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

GEF ID:	**6949**		
Country/Region:	**Tajikistan**		
Project Title:	**Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pamir Alay and Tian Shan Ecosystems for Snow Leopard Protection and Sustainable Community Livelihoods**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5437 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$120,000**	Project Grant:	**$4,181,370**
Co-financing:	**$19,610,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$24,031,370**
PIF Approval:	**September 03, 2014**	Council Approval/Expected:	**October 30, 2014**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ulrich Apel**	Agency Contact Person:	**Maxim Vergeichik, Regional**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Letter dated 10/07/2014 Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. See comments at PIF stage. Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes.	02/29/2016 UA: Yes.

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

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes for SFM. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes for SFM. Cleared
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	08/20/2014 UA: Not fully. Program/objective SFM-4 concers regional and global co-operation and cannot be accessed by single national projects. Please revise Table A accordingly. 8/25/2014 UA: Table A has been revised accordingly. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	based on sound data and assumptions?		
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. But please note that as the project is not eligible for SFM-4 funding, the intended support for transboundary co-operation will have to be provided by co-funding or the global regional GEF sources. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	08/20/2014 UA: Not fully. Please provide the full version of Table F including CO2 mitigation estimates. 8/25/2014 UA: Has been provided. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the **socio-economic benefits**, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	08/20/2014 UA: The integrated landscape approach addresses innovation and the financial and institutuional government commitment indicates good likelihood of replication and sustainability. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: The project satisfies requirements. Please also see comments at PIF stage. Cleared
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		02/29/2016 UA: Yes. The project is fully in line with what was approved by Council at PIF stage. Cleared
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative		02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Confirmation letters have been provided. Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	08/20/2014 UA: Yes. Within threshold. Cleared	02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant		02/29/2016 UA: Yes. BD, LD, SFM TTs provided.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	indicators, as applicable?		Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared
	• Convention Secretariat?		none received
	• The Council?		02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Comments from Germany, Canada, Switzerland have been responded to in the response matrix attached to the CEO endorsement request. Cleared
	• Other GEF Agencies?		none received
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	08/20/2014 UA: No. Please address clarification requests. 8/25/2014 UA: Yes. The PIF is technically cleared and may be included into an upcoming WP.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Project budget should not be used for activities that can be funded by the global UNDP-GEF project: Transboundary Cooperation for SL and Ecosystem Conservation. 08/25/2014: Output 3.1.3 on activities related to the GSLEP requires further elaboration in	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		communication with GEFSEC during project preparation in order to be specific and targeted.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		02/29/2016 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 20, 2014	February 29, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 25, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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