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# **I. Project Summary**

**Project Title:** Conservation and sustainable management of key globally important ecosystems for multiple benefits

**Brief project description:** Kazakhstan has approximately 12.6 million hectares of forest, which makes it one of the most forest-rich countries in Eurasia, despite the fact that its forests amount to only 4.6% of the national territory. Approximately 95% of Kazakhstan’s forests are managed by 123 state forestry entities, which are overseen by regional governments (akimats). Under the current forest governance system, forestry entities lack sufficient capacity to effectively manage HCVF, including those forests neighboring highly biodiverse protected areas. Kazakhstan’s protected area system covers approximately 24,018,800 ha, or 8.81% of the total country, although only 5% of Kazakhstan’s forests are included within protected areas. Therefore, forest ecosystems are underrepresented in the national protected area systems. The project strategy is to holistically address the conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems in Kazakhstan, through management approaches including both protected areas and sustainable use of associated HCVF landscapes. Many forest ecosystems in Kazakhstan have mixed landcover (forest and pasture) and mixed-use (i.e. pastoralism in forest pastures) characteristics. Therefore, the project also applies an integrated landscape management approach by targeting sustainable land management practices within forest landscapes.

On the ground, the project will work primarily in three regions covering multiple landscapes:

* *East Kazakhstan Province:* Altai mountain forests, Saur and Tarbagatai mountain forests
* *Almaty Province:* Zhetysu Alatau mountain forests, Northern/Central Tian Shan mountain forests, Ile river basin tugai forests, Ile river basin saxaul zones
* *South Kazakhstan:* Western Tien Shan mountain forests, Syr Darya river tugai forests

**Implementing Partner:** Forest and Wildlife Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture

**Atlas Project ID/Award ID number:** 00097249 **Atlas Output ID/Project ID number:** 00101043

**UNDP-GEF PIMS ID number:** 5696 **GEF ID number:** 9193

**Project Document Signature:** 28 April 2018 **Planned End Date:** 28 April 2023

**Project Financing:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Cash [USD] | Grants [USD] | In-kind [USD] | Total [USD] |
| **GEF** |  |  |  |  |
| ***GEF Trust Fund*** | ***8,069,178*** | ***-*** |  | ***8,069,178*** |
| ***Total budget administered by UNDP*** |  |  |  | ***8,069,178*** |
| **Co-financing[[1]](#footnote-1)** |  |  |  |  |
| UNDP |  | 200,000 |  | 200,000 |
| Forestry and Wildlife Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture |  | 70,510,507 |  | 70,510,507 |
| Government of Almaty Province |  | 8,229,217 |  | 8,229,217 |
| Government of East Kazakhstan Province |  | 7,177,711 |  | 7,177,711 |
| Institute of Zoology |  |  | 59,249 | 59,249 |
| WWF-Russia |  | 318,992 |  | 318,992 |
| ACBK |  | 300,000 |  | 300,000 |
| ***Total Parallel Co-financing*** |  | ***86,736,427*** | ***59,249*** | ***86,795,676*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Project Financing** | ***8,069,178*** | ***86,736,427*** | ***59,249*** | **94,864,854** |

# **II. Introduction**

In May 2018, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), jointly with the Forestry and Wildlife Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture (FWC of MoA), launched a new project entitled “Conservation and sustainable management of key globally important ecosystems for multiple benefits”. This project, which is supported financially by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as well as various sources of national co-financing including the recipient national and regional governments and civil society, seeks to promote conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems in Kazakhstan, through various management approaches including both protected areas and sustainable use of associated HCVF landscapes. In particular, it aims at improving conservation status and management of key forest and associated grassland, riparian and arid ecosystems important for conservation of biodiversity, land resources and provision of livelihoods for local communities. The project also seeks to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment, to the extent relevant and feasible within the scope of the project. In order to achieve the project objective, and address the barriers, the project’s intervention has been organized into three components:

* *Component 1.* Improved representation of globally important forest biodiversity and improved management of protected conservation-important forests
* *Component 2.* Better integration of forest PAs in wider landscape, including enabling environment for sustainable management of conservation-important ecosystems
* *Component 3.* International cooperation and knowledge management

Detailed background, goals, justifications, planned action steps, and general expected results for the project are presented in the Request for CEO Endorsement approved by GEF, as well as the highly similar UNDP Project Document (both documents together hereinafter referred to collectively as “the project document”). Throughout the duration of the project, the project document along with its annexes should be used as the basis for planning, definition of goals, mapping of action steps, ongoing project management, annual reporting and evaluation. The Project Results Framework is the most important tool for all these areas, as it plainly defines concrete indicators and targets against which the project’s performance will be assessed annually and evaluated at its midterm and terminal stages.

The Project’s preparatory grant (PPG) was approved by the GEF on 11 March 2016 with the concept being approved on 09 June 2016. The project development phase lasted for ca 18 months - from June 22, 2016 to December 31, 2017. The full project proposal was submitted to GEF for review and approval on 19 January 2018 and resubmitted again on February 22, 2018. The project was LPACed on March 12, 2018 followed by the GEF’s final approval on March 13, 2018.

The project document was signed by UNDP Deputy Resident Representative on 26 April 2018 and officially counter-signed by Vice-Minister of the Ministry of Agriculture (on behalf of the Government of Kazakhstan) on 28 April 2018, marking the official start date of the project. The five-year project is designed to terminate on 28 April 2023.

# **III. Project startup and management**

The project’s main office is based in Astana with site experts being present in Almaty and Oskemen as the key project pilot areas. There will be no other project office, but project staff will travel as needed. Consultants and national partners will also help to maintain the project’s presence outside of Astana.

Under the Delegation of Authority, the UNDP country office in Kazakhstan provides steady support and oversight for the project team under the leadership of Mr. Ramazan Zhampiisov, Head of the Sustainable Development & Urbanization (SDU) Unit and Portfolio Manager, and Ms. Victoria Baigazina, Programme Associate in the SDU Unit. Mr. Maxim Vergeichik, Regional Technical Adviser on Global Environment Finance at the UNDP Regional Centre for Europe and the CIS in Istanbul, provides higher-level guidance and advice.

Project management arrangements have been slightly modified to reflect the UNDP CO ongoing practice of having a thematic portfolio manager rather than hiring a project manager for each project. In this context, Mr. Talgat Kerteshev, the Biodiversity National Projects Manager, will serve as a project manager for this SFM project and manage it as part of the Biodiversity Projects Portfolio. The ToR of the BD Portfolio Manager already includes functions and responsibilities required for the SFM project. The SFM project will benefit from the already established project office with furniture and equipment as well as the core technical and support staff. In the technical team, the project already has a PA and Biodiversity Expert (Outcomes 1.1, 1.2), Landscape planning and community engagement expert (Outputs 2.1.2, 2.14, 2.1.5, 2.1.6), GIS & database expert (Output 2.2.5) and a Wildlife conservation expert (Outcome 3.1).

To supplement the core team with key technical expertise, the project will recruit a Forest Management Expert for Outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5 and a Forestry Economist for Outcome 2.3. Respective ToRs have been developed, approved by UNDP CO and recruitment process is ongoing. As for Almaty-based and Oskemen-based Site Coordinators, it has been decided to engage these experts full-time starting January 2019 once the preparatory stage of the project is completed.

The project will be hiring a TSA advisor to guide the project team on planning and implementation of Outcome 2.3 and a HCVF expert to advise on inventory, sustainable management and research of HCV forests within PAs and management in productive landscapes. The project team already had initial discussions with Mr. Marlon Flores, a competent expert in the TSA work globally, who suggested adjustments and clarifications on activities under Outcome 2.3 (Please see section [**Components and planned activities**](#_IV.__Components) for details). Expected role of the TSA advisor in the project will include:

* TSA negotiations with targeted clients: public and private decision makers.
* Drafting or review of TOR for TSA studies.
* Drafting and reviewing TSA budgets.
* Selection, negotiations and coordination with international consultants.
* Over all TSA study quality assurance.
* Support implementation through specific TSA related consultations (methodology and practical applications).
* Review of international consultants’ progress reports.
* Review of TSA reports (drafts and final), and TSA lessons processing.
* Support the development of regional and global events on TSA.

**Project Board and National Project Director**

The Project Board[[2]](#footnote-2) is chaired by Mr. Kairat Zh. Ustemirov, Deputy Chairman of the Forestry and Wildlife Committee (FWC) of MoA. Mr. Ustemirov has been designated as the project’s National Director. During the internal session of the inception workshop the following composition of the Project Board members has been proposed and agreed:

1. Deputy Chair of the Forestry and Wildlife Committee, Ministry of Agriculture RK (Chair of the PB)
2. Deputy Resident Representative of UNDP in Kazakhstan
3. Land Management Committee, Ministry of Agriculture RK
4. Water Resource Management Committee, Ministry of Agriculture, RK
5. Science Committee, Ministry of Education and Science RK
6. Department of Budgeting for Agricultural Sector, Natural Resources, Construction and Utilities, Ministry of Finance RK
7. Committee on Environmental Regulation and Control, Ministry of Energy RK
8. Departments of Natural Resource Management and Use of regional Akimats of Almaty, South Kazakhstan, Zhambyl, and East Kazakhstan regions
9. Ecological Alliance “Baitak Bolashak”, NGO
10. Association of forest management and wood processing organizations “Zhasyl Orman”, NGO

A final composition of PB has been accorded with UNDP CO and FWC of MoA. The Project held its first PB meeting on 04 July 2018 to approve changes to the logframe, the project’s annual workplan, and budget among other issues. The PB meeting also discussed and approved the purchase of: (1) office equipment and furniture for the core national team based in Astana and (2) 4WD vehicles for the core team and territorial groups in Almaty and Ust-Kamenogorsk. These items will be transferred to pilot PAs upon project closure.

**Inception Workshop**

The Project held an internal session of the inception workshop on May 10, 2018 to discuss the relevance of the project objective, its components, indicators, envisioned targets and mechanisms for project implementation among UNDP СО (program, project and administrative staff), Forestry and Wildlife Committee of MoA (the project’s implementing partner), the project team and the project experts.

It was noted and recognized by the participants the relevance of the project, its objectives and outcomes. Participants of the internal session also discussed at length the project’s results framework proposing minor revisions to some of the project’s Objective and outcome level baseline and indicators. (see [**Annex IV**](#_Annex_IV:_Revised) for the updated project logframe).

During the internal session, a preliminary structure of the Project Board, its roles and responsibilities in regard to mandatory financial, monitoring and reporting requirements of a UNDP/GEF project have been discussed (as described above under [**Project startup and management**](#_III._Project_startup)).

The external session of the Inception Workshop was held back-to-back with the internal session, the same day, on 10 May 2018, with participation of 80 representatives of the national government and regional government organizations of Zhambyl, South Kazakhstan, Almaty and East Kazakhstan Oblasts (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Wildlife Committee, Water Resources Committee, regional forestry and wildlife inspections, departments of natural resources and environmental management ), UNDP CO, Financial fund of financial support of agriculture, Development fund “Damu”, Samruk-Energo, Moinak hydropower station, target PAs, scientific & research institutes and organizations, civil society and non-governmental organizations of international, regional and local importance, international organizations and projects, national experts.

The workshop participants reviewed the designed project strategy as per the Project Results and Resources Framework and provided positive feedback on the adopted vision of the project implementation. The Project Results and Strategic Framework is presented in [**Annex IV**](#_Annex_IV:_Revised) and the First-year Annual Workplan in [**Annex VI**](#_Annex_VI:_2018) of this report. Opportunities for collaboration with ongoing and upcoming initiatives in the country having similar goals as well as tapping the success and lessons learned of already implemented or ongoing demonstration and technical assistance programs or projects of other partners and donors were also discussed in detail during the Inception Workshop.

Experiences and best practices of the three ongoing projects in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan that aim at conservation of snow leopard habitats in Western Tian Shan, Hissar-Alay and Pamir Alay, Vakhsh-Darvaz and Tian Shan mountain ecosystems of Central Asia were presented during the inception workshop. Prospects of cooperation between the countries were discussed and outlined.

During a side meeting, preliminary consultations were also held with representatives of Samruk Energo (Mr. Olzhai Nulipov, Chief Manager of Monitoring section of Generation & Fuel Depart, Mr. Saken Kozhabekov, Director of OHS and Environment Protection Department) and Moinak HPP (Mr. Kairat K. Mukambetkaliev, Deputy Chair of Board on Strategic Development). Two main causes were identified that affect uncontrolled releases of stored water, which in turn negatively impact natural regeneration and cause degradation of the Ash-tree grove in the Charyn State Nature Park. These include:

1. Electricity production is regulated centrally by KEGOC, depending on current consumption and electricity demand in the country as a whole. Sometimes HPPs are forced to suspend their operations, as instructed by the central regulator, even in view of economic losses--a decrease in performance efficiency of energy production leads to an increase of production costs. Such centralized management does not allow planning and coordinating HP operations with downstream water users, including natural complexes. In this context, a TSA tool could be of particular use for demonstrating all the downsides of KEGOC centralized management and, given a special protection status of the Ash-tree grove in Kazakhstan, for justifying exclusion of the Moinak HPP from the KEGOC‘s mandatory consumption pool.
2. Lack of coordination between all downstream users resulting in unavailability of data and information on negative impacts of uncontrolled releases of storage water. As part of the TSA assessment, a permanent coordination and information sharing mechanism among all stakeholders can be developed.

Representatives of the Moinak HPP and Samruk Energo expressed their readiness and interest to act as demonstration sites for the TSA within the framework of the SFM project. It was also proposed to consider Shardarinskaya HPP as an alternative or additional demonstration site.

Please see [**Annexes II**](#_Annex_II:_Agenda) and[**III**](#_Annex_III:_Agenda_1) for full agendas from both sessions of the Inception workshop including issues discussed and approved.

# **IV. Components and planned activities**

The intended activities, outputs, and outcomes of the project remain mostly unchanged from the Project Document, with some updates under Outcome 1.1 on establishment of new PAs and Outcome 2.3 on TSA as presented below. Numbering and content of components and activities are the same as shown in the Project Document.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Outputs** | **Activities** | **Comment and proposed revisions** |
| Outcome 1.1. Prevention of loss of conservation important forest and associated non-forest ecosystems and their biodiversity | Output 1.1.1. Protection regimes approved for globally important forest ecosystems (saxaul, floodplain forest, and mountain forest), and their associated SLM and biodiversity ecosystem services, in cooperation with local communities | The project will support preparation of the scientific studies, feasibility studies, land use design study and broad consultations with neighboring communities and other stakeholders to increase the representation of important forests and biodiversity within the PAs system of Kazakhstan up to ***1,729,485 ha*** in order to maintain forests ecological functions. The proposed activities will be implemented for ***9 new PAs*** | Activities under this Output have been adjusted related to the area and number of new PAs with the establishment of the Tarbagatai National Park of 100 000 ha and the Ile-Balkhash Reserve of 415,164 ha during the initial phase of the project. |
| Outcome 2.3. Integrated economic and environmental valuation of ecosystem services and SFM criteria and indicators embedded in decision making in natural resource management, through piloting of innovative sustainable economic development planning mechanisms | Output 2.3.1. Integrated economic and environmental resource management optimization assessments (Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA)) demonstrated in three resource-management scenarios for improved conditions of mountain forests and grasslands, tugai and saxaul forest ecosystems. | The project will select the most feasible demonstration cases from a proposed list of the following cases: regulation of water supply and consumption regulated by of Moinak hydropower station considering the environmental functions of Ili river floodplain forests in a long-term period; implication of landscape planning methodology in 6 districts of Almaty region; nature-based Tourism Development Program in Almaty region; regulation of harvesting of valuable medical herbs in forests; stabilization of sands to protect roads and villages; introduction of sustainable pasture management methods; forest management practices preventing conversion of coniferous forests into the broadleaf forest (CO2 pools) | The envisaged targets seem overly ambitions. It is recommended to select the criteria and indicators and link to specific policies to focus the TSA. TSA is sectorial output centered, not ecosystem centered. Some of the targets here will need revision. The above proposed changes to this Output will be included in ToR of the TSA Advisor to be hired by the project. |
| Study tour for hydropower TSA for sharing practical experience | This activity may be discarded as deemed unfeasible |
| Output 2.3.2. Methodology and guidance for TSAs related to mountain forests and grasslands, tugai and saxaul forest ecosystems, are integrated in Kazakh legal context | Based on the demonstration cases the project will produce policy recommendations to improve ecosystems management policy on valuing biodiversity investments, including but not limited to compensation schemes, tax exemptions, subsidies, certifications, national accounts, EIA procedures, investment regulations, national budget planning. |  |
| The proposed activities are:  3. Improve the guidance for regional planning as a result of TSA recommendations.  5. Consider the TSA application for development of financial incentives for afforestation projects and agroforestry projects (subsidies, tax exemptions, certifications). | Point 3. The text was refined by adding ‘as a result of TSA recommendations’  Point 5. Certifications may be out of the scope of a TSA, to be refined during the actual TSA exercise |

For more details on planned project activities, please see the Project’s work plan and budget for 2018 in [**Annex VI**](#_Annex_VI:_2018).

# **V. Project Risks Assessment and Risk Mitigation**

During the project preparation phase the project identified SESP and non-SESP risks related to environmental, financial, organizational, political, operational, regulatory, security, strategic aspects of project implementation. The identified risks remain valid for the inception phase of the project.

The table below enumerates risks, assesses their probability and potential impact on an ascending scale of 1 to 5, and outlines planned management responses. None of the registered non-SESP risks are of critical nature. The Project Manager will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability escalate to 4 or 5 and 3 or higher, respectively. Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

Five of the six risks identified in the SESP were assessed as low risk, with the SESP risk 6 related to SESP Standards 5.2 and 5.4 (possible economic displacement, or possible change in customary land use) assessed as “moderate” (Impact = minor, probability = moderately likely). Therefore, the project in relation to SESP measures is considered moderate risk.

The risks identified in the SESP mainly relate to the fact that the project will be supporting the establishment of protected areas. When protected areas are established in any place in any country, there are possible risks related to land use regime change, and the potential for social or economic displacement. In this particular project there is no risk of physical displacement. As discussed in the SESP, the project will work closely with all stakeholders throughout the project to ensure that potential risks related to the establishment of protected areas are minimized and mitigated. The project will also ensure that all legal policies and procedures in Kazakhstan related to the establishment of protected areas are respected and followed, as well as international norms relating to the establishment of protected areas.

The SESP risk related to indigenous people (UNDP Social and Environmental Standard 6) was carefully analyzed during the project development phase, particularly in relation to the ethnic Uyghur population minority in Uyghur district, where some of the project activities will be carried out. The criterion of indigenous people was determined not to apply in this instance. At the same time, when working on sites with the presence of ethnic minorities the project will actively engage with all groups, and if necessary, prepare action plans to ensure concerns of all groups are accommodated properly.

| **Project risks** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Type** | **Impact &**  **Probability** | **Mitigation Measures** | **Owner** | **Status** |
| ***Non-SESP Risks*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Changes in government policy priorities related to sustainable forestry development | *Political* | I = 2 (minor)  P = 2 (not likely) | Despite its modest forest resources compared to other countries in Europe and Asia, forestry has a long tradition in Kazakhstan. Forestry continues to be high on the government agenda, particularly due to several government policies including State Forest Planting Program «Jasyl El» and the 2003 Forest Code. | *UNDP* | N/A |
| Biodiversity science and conservation community continue to ignore/underestimate the participatory approaches in planning the landscapes and continue to use formal social surveys as a key tool for community engagement. | *Political* | I = 2 (minor)  P = 2 (not likely) | The project will develop and distribute high quality case studies demonstrating the benefits and differences between conventional and participatory approaches for community engagement activities. And will propose relevant amendments to policies and land use plans, feasibility studies and other planning tools currently used for infrastructural and development projects. | *UNDP* | N/A |
| Data deficiencies to complete the ecosystem services quantification and economic valuation research may undermine the quality of the final products related to species and habitats modeling. | *Operational* | I = 2 (minor)  P = 2 (not likely) | The project will engage high quality international expertise in species and habitats management and will follow the advice especially in relation to methodological tools. The project will avoid completing fundamental scientific research, but will rather focus on specific threats, risks, and solutions within the landscapes. | *UNDP* | N/A |
| Mountain ecosystems are particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts, and data and analysis on climate change impacts for the mountain forest ecosystems of Kazakhstan is still not well developed. Therefore climate change could lead to ecosystem impacts that negatively influence the status of biodiversity and the sustainability of forest ecosystems, despite project efforts. The question will be in what timeframe such effects may happen, whether it would be within the lifetime (or shortly thereafter) of the project, or whether such effects, if they occur, would be on much longer timescales. | *Environmental* | I = 2 (minor)  P = (not likely) | The project will be sure to utilize the best available climate science and data for Kazakhstan’s mountain ecosystems. The project will apply this data to ensure appropriate planning and management of PA boundaries, and related buffer zones and corridors in order to support biodiversity requirements. The project will also support the development of a monitoring program for assessing climate impacts on woody species, which will further be used to improve biodiversity outcomes. The project will ensure that climate resilience measures are incorporated in all relevant project activities. | *UNDP* | N/A |
| ***Risks Identified Through SESP*** | | | | | |
| **Risk 1:**  Principle 1.1 *“Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups? – YES”*  Principle 1.2 *“Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? – YES”*  Principle 1.3 *“Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups? – YES”*  Principle 2.4 *“Would the Project potentially limit women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? – YES”*  **Explanation of risk in relation to project:** The project will be supporting the establishment of multiple new protected areas. When establishing protected areas, there is always a possibility that this process will result in some modification to the enjoyment of human rights of individuals living near or otherwise using territory to be included in the protected area. In addition, the protected areas are primarily in remote rural areas, and the inhabitants in such regions typically have a higher percentage of people living in poverty, and/or marginalized groups. Therefore there is a risk that the project activities could have an adverse effect on the enjoyment of human rights, and/or possibly restrict availability, quality or access to resources. There is also the risk that the populations affected would include the poor or other marginalized groups, and that these groups would be disproportionately affected by the project activities (due to their inherent proximity to the targeted area). | *Political* | I = 2 (minor)  P = 2 (not likely) | The risk is assessed based on the planned project activities, regardless of mitigation measures, or in consideration of the fact that mitigation measures are an inherent element of the project activities itself. For example, in the establishment of protected areas, an integral part of the process is the engagement of and communication with local communities to ensure the protected area is established in a way that is in as much alignment as possible with local needs and priorities. This process is not a mitigation measure per se, it is a de facto part of the action itself. The project will be working closely with all stakeholders to ensure that stakeholders are adequately consulted and their considerations integrated in the establishment of any protected areas. In any cases where there may be adverse impacts, mitigation and compensation measures will be developed and implemented. The fact that there are many different types of protected areas which convey different levels of protection provides significant flexibility for the project and all stakeholders to ensure that environmental as well as social, economic, and human rights needs and priorities are met. This approach is further combined with the fact that within a single protected area there can be many different zones that allow different levels and types of land-use. The protected areas established will also have permanent community-based management mechanisms in place to facilitate ongoing stakeholder consultation and input to the protected area management process. Based on the remoteness of the areas targeted for new protected areas, and the relatively low levels of population in the vicinity of those areas, any potential impact is considered minor, and the probability is considered not likely. With respect to gender, a gender analysis was undertaken, and an action plan developed, which will be further elaborated and updated at the project inception phase. | *UNDP* | N/A |
| **Risk 2:**  Principle 1.5. *“Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project? – YES”*  Principle 1.6 *“Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights? – YES”*  When working developing countries there is always a risk that government authorities and responsible parties may not have the full capacity necessary to fulfill their duties in terms of governance, administration, and management of natural resources. In fact, the fact that many projects work to strengthen the individual, institutional, and systemic capacity of natural resource management government agencies is an indicator of the insufficient capacity of these organizations. Therefore, there is a risk that institutional government duty-bearers related to the management of forest ecosystems and land resources do not have the capacity to meet their obligations.  **Explanation of risk in relation to project:** In addition, by the same principle and rationale of the fact that the project will be working on natural resource management issues in rural and remote areas, there is a risk that resource users and other rights holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights. Such resource users living in rural and remote areas may not been fully educated and informed about what their rights are (in this case, in relation to usufruct or other natural resource-related rights), or the procedures to claim those rights. There is a risk that rights holders may not have the legal, self-organizing, or financial means to claim their rights. | *Organizational* | I = 2 (minor)  P = 2 (not likely) | The risk is assessed based on situation and context that the project will be working in. Although the risks are present, the combination of the impact and probability of the risk is considered low. The fact that there is limited capacity on both the part of the government and rights holders is an inherent element to working on sustainable livelihoods in developing countries; clearly this does not automatically place all such projects in a moderate or high risk category. At the same time, in this project standard procedures will be applied to mitigate the low risk that exists. As with the previous risks, the project will be working closely with all stakeholders to support government natural resource management authorities and institutions to meet their obligations, and with resource user rights holders to claim their rights. This will be accomplished through multiple stakeholder consultation sessions during all relevant aspects of the project to ensure that all parties are aware of and understand the relevant obligations and rights. During the PPG phase a capacity needs assessment was conducted in relation to the PAs involved in the project, through an aggregate assessment of the METT tracking tools. The weakest item identified through the METT in relation to PA management was for item number 24 of the METT: “24. Local communities: Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions?”, which had an aggregate score of 1.33 out of total possible of 3. Based on this capacity needs assessment the project will be including special trainings for PA staff on stakeholder engagement and community participation in PA management, in relation to strengthened HCVF management. | *UNDP* | N/A |
| **Risk 3:**  Standard 1.2 *“Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities? – YES”*  Standard 1.3 *“Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? – YES”*  **Explanation of risk in relation to project:** The project specifically targets the conservation and sustainable management of critical habitats, environmentally sensitive areas, and legally protected areas in the forested regions of Kazakhstan. Part of the project objective is the formal gazettement of national level protected areas, which is likely to involve changes to the use of lands and resources, which has the potential for adverse short-term impacts on livelihoods; long-term impacts are anticipated to be positive as the project will support transitions to sustainable livelihoods The project’s actions are anticipated to have positive short-term and long-term impacts on habitats and ecosystems. | *Environmental* | I = 1 (negligible)  P = 5 (expected) | The risk is assessed based on the actual impact and probability of the activities themselves, without consideration of any potential mitigation measures. The conservation, protection, and sustainable use of these areas is the objective of the project. Therefore the probability of these risks is “expected”. However, given that the objective of the project is to enhance the environmental and social qualities of these areas, the risk of negative social and environmental impacts is “negligible” (theoretically the project has a high likelihood of positive impacts). Nonetheless, this risk will be consistently monitored throughout project implementation via the standard project management oversight and risk monitoring systems. | *UNDP* | N/A |
| **Risk 4:**  Standard 1.6 *“Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? – YES”*  **Explanation of risk in relation to project:** The planned project activities include small amounts of reforestation / afforestation. There are two activities whereby reforestation / afforestation will be conducted. First, the project will be working with national government authorities and stakeholders, including the FWC and the National Plant Breeding Center, to improve tree nurseries in a small number of selected locations. The purpose of these improved nurseries will be to increase the availability of seedlings for rare species, such as wild fruit and nut relatives, the rare native ash tree *Fraxinus sogdiana*, and valuable mountain forest species such as Schrenk’s spruce (*Picea schrenkiana*). | *Environmental* | I = 1 (negligible)  P = 5 (expected) | The risk is assessed based on the impact and probability of the project activities, regardless of any potential or actual planned mitigation measures. However, mitigation measures are also foreseen as an inherent part of the project activity. For example, the project team will work with the partner leskhozes (local forestry services) to ensure ecologically appropriate locations for planting trees, and will use native species (this is the purpose of the activity). The relatively small area of tree planting means that any ecological impact will be minimal, and the overall environmental impact – considering the benefits of the planted trees – is expected to be positive. Kazakhstan’s national forest cover currently stands below its historical average, and it is part of the national forest policy to increase forest cover. | *UNDP* | N/A |
| **Risk 5:**  *“Standard 2.2 Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change? - YES”*  **Explanation of risk in relation to project:** The project impacts include the conservation of endangered and threatened species, and the improved management of protected areas. These results could be sensitive to changing climatic conditions in the future. | *Environmental* | I = 1 (negligible)  P = (3 moderately likely) | The risk is assessed based on the actual impact and probability related to the project activities, regardless of any potential or actual mitigation measures. The project team will work with all partners and stakeholders to apply the best available climate change impact prediction data for the Kazakhstan’s forested regions, and will ensure that all project activities and plans take potential future climate impacts into consideration. For example, the project will ensure that planted trees are in locations that will continue to have suitable climate conditions in the future, and will work with protected area management authorities to develop PA management plans for the new PAs that consider potential future climate impacts. In addition the project will assist in developing a methodology for climate change monitoring of woody species in Kazakhstan. | *UNDP* | N/A |
| **Risk 6:**  Standard 5.2 *“Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)? – YES”*  Standard 5.4 *“Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources? – YES”*  **Explanation of risk in relation to project:** The project will work to support the establishment of protected areas intended to conserve biodiversity as well as a variety of ecosystem services provided by forest ecosystems in these territories. By the very nature of this activity, as indicated in relation to Risks 1 and 3 above, establishing PAs may result in a change in land and resource use in areas where PAs are established. As a result, this could result in economic displacement. It is not foreseen that the project activities would result in any physical displacement of communities or resource users. The same project activities could also affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights or customary rights to land, territories or resources. | *Political* | I = 2 (minor)  P = 1 (moderately likely) | Due to the remote areas where the project will be working and the low population densities in these areas, any possible impact due to project activities is expected to be minor, and the probability is moderately likely. The risk is assessed based on the actual impact and probability of the project activities, without consideration of potential mitigation measures. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are inherently included in the scope of the project as part of the execution of project activities.  As previously discussed under Risks 1, 2 and 3, the project will constantly work with all relevant stakeholders to ensure that these risks are minimized. The project will support the establishment of protected areas in accordance with all norms, policies, procedures and laws of Kazakhstan, as well as international norms in relation to land tenure and all associated rights, as well in relation to possible economic displacement related to the establishment of protected areas. In any instances where economic displacement may occur the project will be working with stakeholders to provide compensation, offsetting support, and mitigation in relation to affected resource users. | *UNDP* | N/A |

# **VI. Annual workplan and budget revisions**

A detailed annual work plan (AWP) of the Project including projected spending by component and category was developed based on thorough consideration of upcoming activities, required expertise and envisioned targets (see [**Annex IV**](#_Annex_IV:_Revised)). The project’s AWP is based on the multi-year work plan of the Project included in Annex A of the Project Document.

On the basis of the project AWP, the following ToRs have been developed to cover the project planned activities in 2018 (see [**Annex V**](#_Annex_V:_Terms) **for ToRs of Key Contractors and Experts**):

* Draft ToR for TSA studies (Outcome 2.3)
* Forest Management Expert (Outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5)
* Forestry Economist (Outcome 2.3)

**Budget Revision and Tolerance:** As per UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP POPP, the Project Board will agree on a budget tolerance level for each plan under the overall annual work plan allowing the Project Manager to expend up to the tolerance level beyond the approved project budget amount for the year without requiring a revision from the Project Board. Should the following deviations occur, the Project Manager and UNDP Country Office will seek the approval of the UNDP-GEF team as these are considered major amendments by the GEF:

* Budget re-allocations among components in the project with amounts involving 10% of the total project grant or more;
* Introduction of new budget items/or components that exceed 5% of original GEF allocation.

The Project’s 2018 annual workplan and budget has been developed within the accepted deviations by the GEF.

# **VII. Indicators and Targets in the Project Results Framework**

Overall, the project’s timeliness and relevance of its objective, outcomes, indicators and targets have been confirmed by the Forestry and Wildlife Committee as well as other project’s stakeholders.

A major change that occurred since project development relates to proclamation of the Tarbagatai National Park of 100,000 ha and the Ile Balkash Reserve of 415,164 ha. As such, Indicator 5 of Outcome 1.1 on *Incremental area under conservation management through establishment of new PAs* has been adjusted to reflect this change and has been reduced to 1,729,485 ha. While the project logframe no longer accounts for these areas of the newly established PAs under Outcome 1.1, these areas will be counted against the end-of-project target under Objective level Indicator 1 of *Area of critical ecosystems with improved management, including tugai, saxaul, and mountain forests, and associated grasslands* and under Indicator 6 under Outcome 1.2 since the project will target these PAs under Outcome 1.2 for improved forest PA management effectiveness.

Another minor change relates to Objective level indicator 2. In the EoP target for the forest area under indirectly improved forest management the number of forest entities was corrected from 123 to 120 while coverage of forest landscapes remained as indicated in the logframe of 12,652,400 ha.

All changes and amendments to the project’s results framework are summarized in the table below:

| **Objective/**  **Outcome** | **In the original project PRF** | | **Revised End of Project Target** | **Justification for change** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Original Indicator** | **Original End of Project Target** |
| **Project Objective:** *Improve conservation status and management of key forest and associated grassland, riparian and arid ecosystems important for conservation of biodiversity, land resources and provision of livelihoods for local communities* | 2. Forest area in Kazakhstan under *indirectly* improved management | Forests managed by 123 forestry entities = 12,652,400 ha of forest landscapes (within 29,318,750 total ha of national forest fund land)); as indicated by status of HCVF management regulations (adopted at national level);  Status of national institutional framework for forest management (plan for restructuring leskhozes under FWC instead of akimats adopted at national level) | Forests managed by 120 forestry entities = 12,652,400 ha of forest landscapes | Corrected as per the most recent information from the Forestry and Wildlife Committee of MoA |
| **Component 1.** Improved representation of globally important forest biodiversity and improved management of protected conservation-important forests  **Outcome 1.1:** Prevention of loss of conservation important forest and associated non-forest ecosystems and their biodiversity  **Outcome 1.2:** Improved management of protected conservation important forests, through HCVF-specific management measures in PA forests | 5. Incremental area under conservation management through establishment of new PAs | 1,830,000 net new hectares under protection, which:  - Increases the national PA coverage 0.67% from 8.81% to 9.49%,  - Secures protection of 761,693 ha of alpine forest ecosystems and 522,593 ha of tugai and saxaul forest ecosystems;  - Provides PA coverage for more than 1,000,000 ha of snow leopard range, which increases PA coverage of the two priority national snow leopard landscapes (Zhongar Alatau, and North/Central Tian Shan) from ~40% to ~90% (Zhongar Alatau = ~1,000,000 ha of snow leopard habitat, with current PA coverage of ~30%, which will increase by approximately 645,000 ha or 61% of snow leopard range; North/Central Tian Shan =~1,100,000 ha of snow leopard range, with current PA coverage of ~48%, which will increase by approximately 440,000 ha, or 40% of snow leopard range) | 1,729,485 ha net new hectares under protection | Proclamation of the Tarbagatai National Park of 100,000 ha and the Ile Balkash Reserve of 415,164 ha during the project’s inception phase |
| **Component 3.** International cooperation and knowledge management  **Outcome 3.1** Increased capacities of Kazakhstan to monitor its wildlife, ensure law enforcement and share knowledge. | 14. Quality and coverage of snow leopard monitoring data in Kazakhstan as indicated by estimated accuracy and timeliness of national snow leopard population estimate | Publishing of annual population estimates with a 95% or greater confidence level | 14. Quality and coverage (≥ 50% of habitat) of snow leopard monitoring data in Kazakhstan as indicated by estimated accuracy and timeliness of national snow leopard population estimate | Clarified coverage for snow leopard population estimate |

# **VIII. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting**

The project will be monitored through the following monitoring and reporting activities.

***On a quarterly basis***:

* Progress made will be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform (ERBM).
* Based on the initial risk analysis, the risk log will be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. For UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, etc. are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
* Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) will be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
* Other ATLAS logs will be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc.
* A monitoring Schedule Plan shall be activated in Atlas and updated to track key management actions/events.

***On an annual basis****:*

* **Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR)**: This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since the launch of the project and in particular for the previous reporting period (1 July to 30 June). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements. The Project will be required to submit its first PIR in 2019 given the official start date of the project in April 2018.
* 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 practices
  + AWP and other expenditure reports
  + Risk and adaptive management
  + Gender mainstreaming progress as per relevant indicators
* **Audit:** The project will be audited according to UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies for National Implementation Modality (NIM) implemented projects.[[3]](#footnote-3)

***Mid-term of project cycle***

The project will undergo an independent Midterm review during August-September 2020, after the second PIR has been submitted to the GEF, and the MTR report will be submitted to the GEF in October 2020. The project will hire 1 international and 1 national consultant to undertake the MTR.

The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s duration. The terms of reference, the review process and the MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#gef) (ERC). MTR report will be available in English and will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and approved by the Project Board.

Relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools– submitted in Annex D to this project document – will be also updated before the midterm evaluation mission and submitted to the GEF along with the completed MTR report.

***End of Project***

An independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The TE process will begin three months before operational closure of the project (January 2023) allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The Project Manager will remain on contract until the TE report and management response have been finalized. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final TE report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#gef) (ERC). Relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed before the final evaluation and submitted to the GEF along with the completed TE report.

The project’s terminal PIR along with the TE report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to examine lessons learned and opportunities for scaling-up.

# **IX. Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan**

The project was assigned a UNDP Gender Marker GEN2. The Project Document provides detailed analysis on how gender issues will be mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring (see **Annex H in the UNDP Project Document** on *Gender Mainstreaming Analysis and Action Plan*) including indicators and targets.

The project addresses gender aspects in the following ways throughout its life cycle:

* The project incorporates gender issues in the project results framework, including gender-sensitive actions, indicators, targets;
* At the project inception phase the project team jointly with a gender expert should develop a detailed action plan for mainstreaming gender in all project outputs
* The project will monitor the share of women and men as direct beneficiaries;
* An analysis of women’s inclusion in project activities will be included in both the mid-term evaluation and the terminal evaluation of the project and will be explicitly stated in the terms of reference for those evaluations;
* Update of the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on gender mainstreaming progress reported in the GEF PIR and the UNDP ROAR;
* The project will involve an in-country gender expert for development of a Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan and gender-disaggregated data to ensure equitable gender representation.

Gender-related indicator and targets from the Project Results Framework are summarized in the table below:

| **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Midterm Target** | **Final Target** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Cross-cutting gender indicator: Gender mainstreaming during implementation*  16. Consistency of project gender mainstreaming approach with project plans | N/A – Project not under implementation; project design includes multiple elements designed to mainstream gender | Project gender mainstreaming action plan completed by end of 1st year of project implementation | Gender mainstreaming carried out during project implementation, as indicated by:   1. Project Board and local stakeholder working groups have gender balance and/or include a gender expert; 2. Policies, laws, and regulations developed with project support include gender perspectives, as relevant 3. Project events and activities (e.g. trainings) promote gender balance among invited participants, as feasible 4. Project education and awareness activities are developed and carried out incorporating gender perspectives, as relevant | All relevant stakeholders support or are in accordance with gender mainstreaming efforts undertaken by the project |

Recommendations for Mainstreaming Gender in Project Design, Implementation and Monitoring

1. *Research on gender-specific contributions to the forest degradation* caused by economic and social activities of local communities in 1 target district in Almaty region, as well as the impact of various solutions (social, economic, institutional, and technological) in order to increase the effectiveness of policies and measures aiming to conserve and/or rehabilitate the biological diversity of forest related ecosystems. The results are to be scaled up to other 5 districts that are part of the landscape planning interventions of the project. This will improve the existing gender specific data accumulation and monitoring at the level of regional management plans.

2. *Situation/Stakeholder Analysis* will be initiated to deliberate drivers (factors/threats to biodiversity, including reasons, incentives, etc., that force men and/or women to act destructively in respect to biodiversity), stakeholders (interest groups/communities, governments and international agencies, private sector representatives, experts), barriers/constraints to change (cultural, financial, administrative, etc.), and local ideas/initiatives upon which a project could be built.

3. *Household surveys at the household level* to identify the different roles that men and women play in the management of forests and pastures at the household and community level as well as sustainable practices developed by men and women. Such surveys will be organized in 1 target district, covering at least 3 villages. The surveys will be conducted in the beginning of the project to feed the research and defining the baseline for the project gender indicators and in the end of the project to measure the impact of the project activities in relation to the targeted gender specific objectives stated above.

4. *Awareness campaign* will be carried out by the project aiming at improving public understanding of the contribution of biodiversity and forests to community well-being, including income, by designing communications strategies and information campaigns in a way that addresses the needs of both women and men.

5. *Capacity-building and knowledge transfers* *in sustainable forest and pasture management* *and planning*, engagement in decision making procedures through the community-based consultations mechanism, practical solutions adapted to specific conditions of ecosystem status, existing and potential threats and targeted scenarios in pilot villages. This will include organizing training workshops designed to improve the efficiency of their use of biological resources and improve professional skills and capacities to manage important forest resources in sustainable and effective way. This will also improve the equal access to information on available funding opportunities and consultations on business planning and compliance with Damu Fund requirements for men and women. Target audience for capacity building will be based on the analysis of the specific roles of women and men in use of biological resources and forest resources.

6. *Pilot projects* will be designed for conservation and/or restoration of forest ecosystems and combining biodiversity and ecological functions with income-generating activities and carry out consultations and technical support to encourage women’s equal participation in developing and completing pilot projects that will generate additional socio-economic benefits in a long-term perspective.

Recommendations for Integrating Gender Considerations in Project Strategy and Design

The below recommendations for project outputs and activities will be further developed into the project’s Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan during the first year of project implementation and submitted to the Regional UNDP-GEF Center on or before July 1, 2019. Outputs not included in the table below have been assessed as having low gender relevance.

| **Project Output** | **Recommendations for integrating gender considerations** |
| --- | --- |
| Output 1.1.2 Newly established forest PAs are operationalized with improved management effectiveness, including community management mechanisms | During the feasibility assessment stage for the planned new/expanded PAs the project will organize consultations with local stakeholders to identify potential conflicts caused by imposed limitations, discuss win-win solutions with the land users, and secure support from all concerned. The project will plan and conduct consultations in a way that women’s views are equally represented and accounted for.  Consultations should also provide full information about potential impact of changes in resource management on rural communities, including differentiated impact on women and men. After the approval of new PAs the project will support the establishment of the Community Council that will be elected from the community members as a formal mechanism for participation in PAs management to communicate the major challenges on a regular basis. While designing and conducting the participatory elections, the project will ensure that women and men are equally represented on the Board. |
| Output 1.2.1. Development and implementation of forest-specific management measures in PA management plans for PAs, covering 839 567 ha of HCVF | The project will support the revision of the management plans so that the key biodiversity values are clearly articulated both for the management and monitoring purposes of PA staff and for the communities that are using the PAs forest resources (e.g. pastures, sub-products, fuel wood and construction wood). Considering the gender-specific housekeeping and income generation segregation between men and women, the project will design the awareness and PA participatory management activities accordingly. For example, women are more often engaged in harvesting and selling of forest sub-products, such as herbs mushrooms, berries, fruits. So they will be identified as a target group for the relevant awareness activities. Similarly, in saxaul forests women and man are both potential fuel wood collectors, so they should have equal access to the information on consequences of this illegal activity. The management plan should also stipulate the development of capacities and improvement of professional skills of men and women staff of target PAs. This particularly refers to HCVF management principles and practices. The training will be also based on self-desired improvement (capacity survey) of skills of the staff even if it is not immediately required for the current position, but will benefit for the future career development of men and women.  The forest biodiversity in Kazakhstan has a number of globally important genetic resources – wild fruit trees and herbs- that are strongly threatened because of the poor management and uncontrolled harvesting. The project will impose regulations that would enable sustainable use of these resources and deliberate business schemes for improving the efficiency of this type of income generation through introducing product processing technics, marketing, and green labeling. This activity will be particularly focused on women as a main target group impacting the genetic resources. This will be accomplished in cooperation with PAs. |
| Output 2.1.1. Revision and implementation of Forest Management Plans for 6 forestry units bordering forest PAs, including community input mechanisms | Most productive pasture resources used by local households are located within the borders of the Forestry entities, and are managed based on forest ticket with inaccurate and outdated bearing capacity assessments. In order to become an effective member of pasture management and forest protection measures, the local communities are to be well informed about all aspects of pasture management planning and SFM principles. They should also support an underlying long-term goal of maintaining biodiversity, land resources and ecosystems’ services for benefits of future generations. To implement this task the project will carry out the research and consultations to ensure fair access to information and scientific knowledge that will back up the Identification of an agreement on key biodiversity areas - corridors and buffer zones surrounding PAs. The men and women will be equally engaged in Forest Management planning processes in cooperation with Forest entities administrations through workshops and consultations.  Saxaul protection and restoration activities of the project are specifically targeted on rural communities. Considering the complete ban of saxaul use in Kazakhstan that was recently introduced, it is important to monitor the impact on the households’ economies, health, sanitation, and social and economic well-being of women, and to increase their role in economic activities in the conditions of dry lands ecosystems in order to balance their role of households maintenance and family care.  One such opportunity is improved afforestation and reforestation practices where the project intends to provide training and research on improved saxaul reforestation techniques, development of SLM measures through improved forest pasture management, feasibility assessment of alternative fuel sources, community awareness raising relating to saxaul protection.  Forest fires, despite the recent positive statistics, remain the key threat both to forest ecosystems and neighboring villages, becoming more prominent in the conditions of climate change. The project will consider gender specific awareness about fire prevention measures, participation of community members in fire management measures, rules of conduct in case of fires etc. |
| Output 2.1.2. Forest pasture management plans (including grazing plans) developed and implemented with local community engagement in pilot sites bordering PAs of forest pastures | The effectiveness of this output will strongly depend on the level of engagement and awareness of local communities and highest possible and fair consideration of variety of interests, including gender-specific interests. During the consultations, the project will accurately document and analyses the responses of surveyed groups, making clear distinction between potential roles of man and women in proposed pastures and water management improvements.  The piloted projects should design gender-responsive impact monitoring system for a different timeframes to measure the efficiency and sustainability of the newly introduced agricultural practices. |
| Output 2.1.4 Integrated land and forest management plans developed and implemented in six administrative districts through community consultation covering ha surrounding newly established PAs, including designation of buffer zones and corridors | Apart from the ground-based deliverables of this output, the project here will target the policy level – testing bottom up regional planning approach. This output provides good ground for introducing gender specific statistics at the regional level on the example of 6 districts of Almaty region. This will address the problem of gender specific data in a longer term. |
| Output 2.1.5 Tourism management strategies developed for forest PAs in cooperation with local communities, strategies integrated in PA management plans and under implementation | Nature-based tourism development is one of the business opportunities that have big potential among women both as a fully operational agent and as a sub-services provider. The project will ensure that women have equal access to information on technical, financial, and land resources for skillful consideration of revenue options from tourism in the framework of the PAs management plans. The project will consider additional activities (consultations, trainings, info tours) to create conditions for women to benefit from tourism management strategies and participate in related activities. |
| Output 2.2.3. Training program and improved forest research and data analysis capacities to support implementation and uptake of HCVF management approaches | The project will ensure equal representation of women and men in groups of trained professionals in the following topics: forest management planning, forest inventory, forest management monitoring, forest restoration and rehabilitation, silviculture in natural and planted forest, fire management, forest and water, non-timber products management, forest pests, forest genetic resources, CC adaptation and mitigation, forest tourism and recreation, forest certification, wildlife management, land use planning. This will provide opportunities for professional career and better employment opportunities of women in forest management sector. in addition, targeted training to women that are already active in sector to increase their competencies, skills and career opportunities will be organized, and models for creation of mentoring network for women in this sector – these interventions have better potential in increasing women’s opportunities. |

# **X. Recommendations**

At the Inception phase, the project requires no major updates since the Project Document was well written, and the development phase was within the acceptable time limits. The proposed recommendations are subject to approval of the Project Board.

Main recommendations include:

* Obtain clearance from RTA and PB on the *updated Project Results Framework*;
* Develop *a Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan* during the first year of project implementation and submit it to the UNDP Regional Hub on or before 01 July 2019;
* Strengthen expertise of the project team by engaging a Technical Advisor on TSA work as soon as possible. A ToR to be approved by UNDP CO and UNDP/GEF Regional Center in Istanbul;
* Follow up with representatives of Samruk Energo and Moinak HPP on participation in the project as demonstration sites for TSA;
* Liaise with representatives of the Shardarinskaya HPP on possible inclusion of HPP as an alternative or additional demonstration site;
* Closely coordinate the project’s activities under Outcome 3 with other ongoing UNDP/GEF projects in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan on monitoring of snow leopard population.

## **Annex I: LPAC Minutes**







## **Annex II: Agenda of the Internal Session of the Inception Workshop**

**Agenda of the internal session of the Inception Workshop for the UNDP/GEF and the Government of Kazakhstan Project “Conservation and sustainable management of key globally important ecosystems for multiple benefits”**

10 May 2018 Astana City

Park Inn Hotel

Objectives:

1. Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project implementation;
2. Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms;
3. Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;
4. Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF OFP in M&E;
5. Update and review responsibilities for monitoring the various project plans and strategies, including the risk log; Environmental and Social Management Plan and other safeguard requirements; the gender strategy; the knowledge management strategy, and other relevant strategies;
6. Review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; and
7. Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first-year annual work plan

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Activity** | **Moderator/Speaker** |
| **10 May 2018, Thursday** | | |
| 09.30-10.00 | Registration of participants | |
| **Internal session to discuss key elements of the project document** (with participation of the UNDP SDU and project team)  *Moderator – Victoria Baigazina, Programme Associate, Sustainable Development and Urbanization Unit, UNDP CO* | | |
| 10.00-10.15 | **Project objective, outcomes, outputs and activities. Project pilot territories.**  Talgat Kerteshev, Manager of UNDP Biodiversity Projects Portfolio | |
| 10.15-10.30 | **Governance and management arrangements of UNDP-GEF projects**  Victoria Baigazina, Programme Associate, Sustainable Development and Urbanization Unit, UNDP CO | |
| 10.30-11.00 | **Targeted Scenario Assessment (TSA)**  Olga Klimanova, PPG phase SFM Project Coordinator | |
| 11.00-11.30 | Coffee-break | |
| 11.30-12.00 | **Work in groups (by components)**   * Project components and activities * Project logical framework * Project beneficiaries * Consideration of gender aspects in project implementation * Risk management | |
| 12.00-12.30 | **Discussion of the first-year AWP** | |
| 12.30-13.00 | General discussion, Q&A | |
| 13.00-14.00 | Lunch | |

## **Annex III: Agenda of the External Session of the Inception Workshop**

**Agenda of the external session of the Inception Workshop for the UNDP/GEF and the Government of Kazakhstan Project “Conservation and sustainable management of key globally important ecosystems for multiple benefits”**

10 May 2018 Astana City

Park Inn Hotel

Objectives:

1. Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project implementation;
2. Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;
3. Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first-year annual work plan.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Activity** | **Moderator/Speaker** |
| **10 May 2018, Thursday** | | |
| 14.00-14.30 | Registration of participants | |
| 14.30-14.40 | **Introductory remarks:**  Marlen Ainabekov, Deputy Chairman of the Forestry and Wildlife Committee of MoA RK  Ramazan Zhampiisov, Head of Sustainable Development and Urbanization Unit, UNDP | |
| 14.40-15.00 | **Project presentation (Objective, Outcomes, Project pilot areas)**  Talgat Kerteshev, Manager of UNDP Biodiversity Projects Portfolio | |
| 15.00-15.20 | **Project components and activities by components**  Olga Klimanova, PPG phase SFM Project Coordinator | |
| 15.20-15.40 | **Targeted Scenario Assessment (TSA): methodology, application in Kazakhstan, identified demonstration projects for TSA analysis**  Olga Klimanova, PPG phase SFM Project Coordinator | |
| 15.40-15.50 | Discussion, Q&A | |
| 15.50-16.15 | Coffee-break | |
| 16.15-16.30 | **Current population status of snow leopard in Kazakhstan**  Aleksei Grachev, Research Associate, Institute of Zoology of the Ministry of Science of RK | |
| 16.30-16.45 | **UNDP-GEF Project in Uzbekistan on Sustainable natural resource and forest management in key mountainous areas important for globally significant biodiversity (Snow leopard conservation project): Lessons learned**  Abbos Akhadov, Project Manager of the UNDP-GEF project on Snow Leopard in Uzbekistan | |
| 16.45-17.00 | **On biodiversity conservation projects implemented by UNDP-GEF in the Kyrgyz Republic**  Mirgul Amanalieva, Coordinator of the UNDP-GEF Project “Conservation of globally important biodiversity and association land and forest resources of Western Tian Shan Forest Mountain ecosystems and support to sustainable livelihoods” | |
| 17.00-17.15 | **Generated lessons learned during implementation of the UNDP-GEF project on snow leopard habitat conservation in Tajikistan**  Vladimir Lekarkin, Administrative assistant of the UNDP-GEF project “Conservation and sustainable use of Pamir Alay and Tian Shan ecosystems for Snow Leopard protection and sustainable community livelihoods” | |
| 17.15-17.30 | Discussion, Q&A | |
| 17.30-18.00 | Wrap-up | |

## **Annex IV: Revised Logical Framework**

Proposed changes in logical framework are highlighted in **yellow**.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):**  Goal 1: No Poverty  Goal 2: Zero Hunger   * By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment * By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality * By 2020, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and international levels, and promote access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed   Goal 5: Gender Equality   * Adopting and strengthening sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels.[27] * Putting a stop to all forms of discrimination against all women and girls globally. * Listen to girls: SDGs can deliver transformative change for girls only if they have been consulted and their priorities and needs have been taken into account.   Goal 12: Responsible Consumption and Production   * By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources * By 2030, ensure that people everywhere have the relevant information and awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature   Goal 13: Climate Action   * Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries   Goal 15: Life on Land   * By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements * By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally * By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world * By 2030, ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development * Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species * Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products * By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts * Mobilize and significantly increase financial resources from all sources to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and ecosystems * Mobilize significant resources from all sources and at all levels to finance sustainable forest management and provide adequate incentives to developing countries to advance such management, including for conservation and reforestation * Enhance global support for efforts to combat poaching and trafficking of protected species, including by increasing the capacity of local communities to pursue sustainable livelihood opportunities | | | | | | |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:**  UNDAF Outcome:  Outcome 1.3. Ecosystems and natural resources are protected and sustainably used, and human settlements are resilient to natural and manmade disasters and climate change  CPD Outputs:  Output 1. Selected settlements have adopted integrated models for sustainable growth  Output 2. Disaster risk reduction plans and dedicated multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms in place in disaster-prone regions  Output 3. Natural resources are protected, accounted for and integrated in national and/or sub-national development planning  Output 4. National and sub-national institutions have strengthened capacities in environmental governance in protected territories and adjacent settlements | | | | | | |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:**  UNDP Strategic Plan Output:  Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.  Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation. | | | | | | |
| **Project Objective:** *Improve conservation status and management of key forest and associated grassland, riparian and arid ecosystems important for conservation of biodiversity, land resources and provision of livelihoods for local communities* | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Mid-term Target** | **End of Project Target** | **Means of Verification** | **Assumptions** | |
| 1. Area of critical ecosystems with improved management, including tugai, saxaul, and mountain forests, and associated grasslands | N/A (zero hectares improved) | 4,000,000 | 9,127,071 hectares | Project reports and documentation; Successful completion of project activities for relevant project components, as verified by the MTR and TE.  GEF-6 Corporate Results Indicator 1: *“Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares”*  GEF-6 Corporate Results Indicator 2: *120 million hectares under sustainable land management* | - Project does not encounter critical risks that derail implementation  - New threats do not emerge | |
| 2. Forest area in Kazakhstan under *indirectly* improved management | N/A (zero hectares indirectly improved) | N/A (zero hectares indirectly improved)  *(achievement of result not expected at mid-point)* | Forests managed by 120 forestry entities = 12,652,400 ha of forest landscapes (within 29,318,750 total ha of national forest fund land); as indicated by status of HCVF management regulations (adopted at national level);  Status of national institutional framework for forest management (plan for restructuring leskhozes under FWC instead of akimats adopted at national level) | Project reports and documentation; Successful completion of project activities for relevant project components, as verified by the MTR and TE | - Stakeholders remain interested in large-scale forest sector reform  - Large scale sector reform can be achieved in the timeframe available for the project  - Changing the institutional framework of the forest sector is not too complex for the scale and scope of the project | |
| 3. a. # direct project beneficiaries  b. # of PA staff with enhanced individual capacity  c. # of forestry staff with enhanced individual capacity  d. # of local resource users with improved sustainability of livelihoods | N/A (zero beneficiaries) | a. Total: ~1,100 :  b. PA staff: >1,000 PA staff with enhanced capacity  c. Forestry staff: 100 leskhoz staff  d. Local resource users: Total: 0 (0 men; 0 women) *(achievement of result not expected at mid-point)* | a. Total: ~41,000 :  b. PA staff: >2,000 PA staff with enhanced capacity  c. Forestry staff: 457 leskhoz staff  d. Local resource users: Total: 38,753 (19,382 men; 19,371 women) (figures official from 2009 census) | Number of staff employed at PAs targeted by the project  Number of staff employed at leskhozes directly targeted by the project  Number of people living in rural districts directly targeted by the project | - All staff in targeted PAs and leskhozes will benefit from project investments in capacity strengthening  - No large-scale staff turnover in targeted PAs and leskhozes  - All community members in targeted districts depend at least partially on pastoralism for livelihoods, and therefore will benefit from project activities on sustainable land management | |
| 4. Population trends for globally significant species, such as snow leopard, argali, goitered gazelle, and other threatened species within the expanded target PA estate:  Alpine forest and associated ecosystems, **flora**:  *- Picea schrenkiana*  *- Malus sieversii*  *- Malus niedzwetzkyana*  *- Juniperus sp. (turkestana, semiglobosa, seravschanica)*  *- Betula tianschanika*  *- Populus tremula L.*  *- Abies siberica*  *- Crataegus turkestanica*  *- Picea obovata*  Alpine forest and associated ecosystems, **fauna**: *- Uncia uncia*  *- Ursus arctos (incl. ssp isabellinus)*  *- Ovis ammon ssp (karelini, nigrimontana)*  *- Capra sibirica*  *- Cervus elaphus*  *- Capreolus pygargus*  *- Canis lupus*  *- Marmota sp. (baibacina, caudate, menzbieri)*  Floodplain (tugai) forest and associated ecosystems, **flora**:  *- Populus pruinosa*  *- Ulmus sp.*  *- Fraxinus sogdiana*  *- Elaeagnus oxycarpa*  *- Tamarix ramosissima*  Floodplain (tugai) forest and associated ecosystems, **fauna**:  - *Capreolus pygargus*  *- Sus scrofa*  *- Cervus elaphus bactrianus*  *- Hemiechinus auritus*  *- Columba eversmanni*  *- Falco cherrug*  *- Aegypius monachus*  Saxaul forest and associated ecosystems, **flora**:  *- Populus pruinosa Schrenk*  *- Elаeagnus oxycarpa*  *- Haloxylon aphyllum, H. persicum*  *- Berberis iliensis M. Pop*  *- Lonicera iliensis Pojark*  *- Tamarix ramosissima*  Saxaul forest and associated ecosystems, **fauna**:  *- Gazella subgutturosa*  *- Capreolus capreolus*  *- Aquila rapax*  *- Aquila chrysaetos*  *- Lepus tolai* | Please see GEF-6 BD Tracking Tool METT scorecards for all PAs, cells C38 and C39  Alpine forest and associated ecosystems, **flora**:  *- Picea schrenkiana* - 65,321  - *Malus sieversii* - 5,100  - *Malus niedzwetzkyana* - no data  - *Juniperus sp. (turkestana, semiglobosa, seravschanica)* - 7,572  - *Betula tianschanika* - 1,522  - *Populus tremula* L. - 4,788  - *Abies siberica* - 76,859  - *Crataegus turkestanica* - 1,100  - *Picea obovata* - 18,580  Alpine forest and associated ecosystems, **fauna**:  *- Uncia uncia* - 110-130  - *Ursus arctos (incl. ssp isabellinus)* - 507  - *Ovis ammon ssp (karelini, nigrimontana)* - 685  - *Capra sibirica* - 6,039  - *Cervus elaphus* - 3,306  - *Capreolus pygargus* – 7,072  - *Canis lupus* - 561  - *Marmota sp. (baibacina, caudate, menzbieri)* – 21,045  Floodplain (tugai) forest and associated ecosystems, **flora**:  *- Populus pruinosa - 172*  *- Ulmus sp. - 280*  *- Fraxinus sogdiana - 1474*  *- Elaeagnus oxycarpa - unknown*  *- Tamarix ramosissima - unknown*  Floodplain (tugai) forest and associated ecosystems, **fauna**:  - *Capreolus pygargus - >68*  *- Sus scrofa - >241*  *- Cervus elaphus bactrianus - 126*  *- Hemiechinus auritus - unknown*  *- Columba eversmanni - >518*  *- Falco cherrug - 24*  *- Aegypius monachus - 4*  Saxaul forest and associated ecosystems, **flora**:  *- Populus pruinosa Schrenk - unknown*  *- Elаeagnus oxycarpa - unknown*  *- Haloxylon aphyllum, H. persicum - >447*  *- Berberis iliensis M. Pop - unknown*  *- Lonicera iliensis Pojark - unknown*  *- Tamarix ramosissima - unknown*  Saxaul forest and associated ecosystems, **fauna**:  *- Gazella subgutturosa - 161*  *- Capreolus capreolus - unknown*  *- Aquila rapax - 7*  *- Aquila chrysaetos - 16*  *- Lepus tolai - 472* | Flora: N/A *(project activities will not affect ecological status by midpoint)*  Fauna: N/A *(project activities will not affect ecological status by midpoint)* | Flora: Non-deterioration of baseline status  Fauna: Increase relative to baseline | Annual PA flora and fauna monitoring, as summarized in METT scorecards cells C38 and C39 | - Project lifetime is sufficient to allow impacts to be generated and monitored  - New threats do not emerge | |
| **Component 1.** Improved representation of globally important forest biodiversity and improved management of protected conservation-important forests  **Outcome 1.1:** Prevention of loss of conservation important forest and associated non-forest ecosystems and their biodiversity  **Outcome 1.2:** Improved management of protected conservation important forests, through HCVF-specific management measures in PA forests | 5. Incremental area under conservation management through establishment of new PAs | N/A (only existing PAs) | N/A (only existing PAs) | 1,729,485 net new hectares under protection, which:  - Increases the national PA coverage 0.67% from 8.81% to 9.49%,  - Secures protection of 761,693 ha of alpine forest ecosystems and 522,593 ha of tugai and saxaul forest ecosystems;  - Provides PA coverage for more than 1,000,000 ha of snow leopard range, which increases PA coverage of the two priority national snow leopard landscapes (Zhongar Alatau, and North/Central Tian Shan) from ~40% to ~90% (Zhongar Alatau = ~1,000,000 ha of snow leopard habitat, with current PA coverage of ~30%, which will increase by approximately 645,000 ha or 61% of snow leopard range; North/Central Tian Shan =~1,100,000 ha of snow leopard range, with current PA coverage of ~48%, which will increase by approximately 440,000 ha, or 40% of snow leopard range) | Area of newly established PAs, according to government approval decree documents, as reported in annual PIR, and verified by MTR and TE | - National political commitment to expanding the PA system remains firm  - Project does not encounter critical risks related to stakeholders in establishment of new PAs  - Various forms of PAs provide for improved conservation of biodiversity | |
| 6. Forest PA management effectiveness | Baseline METT Scores:  Alpine forest ecosystems:  Almaty Zapovednik: 67  Ile-Alatau NP: 66  Kolsay Kolderi NP: 80  Kolsay Kolderi NP Expansion: 24  Zhongar Alatau NP: 59  Zhongar Alatau NP Expansion: 27  SW Zhongar Alatau (“Koksu Reserve”) (proposed): 23  Sairam-Ugam NP: 71  Aksu-Jabagly Zapovednik: 81  Karatau NP: 81  Karatau NP Expansion: 17  Katon Karagay NP: 63  Markakol Reserve: 48  Zapadno-Altay Reserve: 77  Ketmen Reserve (proposed): 21  Terskey Reserve (proposed): 21  Merke Reserve (proposed): 18  Saur-Manrak Reserve (proposed): 17  Tarbagatai NP (proposed): 18  Floodplain (tugai) and saxaul forest:  Charyn Canyon NP: 68  Syr Darya-Turkestan Reserve: 73  Ile-Balkhash Reserve (proposed): 15  Ile Floodplain Reserve (proposed): 16 | Increase in METT Score:  Alpine forest ecosystems:  Almaty Zapovednik: 68  Ile-Alatau NP: 67  Kolsay Kolderi NP: 81  Kolsay Kolderi NP Expansion: 25  Zhongar Alatau NP: 60  Zhongar Alatau NP Expansion: 28  SW Zhongar Alatau (“Koksu Reserve”) (proposed): 24  Sairam-Ugam NP: 72  Aksu-Jabagly Zapovednik: 82  Karatau NP: 82  Karatau NP Expansion: 25  Katon Karagay NP: 65  Markakol Reserve: 49  Zapadno-Altay Reserve: 78  Ketmen Reserve (proposed): 22  Terskey Reserve (proposed): 22  Merke Reserve (proposed): 19  Saur-Manrak Reserve (proposed): 18  Tarbagatai NP (proposed): 19  Floodplain (tugai) and saxaul forest:  Charyn Canyon NP: 69  Syr Darya-Turkestan Reserve: 74  Ile-Balkhash Reserve (proposed): 16  Ile Floodplain Reserve (proposed): 17 | 30% improvement in score gap ((1 – METT value)\*0.3) over baseline  Target METT Scores:  Alpine forest ecosystems:  Almaty Zapovednik: 77  Ile-Alatau NP: 76  Kolsay Kolderi NP: 86  Kolsay Kolderi NP Expansion: 47  Zhongar Alatau NP: 71  Zhongar Alatau NP Expansion: 49  SW Zhongar Alatau (“Koksu Reserve”) (proposed): 46  Sairam-Ugam NP: 80  Aksu-Jabagly Zapovednik: 87  Karatau NP: 87  Karatau NP Expansion: 42  Katon Karagay NP: 73  Markakol Reserve: 64  Zapadno-Altay Reserve: 84  Ketmen Reserve (proposed): 45  Terskey Reserve (proposed): 45  Merke Reserve (proposed): 43  Saur-Manrak Reserve (proposed): 42  Tarbagatai NP (proposed): 43  Floodplain (tugai) and saxaul forest:  Charyn Canyon NP: 78  Syr Darya-Turkestan Reserve: 81  Ile-Balkhash Reserve (proposed): 41  Ile Floodplain Reserve (proposed): 41 | GEF-6 BD Tracking Tool METT for each PA | - Project activities are sufficiently targeted to increase PA METT score  - Project results, in terms of increase METT score, can be documented within the timeframe of the project  - Proposed PAs are established in time to begin implementation of PA including strengthening of management | |
| 7. Level of achievement of Kazakhstan’s forest PAs in securing their biodiversity and other associated values | No forest PAs in Kazakhstan have achieved “Green List” certification | Green List certification assessment process initiated | At least 1 forest PA has had a preliminary Green List assessment | Presence of Green List assessment, as verified by MTR and TE | - Criteria of Green List standard are suitable for Kazakhstan context | |
| **Component 2.** Better integration of forest PAs in wider landscape, including enabling environment for sustainable management of conservation-important ecosystems  **Outcome 2.1:** Improved management of high conservation value forests and pastures in forest PA landscapes with direct community benefits  **Outcome 2.2:** Strengthened enabling environment to support SFM objectives through updated national policies, regulations, and knowledge management systems supporting improved management of 12,652,400 ha of national forest territory  **Outcome 2.3:** Integrated economic and environmental valuation of ecosystem services and SFM criteria and indicators embedded in decision making in natural resource management, through piloting of innovative sustainable economic development planning mechanisms | 8. Change in area of sustainably managed forest in forest ecosystems bordering protected areas | N/A | N/A *(achievement of result not expected at mid-point)* | >1,000,000 ha, as indicated by adoption of improved HCVF management practices in 6 targeted leskhozes | GEF-6 SFM Tracking Tool cell C18 | - Forest managers are open and willing to implement HCVF management measures  - Institutional framework re-alignment in the forest sector does not interfere with forest management planning at the site level | |
| 9. Reduction in degraded and deforested area in targeted forestry territories bordering protected areas | 11,305.60 ha Leskhoz: degraded ha, deforested ha  Bakanas: (no data for degraded area, lack of monitoring capacity), 7,104 ha  Narynkol: 70.6 ha, 67 ha  Uygur: 986.4 ha, 3.2 ha  Zaysan: 786 ha, 1646 ha  Zharkent: 453.4 ha, 189 ha  Zhongar: No data, lack of monitoring capacity. | No net degradation area beyond baseline | >5% improvement over baseline | Reporting by targeted leskhozes *(Note: Baseline determined as per existing methodology and data (area of sanitary cutting and other technical activities), which is not comprehensively reflective of forest characteristics. An updated methodology for calculating forest degradation and deforestation will be determined at the inception phase and described in inception report.)* | - Forest degradation is not significantly worse than currently known  - Forest degradation can be changed and documented within project lifetime  - New threats do not emerge (or rate of impact of threats does not significantly change) | |
| 10. Change in area of degradation in pasture and forest pasture landscapes bordering protected areas | Total: 0 ha with reduced degradation out of 73,000 degraded ha of pastureland | N/A *(achievement of result not expected at mid-point)* | Total: 73,000 ha with reduced degradation | GEF-6 PMAT (Land Degradation) Tracking Tool, sheet 2 (“Project Context”) cell C17. | - Implementation of improved pasture management planning leads to reduced degradation | |
| 11. Area outside PAs with enhanced conservation management (PA corridors and buffer zones identified in district integrated management plans) | N/A (no conservation measures planned in targeted districts) | N/A *(achievement of result not expected at mid-point)* | 350,000 ha | GIS analysis of integrated management plan maps, validated by terminal evaluation | - District authorities are able and willing to apply and implement integrated management plans in other district land use planning policies and procedures | |
| 12. Number of good practice models for private afforestation established in Kazakhstan | N/A (no models yet established by project) | Afforestation initiated in four pilot models with identified key partners | Two functional and replicable models demonstrated as feasible to meet key gaps in private afforestation regulatory framework: One private-sector based, and one community-based | Project documentation, assessment by terminal evaluation | - Potential private afforestation partners remain willing and interested based on terms to be defined for afforestation pilot models | |
| 13. Degree to which policy and regulatory context for managing natural resources incorporates ecosystem services | No methodology for considering full cost-benefit of ecosystem services incorporated in natural resource management policy and regulatory framework | One TSA initiated | At least one regulation adopted at provincial or national level that recognizes and incorporates TSA methodology | Project documentation, assessment by terminal evaluation | - Piloting of TSA in Kazakhstan context is successful, and deemed valuable by stakeholders | |
| **Component 3.** International cooperation and knowledge management  **Outcome 3.1** Increased capacities of Kazakhstan to monitor its wildlife, ensure law enforcement and share knowledge. | 14. Quality and coverage (≥ 50% of habitat) of snow leopard monitoring data in Kazakhstan as indicated by estimated accuracy and timeliness of national snow leopard population estimate | Latest population estimate 15 years prior (2001) with a 91% confidence level (lowest possible estimated population / highest possible estimated population, i.e. 100/110 = 91%) | Updated snow leopard population estimate for 2019 | Publishing of annual population estimates with a 95% or greater confidence level | Annual national snow leopard monitoring database | * Accurately estimating snow leopard population can be done within a 12-month period * It is in the national interest to report an accurate level of snow leopard population on an annual basis * The project, along with other partner initiatives, can provide full national coverage for snow leopard monitoring | |
| 15. Level of international cooperation and coordination with Kazakhstan border countries regarding illegal wildlife trade, biodiversity management in borderland protected areas, and snow leopard monitoring | No formal international agreement between Kazakhstan and neighboring countries related to snow leopard conservation | At least one regional meeting held related to cooperation and coordination for snow leopard conservation | International agreement between Kazakhstan and at least one bordering country under implementation regarding at least one of the below issues:   * Cooperation on law enforcement at border points regarding illegal wildlife trade * Illegal hunting by border guards * Data sharing on snow leopard monitoring | Existence/absence of agreement | * Political will exists between Kazakhstan and at least one bordering country to cooperate on snow leopard conservation * An agreement can be negotiated and adopted within the life of the project * Cooperation on snow leopard conservation presents the opportunity for a non-politically threatening issue for international cooperation | |
| **Cross-cutting:** *Gender mainstreaming during implementation* | 16. Consistency of project gender mainstreaming approach with project plans | N/A – Project not under implementation; project design includes multiple elements designed to mainstream gender | Project gender mainstreaming action plan completed by end of 1st year of project implementation | Gender mainstreaming carried out during project implementation, as indicated by:   1. Project Board and local stakeholder working groups have gender balance and/or include a gender expert; 2. Policies, laws, and regulations developed with project support include gender perspectives, as relevant 3. Project events and activities (e.g. trainings) promote gender balance among invited participants, as feasible 4. Project education and awareness activities are developed and carried out incorporating gender perspectives, as relevant | Monitoring via annual project reporting (PIR) by project team; Verification at mid-term review and terminal evaluation by independent external experts | * All relevant stakeholders support or are in accordance with gender mainstreaming efforts undertaken by the project | |

## **Annex V: Terms of References for Key Contractors/Experts**

**1. Generic TOR for Commodities TSA**

**Context:**

Provide reference to the national commodities context and need for the TSA study; and the institutional back up.

**Purpose**

The core purpose of the TSA is to promote commodities and ecosystems management policy reform. To this end, the consultancy will carry out a Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA) to compare different ecosystems management approaches at sectorial level (agricultural commodities), in order to assess potential economic losses or gains in terms of sectorial output. The TSA approach will be a client and sector-focused (the targeted decision-maker (s) of a selected commodities sector with capacity to lead decisions of policy reform and investment). The TSA will produce a balanced time-bound presentation of economic and financial evidence, for the decision maker (s), that weighs up the pros and cons of continuing with business as usual (BAU) or following a sustainable development path in which ecosystems are more effectively managed, i.e., sustainable ecosystem management (SEM). The recommendations of the study will be based on concrete economic evidence and fully linked to specific policy reform needed to shift from BAU to SEM in the selected commodities sector. It is expected that the TSA data and recommendations will be used to make policy and management decisions that result in a more effective and sustainable policies and investment to enhance the production of green commodities, as well as improve management of ecosystems and ecosystem services that are key to the production of the targeted commodities. The TSA is a commodities sector centered study.

**Execution and reporting**

Under the overall guidance of the UNDP CO, and the Senior Global TSA Advisor, the international consultant (or Consulting Firm) is expected to work together with the National Project Manager, and the TSA focal point at the targeted institutions to assess the gains and/or losses of the different ecosystems management approaches vis-à-vis sectorial output.

The designated lead agency for the execution of the TSA (e.g. Ministry of Agriculture/Camber of Agriculture/Producers Association).

**Main tasks**

During the implementation of the following tasks, the TSA valuation team will maintain close communication and coordination with the targeted decision makers and stakeholders.

1. Inception mission to the country to meet with potential decision makers and key stakeholders to confirm ownership of the TSA study.
2. Prepare a work plan to implement the TSA, and progress reports.
3. Review the UNDP TSA Guideline; and prepare a draft annotated outline for the report to be consulted with targeted decision makers and stakeholders.
4. Review literature and case studies on ecosystems valuation that could be relevant to the TSA, at national level, in other countries in the region, and countries in other regions (as needed).
5. Prior to any field work, and based in the above indicated review, describe the background, including all possible interrelations between the specific commodities sector under study and the natural resource base. This task includes:
6. Construct a conceptual model of all existing interactions between the ecosystem under study and the commodities sector under analysis. The model should be concise and descriptive, rather than analytical or mathematical.
7. Based on the conceptual model, identify actual and potential environmental inputs (including goods and services) that the ecosystem provides to the targeted commodities sector.
8. Support the implementation of a comprehensive TSA training workshop for decision makers, stakeholders and national consultants. The workshop aims at developing a common understanding of TSA and what to expect out of the TSA study.
9. Define the scope of the TSA (select the main issues to be analyzed): Based on consultations with the decision maker and key stakeholders, identify the policy (s) or management questions to be resolved. Provide background on how the process was conducted and how the final policies or management questions came about.
10. Based on existing information, workshops, focus groups and and/or expert interviews, provide a detailed description of the BAU intervention and proposed SEM policy or management interventions. Describe the process of reaching agreement with key stake holders.
11. Select and justify the relevant criteria and indicators for TSA and for the specific questions related to the targeted policy and/or investment decision.
12. In consultation with the decision maker, select the relevant criteria and indicators that can capture change in the relevant criteria. Provide a sound and defensible justification for the selection. Criteria and indicators could be:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Sample Indicators*** |
| **Financial** | Change in productivity  Annual revenues, net profits  Costs, investment costs |
| **Economic** | Consumer surplus (total willingness to pay)  Producer surplus  Estimated cost of sector development strategies |
| **Employment** | Number of new jobs and salary level  Number of part-time jobs  Ratio of high-paying versus low-paying jobs |
| **Equity and fairness** | Ratio of salaries by gender  Ratio of benefits by ethnic group |

1. For each indicator, mention the expected relationship between the ecosystem under study and changes in the indicator.
2. Provide a short review of existing information and identified data gaps.
3. Carry out a detailed analysis of the selected policies and/or management regulations. The analysis will identify loopholes and potential areas for reform.
4. Carry out all other required research, technical activities and field visits (as needed).
5. Construct the BAU and SEM scenarios for each indicator. Whenever primary data is collected, provide a detailed description of the valuation methodology used, and how the estimated values respond to changes in the temporal and spatial dimension; and provide an account of uncertainty in the analysis. This will help provide background on how generalizable the results are.
6. Carry out different levels of analysis, for example:
7. Breakdown of net values and benefits of key ecosystem services using the selected indicators under BAU and SEM; include an estimation of the commodity sector’s multiplier effect (when appropriate). In addition to the economic benefits arising from shifting to SEM, consider the potential economic gains or losses from shifting from BAU to SEM to other closely related sectors.
8. Analyze how ecosystem management costs and net benefits are distributed within the commodity sector, including net benefits or losses of the poorest and most vulnerable groups.
9. Identify benefits, winners and losers and potential economic activities for SEM without affecting the economy and livelihoods.
10. Assess the cost of shifting from BAU to SEM and responsibilities.
11. Describe the way in which these economic values and services are reflected in economic and development indicators for the selected commodities sector and at the macroeconomic level, including the commodities sector’s contribution to the sector (agriculture) economic and development goals (and related SDGs). This could cover both of economic and development policies, strategies and sectorial development plans, and also other relevant documents such as poverty reduction strategies, disaster risk reduction strategies, etc.
12. Draft clear policy and management-related recommendations based on the economic impact of BAU vs. SEM; and the rationale to shift from BAU to SEM. The recommendations should include a set of simple and direct policy and/or management reforms needs for the decision maker. The recommendations will be operational and backed up by credible data from the results of the analysis to be included in the conclusion of the TSA.
13. Present the preliminary TSA results to decision makers and stake holders; and review the outline of the TSA report.
14. Based on initial feedback from decision makers and stake holders, prepare the draft report (including and policy reform action plan), and submit the draft report for comments.
15. Incorporate comments to draft report and complete the final report.
16. Prepare a short policy brief and action plan document for decision makers and communications purposes.
17. Prepare a short “lessons learned” document based on the TSA implementation process.

**Deliverables**

1. Work plan and bi-monthly progress reports
2. Inception report after Task 6 has been completed.
3. Policy review report (Task 11)
4. TSA draft results (ppt presentation, after Task 16 is completed)
5. TSA Draft report for comments, including policy reform plan.
6. TSA Final Report
7. Policy Brief Document
8. Lessons Document (Draft and final versions)

**2. Terms of Reference for National Forest Management Expert**

To be included

**3. Terms of Reference for the National Forest Economist**

To be included

## **Annex VI: 2018 Annual Work Plan and Budget**

The 2018 Annual Work Plan and Budget was drafted by the Project Manager with inputs from responsible experts, finalized and approved by the Project Board on 04 July 2018.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expected results of the CP**  **and indicators, incl. annual targets** | **Activities planned**  **List of all activities incl. M&E held during the year for specified results under CP** | **Timeframe** | | | **Responsible Partner** | **Budget Planned** | | |
| **Q2** | **Q3** | **Q4** | **Source of funds** | **Budget description** | **Amount in US Dollars** |
| The **project objective** is to improve conservation status and management of key forest and associated grassland, riparian and arid ecosystems important for conservation of biodiversity, land resources and provision of livelihoods for local communities.  **Indicator 1.** Area of critical ecosystems with improved management, including tugai, saxaul, and mountain forests, and associated grasslands  **Indicator 2.** Forest area in Kazakhstan under *indirectly* improved management  **Indicator 3.** Number of direct project beneficiaries  **Indicator 4.** Population trends for globally significant species  **Indicator 16.** Consistency of project gender mainstreaming approach with project plans | | | | | | | | |
| **Component 1. Improved representation of globally important forest biodiversity and improved management of protected conservation-important forests** | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 5.** Incremental area under conservation management through establishment of new PAs  **Indicator 6.** Forest PA management effectiveness  **Indicator 7.** Level of achievement of Kazakhstan’s forest PAs in securing their biodiversity and other associated values | **Outcome 1.1: Prevention of loss of conservation important forest and associated non-forest ecosystems and their biodiversity** | | | | | | | **43 000** |
| **1.1.1** Protection regimes approved for globally important forest ecosystems (saxaul, floodplain forest, and mountain forest), and their associated SLM and biodiversity ecosystem services, in cooperation with local communities: | | | | | | | |
| Preparation of the scientific studies, feasibility studies, land use design study to expand Karatau Reserve, Zhongar-Alatau National Park and Kolsai Koldery National Park | - | Х | - | FWC/UNDP | GEF-62000 | - | - |
| Preparation of the scientific studies, feasibility studies, land use design study to establish Koksu and Ketmen Complex Zakazniks | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| Revision of the scientific studies, feasibility studies, land use design study for Merke Regional Nature Park | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 72100 | 10 000 |
| Broad consultations with all targeted groups and partners of pilot PAs | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71600 | 5 000 |
| Update of PAs map, ecosystem maps, project sites map | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 72100 | 10 000 |
| **1.1.2 Newly established forest PAs are operationalised with improved management effectiveness, including community management mechanisms.** | | | | | | | |
| Laying the groundwork to set up public committees for PA management | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| Analysis of current risks and threats, concerns to address conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and participatory management | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| Elaboration of recommendations on the membership of public committees for each target PA | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| Consultations and participatory discussions with local stakeholders and partners of pilot PAs | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71600 | 3 000 |
| Elaboration of proposals and recommendations on gender-related project activities | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71200 | 10 000 |
| The roundtable to discuss the status of riparian forests of Rivers Ile and Charyn for ecosystem functioning and biodiversity conservation (Almaty city, Chunja village) | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 75700 | 5 000 |
| **Outcome 1.2:** **Improved management of protected conservation important forests, through HCVF-specific management measures in PA forests** | | | | | | | **106 310** |
| **1.2.1. Development and implementation of forest-specific management measures in PA management plans for PAs:** | | | | | | | |
| Analysing the implementation of MPs of pilot PAs to identify gaps in the planning | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71600 | 5 000 |
| Assessing the effectiveness of MP implementation in pilot PAs | - | Х | Х |
| Analysing the monitoring quality (including forest ecosystems) | - | Х | Х |
| Analysing the best sustainable forest management practices for PAs | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 72100 | 5 000 |
| Developing the criteria and indicators to monitor sustainable forest management at the national level | - | Х | Х |
| Preparing the recommendations to include the forest ecosystem management section in the plans | - | Х | Х |
| **1.2.2. Building the technical capacities of PAs to save and better manage forests and biodiversity** | | | | | | | |
| Assessment of facilities and equipment of pilot PAs | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| Assessment of staff capacity of pilot PAs | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| Upgrading the facilities and equipment (communication equipment - walkie-talkies, 400 pcs) | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 72100 | 42 810 |
| Upgrading the facilities (computers and office equipment – 16 sets, furniture – 16 sets for national project implementation group) | - | X | X | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 72200 | 48 500 |
| PA staff training in management and monitoring | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 75700 | 5 000 |
| **Services of project experts (SC)** | Х | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71400 | 17 999 |
| **Services of UNV** | Х | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71500 | 4 013 |
| Miscellaneous | Х | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 74500 | 1 000 |
| **SUBTOTAL, OUTCOME:** | | | | | | | **172 322** |
| **Component 2. Better integration of forest PAs in wider landscape, including enabling environment for sustainable management of conservation-important ecosystems** | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 8.** Change in area of sustainably managed forest in forest ecosystems bordering protected areas  **Indicator 9.** Reduction in degraded and deforested area in targeted forestry territories bordering protected areas  **Indicator 10.** Change in area of degradation in pasture and forest pasture landscapes bordering protected areas  **Indicator 11.** Area outside PAs with enhanced conservation management (PA corridors and buffer zones identified in district integrated management plans)  **Indicator 12.** Number of good practice models for private afforestation established in Kazakhstan  **Indicator 13.** Degree to which policy and regulatory context for managing natural resources incorporates ecosystem services | **Outcome 2.1. Improved management of high conservation value forests within ecological and economic landscapes with direct community benefits.** | | | | | | | **29 934** |
| **2.1.1. Organisation of the work to assess the ecological state of forests in target forestry entities and to zone the biodiversity hotspots within forest estate lands (continuation of contract):** | | | | | | | |
| identification of scope of work and preparation of TOR | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| organisation of the selection process for companies |
| **2.1.2 Implementation of fire prevention and forest protection measures for 8 pilot forestry entities of Almaty (Narynkol, Uighur, Zharkent, Bakanas, Zhongar) and East Kazakhstan (Zaisan, Pikhtovoye, Ridderskoye) regions:** | | | | | | | |
| needs analysis and identification in accordance with the regulations | - | Х | - | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| preparation of technical specification to purchase walkie-talkies (200 pcs) to enhance fire control measures of target forestry entities | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF 62000 | 72200 | 15 000 |
| 2.1.3. Organisation of works to assess and make inventory of the pilot pastures within forest estate lands of target forestry entities: | | | | | | | |
| preparation of TOR and hiring the rangeland expert | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71300 | 4 000 |
| organisation of works to assess the pilot pastures and to select at least 4 pilot projects on sustainable rangeland management | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| 2.1.4 Organisation of works to assess and make inventory of the pilot pastures within forest estate lands of target forestry entities: | | | | | | | |
| Consultations with all target groups in 5 target districts | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71600 | 6 920 |
| analysing the existing risks and threats, concerns to use lands within forest estate (pastures, tourism, hunting concessions); | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| identifying the key milestones of the work on landscape planning | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| **2.1.5 Organisation of works to analyse and assess the existing tourism and recreation planning and monitoring practices in Ile-Alatau, Charyn, Sairam-Ugam and Syrdaria-Turkestan National Parks (continuation of contract):** | | | | | | | |
| preparation of TOR and hiring the tourism expert | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71500 | 4 014 |
| implementation of works, assessment of tourism and recreation activities of target PAs | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| **2.1.6. Inventory of operational hunting areas and biodiversity inventory analysis in forest hunting areas in three regions (Almaty region, South Kazakhstan region, East Kazakhstan region):** | | | | | | | |
| * identification of scope of work and preparation of TOR   - organisation of the selection process for companies | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| **Outcome 2.2: Strengthened enabling environment to support SFM objectives through updated national policies, regulations, and knowledge management systems supporting improved management of 12,652,400 ha of national forest territory** | | | | | | | **18 000** |  |  | FWC/UNDP |
| **2.2.1** Development of the sectoral programme and the action plan for conservation and sustainable use of forests with providing budget support for their implementation: | | | | | | | |
| preparation of TOR and hiring experts | - | Х | - | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71300 | 10 000 |
| development of the draft programme document | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| conduction of work to agree the programme and the action plan with key stakeholders (MOA, ME, Parliament) | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 75700 | 3 000 |
| **2.2.2. Analysis and assessment of the current state of forest management in Kazakhstan to identify whether it conforms to international HCVF standards/tools; review and analysis of best practices on sustainable forest management and their adaptation to Kazakhstan:** | | | | | | | |
| preparation of TOR for an international consultant in sustainable forest management | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| arrangement of the selection process for hiring the international consultant in SFM | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71200 | 5 000 |
| **Outcome 2.3 Integrated economic and environmental valuation of ecosystem services and SFM criteria and indicators embedded in decision making** | | | | | | | **-** |
| **2.3.1. Integrated economic and environmental resource management optimisation assessments (Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA)) demonstrated in various ecosystems:** | | | | | | | |
| preparation of TOR for an international consultant and a national consultant, arrangement of the selection process | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | - | - |
| **Organisation of the project inception workshop** | Х | - | - | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71600 | **8 900** |
| 75700 | **17 900** |
| **Preparation of the project inception report** | - | Х | - | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71300 | **2 000** |
| **Purchase of a cross-country vehicle for project implementation group** | **-** | **Х** | **Х** | **FWC/UNDP** | **GEF -62000** | **72100** | **50 000** |
| Services of project experts (SC) | Х | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71400 | **24 580** |
| Miscellaneous |  |  | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 74500 | **2 000** |
| **SUBTOTAL, OUTCOME:** | | | | | | | **153 314** |
| **Component 3. International cooperation and knowledge management** | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 14.** Quality and coverage of snow leopard monitoring data in Kazakhstan as indicated by estimated accuracy and timeliness of national snow leopard population estimate  **Indicator 15.** Level of international cooperation and coordination with Kazakhstan border countries regarding illegal wildlife trade, biodiversity management in borderland protected areas, and snow leopard monitoring | **Outcome 3.1** **Increased capacities of Kazakhstan to monitor its wildlife, ensure law enforcement and share knowledge** | | | | | | | **87** **871** |
| **3.1.1. Hiring a specialist to collect and analyse data, identify gaps, elaborate recommendations and develop an action plan to develop capacities of institutions involved in wildlife protection** | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71300 | 5 700 |
| **3.1.2. Snow leopard and prey population assessment to elaborate recommendations for preparing the National Snow Leopard Conservation Plan** | Х | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 72100 | 7 700 |
| **3.1.3. Elaboration of proposals to ensure that the long-term regular snow leopard monitoring system in Kazakhstan is put in place applying internationally certified quality standards, including transboundary monitoring arrangements with key neighboring countries (TOR prepared, an international consultant hired)** | | | | | | | |
| The Roundtable meeting attended by scientific organisations, public associations, government | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 75700 | 9 000 |
| Procurement of equipment for snow leopard monitoring (camera traps, 25 pcs) | - | - | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 72200 | 20 000 |
| **3.1.4. Knowledge products disseminated, and education and awareness activities completed to enhance understanding of natural resource managers and communities about SFM, SLM, and biodiversity conservation** | | | | | | | |
| Collection of information from stakeholders to prepare the National Annual State of the Snow Leopard Report | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71600 | 7 000 |
| Participation in the roundtable to collaborate as part of the snow leopard conservation programme (Tashkent) |
| Visits to project areas: Almaty region, East Kazakhstan, South Kazakhstan |
| Awareness raising activities in pilot PAs, publications, promo products | - | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 72100 | 5 525 |
| **Services of project experts (SC)** | **Х** | **Х** | **Х** | FWC/UNDP | GEF **-62000** | **71400** | **21 933** |
| **Preparation of the National State of the Snow Leopard Report** | **Х** | **Х** | **Х** | FWC/UNDP | GEF **-62000** | **71300** | **5 000** |
| **Technical specialist in project area** | **Х** | **Х** | **Х** | FWC/UNDP | GEF **-62000** | **71500** | **4 013** |
| Miscellaneous | **Х** | **Х** | **Х** | **FWC/UNDP** | GEF **-62000** | **74500** | **2 000** |
| **SUBTOTAL, OUTCOME:** | | | | | | | **87** **871** |
| **Component 4. Project management** | | | | | | | | |
|  | Services of project experts (SC) | Х | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71400 | 17 868 |
| Travels | Х | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 71600 | 2 625 |
| Rental of premises and utilities | Х | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 73100 | 10 000 |
| Direct operational costs | Х | Х | Х | FWC/UNDP | GEF -62000 | 74596 | 6 000 |
| **SUBTOTAL, OUTCOME:** | | | | | | | **36 493** |
| **GRAND TOTAL YEAR 2018 :** | | | | | | | | **450 000** |

1. Co-financing of Government of RK, the private and the social sectors was committed in KZT and is shown in USD [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The terms of reference for the Project Board is contained in Annex E of the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See guidance here: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/frm/pages/financial-management-and-execution-modalities.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)