



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

GEF ID:	<b>8031</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Uzbekistan</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Sustainable Natural Resource and Forest Management in Key Mountainous Areas Important for Globally Significant Biodiversity</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5438 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$160,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,209,863</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$24,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$30,369,863</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Maxim Vergeichik</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes. Letter dated 17 Dec 2014, signed by OFP.  Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes.	

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes.	
		Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
Strategic Alignment	• focal area set-aside?		
	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	02/12/2015 UA: Yes. BD-1 Program 2, LD-3 Program 4, SFM-1, SFM-2, SFM-3. Aichi target: 12  Please include also Aichi target 11.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	02/12/2015 UA/YW  Not fully.  While the PIF refers to a driver-driven approach to environmental degradation,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		the text does not sufficiently address the drivers but more the symptoms and solutions. For example, on the section on habitat loss (p.6), it does not clarify what is the driver of habitat loss and the emerging trends and threats. Further, inadequate monitoring is a barrier but not a driver. Some of the key drivers that are noted are increased grazing demand, increased energy use, etc. Please further clarify the drivers, and provide adequate information.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>02/12/2015 UA/YW: Not fully.</p> <p>In Table B and in the text the following clarifications would be helpful:</p> <p>1) Considering the drivers and threats, the PM suggests that the project to consider a holistic landscape approach for conservation. Rather than simply dividing the components into PA and outside of PA, it seems the region requires clear land use mapping and planning, and agreed management based on them (i.e. PA, bufferzones, corridors, pasture management, etc) with necessary institutional capacities at multiple levels (from government to community). The project does not provide this larger perspective, but rather seem to provide isolated sets of activities centered around snow leopard. Please review and revise the project approach as appropriate.</p> <p>2) The PIF is built around the key concept of incentivizing communities for</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>more sustainable and BD friendly use of forests and grassland. The PIF should describe the direct linkages that the project seeks to establish between various planned incentivizing activities and the conservation goals.</p> <p>In this context, an option that should be explored is to build pride among local communities for snow leopard conservation - a concept that has worked in other conservation projects.</p> <p>Moreover, experience has already shown the limitation of "alternative livelihoods activities." While working with communities and incentivizing them for conservation is an important element of a project, activities should rather be focused on shifting and diversifying towards biodiversity-friendly production systems based on solid market analysis and economic opportunities. Please revise the approach.</p> <p>3) While the project concept includes SFM activities on in total 48,000 ha the proposal should strengthen the rationale and justification for Sustainable Forest Management incentive funding as an indispensable part of the project design, in particular with regard to the community forest management arrangements. How exactly, will be the specified SFM objectives SFM-1, SFM-2, SFM-3 be addressed within the project and which multiple benefits be generated?</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>4) It is not fully clear if hunting or poaching of prey species is a threat. There are inconsistent references to hunting and poaching throughout the text. It is sometimes not clear what is being poached - the prey of the Snow Leopard? Please convey a consistent message.</p> <p>5) The several mentioning of the Shepherd dogs are not fully clear either - please state the issue and proposed solution clearly, and only once should be sufficient.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>02/12/2015 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>02/12/2015 UA: Not fully. As the major thrust of the project implementation is on local communities, it is unclear on how and through which CSOs the project will achieve this.</p> <p>In this context, please explore whether the national SGP can be used as a delivery mechanism for working with local communities.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Please also clarify gender dimension of the project approach.	
	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)	02/12/2015 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	02/12/2015 UA: Please rephrase the innovation section under A.1.6, which can be made more concise and some terms may need to be replaced. "Compacts" (?) "Mini-biogas plants" (?), "mini-plantations" (?)  The statement concerning 'hindering economic development' appears generic and not really suited to the context.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	design as compared to alternative 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?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	02/12/2015 UA: Yes. Within allowable threshold.  Cleared	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
Secretariat Recommendation	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	02/12/2015 UA/YW: No. Please address clarification requests.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	February 12, 2015	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.