>Output 2.3:</u> Strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities</p>	<p>GEFTF</p>	<p>1 355 700</p>	<p>12 700 000</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10,000ha of degraded pastures are under active rehabilitation; <p>The extent of high altitude forests under a sustainable management regime in the Hissar-Alay and Vaksh-Darvaz areas increases from less than 2,000ha to more than 15,000ha;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an enabling policy and regulatory framework for the sustainable harvesting and use of forest products from high altitude forests is consultatively developed and enforced; - 6,000ha of degraded forests are under active restoration and/or rehabilitation; - at least 3 PFM committees are actively involved in the ongoing planning, management, rehabilitation and monitoring of high altitude forests; and - more than 10 households benefit from technical and grant funding support for the adoption of alternative fuel and energy technologies. 				
<i>Component 3</i> Support to international cooperation	Inv	<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 system, and a national snow leopard information management system, is established and operational; - 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 GLSEP. <p>The snow leopard population continues to grow, albeit modestly - increasing to more than 220 cats across the country - as fewer snow leopards are being trapped, hunted or poached;</p> <p>The population of key medium-sized ungulates that form the prey base of snow leopards continue to grow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marco Polo sheep population increases from 1,125 to more than 	<p><u>Output 3.1:</u> Enhance the state of knowledge on snow leopard and prey populations</p> <p><u>Output 3.2:</u> Improve the coordination of, and cooperation in, snow leopard conservation and monitoring</p>	GEFTF	735 900	2 300 000

	<p>1,400 animals; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Siberian Ibex population increases from 4,190 to more than 5000 animals; and - Heptner's markhor population increases from 1,018 to more than 1,400 animals. <p>The responsible government institutions, and community-based conservancies, are better capacitated and resourced to monitor wildlife crime:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at least 100 personnel/annum participate in wildlife enforcement training and skills development programs; and - at least 55 field-based wildlife enforcement staff in the Forestry Agency and CEP, and 5 rangers in the community-based conservancies, are fully equipped - including uniforms, rations, GPS, communications, transport, etc. - and operational. <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"> - a National Environmental Security Task Force for wildlife is constituted and operational; - at least three trans-boundary agreements addressing collaboration in the management of wildlife crime are under implementation; - the <i>National Action Plan for Snow Leopard Conservation in Tajikistan</i> is under implementation; and - the National Snow Leopard Conservation Committee is constituted and operational. 				
Subtotal			GEFTF	3 982 257	19 200 000
Project Management Cost (PMC)			GEFTF	199 113	410 000
Total project costs				4 181 370	19 610 000

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 co-financing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	National Biodiversity and Biosafety Centre (NBBC)	Grants	2 500 000
		In-kind	200 000
Recipient Government	Committee on Environmental Protection (CEP)	Grants	2 100 000
Recipient Government		In-kind	200 000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Economic Development and Trade	Grants	3 000 000

Recipient Government	Forestry Agency (State Institute of SPNAs)	Grants	2 000 000
GEF Agency	UNDP Tajikistan	Grants	410 000
GEF Agency		In-kind	6 000 000
Private Sector	Micro-loan Funds	Grants	1 500 000
Others	Local <i>jamoats</i>	Grants	1 200 000
CSO	Panthera	Grants	500 000
Total co-financing			19 610 000

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	Tajikistan	Biodiversity		1 331 647	126 506	1 458 153
UNDP	GEF TF	Tajikistan	Land Degradation		1 455 933	138 314	1 594 247
UNDP	GEF TF	Tajikistan		SFM	1 393 790	132 410	1 526 200
Total Grant Resources					4 181 370	397 230	4 578 600

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

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	<i>130 000 hectares</i>
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	<i>124 000 hectares</i>
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	<i>Number of freshwater basins</i>
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	<i>Percent of fisheries, by volume</i>
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)	<i>2.27 million metric tons CO₂-eq/20 yr¹</i>
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	<i>metric tons</i>
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	<i>metric tons</i>
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	<i>ODP tons</i>

¹ Total sequestered and avoided in soil and above-ground biomass.

6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries.	<i>Number of Countries:</i>
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries.	<i>Number of Countries:</i>

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 PIF²

1. Project Description.

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed

The description of the environmental and/or adaptation problems has been considerably improved. These improvements are briefly summarized as follows:

SECTION I, PART 1 *Situation Analysis* ('Context and global significance') of the UNDP PRODOC describes in more detail: the geographical context of Tajikistan; the biodiversity significance of, and conservation status of snow leopard and wild prey conservation in, Tajikistan; a socio-economic profile of Tajikistan; the current conservation status of forests, pastures and SPNAs in Tajikistan; and the institutional, policy and legislative context for the conservation and sustainable use of snow leopard, wild prey and their habitats in Tajikistan.

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 the snow leopard, snow leopard native prey species and snow leopard- and prey-dependent habitats.

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 conservation status of snow leopards, their wild prey, and their ecosystems across the entire snow leopard range in Tajikistan. These are: (i) 'Limited resources for, and capabilities in, the planning and management of SPNAs'; (ii) 'Unsustainable land use management practices outside the SPNAs'; and (iii) 'Incomplete information and knowledge management systems for management decision-making and trans-boundary cooperation'. A more detailed description of each barrier, with relevant examples, is further elaborated in this section.

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

The description of the baseline scenario and the associated baseline projects has been considerably improved. 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 organisations – over the five-year time frame of the project - to address, in part, the key barriers to the conservation and sustainable use of snow leopard, wild prey and their habitats in Tajikistan. The baseline analysis focuses on the baseline investments that are targeting improvements in the planning, management, use and monitoring of SPNAs, pastures, forests, snow leopards and snow leopard wild prey across the snow leopard range.

3) the proposed alternative scenario, 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 GEF Council comments. These improvements are briefly summarized as follows:

The Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program (GSLEP, 2013) provides the strategic context for this GEF-funded project. Within the overarching framework of this GSLEP, this project will support the

² 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.

Government of Tajikistan in the implementation of the National Snow Leopard Ecosystem Protection (NSLEP) portfolio for Tajikistan.

Project outputs and activities are spatially contained to a ‘planning domain’ for the project. The project planning domain comprises 5 discrete areas - *Kuraminsky-West-Tien Shan*; *Hissar-Alai*; *Vakhsh-Darvaz*; *Badakhshan*; and *Pamir* – which collectively incorporate the natural dispersal and migration routes for snow leopard and their prey in Tajikistan. The planning domain extends from the far east of Tajikistan along the border with China to the Uzbekistan border in the far west, and along much of the northern border with Kyrgyzstan and significant parts of the south-eastern border with Afghanistan.

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 SPNAs and community-based conservancies by building the institutional and individual capacities to implement a smart patrol system³;
Livestock pasture areas – (i) improving sustainable management of pasture lands across the snow leopard range by incentivising changes to unsustainable practices; and (ii) reducing the extent and intensity of conflicts between pastoralists and snow leopard and their prey by enhancing the survival rate of livestock;
Forest areas – improving the ecological integrity of forests in the snow leopard range by: (i) rehabilitating degraded forests; and (ii) reducing the extent and intensity of harvesting of wood from these forests by encouraging the adoption of other fuel sources; and
Knowledge – expanding the reach of research, monitoring and planning efforts about snow leopard, snow leopard prey and their habitats by building institutional capacities, resources and partnerships.

The project is structured into three components, with each component comprising a complementary suite of two to four outputs which will collectively contribute to realizing the targeted outcome for the component.

The first component will support the development and implementation of a smart patrol system in targeted specially protected natural areas (SPNAs) Work under this component will be focused around four key areas of project support: (i) Secure the conservation status and boundaries of protected areas (Output 1.1); (ii) Develop the capacity to implement a smart patrolling system in protected areas (Output 1.2); (iii) Improve the equipment and infrastructure to support the implementation of a smart patrolling system in protected areas (Output 1.3); and (iv) Enhance community involvement in, and beneficitation from, protected areas (Output 1.4).

The second component will assist in improving the planning and management of the high altitude livestock pastures and indigenous forests located along, or immediately adjacent to, the key snow leopard migration routes within the *Hissar-Alay* and *Vakhsh-Darvaz* areas. Work under this component will be focused around three key areas of project support: (i) Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, livestock pastures (Output 2.1); (ii) Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, forests (Output 2.2); and (iii) Strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities (Output 2.3).

The third component will strengthen the state of knowledge of, and collaboration in, the conservation of snow leopard and their ecosystems. Work under this component will be focused around two key areas of project support: (i) Enhance the state of knowledge on snow leopard and prey populations (Output 3.1); and (ii) Improve the coordination of, and cooperation in, snow leopard conservation and monitoring (Output 3.2).

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.

³ The term ‘smart patrol system’ has been developed to reflect the integration of science and technology into field-based law enforcement and monitoring in protected areas.

The table below summarises 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.

		Comments on the strategic focus of the component
Components	<i>1. Conservation of, and sustainable management of key biodiversity areas within landscape</i>	<p>In response to the STAP review and Council comments, work under this component will now be spatially focused in Sangvor Special Nature Area and the adjacent Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik National Park (NP), a World Heritage Site. It is envisaged that the project will support the re-designation of Sangvor as a NP, and incorporating its management into the Tavildara section of Tajik NP. The outputs and activities under this component have been restructured (see below) to support the development and implementation of a <i>smart patrol system</i> in the Tavildara (including Sangvor) and Jirgital sections of Tajik NP.</p> <p>The smart patrol system will comprise the following basic elements: (i) a secure legal status and clearly demarcated boundaries; (ii) adequate numbers of patrol staff; (iii) suitably equipped ranger patrol staff; (iv) fully trained ranger patrol staff; (v) regular monitoring of ranger patrol performance; and (vi) full integration of patrol data into park planning and management.</p>
	<i>2. Ecosystem resilience and habitat connectivity in wider landscape outside protected areas</i>	<p>Work under this component will now be spatially focused on the high altitude forests and pastures located in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas. The outputs and activities under this component are directed at improving the planning and management of the high altitude <u>livestock pastures and indigenous forests</u> located along, or immediately adjacent to, the key snow leopard migration routes in these areas.</p> <p>Work under this component will also seek to strengthen the <u>wildlife enforcement and networking capacities</u> of the key stakeholder institutions, agencies, organisations and communities working in these areas.</p>
	<i>3. Support to international cooperation</i>	<p>The outputs and activities under this component are now broadly directed at: (i) establishing a strong scientific base for the conservation and restoration of snow leopard and prey populations in Tajikistan; (ii) adopting a <i>National Action Plan for Snow Leopard Conservation</i>; (iii) facilitating the regular coordination, monitoring, and reporting on the National Action Plan; and (iv) developing a framework for transboundary collaboration with Uzbekistan on the conservation of snow leopards and their prey.</p> <p>The knowledge of snow leopard and prey populations and their habitats collected under this component will now be used to guide the strategic focus for the implementation of outputs and activities under components 1 and 2 above.</p>
	Original outputs in the PIF	Changes made to outputs at GEF CEO
		Rationale for changes to outputs

		ER stage		
Component 1 (Outputs)	<i>1.1 National ecological network expanded and its financial sustainability ensured</i>	Removed	Extensive consultations undertaken during the project preparation phase indicated that, with protected areas already covering some 21% of the country, there is considerable political and public resistance to any further expansion without an investment in the proper resourcing and effective management of the existing protected area estate. This view is completely compatible with the STAP review and the Council comments. The project thus no longer seeks to expand the protected area estate in Tajikistan.	
	<i>1.2 Upgrading the Aktash Reserve to Boboy Ob Strict Reserve</i>	1.1 Secure the conservation status and boundaries of protected areas	The Aktash reserve has limited snow-leopard conservation value, with no permanent snow leopard population recorded in the reserve. The STAP review and Council comments also emphasised that the project should rather focus GEF resources on the immediate operational needs – most of which are linked to securing the conservation tenure – of protected areas, and not on more system-wide planning. Work under this output has thus now been re-focused on: changing the current categorisation of Sangvor Special Nature Area to a higher level of legal protection; and improving the demarcation of the boundaries of, and security of the entry points to, the Tavildara (including Sangvor) and Jirgital sections of Tajik NP.	
	<i>1.3 Management and business plans for six critical areas under implementation</i>		Work under this output has thus now been re-focused on: changing the current categorisation of Sangvor Special Nature Area to a higher level of legal protection; and improving the demarcation of the boundaries of, and security of the entry points to, the Tavildara (including Sangvor) and Jirgital sections of Tajik NP.	
	<i>1.4 Strengthened patrolling and law enforcement systems</i>	1.2 Develop the capacity to implement a smart patrolling system in protected areas	1.3 Improve the equipment and infrastructure to support the implementation of a smart patrolling system in protected areas	In response to the STAP review and Council comments, the outputs and activities have now been refocused on piloting the implementation of a smart patrol system in the Tavildara (including Sangvor) and Jirgital sections of Tajik NP (see rationale for component 1 above).
<i>1.5 Local PA management boards operationalized</i>	1.4 Enhance community involvement in, and beneficitation from, protected areas		Work under this output has been broadened to include other related co-management activities, including: (i) raising the awareness in communities living around the Tavildara (including Sangvor) and Jirgital sections of Tajik NP of the need to conserve, and the importance of protecting, snow leopard, their prey and their habitats; (ii) collaboratively identifying potential opportunities to improve the livelihoods of those communities from the conservation, development and sustainable use of the protected areas; (iii) supporting the development of working agreements between the protected area and each adjacent village government (i.e. the <i>deha</i>); and (iv) facilitating the implementation of these agreements, notably in respect of development opportunities for ‘beneficitation’ of communities from the conservation and use of the park (e.g. employment; revenue sharing agreements; service/supply agreements;	

			capacity building; participation in hunting concessions; access/traversing rights; seasonal access to grazing; wood collection; preferential contracting; and participation in management decision-making).
	<i>1.6 Programmes on biotechnology, research and public awareness</i>	Removed	The project monitoring- and research-related activities were all moved to Component 3 (see below).
	<i>1.7 Community-focused restoration of degraded mountain forests</i>	Removed	The community-focused restoration of degraded high altitude forests has now been included as an activity under Output 2.2 (see below).
Component 2 (Outputs)	<i>2.1 Update territorial plans of selected districts</i>	Removed	Extensive consultations undertaken during the project preparation phase (notably with the jamoats and hukumat local authorities) demonstrated that most districts already have contemporary territorial plans. The local authorities have indicated that the real need is on ensuring the compliance with existing territorial plans, not the revision of these. Project outputs have thus been structured to respond to this need.
	<i>2.2 Assisted regeneration of pastures</i>	2.1 Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, livestock pastures	This output now includes all activities linked to sustainable pasture management, not just regeneration of pastures. For the targeted ⁴ high altitude <u>livestock pastures</u> , work under this component will now seek to improve the ecological integrity and productivity of these pastures by: (i) encouraging the adoption of more sustainable pasture management practices; (ii) restoring degraded pasture areas; and (ii) reducing conflicts between pastoralists and snow leopard and their prey.
	<i>2.3 Migration corridors between protected areas identified and designated; buffer zones defined and enforced; species management plans drafted and implemented; land and forest use regimes regulated</i>	Removed - relevant activities have been incorporated into other outputs	Based on existing datasets, the migration corridors were already pre-defined during the project preparatory phase (as part of the process of mapping the project planning domain). The updating of the snow leopard and prey migration data will be undertaken in Output 3.1. There is currently no legal mechanism to further define and enforce additional 'buffer zones' in Tajikistan. The preparation of the <i>National Action Plan for Snow Leopard Conservation</i> will be supported under Output 3.2. The regulation of pasture and forest use regimes have been included under Output 2.1 and 2.2.
	<i>2.4 Targeted forest restoration of degraded forests</i>	2.2 Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, forests	This output now includes all activities linked to sustainable forest management, not just forest restoration. For the targeted high altitude <u>forest areas</u> , work under this component will seek to improve the ecological integrity of forests in the snow leopard range by: (i) encouraging the adoption of other fuel sources; (ii) facilitating the implementation of joint forest management agreements; and (iii) rehabilitating degraded forests.
	<i>2.5 Alternative</i>	Removed – livelihood	The livelihoods program has, in response to the

⁴ i.e. The sites used for both forest production/ livestock farming and as critical habitats for snow leopard and prey species.

	<i>livelihood program for local communities jointly with micro-crediting institutions</i>	activities have been subsumed into the relevant outputs	STAP review and comments from the Council, been re-focused towards developing incentives that will encourage more sustainable levels of natural resource use in high altitude conservation areas, pastures and forests. Livelihood development activities have thus now been included under Output 1.4 ('beneficiation' of communities from the conservation and use of protected areas), Output 2.1 (technical and grant funding support in the implementation of more sustainable pasture management practices), Output 2.2 (grant funding support in the adoption of alternative fuel and energy technologies) and Output 2.3 (staffing, training, equipping and deployment of a local corps of 'community rangers').
		2.3 Strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities	This output has been included in response to the STAP review and Council comments. This output will focus on strengthening the capacities (knowledge, training, networking, skills, equipment, ranger staff) of the key responsible government agencies (e.g. CEP, Forestry Agency, Border and Customs services) and community-based institutions to monitor and enforce illegal activities that detrimentally affect the conservation of snow leopard and prey populations and habitats outside formal protected areas.
Component 3 (Outputs)	<i>3.1 System for research and long-term monitoring of threats to and status of key species and ecosystems</i>	3.1 Enhance the state of knowledge on snow leopard and prey populations	The description of the output has been modified to include the development, implementation and maintenance of an integrated national snow leopard monitoring and reporting system and snow leopard information management system.
	<i>3.2 Vocational training for staff from the new and existing Pas</i>	Removed – training activities have been subsumed into relevant outputs	This activity has now been broadened to include training and skills development activities under the following outputs: Output 1.2 (smart patrol training program) Output 2.3 (basic and advanced wildlife enforcement training and skills development program); and Output 3.1 (specialist training in the implementation of the snow leopard monitoring and reporting system).
	<i>3.3 Targeted support to participation of Tajikistan in the Global GSLCP process</i>	3.3 Improve the coordination of, and cooperation in, snow leopard conservation and monitoring	The description of the output has been modified to include activities linked to: (i) finalising the adoption of the draft <i>National Action Plan for Snow Leopard Conservation</i> ; (ii) improving the cooperation between institutional partners and civil society in the implementation of the <i>National Action Plan</i> ; and (iii) developing the framework for trans-boundary collaboration.
	<i>3.4 National Management Plan for conservation of snow leopard</i>		

- 4) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF and co-financing
5) global environmental benefits (GEFTF)

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 of snow leopards, their prey and their natural habitats is one where: (i) the numbers of indigenous medium-sized mountain

ungulates continue to decrease as large domestic livestock populations use more of the higher altitude pastures, and for longer periods of time; (ii) the snow leopards - in the absence of their natural prey species - progressively resort to killing domestic livestock, leading to an increase in retaliatory killings by farmers; (iii) the ecological integrity of the snow leopard and prey's alpine and sub-alpine natural habitats further degrades as a consequence of increasingly unsustainable agricultural practices and high levels of wood harvesting and fuelwood collection; and (iv) the low levels of monitoring, enforcement and prosecutions of illegal activities continue to undermine the effectiveness of localised conservation efforts across the snow leopard range.

The *alternative scenario* that the project seeks to contribute to is characterised by: (i) preventing the further fragmentation of snow leopard and prey landscapes in Tajikistan; (ii) maintaining and/or restoring the quality of key snow leopard and prey habitats within these landscapes; (iii) improving the conservation status, and sustainability of pasture and forest use, in these key snow leopard and prey habitats; and (iv) reducing the direct threats to the survival of snow leopards and prey populations living in these key habitats.

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

Business-as-usual	GEF alternative	Benefits
<i>Snow leopard and prey populations</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensive poaching by local communities of species that naturally form the prey base of snow leopard continues; - Human-snow leopard conflicts increase, leading to further retaliatory killings by farmers. - Enforcement of wildlife laws outside the network of protected areas continues to be very weak or non-existent; and - Efforts to control poaching of, and illegal trade in, snow leopard and prey species between neighbouring countries remains uncoordinated and poorly controlled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop and implement an in-service wildlife enforcement program for staff of all the key responsible government agencies; - Procure key equipment for local field-based environmental (CEP) and forestry (Forestry Agency) monitoring and enforcement staff. - Pilot the staffing, training and equipping of a local community ranger corps; - Update and formally adopt the <i>National Action Plan for Snow Leopard Conservation in Tajikistan</i>; and - Establish and maintain a cooperative governance structure to coordinate the efforts of partner institutions in the implementation of the National Plan; - Develop a framework for transboundary collaboration in combatting poaching and illicit trade; and - Strengthen the capacity of border and customs officials to implement transboundary poaching and wildlife trade agreements. 	<p>The snow leopard population continues to grow, albeit modestly - increasing to more than 220 cats across the country - as fewer snow leopards are being trapped, hunted or poached;</p> <p>The population of key medium-sized ungulates that form the prey base of snow leopards continue to grow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marco Polo sheep population increases from 1,125 to more than 1,400 animals; - Siberian Ibex population increases from 4,190 to more than 5000 animals; and - Heptner's markhor population increases from 1,018 to more than 1,400 animals <p>The responsible government institutions, and community-based conservancies, are better capacitated and resourced to monitor wildlife crime; and</p> <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>
<i>Protected areas</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The formal conservation tenure, and security of boundaries, of many SPNAs and community conservancies remains unsecured; - Most SPNAs and conservancies are still too small to conserve viable snow leopard and prey populations and not configured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the conservation status of Sangvor to a higher level of legal protection and integrate its planning and management into the adjacent Tavildara section of Tajik NP; - Strengthen the medium-term and annual management planning and budgeting systems Tajik NP (Jirgital and Tavildara sections); 	<p>The extent of IUCN Category I and II protected areas in Tajikistan increases from a baseline of 2,777,018ha to 2,837,018ha;</p> <p>The annual government budget allocations to IUCN Category I and II protected areas in Tajikistan increases from less than US\$250,000/annum to more than US\$450,000/annum;</p>

Business-as-usual	GEF alternative	Benefits
<p>to secure safe movement corridors for snow leopards and prey;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low levels of monitoring, enforcement and prosecution of illegal activities continues to compromise the management effectiveness of SPNAs and conservancies across the snow leopard range; - Outdated planning systems and ineffectual operational approaches fail to effectively address the emerging management challenges facing SPNAs and conservancies; - Funding for the administration of SPNAs and conservancies remains insufficient to meet basic management requirements; and - Limited meaningful and sustained collaboration between the SPNAs and adjacent communities (most of whom still rely on access to natural resources for part of their livelihood) in the protection of snow leopard, their prey and key habitats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve the boundary demarcation of, and the security of entry points to, Tajik NP (Jirgital and Tavildara sections); - Design a smart patrol system for Tajik NP (Jirgital and Tavildara sections); - Establish and deploy a core of professionally trained and fully equipped rangers across Tajik NP (Jirgital and Tavildara sections); - Establish and maintain a smart patrol database and data collection system in Tajik NP (Jirgital and Tavildara sections); - Improve the park infrastructure (ranger outposts, data centre) and equipment (communications, transport) to support the implementation of the smart patrol system in Tajik NP (Jirgital and Tavildara sections); - Raise awareness levels in communities around Tajik NP (Jirgital and Tavildara sections) of the benefits of snow leopard and prey conservation; - Improve extent and scale of economic involvement of communities in the conservation, monitoring and use of Tajik NP (Jirgital and Tavildara sections); - Support the establishment and functioning of joint local management committees for Tajik NP (Jirgital and Tavildara sections). 	<p>The conservation values of at least 440,000 ha of snow leopard and prey habitats are secured, and effectively monitored and enforced;</p> <p>Rural communities are increasingly involved in, and financially benefit from the planning and management of protected areas across the snow leopard range.</p>
Pastures and forests		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of sustainable pasture and forest management practices is limited due to poor technical skills, limited knowledge and a severe lack of funding; - An upsurge in domestic livestock populations using higher altitude pastures, and for longer periods of time, leads to an increase in competition for forage with indigenous medium-sized mountain ungulates; - The continued increase in livestock populations in high altitude areas leads to further killing of snow leopards by pastoralists to ensure protection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Profile the high altitude <u>pastures</u> in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas that overlap with the critical habitats and movement corridors for snow leopard and prey; - Support the establishment and functioning of PUUs in these high altitude pastures; - Prepare pasture management plans for a sub-selection of priority high altitude pastures; - Provide technical and financial support to PUUs and individual pastoralists in the implementation of more sustainable pasture and livestock management practices in these priority high altitude pastures; - Restore and/or rehabilitate degraded high altitude pastures in the <i>Hissar-</i> 	<p>The extent of high altitude pastures under a more sustainable management regime in the Hissar-Alay and Vaksh-Darvaz areas increases from less than 5,000ha to more than 100,000ha, with more than 10,000ha of degraded pastures under active rehabilitation; and</p> <p>The extent of high altitude forests under a sustainable management regime in the Hissar-Alay and Vaksh-Darvaz areas increases from less than 2,000ha to more than 15,000ha, with 6,000ha of degraded forests under active restoration and/or rehabilitation.</p>

Business-as-usual	GEF alternative	Benefits
<p>of their livestock;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ecological integrity of the natural alpine and sub-alpine habitats further degrades as a consequence of increasingly unsustainable pastoral practices and high levels of wood harvesting and fuelwood collection; and - A lack of awareness and understanding of the plight of the snow leopard; the value of conserving snow leopards, prey, and habitat; and the local and regional consequences of the ongoing degradation of ecosystems. 	<p><i>Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Profile the high altitude <u>forests</u> in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas that overlap with the critical habitats and movement corridors for snow leopard and prey; - Facilitate the participative development and implementation of measures to ensure the sustainability, and reduce the environmental impacts, of the harvesting of wood from these high altitude forests; - Restore and/or rehabilitate degraded high altitude forests in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas; and - Demonstrate alternatives to wood for the delivery of energy and fuel needs in a selected <i>jamoat</i> resource centre and provide technical and financial support in the adoption of these alternatives. 	
Knowledge management		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Baseline information on the distribution, abundance, seasonality and recruitment rates of snow leopards and prey remains incomplete; - No national program in place to coordinate the monitoring of snow leopard and prey populations and habitats; - No formally adopted, and properly resourced, National Action Plan on the Conservation of Snow Leopard in place; and - National scientific and management institutions continue to work in relative isolation from their counterparts from other home range countries as a result of the low levels of inter-governmental cooperation in snow leopard conservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop, implement and maintain a consolidated national snow leopard monitoring and reporting system; - Develop, implement and maintain a consolidated national snow leopard information management system; - Host specialist training sessions for all researchers, scientists, academics, volunteers, students, NGO staff, government field staff, etc. on the snow leopard monitoring and reporting system and the snow leopard 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; and - Facilitate the participation and involvement of national scientists, researchers, managers and academics in regional/international snow leopard conservation initiatives. 	<p>A strong scientific base for the conservation of snow leopard and their prey is established.</p>

6) innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up

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:

Project sustainability will ultimately depend on ensuring the full ownership of the project outputs and activities by the responsible mandated public institutions and securing their long-term commitment (regulatory, policy, funding and resources) to scale-up and replicate best practices in snow leopard conservation, and sustainable forest and pasture management, beyond project completion.

Environmental sustainability will be enhanced in the project by: (a) preventing the further fragmentation of snow leopard and prey landscapes in Tajikistan; (b) maintaining and/or restoring the quality of key snow leopard and prey habitats within these landscapes; (c) improving the conservation status, and sustainability of pasture and forest use, in these key snow leopard and prey habitats; and (d) reducing the direct threats to the survival of snow leopards and prey populations living in these key habitats. More specifically, the project will support the development and implementation of a smart patrol system in targeted specially protected natural areas and reduce the impacts on, and improve the sustainable management of, the high altitude livestock pastures and indigenous forests located along, or immediately adjacent to, the key snow leopard migration routes. The project will also seek to improve the awareness of rural communities living in the snow leopard range of the importance of conserving snow leopard, their prey and their habitats.

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 across the snow leopard range in Tajikistan. 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 staff in the targeted SPNAs, *leskhoz*, border control points, *khukumats* and *jamoats*. The project will specifically: (i) pilot the implementation of a smart patrol system in two SPNAs; (ii) strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities in the responsible state agencies; (iii) build the capacity of border and customs officials to improve the detection of illegal wildlife trade; and (iv) facilitate the establishment of a NEST to coordinate the efforts of different state institutions in combatting wildlife crime. The PMU and NBBC will, during the course of project implementation, 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 term of the project. 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.

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

NA

3. *Stakeholders.*

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; provides a brief summary of the responsibilities of each of these stakeholder organisations (specifically as it applies to the management of high altitude SPNAs, pastures and forests); and broadly describes the anticipated role of each of the stakeholder organisations in supporting or facilitating the implementation of project activities:

Stakeholder	Roles and Responsibilities	Proposed involvement in the Project
National Government		
<i>Committee on Environmental Protection (CEP)</i>	The role of the Committee is to: (i) regulate nature conservation functions and activities; (ii) develop and implement nature protection and forestry policies; (iii) regulate the use	The Committee will play an oversight and guidance role in the project particularly as it pertains to conservation and sustainable management of key protected areas and

Stakeholder	Roles and Responsibilities	Proposed involvement in the Project
	and management of natural resources; and (iv) develop medium and long-term state programs for nature protection and sustainable use of natural resources.	ecosystem resilience and connectivity outside of protected areas. This will be achieved through representation on the project steering committee and consultation with officials from the local level offices.
<i>Ministry of Agriculture</i>	Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for the development and implementation of state policy relating to agriculture and rural economic development.	The Ministry will be represented on the steering committee of the project to ensure effective consultation relating to project activities pertaining to ecosystem resilience and connectivity outside of protected areas.
<i>Ministry of Economy and Trade</i>	Ministry of Economy and Trade is responsible for drafting and implementing state strategy, policy and regulations to do with social and economic development in all sectors, including the environmental arena.	The Ministry will be represented on the steering committee of the project to ensure effective consultation relating to project activities pertaining to the development of incentives for alternative livelihood opportunities to reduce the impacts on grasslands and forestry.
<i>Committee for Land Management, Geodesy and Cartography</i>	The Committee develops and implements land policy and manages the process of land reform and land-use planning.	The Committee will serve as a reference to and provide guidance on matters relating to land use and land use planning.
<i>The Forestry Agency</i>	The role of the Forestry Agency is to: (i) prepare and administer state forest policy and regulations; (ii) plan and manage state forests and forest resources (including reforestation and seed harvesting); (iii) oversee hunting activities; and (iv) plan and manage all SPNAs. There are three divisions, of which the Division for Forestry, Fauna and Flora Protection and Hunting is most concerned with this project.	The Forestry Agency will play a leading role as an institution in implementing the project through its four operational units which fall under the Division for Forestry, Fauna and Flora Protection and Hunting within the Agency. These units are the Forestry and Hunting Inspectorate; the Department of Special Protected Natural Areas; the State Forest Institution; and the Scientific Institute of Forestry.
<i>National Biodiversity and Biosafety Center</i>	The Center is responsible for the implementation of monitoring and reporting activities related to the obligations of Tajikistan in relation to the UN Convention on Biodiversity.	The Center has been identified as the lead executing agency of this project and will take overall responsibility for co-ordinating, monitoring progress and reporting on the project.
<i>The Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan</i>	The Academy provides the scientific expertise and capability to underpin decisions and actions in the field of sustainable natural resource use.	The Academy will play the role of providing a scientific perspective to project decisions and actions as well as being the beneficiary of a number of the project interventions.
Regional and local government		
<i>Regional government (Hukumat)</i>	The Hukumat has overall responsibility for the economic and development activities within the region. There are a number of Regions within the project domain.	A representative of the Hukumat will sit in the project steering committee and will mediate two-way communication between national policy directives and local project activities and actions to ensure that there is good alignment between them.
<i>District Government (Jamoat)</i>	The District level Government provides support for local economic activities and regulates land use and supervises land use decision making.	The district government will play an important role in supporting the implementation of the project in selected areas (in the project domain). They are likely to be direct beneficiaries of capacity development activities.
Local NGO and NPOs		
<i>Jamoat Resource Centres</i>	The role of the Jamoat Resource Centres is to provide support for the local management	Individuals will be direct beneficiaries of capacity development activities.

Stakeholder	Roles and Responsibilities	Proposed involvement in the Project
	of the micro-credit institutions as well as providing technical support.	
<i>Micro-financial institutions</i>	Micro-financing institutions provide financial support to communities in rural areas to support, in a sound and transparent manner, the development of the rural economy.	Individuals will be direct beneficiaries of capacity development activities.
<i>Local and national NGOs such as Zan va Zamin, Bars Consulting and Noosfera</i>	The NGOs will provide specific communication and awareness support to ensure that the project is clearly understood and to encourage active involvement and participation in the project and its activities.	
Local communities		
<i>Local pastoralists and natural resource users</i>	Local resource users will be consulted through the project in relation to potential conflict mitigation techniques, alternative livelihoods, and land uses. They are likely to be direct beneficiaries of capacity development activities. They will be involved in the planning related to aspects of the project and will contribute to the implementation of the needs and priorities of local and national decision-making processes.	
International Partners		
<i>Secretariat of the Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection programme (Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan)</i>	These partners will participate in knowledge sharing and technology transfer exercises as well as communications on data collection and sharing, best practices for planning and priority-setting.	
<i>Panthera</i>	Panthera conduct research as well as providing a connection between communities and the state in relation to snow leopard conservation.	Communication and awareness raising. Support for activities and interaction (communication) and raising awareness in favor of the rural community / farmers.
<i>Development partners (e.g. German Government, World Bank, ADB, FAO)</i>	Development partners supporting snow leopard and prey conservation projects and initiatives to improve the sustainable management of snow leopard habitats in Tajikistan will be important project partners. They will share, coordinate and collaborate with the project as and where relevant. May be represented on the Project Steering Committee.	

4. *Gender Considerations.* Elaborate on how gender considerations were mainstreamed into the project preparation and implementation, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of men and women.

In the 2014 edition of the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI)⁵, Tajikistan reportedly has medium levels of discrimination against women in social institutions (SIGI score of 0.1393). It has lower discrimination in restricted access to resources and assets and higher discrimination in son bias.

During the project preparation phase, the following key gender issues were identified:

- In 2012, the ratio of female to male primary education enrolment was 98%. In 2011, the ratio of female to male secondary school enrolment was 88% and 97 for primary education. The male/female sex ratio for the working age population in 2013 is 0.98. Rigid notions of men's and women's roles in society and in the home remain. It is believed that men should occupy the role of breadwinner and head of the household, while women should confine themselves to domestic and care work within the home.
- Under the Land Code, women and men have equal rights to access and manage land. According to the World Bank (2011), 78% of female-headed households (where there is no working-age male) manage land, compared to 89% of male-headed households, and 91% of female-headed households with at least one working age male.

⁵ The SIGI measures gender-based discrimination in social norms, practices and laws. It covers five dimensions of discriminatory social institutions, spanning major socio-economic areas that affect women's lives: (i) discriminatory family code; (ii) restricted physical integrity; (iii) son bias; (iv) restricted resources and assets; and (v) restricted civil liberties. The SIGI's variables quantify discriminatory social institutions such as unequal inheritance rights, early marriage, violence against women, and unequal land and property rights.

- The Tajik Civil Code gives women the right to have access to property other than land and to enter into contracts in their own names. In practice, 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. In addition, requirements in the Land Code that land only be allocated to those who are qualified to manage it discriminate against women, given that few have formal agricultural qualifications, and local officials tend to view them as incapable of running a farm. Women 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. Few women apply for loans, however, primarily because they do not 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 women's access to credit. As of 2012, women made up 32.91% of recipients of micro-credit in Tajikistan, according to the Microfinance Information Exchange.

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 women as park rangers (Output 1.2), smart patrol trainers (Output 1.2), community liaison officers (Output 1.4), leskhoz forest enforcement staff (Output 2.3), local environmental enforcement staff (Output 2.3) and community rangers (Output 2.3).
- The project will actively encourage the equitable use of women labour and supervisors from local rural villages in: the planning and implementation of pasture management plans (Output 2.1); the planning and restoration of degraded high altitude pastures (Output 2.1); and the planning and rehabilitation/restoration of high altitude forests.
- 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-owned businesses.
- The project will ensure that the reach of project-funded education/awareness-raising programmes, sustainable livelihood development support, and skills training in villages surrounding Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik National Park will include both male- and female-headed households from the targeted villages (Output 1.4).
- The project will ensure that the interests of women and women-headed households are adequately represented on Park Management Committees (Output 1.4), Pasture User Unions (Output 2.1) and PFM Committees (Output 2.2); 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 support in villages surrounding Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik National Park will equitably include both male- and female-headed households from the targeted villages (Output 1.4).
- The project will actively assist women-headed households living in the high altitude areas of the Hissar-Alay and Vakshsh-Darvaz areas to access: (i) micro-financing for sustainable livelihoods; and (ii) technical and financial support from project grants for developing and installing alternative fuel and energy systems and implementing more sustainable pasture management practices.
- 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 Action Plan for 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 which may further strengthen the capacities of local women and women-headed households across the project planning domain.

The project has targeted the involvement of at least 1,200 women (of a total of 2000) in, and the direct beneficitation of at least 270 women (of a total of 450) from, project activities.

5 *Risk*. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental future 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:

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
<p>State institutions responsible for the administration of protected areas, pastures and forests do not have adequate capacity, or demonstrate the necessary political will, to support, maintain and enforce working agreements with rural pasture user groups, forest user groups and communities living adjacent to SPNAs</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>MODERATELY LIKELY</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>As a signatory to the ‘Bishkek Declaration’ (October, 2013), the Government of Tajikistan (GoT) has resolved to ‘<i>commit resources for (the) implementation</i>’ (of the Global Snow Leopard Ecosystem Protection Program). It has further committed to act to ‘<i>protect and recover snow leopard populations and their fragile habitats</i>’. This project has thus been developed to assist the GoT in meeting the ‘political will’ already represented in these resolutions and commitments.</p> <p>The project will seek to significantly strengthen and expand the current capabilities of the key institutions⁶ that are directly responsible for the planning and management of protected areas, natural habitats, pastures and forests across the snow leopard range in Tajikistan. More specifically, it will assist in building a professional corps of well-trained and properly equipped management, monitoring, enforcement, community liaison and pastoral extension service staff in the targeted SPNAs, <i>leskhoz</i>, border control points, <i>khukumats</i> and <i>jamoats</i>.</p> <p>The PMU and NBBC will, during the course of project implementation, 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 term of the project.</p> <p>The project will also support the implementation of income-generating opportunities (e.g. income from</p>

⁶ This includes: the Department of Special Protected Natural Areas (Forestry Agency); the State Forest Institution (Forestry Agency); the Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture); the Border and Customs Service; the CEP inspectorates within the *khukumats*; and the *jamoats*.

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
				<p>hunting fees, income from pasture tax, specialist tourism services, income from fines, etc.) to further augment the current budgets of the responsible institutions.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>MODERATELY LIKELY</p>	<p>MEDIUM</p>	<p>The project has adopted a three-pronged approach to addressing this risk.</p> <p>In the <u>first</u> instance, while the widespread culture of impunity from environmental prosecution will not be fully reversed, the project will seek to improve the monitoring and enforcement capabilities across the snow leopard range. The project will specifically: pilot the implementation of a smart patrol system in Tajik NP (Output 1.2 and 1.3); strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities (knowledge, training, skills, equipment and staff) in the responsible state agencies (Output 2.3); pilot the training, equipping and deployment of a corps of local community rangers (Output 2.3); build the capacity of border and customs officials to improve the detection of illegal wildlife trade (Output 3.2); and facilitate the establishment of a NEST to coordinate the efforts of different state institutions in combatting wildlife crime (Output 3.2).</p> <p>In the <u>second</u> instance, the project will seek to incentivise an incremental shift to more sustainable land use (focused on grazing and forest use) practices. The project will specifically: facilitate the economic beneficiation (employment, contractual work, provision of services, income from hunting concessions, etc.) of communities living around Tajik NP in return for a reduction in illegal activities in the the park (Output 1.4); help village governments to plan, source funding for and implement alternative livelihoods (Output 1.4); provide technical and financial grant support to pastoralists in return for a shift to more sustainable pasture management practices (Output 2.1); and provide small grants to assist rural communities and local governments to install alternative fuel and energy technologies in return for a reduction in harvesting of wood for fuel and energy needs from forests (Output 2.2).</p> <p>In the <u>third</u> instance, the project will seek to improve the awareness of rural communities living in the snow leopard range of the importance of conserving snow leopard, their prey and their habitats. The project will specifically: develop and implement an education and awareness programme around Tajik NP (Output 1.4); strengthen the knowledge and awareness of sustainable pasture management in the PUUs (Output 2.1); strengthen the knowledge and awareness of sustainable forest management in PFM committees (Output 2.2); present informational materials and displays on alternative fuel and energy technologies (Output 2.2); and conduct an ecosystem</p>

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
				services and economic valuation of snow leopard and their mountain ecosystems (Output 3.2).
<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>	MODERATE	MODERATELY LIKELY	MEDIUM	<p>The project is building on almost a decade of cooperation with communities and local and regional authorities in the implementation of biodiversity conservation initiatives under the framework of a UNDP-GEF-CEP/NBBC partnership. This work 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.</p> <p>The project will work closely with the administration of the targeted SPNAs, <i>leskhoz</i>, <i>khukumats</i>, <i>jamoats</i> and <i>dehas</i> in ensuring the effective involvement of all affected stakeholders in the implementation of project activities.</p> <p>The project will specifically work through (and assist in establishing, where these have not yet been constituted) the coordinating structures of Park Management Committees, Pasture User Unions (PUUs) and Participatory Forest Management (PFM) committees 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.</p> <p>The project will also strengthen the knowledge and skills base of protected area, 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 practises.</p> <p>A full stakeholder participation plan will be prepared as the project is further developed.</p>
<p>The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change, results in more intensive and extensive grazing pressures on high altitude pastures, potentially leading to 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 matrix of 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 also 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>

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
				<p>The project will also support the finalisation of the <i>National Action Plan for Snow Leopard Conservation in Tajikistan</i> (Output 3.2) An integral part of the action plan will be the development of strategies and approaches to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change on snow leopard conservation.</p> <p>The project will further support the involvement of managers, scientists, researchers and academics in more rigorously monitoring the effects of climate change on snow leopard and prey and collaborating in regional initiatives to develop strategies to mitigate and manage these effects.</p>

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.

(i) Implementation arrangements:

The project will be implemented over a period of five years.

The project will be nationally implemented (NIM) by the National Biodiversity and Biosafety Centre (NBBC) in line with *Standard Basic Assistance Agreement* between the Government of Tajikistan and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), signed by the parties on 1 October 1993.

Following the programming guidelines for national implementation of UNDP supported projects, the NBBC will sign the Project Document with UNDP and will be accountable to UNDP for the disbursement of funds and the achievement of the project objective and outcomes, according to the approved work plan.

The UNDP will monitor the implementation of the project, review progress in the realization of the project outputs, and ensure the proper use of UNDP/GEF funds. Working in close cooperation with the NBBC, the UNDP Country Office (CO) will provide support services to the project - including procurement, contracting of service providers, human resources management, administration of project grant funding, and financial services - in accordance with a Letter of Agreement (LOA) for the provision of support services concluded between the NBBC and the UNDP. The UNDP CO will also ensure conformance with UNDP Programme and Operational Policies and Procedures and UNDP Results-Based Management (RBM) guidelines.

The NBBC, as the Implementing Partner (IP), will be responsible for the following functions: (i) coordinating activities to ensure the delivery of agreed outcomes; (ii) certifying expenditures in line with approved budgets and work-plans; (iii) facilitating, monitoring and reporting on the procurement of inputs and delivery of outputs; (iv) coordinating interventions financed by GEF/UNDP with other parallel interventions; (v) approval of tender documents for sub-contracted inputs; (vi) reporting to UNDP on project delivery and impact; (vii) certifying the AWP; and (viii) carrying out the selection and recruitment process. It will also be directly responsible for creating the enabling conditions for implementation of all project activities.

The NBBC will work in close cooperation with the CEP, Forestry Agency, and SPNA. The NBBC will coordinate all project activities at the local level, in close collaboration with the district (*Jamoat*) government authorities in each of the targeted regions.

The NBBC will designate a senior staff member to act as a Project Director (PD). The PD will provide the strategic oversight and guidance to project implementation and will chair the meetings of the Steering Committee⁷.

The day-to-day administration of the project will be carried out by a full-time Project Manager (PM), with the support of a Project Administrative Assistant (PAA) and a Project Financial Assistant (PFA). Field-based technical support and oversight will be provided by 3 Field Coordinators, one for SPNAs (component 1), one for pastures and forests (component 2) and one for knowledge management (component 3). Collectively the PM, PFA PAA and the FCs will comprise the Project Management Unit (PMU). The PM has the authority to administer the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the NBBC and UNDP, within the constraints laid down by the Steering Committee (SC). The PM'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 PM will liaise and work closely with all partner institutions to link the project with complementary national programs and initiatives. The PM is accountable to the PD and UNDP for the quality, timeliness and effectiveness of the activities carried out, as well as for the use of funds. The PFA, PAA and FCs will report to the PM and will provide professional, technical and administrative support to the PM, as required. The terms of reference for the PM, PFA, PAA and FCs are detailed in Section IV, Part I of the UNDP PRODOC.

An international Technical Adviser (TA) will provide overall professional and technical backstopping to the Project. He/She will render professional and technical support to the PMU, NBBC, and other government counterparts. The TA will support the provision of the required professional and technical inputs, reviewing and preparing Terms of Reference (TORs) and reviewing the outputs of service providers, experts and other sub-contractors. He/She will report directly to the PD and PM.

The PMU will be technically supported by contracted teams of national experts, international NGO's, international consultants and companies. The recruitment of specialist support services and procurement of any equipment and materials for the project will be done by the PM, in consultation with the PD, and in accordance with relevant recruitment and procurement rules and procedures. The terms of reference of the key individual national and international experts and consultants to be contracted by the project are detailed in Section IV, Part I of the UNDP PRODOC.

The NBBC, the CEP, the Forestry Agency and the Academy of Sciences may also, in accordance with the AWP, directly implement some project activities, under the supervision of the PM and PD.

A project Steering Committee (SC) will be constituted to serve as the executive decision making body for the project. While the final composition of the SC will be determined at the Project Inception Workshop (see Section I, Part IV of the UNDP PRODOC), it may include representation from the NBCC, UNDP, CEP, Forestry Agency, Academy of Science, affected regional administrative authorities, NGOs and pasture user unions. The SC will ensure that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcomes of the required quality. The SC will meet at least twice per annum (more often where required). The SC provides overall guidance and policy direction to the implementation of the project, and provides advice on appropriate strategies for project sustainability. The SC will play a critical role in project monitoring and evaluation by quality assuring the project processes and products. It will arbitrate on any conflicts within the project, or negotiate a solution to any problems with external bodies. It will also approve the appointment and responsibilities of the Project Manager and any delegation of its project assurance responsibilities.

The PM will produce an Annual Work Plan (AWP) to be approved by the SC at the beginning of each year. These plans will provide the basis for allocating resources to planned project activities. Once the SC approves the AWP, it will be signed by NBBC and UNDP and sent to the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) at the GEF Regional Service Centre (RSC) in Istanbul for clearance. Once the AWP is cleared by the RSC, it will be sent to the UNDP/GEF Unit in New York for final approval and release of the funding. The PM will further produce quarterly operational reports, Annual Progress Reports (APR) and the Project Implementation Review (PIR) report for review by the SC, or any other reports at the request of the SC. These reports will summarize the progress

⁷ The PD will not be paid from the project funds, but will represent a Government in-kind contribution to the Project.

made by the project versus the expected results, explain any significant variances, detail the necessary adjustments and be the main reporting mechanism for monitoring project activities.

(ii) *Coordination*

This project is complementary to 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 (2016-2020). This project will thus seek to adopt and operationalise, at the national level, the relevant tools and guidelines that will be developed under the regional project. The GSLEP Focal Point for Tajikistan will be represented on the Project Board of both the regional project and this projects Steering Committee (SC) committee in order to strengthen the strategic linkages between the projects. The Project Manager of this project will also maintain a close working relationship with the Project Technical Committee (PTC) of the regional project in order to enhance the operational linkages between the projects. The implementation of Component 3 (Outputs 3.1 and 3.2) of this project will, in particular, benefit significantly from the effective coordination of efforts, and sharing of knowledge between the projects.

The project will meet on a regular basis with the project staff of GIZ involved in complementary donor-funded sustainable forest management and pasture co-management initiatives in Tajikistan, in order to identify and develop opportunities for ongoing collaboration. The project will specifically seek to build on the substantial foundational work already undertaken by GIZ (and other partners) in setting up and maintaining PFM Committees, community-based conservancies and Pasture User Unions across the country. To further strengthen the cooperative relationship with GIZ, it is also envisaged that GIZ will be represented on the project Steering Committee (SC).

The Project Management Unit (PMU) of this project will work closely with the World Bank and Asian Development Bank to, wherever practicable, align the Banks' initiatives and the project activities in order to ensure optimal benefits from efforts to improve the country's climate resilience capacity and improve its capacity to adapt to the effects of climate change. A particular focus of this alignment of efforts will be on harmonising the financial and technical support (technical and financial) provided to rural communities in: implementing more sustainable pasture management practices in high altitude grasslands; improving the management and sustainable use of high forests; and adopting more environmentally-friendly fuel and energy technologies.

The grant and technical funding support under Output 2.1 and 2.2 of the project will be subsumed under the UNDP Communities Programme (CP) portfolio for Tajikistan⁸. The grant and technical funding support to targeted rural pasture and forest users under the project will then be implemented directly by the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) to ensure that it fully complements the seven other projects currently under active implementation within the UNDP CP portfolio (representing an investment of US\$23.2 million for the period 2014-2017).

The project will seek to develop collaborative agreements with key NGO partners (notably Panthera) and international research institutions to support the implementation of selected project activities (e.g. snow leopard and prey surveys and monitoring, specialised 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. To further strengthen the cooperative relationship with NGOs, it is also envisaged that Panthera will be represented on the project Steering Committee (SC).

The project will, if considered feasible by the Government of Tajikistan, support the establishment and administration of the National Environment Security Task Force (NEST), as envisaged by the *Regional Enforcement Strategy to Combat Illegal Wildlife Trade in Central Asia*. If established, this NEST will then nationally address and combat wildlife crime through a more coordinated, collaborative and strategic response. The PMU may also, during the project implementation phase, later facilitate linkages with the envisioned regional Snow Leopard and Wildlife Enforcement Network (SLAWEN) once it has been established.

⁸ Refer to http://www.tj.undp.org/content/tajikistan/en/home/operations/projects/poverty_reduction/communities-programme/.

The project will integrate the snow leopard monitoring and reporting system and snow leopard information management system into the broader Environmental Information Management and Monitoring System in Tajikistan currently being developed by the UNDP-GEF medium-sized project *Strengthening Capacity for an Environmental Information Management and Monitoring System in Tajikistan* (2014-2017).

7 *Benefits*. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. Do any of these benefits support the achievement of global environment benefits (for GEF Trust Fund)?

Socio-economic benefits will be enhanced in the project by incentivising an incremental shift to more sustainable land use (focused on grazing and forest use) practices. The project will specifically: (i) facilitate the economic beneficiation (from direct employment, contractual work, provision of services, income from hunting concessions, etc.) of communities living around targeted SPNAs in return for a reduction in illegal activities in the SPNAs; (ii) help village governments to plan, source funding for and implement alternative livelihoods; (iii) provide technical and financial grant support to pastoralists in return for a shift to more sustainable pasture management practices; and (iv) provide small grants to assist rural communities and local governments to install alternative fuel and energy technologies in return for a reduction in harvesting of wood for fuel and energy needs from forests. The project will primarily work through (and assist in establishing, where these have not yet been constituted) the coordinating structures of Park Management Committees, Pasture User Unions (PUUs) and Participatory Forest Management (PFM) committees 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.

8. *Knowledge Management*. Outline the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.

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 Manager 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 smart patrol systems in SPNAs and community-based conservancies; (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 alternative energy and fuel technologies; and (vi) new snow leopard and prey population monitoring technologies (e.g. aerial drones, fecal DNA analysis and radio collars). The lessons learnt in project implementation will be incorporated into the development of the National Action Plan for *Snow Leopard Conservation in Tajikistan*. The sharing of best practices and lessons learned in project implementation with other member countries of the GSLEP will be facilitated through regional GSLEP meetings and regular communications through the GSLEP Secretariat.

9. *Consistency with National Priorities*.

The project will broadly contribute to achieving the national targets under Objectives 1.1 (Goal 1 – sustainable management and development), Objectives 3.1 and 3.2 (Goal 3 – forests) and Objective 4.3 (Goal 4 – SPNAs) of functional area 3.5 (‘Ensure environmental stability and sustainable development’) in the Social Sector of the *Living Standards Improvement Strategy* (2007-2015) It will also assist in the implementation of key areas of activities under the output ‘Promote conservation and proper management of biodiversity and ecosystems’ contained in the *National Development Strategy* (2013-2015).

The project will support the implementation of the activities 1-3, 5-6, 11, 13, 15-18, 25 and 28 identified in the 'Action Plan for Biodiversity Conservation' in the *National Environmental Action Plan* (NEAP, 2006). The project will specifically facilitate the funding and implementation of elements of the following three 'especially high priority environment-sector projects' referred to in Annexure D of the NEAP): Project 16 (reforestation); Project 24 (small hydropower projects); and Project 25 (raising environmental awareness).

The project is closely aligned to the *State Environmental Program of the Republic of Tajikistan*⁹ (2009-2019), notably in respect of two thematic areas: (i) 'improving the ecological condition of flora' (improved forest and grassland management capacities, restoration of degraded grasslands, reforestation); and (ii) 'improving the ecological condition of fauna' (improving the habitats of migratory species, inventory of rare and threatened fauna; strengthening the protection of migratory wildlife).

The project will also contribute to implementing the priority activities identified in the *State Program on Development of Forestry in the Republic of Tajikistan for 2006-2015*, notably the suite of activities under Objective 2.1 (conservation of existing forests), Objective 2.2 (development of the forestry sector) and Objective 2.5 (regularization of state forest fund lands - including pastures – in support of rural development) of the State Program.

The project is consistent with the key priorities identified in the *State Program on Development of Natural Protected Areas in the Republic of Tajikistan for 2005-2015*, particularly in respect of activities under Objectives 3 and 4 (strengthening institutional and individual capacities; development of infrastructure; improving knowledge systems; and improving public awareness) of the State Program.

The project will contribute to the implementation of Objective 6 (establishment and promotion of sub-sector unions) and Objective 11 (sustainable use and management of natural resources) of the *Agriculture Reform Programme of the Republic of Tajikistan for 2012-2020*. The project is also closely aligned with the *State Program on Improvement of Conditions and Rational Use of Pastures in the Republic of Tajikistan for 2009-2015*, especially in respect of Activity 2 (improved pasture management) Activity 3 (inventory of pasture lands) and Activity 4 (restoration of degraded pastures) of the State Program.

The project will further contribute, at least in part, to the ongoing establishment of the 'national state environmental monitoring system', as envisaged in Decree No. 791 '*On the Regulations to set up a unified state Environmental Monitoring System of the Republic of Tajikistan and to maintain the State Register of Environmental Monitoring Facilities of the Republic of Tajikistan*' (2014), and is further elaborated in the corresponding *Program on Environmental Monitoring of the Republic of Tajikistan for 2013-2017*.

10. 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 4 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 programme 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, NBBC 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

⁹ Approved by Government Resolution on February 27, 2009 (№123)

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 6 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared 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.

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 Evaluation (MTE) at the mid-point of project implementation.

The MTE 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 MTE will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this MTE 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 evaluation cycle.

End of Project:

An independent Final 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 final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the MTE, if any such correction took place). The final 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 final 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 final 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.

M&E work plan and budget


Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PM ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP-GEF RSC 	Indicative cost: 12,000	Within first four months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PM 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PM ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP ERC 	None	Annually

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PM 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PM ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RSC ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 45,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PM ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RSC ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 45,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PM ▪ UNDP CO ▪ local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Project manager and team 	For GEF-supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RSC (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For GEF-supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST <i>Excluding project staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>		US\$ 102,000	

***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 policies¹⁰ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP- GEF Executive Coordinator		February 10, 2016	Maxim Vergeichik, Regional Technical Advisor, EBD, UNDP	+42-190- 563-3046	maxim.vergeichik@undp.org

¹⁰ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF

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).

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: <i>Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alai and Tien-Shan ecosystems for snow leopard protection and sustainable livelihoods</i>	Extent (ha) of protected areas under a secure, and effectively managed, monitoring and enforcement regime	0	>440,000ha	Annual reports of the Department of Specially Protected Natural Areas (Forestry Agency)	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The GoT remains committed to supporting efforts to increase the management effectiveness of SPNAs, and improving the ecological integrity and productivity of high altitude pastures and forests, in the country; – The responsible public institutions will continue to actively administer, monitor and enforce the existing conservation legislation and regulations. Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – State institutions responsible for the administration of protected areas, pastures and forests do not have adequate capacity, or demonstrate the necessary political will; – 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
	Extent (ha) of high altitude grasslands (above 1,500m) in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas under a regulated and sustainable management regime	<5,000 ha	>100,000 ha	Annual reports of the Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture) and CEP	
	Extent (ha) of high altitude forest (above 1,500m) in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas under a sustainable management regime	<2,000 ha	>15,000 ha	Annual reports of the Forestry Agency and CEP	
	Number of primary snow leopard prey populations: Marco Polo Sheep (NT) Siberian Ibex (LC)	Marco Polo Sheep: ~1,125 Siberian Ibex: ~4,190	Marco Polo Sheep: >1,400 Siberian Ibex: >5,000	Population census reports Snow leopard Information Management System	
	Total snow leopard population in Tajikistan	180-220	>220	Snow leopard Information Management System	
	Number of women (as a proportion of the total) involved in, and directly benefiting from project investments in the conservation and sustainable use of snow leopard, snow leopard prey and snow leopard habitats	NA	Involvement: >2000 (>60%) Direct benefits: >450 (>60%)	Project reports	

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
					holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users; and – The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change.
Outcome 1: <i>Conservation and sustainable management of key biodiversity areas</i>	Outputs: 1.1 Secure the conservation status and boundaries of protected areas 1.2 Develop the capacity to implement a smart patrolling system in protected areas 1.3 Improve the equipment and infrastructure to support the implementation of a smart patrol system in protected areas 1.4 Enhance community involvement in, and beneficitation from, protected areas				
	Total extent (ha) of IUCN Category I and Category II protected areas	2,777,018 ha	2,837,018 ha	Annual performance reports of the Department of Specially Protected Natural Areas (Forestry Agency)	Assumptions: – Stakeholders will constructively participate in the design, development and implementation of a smart patrol system in Tajik and Sangvor; – The Forestry Agency will budget adequately for the continued employment of project-funded ranger staff, and the ongoing maintenance of new equipment and infrastructure procured by the project; – The Forestry Agency will commit to facilitating the involvement and beneficitation of local communities living adjacent to Tajik NP and Sangvor Risks:
	Total annual budget (US\$/annum) allocation for the management of IUCN Category I – IV protected areas	US\$250,000/annum	>US\$450,000/annum	Annual financial reports of the Forestry Agency	
	METT scores for: Tajik NP (Jirgital section) Tajik NP (Tavildara section, including Sangvor)	Jirgital: 20 Tavildara: 20	Jirgital: 44 Tavildara: 40	Annual METT reporting	
	Number of active patrol rangers in the Jirgital and Tavildara (including Sangvor) sections of Tajik NP	Jirgital: 10 Tavildara: 8	Jirgital: 18 Tavildara: 16	Smart patrol system Annual performance reports for Tajik NP	
	Extent (as a percentage of the total area) of Jirgital and Tavildara (including Sangvor) sections of Tajik NP under a secure and effective monitoring and enforcement regime	Jirgital: <15% Tavildara: <12%	Jirgital: >85% Tavildara: >60%	Smart patrol system Annual performance reports for Tajik NP	

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of (i) poaching (of snow leopard and prey); and (ii) other illegal (encroachments for crops and grazing, wood harvesting) incidents recorded (and prosecuted) per annum by ranger patrol staff from the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP	(i) >15 (1)/annum (ii) >45 (2)/annum ¹¹	(i) <5 (4) /annum (ii) <60 (40) /annum ¹²	Smart patrol system Annual performance reports for Tajik NP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – State institutions responsible for the administration of protected areas do not have adequate capacity, or demonstrate the necessary political will; – Low levels of compliance with environmental legislation; – Low levels of coordination and cooperation between public institutions, tenure holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users; and – The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change.
	Number of individuals from targeted villages directly involved in (proportion of women), and financially benefiting from (proportion of women), the management of the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP	Involvement in: <100 (<15) Direct financial beneficiation ¹³ from: <10 (1-2)	Involvement in: >2000 (>1100) Direct financial beneficiation from: >150 (>80)	Project reports Annual performance reports for Tajik NP	
Outcome 2: <i>Ecosystem resilience and habitat connectivity in wider landscape outside protected areas</i>	Outputs: 2.1 Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, livestock pastures 2.2 Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, forests 2.3 Strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities				

¹¹ The low baseline is an under-representation of the actual number of illegal activities because of the exceptionally poor state of patrolling in the the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP.

¹² The increased number of reported incidents of illegal activities is a direct consequence of the improved coverage of smart patrols, and not an indication of an increase in the number of illegal incidents *per se*. It is anticipated that the implementation of the smart patrol system should reduce the actual number of illegal activities occurring in the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP by at least 50%.

¹³ As a sub-set of the individuals involved in the management of the Jirgital and Tavildara sections of Tajik NP.

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of days of use ¹⁴ of high altitude pastures in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas: Spring and autumn Summer	Spring/Autumn: 85-90 days Summer: 90-100 days	Spring/Autumn: 45-55 days Summer: 60-70 days	Annual reports of <i>Jamoats</i> Annual reports of Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture)	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Development partners, NGOs, micro-loan banks, CBOs and local authorities (<i>jamoats</i> and <i>hukumats</i>) will constructively cooperate with the project in supporting the establishment and administration of PUUs and PFM Committees – The NBBC, Academy of Sciences the Forestry Agency and/or the Ministry of Agriculture (Pasture Trust) will maintain monitoring plot data in order to evaluate the efficacy of project interventions; – The GoT will actively support the formalisation of PUUs and PFM committees Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – State institutions responsible for the administration of pastures
	Productivity (dry fodder mass in tons/ha) of the high altitude pastures in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas	<0.3 t/ha	>1 t/ha	Permanent pasture monitoring plots Annual reports of Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture)	
	Percentage (as an average of the total grass/forb/herb cover per hectare) of palatable and edible species ¹⁵ for ungulates and livestock in the high altitude pastures of the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas	<30%	>50%	Permanent pasture monitoring plots Annual reports of Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture)	
	Number of Pasture User Unions (PUUs) with approved pasture management plans under implementation in the high altitude pastures of the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas	0	>10	Annual reports of <i>Jamoats</i> Annual reports of Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture)	

¹⁴ The average number of days of use per annum will vary, depending on the specific location and nature of the pastures being grazed/browsed.

¹⁵ The increase in cover of unpalatable species is a direct consequence of the effects of unsustainable levels of grazing and forage collection, increased compaction and erosion and short fire regimes.

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of households in the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas directly benefiting from project technical and grant funding support for: (a) implementation of sustainable pasture management practices; (b) adoption of alternative fuel and energy technologies; and (c) community ranger pilot project	NA	Sustainable pasture management: >40 Fuel and energy technologies: >10 Community ranger: 5	Project reports	<p>and forests do not have adequate capacity, or demonstrate the necessary political will;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 – The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change.
	Extent (ha) of degraded high altitude pastures and forests of the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas under active rehabilitation or restoration	Pastures: 0 ha Forests: <100 ha	Pastures: 10,000 ha Forests: 6,000 ha	Annual reports of <i>leskhoz</i> (Forestry Agency) and CEP	
	Number of Participatory Forest Management (PFM) committees actively involved in the planning, management and monitoring of high altitude forests of the <i>Hissar-Alay</i> and <i>Vakhsh-Darvaz</i> areas	0	>3	Annual reports of <i>leskhoz</i> (Forestry Agency) and CEP	
	Number (per annum) of individuals involved in wildlife monitoring and enforcement training and skills development programmes	5-7/annum	>100/annum	Training records Project reports	
Outcome 3: <i>Support to international cooperation</i>	Outputs: 3.1 Enhance the state of knowledge on snow leopard and prey populations 3.2 Improve the coordination of, and cooperation in, snow leopard conservation and monitoring				

	Indicator	Baseline (2015)	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Establishment and maintenance of a: (i) national snow leopard Monitoring and Reporting (M&R) system (ii) national snow leopard Information Management (IM) system	M&R: No IM: No	M&R: Yes IM: Yes	Project reports Annual reports of the NBBC	Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development partners and NGOs will constructively participate in the planning, research, monitoring, information management and evaluation activities under the project; - There are no political conflicts between neighbouring countries which may undermine any transboundary cooperation efforts. Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low levels of coordination and cooperation between public institutions, tenure holders, rights holders, land owners, NGOs/CBOs and natural resources users; and - The increasing aridisation of high altitude habitats, as a result of the effects of climate change.
	National coverage (as a % of the total snow leopard range) of snow leopard and prey monitoring activities	Snow leopard: <10% Prey: <5%	Snow leopard: >25% Prey: >20%	Snow Leopard Information Management System	
	Approved and implemented National Action Plan for snow leopard conservation.	No	Yes	Annual reports of the NBBC	
	Number of managers, scientists, researchers and academics participating in: (i) regional snow leopard and prey conservation initiatives; and (ii) regional monitoring and report-back meetings	2 0	15 10	Project reports Annual reports of the NBBC	
	Number of meetings per annum of the: (i) National Environment Security Task Force (NEST) (ii) National Snow Leopard Conservation Committee	0 0	4 5	Project reports Annual reports of the NBBC and CEP	
	Number of trans-boundary agreements (Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, China, Kyrgyzstan) addressing collaboration in the management of wildlife crime under implementation	1	3	Annual reports of the NBBC and CEP	

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) Council comments (Canada; Germany; and Switzerland)		
<p>1. Integration of performance-based management systems in PAs STAP: ... <i>consideration should be given to developing PAs as cost centers using performance based management systems so that they achieve management effectiveness as well as biodiversity coverage.</i> Canada: (T)he final project proposal should place increased focus on developing protected areas as devolved cost centers that use performance based management to plan, track and report on project performance.</p>	<p>The Department of Special Protected Natural Areas National Parks – responsible for the administration of IUCN category I (<i>Zapovedniks</i>) and II (National Parks) protected areas in Tajikistan - already have in place a system of devolved cost centres. Either an entire SPNA, or a management section within the SPNA (in the case of Tajik NP), comprises an individual ‘cost centre’. Each cost centre then includes a number of ‘cost codes’ linked to different management-related costs of the cost centre. In practise, the most immediate challenge for these protected areas is the adequate funding of these cost centres, rather than the monitoring of actual performance against the budgeted costs. Each cost centre, at best, currently only makes provision for the employment of a few badly paid and poorly equipped staff in order to maintain a basic presence in the protected area. By example, the Tavildara section (~360,000 ha) of Tajik National Park – a World Heritage Site - has a staff complement of 15 and an annual budget (including HR, operating and capital costs) of less than US\$26,400 per annum (equivalent to ~0.08 US cents/ha/annum <u>or</u> US\$2,200 per month for ALL costs). The section management team has only one vehicle, which at the time of the site visit, was not functional (and has no funds for fuel anyway). The park staff are not uniformed, have no park-funded equipment and pay for their own running costs while working in the park. A performance management system in this context has little inherent value. So, while the project will continue to encourage the retention of the system of devolved cost centres, its focus is rather on establishing a basic management capability (focused on a corps of patrol rangers) within the protected areas targeted for project support (i.e. Sangvor and Tajik). The project will then, during the course of implementation, use the GEF support to further leverage an increase in government funding support to ensure that this core of patrol rangers is maintained and sustained (hopefully because of the real, and perceived, value by government of establishing a more professional ranger corps in protected areas) beyond the project term.</p>	<p>Changes to the project design were not considered prudent.</p>
<p>2. Optimising income from hunting STAP: (The project) <i>needs to develop a realistic case for the integration of the bio-experience economy (e.g. high-value hunting) into local livelihoods. (T)he management and governance of (hunting) needs to be optimized to flip the economy towards natural' uses.</i> Switzerland: <i>We also highly recommend to</i></p>	<p>It is fully agreed that, in principle, hunting needs to be more sustainably managed to ensure optimal (financial) returns to local communities. The controlled hunting of high-value ungulates (notably argali, Siberian ibex, urial, and Tajik markhor) in Tajikistan is currently regulated in terms of the Law on Hunting (2014). The implementation of the Law on Hunting is directly managed by the Forestry and Hunting Inspectorate in the Forestry Agency. While the Law strongly promotes the notion of local community beneficitation from hunting activities, the implementation of the relevant provisions contained in the law have yet to be fully enacted due to institutional capacity and knowledge constraints. The project</p>	<p>SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC has been improved to support the implementation of the Law on Hunting</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p><i>consider the STAP comments 3 and 4 regarding the role of communities in the management of trophy hunting and benefit sharing in the further development of the project.</i></p>	<p>has been designed to support the Government of Tajikistan in addressing some of these constraints.</p> <p>For example, hunting quotas are still being set for high value ungulates without carrying out systematic surveys of population numbers or undertaking regular research on the population dynamics of these species. Annual hunting quotas are often too high to ensure that viable populations of wild ungulates (e.g. argali and Siberian ibex) are being maintained. This project will thus contribute to: improving the baseline population data for the key snow leopard prey species; supporting ongoing research efforts into their population dynamics; and implementing a system for the regular monitoring of their populations (Outputs 3.1 and 3.2).</p> <p>The Law on Hunting also makes explicit provision for a portion of hunting income to be allocated to local communities for community-based development projects, and for a portion to be allocated to protected areas to supplement their income for operational costs. This project will thus develop the capacity of the Forestry Agency to more equitably distribute the income from hunting, in conformance with the explicit requirements of the Law, to local communities and to protected areas (Output 1.4 and 2.3).</p> <p>The development of community-based conservancies - run by non-profit organizations or by family-based small enterprises of local community members - has already been successfully implemented in Tajikistan, with the active support of a number of international development partners and NGOs. Populations of Siberian ibex, Tajik markhor and argali in these conservancies have stabilized or increased as a result of these initiatives. These conservancies have now started to derive significant income streams from the award of high-value hunting concessions within the conservancies. The capacity of these conservancies to monitor and enforce the hunting conditions and to control illegal hunting and poaching is however seriously constrained, leading to the slower recovery of ungulate populations in the conservancies (and subsequent loss of income from legitimate hunting concessions). The project will thus support the staffing, training, equipping and deployment of a local corps of community rangers to patrol and monitor illegal hunting and poaching activities occurring in the community conservancies (Output 2.3).</p> <p>The project will also support the procurement of key equipment (e.g. vehicles, uniforms, rations, protective clothing, computer equipment, GPS, communications equipment) for local field-based enforcement staff of the Forestry Agency to also monitor and enforce illegal activities that detrimentally affect the conservation of wild ungulate populations and habitats in the different hunting concession areas around the country (Output 2.3 and 3.2).</p>	<p>(2014), notably in respect of promoting the administration of community-based hunting concessions and improving the equitable distribution of income from hunting activities.</p>
<p>3. Participation and equitable benefit-sharing STAP: (The project) <i>depends heavily on community buy in, but gives little consideration to how communities are to be empowered, organized and capacitated.</i> <i>Careful thought should also be given to the local governance arrangements necessary for</i></p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>During the PPG phase, the local governance mechanisms to be used in the ‘engagement, empowerment and capacitation’ of communities were more explicitly defined.</p> <p>The project will now specifically work through (and assist in establishing, where these have not yet been constituted) the coordinating structures of <u>Park Management Committees</u> for protected area planning and management-related issues (Component 1), <u>Pasture User Unions</u> (PUUs) for pasture planning and management-related issues (Component 2, Output 2.1), and</p>	<p>SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (‘Rationale and summary of the GEF alternative’) of the UNDP PRODOC has been revised to describe the strategic approach to</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p>implementation. STAP: <i>It is laudable that local communities will be engaged ..., but the stakeholder analysis reinforces the concern that the exact mechanisms for community organization and engagement have not been thought through.</i> Switzerland: <i>We believe that the project could benefit if the role of the local communities would be shown in more detail and stronger local community management component would be integrated.</i></p>	<p><u>Participatory Forest Management committees</u> (Component 2, Output 2.2) 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 further strengthen the knowledge and skills base of protected area, 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 practises. The project will also work closely with the administration of the targeted SPNAs, <i>leskhoz</i>, <i>khukumats</i>, <i>jamoats</i> and <i>dehas</i> in ensuring the effective involvement of all affected stakeholders in the implementation of project activities. A full stakeholder participation plan will be prepared as the project is further developed.</p>	<p>local governance arrangements. SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC further describes the local governance arrangements, and envisaged mechanisms for involvement of communities, for each individual output.</p>
<p>4. Over-ambitious targets and time-frames STAP: (There is a need to) <i>match the scale of the project realistically to budgets and capacities</i> STAP: (T)he challenge is whether these (outcomes) <i>can be achieved within the budget and time frame of a single project.</i> ... <i>the indicators may be over-optimistic ... within the project timeframe.</i> Switzerland: <i>The scale of the project (objectives and budget) has to be matched to the capacities of the partners including the government agencies involved in order to be sustainable.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. This issue was critically addressed during the project preparation phase. Stakeholder institutions were requested to scale down the scope of the project outputs and activities to better align with the limited time frame for implementation, the low capacities of implementing agencies, and the constraints of the project budget.</p>	<p>SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC reflects the significant changes made to the scope and scale of project outputs and activities. The <i>Strategic Results Framework</i> in SECTION II of the UNDP PRODOC has been updated to reflect the revised baselines and targets.</p>
<p>5. Spatial focus of project outcomes STAP: (T)he (project) <i>would be considerably strengthened by including a clear geographic representation of its goals.</i> STAP: The (project) ... <i>needs to be clearer about which parks are involved (a map?!).</i> Germany: <i>The Ak-Tash reserve in Sogd Province has been set up for conservation of marmot and has only very limited area suitable for snow leopard and its prey</i> Switzerland: <i>The project would benefit if it would</i></p>	<p>Agreed. A project ‘planning domain’ was identified during the project preparation phase. The extent of the planning domain was determined by the natural dispersal and migration routes for snow leopard and their prey, with specific consideration of linkages to the north-east through the Tien Shan range and to the south and east through the Pamir range. This planning domain was further sub-divided into 5 discrete geographical regions – <i>Kuraminsky-West-Tien Shan; Hissar-Alai; Vakhsh-Darvaz; Badakhshan; and Pamir</i>. The spatial focus for the project components, outputs and activities were then explicitly linked to a geographical region (or regions) within the planning domain. The Aktash Special Nature Reserve has limited snow-leopard conservation value, with no permanent snow leopard population recorded in the reserve, and was removed from the</p>	<p>SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (‘Rationale and summary of the GEF alternative’) of the UNDP PRODOC now includes a map of the planning domain, and a profile of the five discrete regions within the planning domain. SECTION IV, PART II</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p><i>be further defined, both geographically as well as in terms of content. The project area is very large and subdivided. Several of the areas mentioned in the text and where activities are planned are not key areas for SL and some are not known to hold SL to date. On the other hand, some of the most important areas for SL in Darvoz district and large parts of Murghab district are not covered.</i></p>	<p>project.</p>	<p>(‘Project maps’) now includes a map of the location of the protected areas within the planning domain.</p>
<p>6. Feasibility of alternative livelihoods approach STAP: <i>The implementation of "alternative livelihoods activities" is not well defined and may be insufficient given the high dependence of people on the land for survival.</i> STAP: <i>... consideration should be given to the practicality and viability of these alternative livelihoods and the time it takes to develop new technologies, farming systems and markets; many projects fail by promoting enterprises that are well-meaning but, in the end, unviable and impractical.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. The project activities have been re-focused on incentivising an incremental shift to more sustainable land use (focused on grazing and forest use) practices, rather than the broad-brush and somewhat naïve (albeit well-meaning) approach of supporting ‘alternative livelihoods’. The project will now specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • facilitate the economic beneficiation (employment, contractual work, provision of services, income from hunting concessions, etc.) of communities living around targeted SPNAs in return for a reduction in illegal activities in the SPNAs (Output 1.4); • help village governments to plan, source funding for and implement livelihood opportunities that will offset losses arising from reduced natural resource use (Output 1.4); • provide technical and financial grant support to pastoralists in return for a shift to more sustainable pasture management practices (Output 2.1); and • provide small grants to assist rural communities and local governments to install alternative fuel and energy technologies in return for a reduction in harvesting of wood for fuel and energy needs from forests (Output 2.2). 	<p>SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (‘Rationale and summary of the GEF alternative’) of the UNDP PRODOC has been revised to describe the strategic approach to incentivising more sustainable land use practises and reducing illegal activities. SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC further describes the local governance arrangements, and envisaged mechanisms for involvement of communities, for each individual output.</p>
<p>7. Reducing the drivers of deforestation STAP: <i>(T)he (project) doesn't provide much if any detail about how it will reduce the main drivers of deforestation ... apart from excluding some areas from human use with the creation of new PAs (?) and limited efforts to support income generation through micro-credit. Are there plans to support alternative energy sources to alleviate pressure on the forest? How will people satisfy their demand for energy services if they don't</i></p>	<p>Agreed. The project now focuses on: (i) identifying the priority high altitude forests that are also critical habitats for snow leopard and prey; (ii) facilitating the implementation of joint forest management agreements in these priority high altitude forests; (iii) rehabilitating degraded high altitude forests; and (iv) demonstrating viable alternatives to wood for delivery of energy and fuel needs in rural communities.</p>	<p>Component 2 (Output 2.2: <i>Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, forests</i>) in SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC has been completely revised.</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<i>have access to fuelwood?</i>		
<p>8. Costs of transboundary arrangements STAP: (T)ransboundary arrangements need to be carefully designed to avoid absorbing significant revenues without concomitant conservation returns, or bureaucratizing arrangements and centralizing them even further away from local people and park managers</p>	<p>Agreed. This project has now concentrated all the project activities on building and strengthening the national capacities to implement the NSLEP. The only trans-boundary arrangements remaining in the project are linked to the combatting of wildlife poaching and illegal trade at key border and customs posts within Tajikistan.</p>	<p>Component 3 (Output 3.2 <i>Improve the coordination of, and cooperation in, snow leopard conservation and monitoring</i>) in SECTION I, PART II Strategy (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC has been updated.</p>
<p>9. Sequencing of components STAP: <i>The (project) could be strengthened by additional clarity on whether the three components are intended to occur simultaneously or are sequential.</i></p>	<p>The components are not meant to be sequential. In some cases, there is a strong inter-dependency between outputs and activities, while in others there are no, or limited, dependency relationships. The underlying project design has a clear notion of the dependency relationships (and hence sequencing) between components, outputs and activities but the templates for the GEF project documentation (in this case the UNDP PRODOC and GEF CEO ER) do not make adequate provision to demonstrate this inter-dependency. The linear sequencing of activities within an output have (where relevant) however been clearly indicated in the UNDP PRODOC. The critical sequencing of outputs and activities will be more fully addressed in the preparation of the annual work plan (AWP) during the project implementation phase. It is important to note (and is clearly stated in the full project documentation) that the knowledge of snow leopard and prey populations, and their habitats, collected under component 3 will be used to guide the strategic focus for the implementation of outputs and activities under components 1 and 2.</p>	<p>No changes.</p>
<p>10. Effective institutions STAP: <i>(T)he Project is likely to sink or swim depending on whether it can get sound institutions in place, either through state run PAs or genuinely devolved and capacitated community based resource management.</i> STAP: <i>Critically, the whole aspect of designing institutions for effective community participation and benefit sharing (e.g. CBNRM) is an oversight</i></p>	<p>Agreed. The project will seek to significantly strengthen and expand the current capabilities of the key institutions¹⁶ that are directly responsible for the planning and management of protected areas, natural habitats, pastures and forests across the snow leopard range in Tajikistan. More specifically, it will assist in building a professional corps of well-trained and properly equipped management, monitoring, enforcement, community liaison and pastoral extension service staff in the targeted SPNAs, <i>leskhoz</i>, border control points, <i>khukumats</i> and <i>jamoats</i>. The PMU and NBBC will, during the course of project implementation, iteratively develop an institutional sustainability plan to ensure that the different project investments in building</p>	<p>SECTION I, PART II Strategy (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC further describes the different mechanisms for building the capacity of public institutions, and the</p>

¹⁶ This includes: the Department of Special Protected Natural Areas (Forestry Agency); the State Forest Institution (Forestry Agency); the Pasture Trust (Ministry of Agriculture); the Border and Customs Service; the CEP inspectorates within the *khukumats*; and the *jamoats*.

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p><i>that must be corrected.</i> STAP: <i>Likewise, the underlying causes of (un) Sustainable Forest Management are institutional, and the comprehensive technical activities described are only likely to be successful if institutional issues are addressed.</i></p>	<p>the capacity of the targeted institutions are maintained (and scaled-up, if feasible and affordable) beyond the term of the project. As mentioned above (in the response to comment 3), the project will work through (and assist in establishing, where these have not yet been constituted) the coordinating structures of Park Management Committees for protected area planning and management-related issues, Pasture User Unions (PUUs) for pasture planning and management-related issues, and Participatory Forest Management committees for forests 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.</p>	<p>increasing devolution of decision-making around the use of protected areas, forests and pastures to community-based institutional structures.</p>
<p>11. Prioritisation of enforcement measures Germany: (P)riority should be given to enforcement of management measures and demonstration and dissemination of good practices with involvement of local population. Switzerland: (W)e would like to highlight the enforcement challenges linked to habitat protection in Tajikistan. (W)e recommend that ... the project should also focus on the strengthening of enforcement and accountability to the conservation targets to add to the sustainability of the project.</p>	<p>Agreed. The project now places a strong emphasis on improving the monitoring and enforcement capabilities across the snow leopard range. The project will specifically: pilot the implementation of a smart patrol system (Output 1.2 and 1.3); strengthen wildlife monitoring and enforcement capacities (knowledge, training, skills, equipment and staff) in the responsible state agencies (Output 2.3); pilot the training, equipping and deployment of a corps of local community rangers (Output 2.3); build the capacity of border and customs officials to improve the detection of illegal wildlife trade (Output 3.2); and facilitate the establishment of a NEST to coordinate the efforts of different state institutions in combatting wildlife crime (Output 3.2).</p>	<p>SECTION I, PART II Strategy (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC further describe the suite of monitoring and enforcement activities to be supported under the project.</p>
<p>12. Rationale for SFM programming funds Germany: <i>Despite the undoubtable need and importance to protect “forests important for biodiversity”, its role as important buffer zones and migration corridors for Snow Leopards is not clear. Scientific literature indicates that Snow Leopards usually avoid forested areas, as do most of its main prey species.</i></p>	<p>The project integrates both the ecosystem-based approach and the species-based approach into the design of the project components, outputs and activities. Forests represent an important - albeit small - ecosystem within the project planning domain (i.e. the natural dispersal and migration routes for snow leopard and their prey, with specific consideration of linkages to the north-east through the Tien Shan range and to the south and east through the Pamir range – see response to comment 5 above). Concentrated in mountainous areas of the western part of the country, many of the remaining forests in the country fall within 3 (Karamnisky West-Tien Shan; Hissar Alai; and Vakhsh-Darvaz) of the 5 regions within the project planning domain. Illegal logging, accompanied by unsustainable levels of fuelwood collection, is leading to the continued degradation and loss of the forests in these regions. Project support to the improved conservation and sustainable use of high altitude forests is spatially focused in 2 of these 3 regions - Hissar Alai and Vakhsh-Darvaz. The current state of knowledge of snow leopards and their ungulate prey is wholly inadequate to state unequivocally that snow leopards and the main prey species ‘avoid forested areas’. Many of the forested areas in the project planning domain lie directly along important snow leopard and prey migration routes and both snow leopards and prey have been observed moving through, and grazing/browsing in (in the case of ungulates), forested areas. Work under this project will thus seek to clarify the importance of high altitude forests to the population ecology of snow leopards and their prey, secure and/or restore the ecological integrity of these high altitude forests, reduce the threats to these high altitude</p>	<p>No specific change. Component 2 (Output 2.2: <i>Reduce impacts on, and improve the management of, forests</i>) in SECTION I, PART II Strategy (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC has however been completely revised.</p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
	forest habitats, and ensure improve the scientific basis for the sustainable use of timber and non-timber forest products from these high altitude forests.	
<p>13. Suitability of ‘bio-technical’ measures Germany: <i>Concerning the “bio-technical” measures, international experience raises concerns that migration bridges and feeding of prey of Snow Leopards are neither suitable nor sustainable measures for wildlife conservation.</i> Germany: <i>The statement that the project will further stimulate livestock mobility (micro-bridges and equipped mountain trails in farther areas that are suitable for grazing) might unintendedly lead to the effect that last unused areas are included into the livestock grazing, thus affecting last existing undisturbed habitats of snow leopard and its prey.</i> Switzerland: <i>Improved access to rarely used pastures is counter-productive to the conservation of SL and its prey species, as these pastures are relatively undisturbed and thus provide crucial refuge.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. These activities do not represent ‘good practice’ in high altitude pasture management and have been removed from the project.</p>	<p>The proposed bio-technical measures have all been removed from the project.</p>
<p>14. Cooperation with other stakeholders Germany: <i>Regarding cooperation with other actors, important projects on sustainable land management and ecosystem restoration, such as the World Bank’s Environmental Land Management and Rural Livelihoods Project (duration 2013-2018, 16 Mio USD) and the IFAD program on Livestock and pasture development (until 2017, 16 Mio USD) are not mentioned although they are partly active in the proposed areas (especially the districts Jirgatol and Tavilderra, Shurabod). Furthermore, no involvement of renowned wildlife experts from the Academy of Sciences, responsible for wildlife monitoring, seems to be foreseen in the project preparation.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. The Project Management Unit (PMU) of this project will work closely with other development partner projects in the country – including inter alia the ‘<i>Adaptation to climate change through sustainable forest management</i>’ project, the <i>Pasture Management Networking Platform in Tajikistan</i>, the <i>Environmental Land Management and Rural Livelihoods Project</i>, the <i>Strengthening the capacity to adapt to climate change</i> project, the <i>Increasing Employment for Sustainable Agriculture and Water Management</i> project and the <i>Farm Privatization Support Project</i> - to, wherever practicable, align this projects activities with these initiatives. A particular focus of this alignment of efforts will be on harmonising the financial and technical support (technical and financial) provided to rural communities in: implementing more sustainable pasture management practices in high altitude grasslands; improving the management and sustainable use of high forests; and adopting more environmentally-friendly fuel and energy technologies. The Academy of Sciences, and particularly the Institute of Zoology and Parasitology, were extensively consulted during the project preparation phase. The Academy of Sciences will be a very important project partner in project implementation, notably for the outputs and activities under component 3.</p>	<p>SECTION I, PART I <i>Situation Analysis</i> (Baseline analysis) has been updated to describe all complementary baseline projects. SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (Coordination with other related initiatives) of the UNDP PRODOC has been updated to describe the coordination between this project and other complementary multilateral initiatives.</p>
<p>Forest restoration and rehabilitation Germany: <i>The (project) does not explain how the restoration</i></p>	<p>Agreed. In collaboration with the relevant PFM committees and the responsible <i>leskhoz</i>, the project funds will be used to identify and prioritise the selection of 6-10 degraded high altitude</p>	<p>Component 2 (Output 2.2: <i>Reduce impacts on, and improve the</i></p>

Comments (summary of main issues and key quotes from review sheets, by source)	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p><i>of a total area of 6000 ha of forested areas shall be realized and how its sustainability can be ensured.</i></p> <p>Switzerland: (W)e we welcome the reforestation component in this project. Nevertheless, we would like to highlight that reforestation with juniper is technically very demanding and therefore recommend that the design of the reforestation component should be further developed to ensure the multiple above mentioned benefits.</p>	<p>forests (collectively representing a total area of ~6,000ha) for active rehabilitation/ restoration. The project funds will then be used to review the national and regional best practices in forest restoration and rehabilitation. On the basis of this review, the project funds will then be used to develop a basic rehabilitation/ restoration plan for each identified forest. This restoration/ rehabilitation plan will strive to realize the overall management objective for each forest and will identify the optimal species mix, soil treatments (e.g. tillage, irrigation), restoration/rehabilitation methodologies (e.g. seeding, enrichment planting, terracing, etc.) and maintenance measures to be implemented. The project funds also be used to establish and maintain a system of firebreaks around each identified forest to reduce the impact of wildfire on the restoration/ rehabilitation efforts. Project funds will further be used to support the establishment of small local nurseries for forest species to be used in the restoration/ rehabilitation. Finally, project funds will be used to support the implementation and monitoring of the forest restoration/rehabilitation plan in each identified forest.</p> <p>The PMU will contract the services of a team of local experts from the Academy of Sciences, the Forestry Agency, the Committee for Environmental Protection, and the NBBC to provide professional, technical and scientific support to the preparation of the rehabilitation/ restoration plan for each of the targeted degraded high altitude forests. The PMU will also contract the services of an international high altitude forest management expert to provide technical backstopping support to this team of local experts, and to the <i>leskhoz</i>, in the restoration/rehabilitation of the targeted degraded high altitude forests. The affected PFM committees and/or responsible <i>leskhoz</i> will, with the support of the PMU: identify and prioritise the selection of the degraded high altitude forests; establish small nurseries for forest species used in forest restoration efforts; and implement the rehabilitation/restoration plans for targeted forests, using local labour.</p>	<p><i>management of, forests</i>) in SECTION I, PART II <i>Strategy</i> (Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities) of the UNDP PRODOC has been completely revised.</p>

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

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF (GEF): US\$ 120,000.00			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented (GEF)</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted amount</i>	<i>Amount spent todate</i>	<i>Amount committed</i>
Project preparation grant to finalize the UNDP-GEF project document for project "Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pamir Alay and Tien Shan Ecosystems for Snow Leopard Protection and Sustainable Community Livelihoods"	120,000.00	96,744.67	23,255.33

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)

NA