

Carbon Sequestration through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands (CS-FOR) in Kyrgyzstan

Stakeholders Engagement

1. The CS-FOR was developed and prepared following a request by the Government of Kyrgyzstan, and a No-Objection Letter was signed by the NDA (SAEPF). SAEPF, who was, and will be involved, in the stakeholder engagement process, is also a member of the CS-FOR Steering Committee and the Project Implementation Unit. The CS-FOR proposal was developed in consultation with stakeholders to ensure that the project design is appropriate and meets national and local needs, to verify the feasibility of the activities included in the project components, and to obtain feedback from all stakeholders on all aspects of the project, including the ESMF and its components (including GRM and Gender). Project disclosure during stakeholder involvement is crucial especially at the local level where Community Landscape Management Groups (CLMGs) will be heavily involved in the process of INRMCRP development which will decide the exact activity areas and precise beneficiary identification.



2. Stakeholder engagement was undertaken during the Funding Proposal development stage and will continue during project implementation. Consultations during the Funding Proposal development stage were held through: workshops with potential stakeholders, meetings with potential stakeholders, and structured consultations. During project formulation missions, “non-structured” bilateral meetings were also held on both technical and project management/implementation issues.

3. The following consultations were held: National Facilitation Workshop on Green Climate Fund Project Formulation (Bishkek, 28-29 March, 2017, and bi-lateral meetings on 20 March, 2017); Meeting of the Working Group on discussion Green Climate Fund project proposal concept. Bishkek, 15 June 2017; Initiating Funding Proposal Development (September-October 2017); Furthering Funding Proposal Development (December 2017); and Structured Consultations (District-level Consultation Meeting (Jalalabad, 6 April 2018); Consultations with CSOs (Bishkek, 12 April 2018) and National Workshop (Bishkek, 13 April 2018)).

4. During consultations, stakeholders identified activity priority areas and gaps, project target areas, and main stakeholders. Other issues that were discussed included the climate rationale, the relevant climate change adaptation and mitigation targets, the proposed project approach including the investment criteria, the sustainability and the expected paradigm shift. Stakeholders agreed on needs to be addressed, targets, methodology, timeframe and budget. Targeted district-level consultations involved over 40 stakeholders including representatives of local self-governments (*ayil okmotu*), forest enterprises (*leskhoze*), pasture committees, women's councils and traditional councils of the elders. Consultations with CSOs active in related areas (forestry, pasture, community development and value chain) saw a strong support to the project by confirming the current challenges which the project attempts to address as well as presenting success stories in similar interventions.

6.1 STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION

5. The preparation of the Concept Note submitted by FAO to the GCF in September 2017 was based on the engagement of relevant stakeholders into the whole project identification and preparation cycle. National consultations with the participation of wide range of stakeholders provided the analysis of current priorities in the agricultural sector and livelihoods within climate change settings. The project idea, including structure and main interventions, was discussed and agreed with both government officials, representatives of the non-government sector and field specialists in Kyrgyzstan.

6. Participants in these discussions included the FAO Representative and the FAO projects' staff and experts; officials and staff of the State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) (whose role also includes management of forests, SFF pasture and parks); the Ministry of Emergency Situations (MES); the Ministry of Economy; the Agricultural Projects' Implementation Unit (APIU) and the Department of Pastures, Livestock and Fisheries (DPLF) under the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Industry and Melioration (MAFIM); management and staff of ARIS (Community Development and Investment Agency); the Association of Pasture User Unions “Kyrgyz Jaiyty” (AKJ); the Russian-Kyrgyz Development Fund (RKDF); local NGOs Rural Development Fund (RDF) and CAMP Alatoo; the Kyrgyz Scientific-Research Institute of Livestock and Pasture (KSRILP); the Kyrgyz Scientific-Research Veterinary Institute (KSRVI); the recently established Climate Financing Secretariat; the KyrgyzHydromet; and the State Design Institute for Land Management Kyrgyzgiprozem.

7. Meetings were also held with donors engaged in rural development, environmental protection and climate change adaptation and their projects' representatives including the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and World Food Programme (WFP), and interacted with relevant World Bank-funded projects. The mission visited all target area districts where it met with officials of *ayil okmotu* (local government body (AO)) and *leskhoz*es (state forest enterprises), ARIS and AKJ district staff, representatives of *zhayit* committees (Pasture User Unions (PUUs)), representatives of national parks, agro-enterprises, women's councils, traditional councils of the elders, private farmers, households and private veterinarians.

8. During these meetings, and through iterative consultations, stakeholders were identified but specific direct project beneficiaries will be further identified at project implementation (details of the

meetings/workshops/consultations are found in Annex).

6.2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

9. The process of stakeholder engagement is two-phased: during project formulation, throughout project implementation, as described below.

6.2.1 Stakeholder Engagement During Project Formulation

10. Stakeholder engagement during project design was an over one-year long process that took place during five project design missions. The process of stakeholder engagement involved discussions with, and feedback from, national-level institutions (both governmental and technical), NGOs, CSOs, donors engaged in rural development, environmental protection and climate change adaptation in Kyrgyzstan, officials of local government (*aiyl okmotu*) and *leskhoz*es (state forest enterprises). Stakeholder engagement also saw discussions held, and feedback received, from representatives of *zhayit* committees (Pasture User Unions (PUUs)), agro-enterprises, private farmers, households and private veterinarians.

11. In March 2017, a National Facilitation Workshop on GCF Project Formulation was held to brief participants on the Green Climate Fund, review climate change impact and trends in the country, identify gaps and lessons learned, and set priorities for the formulation of a proposal to the Green Climate Fund. Throughout June, July and August, discussions between FAO and the NDA were on-going; in July 2017, FAO submitted a GCF funding proposal to SAEPF (the National Designated Authority (NDA) of the Kyrgyz Republic). SAEPF, in their capacity as NDA, then submitted a No-Objection Letter to the funding proposal (Concept Note) to the GCF in August, 2017; FAO submitted the Concept Note to the GCF in September 2017.

12. The Annex presents the list of consultations carried out to date, and results of the engagement process. Below is a summary.

National Facilitation Workshop on Green Climate Fund Project Formulation

13. The State Agency on Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic (KR) jointly with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations held a National Facilitation Workshop on Green Climate Fund Project Formulation on March 28-29, 2017 in Bishkek. The main objectives are to brief participants on the Green Climate Fund, review climate change impact and trends in the country, identify gaps and lessons learned, and set priorities for the formulation of a proposal to the Green Climate Fund. As a result of this Workshop, it was agreed to prepare a project proposal for the Green Climate Fund.

Meeting of the Working Group on discussion Green Climate Fund project proposal concept

14. On 15 June 2017, a meeting was held, in Bishkek, to identify and agree – together with national stakeholders - GCF concept note components and the theory of change, for project design. The main goal of the event was to present the project proposal concept to the participants of the meeting, as well as to discuss the details of the concept with stakeholders. Useful feedback was received and a table was prepared detailing stakeholders/partners and their potential role in project implementation.

Initiating Funding Proposal Development

15. A Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) mission was fielded in Kyrgyzstan between 30 September and 18 October 2017 (individual travels varied), with the objective of initiating the design of the proposed Carbon Sequestration Through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands in the Kyrgyz Republic (CS-FOR). The mission's activities in Kyrgyzstan included meetings with the different stakeholders including national-level institutions (both governmental and technical), NGOs, CSOs, donors engaged in rural development, environmental protection and climate change adaptation in Kyrgyzstan, officials (Suzak and Uzgen districts of Jalalabad and Osh regions) of local government (*aiyl okmotu*) and *leskhoz*es (state forest enterprises). Stakeholder engagement also saw discussions held, and feedback received, from representatives of *zhayit* committees (Pasture User Unions (PUUs)), agro-enterprises, private farmers, households and private veterinarians.

16. As a result of this mission, a preliminary Concept Note was prepared, including a brief project

description, rationale and implementation arrangements; summary of the project structure, results and activities; and a proposed Logframe (in the format of the GCF funding proposal).

Furthering Funding Proposal Development

17. Building upon the priorities for investment identified during the a National Facilitation Workshop on Green Climate Fund (GCF) Project Formulation (March 2017), on the subsequent Concept Note, submitted for comments to the GCF Secretariat in September 2017 (and their comments received in November 2017), on expert reviews within FAO and in the country gathered during and between the missions, and on further discussions with the project stakeholders, a mission was fielded from 1-9 December, 2017. The purpose of the mission was to continue discussions with relevant stakeholders and to begin the process of formulation of the Feasibility Study. Results included refining of the project proposal and details of project activities.

18. During the period of project preparation, and in preparation of the feasibility study, a number of thematic studies were prepared, including: (a) the development of Earth Map, an open-source platform for climate change analysis (in collaboration with CBC, expected to be released to the public soon); (b) a livelihood and resilience analysis study, carried out by a national NGO with support from FAO-ESA using RIMA (Resilience Impact Measurement Approach) approach. The survey and the analysis covered the project area as well as a control area with similar conditions; and (c) five working papers supporting the climate investment design, namely on: (i) NRM governance; (ii) pasture conditions and needs for investment; (iii) forests conditions and needs for investment; (iv) livestock production and productivity; and (v) market analysis of non-timber forest products.

19. During this December 2017 mission, a workshop was also held (7 December, 2017) where findings of the above-mentioned assessments and of the field mission were presented in a second workshop (December 2017) to discuss the climate rationale, the relevant climate change adaptation and mitigation targets, the proposed project approach including the investment criteria, the sustainability and the expected paradigm shift. Agreement was reached on needs to be addressed, targets, methodology, timeframe and budget. The resulting document was circulated among participants for comments and additional recommendations.

Structured Consultations

20. On 13 April 2018 the FAO project design team held a half-day workshop in Bishkek, with government agencies for consultation of the CS-FOR proposal to the GCF. In addition to that, a series of structured consultations were held: three district-level consultation meetings were conducted as part of the stakeholder engagement process with representatives of the intended beneficiaries, including representatives of national parks; a fourth consultation was held with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).

21. The main purposes of the structured consultation meetings were to:

- a) Explain the Project's objective and approach, as well as proposals on main activities and expected benefits, institutional set-up and implementation modalities, with special attention to the overall framework of beneficiary participation;
- b) Obtain feedback and suggestions from beneficiaries, including groups with potential risks, and other project affected people on the above topics;
- c) Discuss potential environmental and social risks, as perceived by beneficiaries and other project affected people, and effective mitigation measures; and
- d) Gather suggestions on the most effective project's Grievance Redress Mechanism.

22. The first meeting was held in Jalal-Abad on 6 April 2018, in which over 40 stakeholders from Suzak and Uzgen districts participated. The CSO meeting was held on 12 April 2018 at the FAO office in Bishkek, inviting representatives from about 10 CSOs active in related areas (forestry, pasture, community development and value chain). The third meeting of district stakeholders (Toguz-Toro district) was held in Kazarman on 17 May 2018. Lastly, the fourth meeting took place in Baetov on 18 May 2018, for the Ak-Talaa district stakeholders.

23. In the meetings, the FAO design team presented an outline of the project, answered questions for

clarifications and sought feedback from the participants. Outputs from the Stakeholder Consultations were used to refine and improve the project design, especially in the areas related to participation and capacity development of beneficiaries and their institutions, and feed into the environmental and social management framework for the Project. The information and feedback obtained at the consultation helped strengthen the overall content of Funding Proposal and associated documents.



6.2.2 Stakeholder engagement during project implementation

24. Stakeholder engagement during project implementation is heavily based upon the development of Integrated Natural Resource Management and Climate Resilience Plans (INRMCRPs), as these are the primary vector for the full involvement of communities, district and local government, PUUs, lezhkoses, and representatives of SNPs. The process of INRMCRP development will decide the exact activity areas (which will be georeferenced) and precise beneficiary identification and will be determined through Community Landscape Management Groups (CLMGs)¹. Direct contact with stakeholders through CLMGs will develop INRMCRPs and through these will provide feedback for reporting on the technical aspects of the projects, needs for and results of training/capacity building, and annual operations plans.

25. The first structured engagement process will be undertaken at the beginning of inception phase. The objective of this first step in stakeholder engagement during project implementation will be to present the project, including activities intervention areas at community level, and definition of all beneficiaries. This will be jointly organized by SAEPF and FAO and will be held in Bishkek. In addition, at the onset of the project implementation, the project's Expertise Group, under the overall responsibility of Gender and Social Development Specialist, will organize a workshop to validate the proposed Gender Action Plan and

¹ CLMGs are informal institutions which will be established at the local level by the project to advance participatory management of resources. The CLMGs will be comprised of the representatives of the district administration, local self-government bodies (aiyl okmotu and aiyl kenesh), management of lezhkoses and national parks, representatives of the Pasture Users Unions (PUUs), Water Users' Association (WUAs), other civil society and community organizations. The CLMGs would also include active forest and pasture resources' users, and local entrepreneurs, as well as representatives of women's and youth committees. ARIS will elaborate social mobilization and institutions development process on establishment of such groups in four target areas, starting from the village meetings to the district clusters' organizations. Representatives of the communities will be selected at the general village meetings, depending on the specifics of the area. Some villages are located far from the forests and do not use forest resources, and thus they might not be interested to join the CLMG, which will be formed at the level of the Aiyl Aimak. Several CLMGs will form a cluster at the district level chaired by the District Akim, at the tier of the forestry management and district authorities, as well as other state institutions. When necessary, the CLMG cluster would invite representatives of the State Registration Offices, district tax bodies to participate in the meetings. The CLMGs will report to their communities on the preparation and implementation of the INRMCRPs. The project will develop training methodologies and materials on INRMCRP and other issues of pasture-forest ecosystem management and use, organize training for local government, lezhkoses and Community Landscape Management Groups (CLMGs) on new arrangements for pasture-forest ecosystem management and monitoring arrangements.

sensitize key stakeholders.

26. The second stakeholder engagement process will take place at the end of the fourth year of implementation to identify progress and the need for corrective measures, validate the beneficiaries and assessment of new beneficiaries as needed. Feedback from district-level meetings through CLMGs will inform this process. Also organized by SAEPF and FAO in Bishkek, the National Stakeholders Platform (NSP) under the CCCC, acting as Project Steering Committee (PSC), will have a prominent role at this consultation given its mandate.

27. The third and last stakeholder engagement process will take place before project closure, for a participatory analysis of achievements, lessons learned and identification of good practices and exit strategies to ensure the sustainability of impacts. This will take place at the district level, and a final meeting in Bishkek.

28. During CS-FOR implementation, all stakeholder engagement processes will be fully documented.

6.3 GENDER ASSESSMENT

29. Kyrgyzstan's formal legal framework supports women's equality. Its constitution mandates equality between women and men and prohibits gender-based discrimination. The current policy on gender equality is articulated in three core documents: The National Strategy on Gender Equality to 2020 (adopted in 2012, it is the country's first long-term gender strategy); a National Action Plan on Gender Equality for 2015-2017; and the National Strategy on Sustainable Development for the Kyrgyz Republic for 2013-2017. Furthermore, the 2003 law on Basics of State Guarantees for Ensuring Gender Equity grants equal rights and opportunities to women and men and guarantees gender equality in governance structures. Customary law and traditional practices, however, continue to allow for male dominance, undermining women's equal access to assets, services, economic opportunities and decision-making. There is a prevalence of women in informal, high-risk labour markets; gender-based violence is common.

30. A Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan were prepared, addressing gender gaps and promoting gender equality and social mobilization across activities.

6.4 DISCLOSURE

31. Disclosure of relevant project information is part of the process which ensures effective participation of stakeholders, and project transparency. FAO will disclose information in a timely manner, and in a manner that is accessible and culturally appropriate, placing due attention to the specific needs of community groups which may be affected by project implementation (such as literacy, gender, differences in language or accessibility of technical information or connectivity).

32. For moderate risk projects FAO releases the applicable information as early as possible, and no later than 30 days prior to project approval. The 30-day period commences only when all relevant information requested from the project has been provided and is available to the public.

33. FAO will undertake disclosure for all moderate risk projects. For this, a disclosure portal has been established to publicly disclose projects documentation including environmental and social safeguards: <http://www.fao.org/environmental-social-standards/en/>. The GCF will also disclose documents on their portal.

34. In order to ensure the widest dissemination and disclosure of project information, including any details related to applicable environmental and social safeguards, local and accessible disclosure tools (including materials such as flyers, brochures, and other relevant and available tools) will be prepared and distributed. Attention will be paid to vulnerable groups. The dissemination of information among these groups will be carried out with the project counterparts and local actors such as local governments and user associations.

35. The Department of the State Environmental Review under the SAEPF, of the Government of Kyrgyzstan, will also disclose all relevant ESMF CS-FOR documentation on: www.ecology.gov.kg.

6.5 GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM

36. FAO is committed to ensuring that its programs are implemented in accordance with its environmental and social obligations. In order to better achieve these goals, and to ensure that beneficiaries of FAO programs have access to an effective and timely mechanism to address their concerns about non-compliance with these obligations, the Organization, in order to supplement measures for receiving, reviewing and acting as appropriate on these concerns at the program management level, has entrusted the Office of the Inspector-General with the mandate to independently review the complaints that cannot be resolved at that level.

37. FAO will facilitate the resolution of concerns of beneficiaries of FAO programs regarding alleged or potential violations of FAO's social and environmental commitments. For this purpose, concerns may be communicated in accordance with the eligibility criteria of the Guidelines for Compliance Reviews Following Complaints Related to the Organization's Environmental and Social Standards², which applies to all FAO programs and projects (Guidelines for Compliance Reviews Following Complaints Related to the Organization's Environmental and Social Standards).

38. Concerns must be addressed at the closest appropriate level, i.e. at the programme management / technical level, and if necessary at the Regional Office level. If a concern or grievance cannot be resolved through consultations and measures at the project management level, a complaint requesting a Compliance Review may be filed with the Office of the Inspector-General (OIG) in accordance with the Guidelines. Program and project managers will have the responsibility to address concerns brought to the attention of the focal point.

Project-level grievance mechanism

39. The project will establish a grievance mechanism at field level to file complaints. Contact information and information on the process to file a complaint will be disclosed in all meetings, workshops and other related events throughout the life of the project. In addition, it is expected that awareness raising material be distributed to include the necessary information regarding the contacts and the process for filing grievances.

40. The Project Management Unit (PIU) will be responsible for addressing incoming grievances regarding environmental and social standards; as part of the safeguards performance monitoring, the Project Coordinator of the PIU will be responsible for documenting and reporting on any grievances received and how they were addressed.

Grievance Redress Mechanism Structure:

1. The complainant files a complaint through one of the channels of the grievance mechanism, which will be set up (email address, telephone number(s), contact person or physical address) before project implementation.
2. This will be sent to the PIU, where the Safeguards Specialist, who also acts as the GRM Focal Person, will assess whether or not the complaint is eligible. The confidentiality of the complaint must be ensured throughout the process.
3. Eligible complaints will be addressed by the PIU Safeguards Specialist together with the Project Coordinator of the PIU. The Project Coordinator will be responsible for recording the grievance and how it has been addressed if a resolution was agreed upon.
4. If the situation is exceptionally complex, or the complainer does not accept the resolution, the complaint must be escalated to a higher level (FAO Kyrgyzstan Representation), until a solution or acceptance is reached.
5. If the situation is still not resolved, the grievance will be escalated to the FAO Regional Office Europe and Central Asia.
6. If the situation is still not resolved, the grievance will be escalated to the FAO Office of the Inspector-General.

² Available online at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4439e.pdf>

7. For every complaint received, written proof of receipt will be sent within seven (7) working days; afterwards, a resolution proposal will be made within ten (10) working days.
8. In compliance with the resolution, the person in charge of dealing with the complaint may interact with the complainant, or may call for interviews and meetings, to better understand the situation.
9. All complaints received, their response and resolutions, must be duly registered.

Internal process

1. Project Implementation Unit. The complaint can directly contact the PIU either in writing, or orally. At this level, received complaints will be registered, investigated and solved by the PIU.
2. FAO Representative. The assistance of the FAO Representative is requested if a resolution was not reached and agreed upon in level 1.
3. FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia. If necessary, the FAO Representative will request the advice of the Regional Office to resolve a grievance, or will transfer the resolution of the grievance entirely to the regional office, if the problem is highly complex.
4. Only on very specific situations or complex problems, the FAO Regional Representative will request the assistance on the FAO Inspector General who pursues its own procedures to resolve the problem.

Resolution

41. Upon acceptance a solution by the complainer, a document with the agreement should be signed.

Level of Redress Mechanism	Details
PIU	Must respond within 7 working days. Contact details to be established before project implementation.
FAO representation	In consultation with PIU, must respond within 5 working days. Mr Dorjee Kinlay Akhunbaeva 201, Bishkek FAO-KG@fao.org Tel: +996 312 250827
Regional FAO Office for Europe and Central Asia	Must respond within 5 working days in consultation with FAO's Representation. Mr Vladimir Rakhmanin REU-ADG@fao.org FAO-RO-Europe@fao.org Tel: +36 1 4612000 Fax: +36 1 3517029
Office of the Inspector General (OIG)	To report possible fraud and bad behavior by fax, confidential: (+39) 06 570 55550 By e-mail: Investigations-hotline@fao.org By confidential hotline: (+ 39) 06 570 52333

ANNEX: CONSULTATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS

I. National Facilitation Workshop on Green Climate Fund Project Formulation (Bishkek, 28-29 March, 2017, and bi-lateral meetings on 20 March, 2017).

Report

42. The State Agency on Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic (KR) jointly with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations held a National Facilitation Workshop on Green Climate Fund Project Formulation on March 28-29, 2017 in Bishkek. The main objectives were to brief participants on the Green Climate Fund, review climate change impact and trends in the country, identify gaps and lessons learned, and set priorities for the formulation of a proposal to the Green Climate Fund. The workshop was attended by representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Industry and Melioration of the KR, the Ministry of Emergency Situations of the KR, the Ministry of Economy of the KR, as well as international organizations such as UNDP, WFP, GIZ, World Bank and NGOs and academia. The workshop was organized with the support of the Representative of the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia, Mr. Reuben Sessa, Climate Change, DRR and Energy Coordinator for Europe and Central Asia, REU focal point for the Green Climate Fund.

43. On the first day of the workshop Mr. Azamat Erkebaev - State Secretary of SAEPP on behalf of the Director of SAEPP – Mr. Abdykalyk Rustamov and Mr. Dorjee Kinlay - Representative of FAO in the Kyrgyz Republic delivered a welcoming speech. The moderator of the workshop was Mr. Abdymital Chyngojoev, forest expert of the FAO/GEF project - Sustainable management of mountainous forest and land resources under climate change conditions.

44. National partners made presentations in which they highlighted the current situation in the climate change issue:

1. "UNFCCC implementation in the Kyrgyz Republic" (Ms. Dzhymparkul Bekkulova, SAEPP)
2. "Priorities of the Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Kyrgyz Republic on climate change adaptation" (Ms. Gulmira Kalchekeeva, MES KR);
3. "Climate change, risks and adaptation" (Mr. Temirbek Bobushev, CAIAG)
4. "Pastures adaptation to climate change: current condition and tasks" (Mr. Malik Bekenov, MoA KR)
5. "Mountain forest ecosystems in adaptation and mitigation measures as a factor of reducing risks related to the negative effect of climate change in the Kyrgyz Republic" (Mr. Muslim Rajapbaev, NAS KR).

45. In turn, the representative of the Secretariat of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) - Ms Carmen Arguello provided information in her presentation about the fund, financial instruments and project approval process. Ms. Margarita Dyubanova, FAO Climate Finance Specialist, also told about the role of FAO in the Readiness and Preparatory Support Program.

46. Based on the results of the first day, the National Designated Authority represented by SAEPP had identified the following priority areas:

- Strengthening the sustainability of agroforestry on the lands of the state forest fund under climate change conditions. Integration of climate aspects in sustainable management;
- Development of social plantations (fast-growing, fruit). Introduction of modern technologies for processing biomass into biofuels;
- Rehabilitation and creation of shelter belts;
- Research of climate change impact on forest ecosystems for introduction into educational programs;
- Increasing control over diseases and pests (climate change also leads to increasing of fires) of forest and agro ecosystems;
- Adaptation of agricultural production to climate change.
- Research of climate change on changes of soil humus to identify adaptation measures;
- Interventions of reducing land degradation, increasing soil fertility.
- Introduction of climate-resilient crop varieties;
- Strengthening of veterinary services and breed composition under climate change conditions;

- Resilience to natural disasters through measures for agroforestry, slope stabilization and others under climate change conditions.

47. The second day of the workshop was devoted priority areas identified on the 1st day. In addition, FAO experts made presentations on the main areas in which FAO provides technical support:

1. "Sustainable production systems" (Ewald Rametsteiner, FAO SP2)
2. "Sustainable Food Systems/Value Chain SFS/VC Development" (Azeta Cungu, FAO SP4)
3. "The FAO-CSA approach: A methodology for evidence based policy support" (Adriana Ignaciuk, FAO ESA)
4. "CACILM: Integrated approach to land management" (Oleg Guchgeldiyev, FAOSEC)

48. Besides on the second day the participants worked on the priority areas identified on the first day in the following groups:

1. **Sustainable production systems, including forestry, livestock, crop and fishery production systems for resilient livelihoods**
Subgroups:
 - Forestry and forestry production
 - CSA in crop production
 - Livestock and fishery production
2. **Improved markets, including value chains, for sustainable production and resilient livelihoods**
 - Value chains for crop production
 - Improved markets for livestock production
3. **Improved governance capacity for climate change mitigation and climate resilient livelihoods**

49. The results of the work in the groups included the following:

Group 1 Sustainable production systems, including forestry, livestock, crop and fishery production systems for resilient livelihoods

Livestock

Risks

- Diseases of livestock.
- Desertification.
- Displacement of pastoral habitats.
- Decrease in pasture capacity.

Actions

- Improving access to veterinary medicines, (certification, pricing).
- Caragana weed control, undersowing of pasture grasses.
- Rotation of pastures for the season, early warning systems.
- Settlement of grazing (harmonization).

Aquaculture and Fisheries

Risks

- Disturbance of fish biodiversity.
- Disturbance of biological processes of fish.
- Changes in the ecosystem of water bodies (the productivity of water bodies, biomass of feed organisms changes).
- Changes of the water level in water bodies (disturbance of the oxygen regime, chemical, physical indicators of water).
- Disturbance of fish reproductive indicators
- Eutrophication of water bodies.
- Fish diseases.
- Mudflows and landslides, which can wash off ponds and reduce the water quality for the life of fish
- Reduction of endemic fish species.

Actions

- Creation of adaptive mechanisms for the natural resources management (to introduce an ecosystem approach to the exploitation of aquatic biological resources in aquaculture).
- Improvement of the regulatory framework in the aquaculture and fishery sectors (development of the Aquaculture Development Law and other regulatory instruments under adaptation to climate change conditions).
- Development of pasture, pond and cage culture fishery, development of small-scale fisheries.
- Introduction of new highly productive fish species breeding methods and introduction of a program for the creation of own breeding stock of valuable commercial fishery species.
- Diversification of species composition and modern production technologies under the adaptation to climate change conditions.
- Creation of conditions for monitoring research, and digitization of available information.
- Creation of an educational and research center with its own fish nursery.
- Creation of small-scale nursery systems (fish nursery) to extend the breeding season for carp and trout, whitefish, endemic species and other fish species.
- Creation of a system of training and retraining of higher and middle level specialists.
- Introduction of production system of live forage organisms with the aim of increasing the productivity and trophic status of water bodies for the fish polyculture development and minimizing the risks related to models of an individual species production.
- Creating a logistics system (storage, transportation, etc.).
- Creation of an effective value chain from the producer to consumers, and as a result, decrease the costs of producers and maintain product quality.
- Conduct a multidisciplinary research of natural lakes to create new knowledge about managing the ecosystem and maintaining the lake ecosystem services, and increasing water productivity under the climate change conditions.
- Introduction of fisheries joint management system in major fishery water bodies.
- Introduction of the MCS system in fisheries (monitoring, control, surveillance).

Forestry

Risks

- Changing the vertical forest belt.
- High fire hazard.
- Increasing of diseases and pests in forest.
- Increasing of natural disasters (mudflows, landslides, avalanches, etc.).
- Decreasing of household income from forest use.

Actions

- Increasing of number of permanent and temporary forest seed plots; Establishment of a center for improving seed quality and storage; Strengthening of the nursery farm (number of areas, assortment and introduction of new technologies for growing saplings); Adaptation and introduction of technologies of planting, care of forest cultures; Introduction of agro-forestry (forest policy, legislation and NAP).
- Creation of improved monitoring system, early warning and forest fire prevention; Improvement of the material and technical base of forest protection; Improvement of the quality of fire-prevention measures (mineralized strips, clearing of water reservoirs, strengthening of forest protection, etc.).
- Creation of forest health monitoring; Improvement of biological methods of forest protection; Actions of improving of the material and technical base of forest protection, the creation of mobile biological laboratories.
- Green Projects to strengthen the mudflow, avalanche, landslide areas, slopes and coast-protecting constructions.
- Creation of social plantations (fast-growing and nut-bearing plantations); Restoration of forest shelter belts; The introduction of production of briquettes from wood waste derived from types of cuttings; Creation of shop floors of processing non-wood forest products (walnut, honey, mushrooms, medicinal plants, etc.).

Crop production

Risks

- Frosts (cessation of vegetation, loss of harvest).

- Drought (crop failure, land degradation, water scarcity).
- Strong precipitation (mudslides, floods, land degradation).
- Socio-economic difficulties of the population.
- Decreasing of household income from land use.

Actions

- Creation of a working group on improving the NAP for land relations; Conducting trainings and analytical campaigns; Development of the projects implementation of the GCF and FAO; Implementation of mitigation plans and their monitoring.
- Development, dissemination and practical application of climate-resilient varieties of crops, measures for biological protection and plant quarantine. Strengthening the capacity of household, scientific and production organizations in this area;
- Development, dissemination and practical application of methods for reducing land degradation, improving soil fertility. Monitoring of tracking, assessment and forecast in the face of climate change, strengthening the capacity of economic, scientific production organizations;
- Reduction of filtration at inter-farm, intra-farm irrigation networks, use of equipment for regulating and measuring water flow. Monitoring of open, closed drainage systems work, hydrants. Application of water-saving and water-regulating measures. Strengthening the capacity of water user associations.

Group 2 Improved markets, including value chains, for sustainable production and resilient livelihoods

Interventions/ actions to strengthen value chains

Corn - Strategy for the development of agriculture, including the processing industry; Establishment of logistics centers.

Potatoes - HACCP FSC; Loan products for farmers, Capacity building and awareness raising, Institutional development of PPPs.

Sugar beet - Tax benefits, cooperation and processing industry, Lobbying.

Beans - Establishment of regional laboratories.

Apricot - Improvement of legislation.

Livestock

Meat, milk, egg, fish and honey.

Disadvantages:

- Veterinary, feed production, processing, quality certification, storage, export.
- Disadvantages of forest products: Lack of processing, Lack of packaging, Marketing, Certification of the supply chain.

Main areas of strengthening:

- Application of international best practices.

Group 3 Improved governance capacity for climate change mitigation and climate resilient livelihoods

Legal and institutional gaps

- Lack of organizations in the rural community, which unite the interests of different institutions. There is no single state land use policy.
- There is no certification for agricultural and forest products for export.
- Lack of state planning for food production.
- Lack of a state mechanism of control livestock number.
- Lack of interaction mechanisms between scientific organizations and executive authorities, planning, reporting, implementation of results.
- Weak potential of research and production in agriculture and forestry sectors under climate change conditions.
- Lack of legal definition of some terms: forest, plantation etc. It is necessary to amend the Forest Code;
- Researches related to forest ecosystem services, which prevent and mitigate the impacts of climate change.
- Lack of mechanisms for organizing, creating private forest lands, their stimulation and management.

- Lack of soil law.
- Improve the activities of microfinance organizations (at the legislative level).
- Lack of knowledge and skills.
- Lack of phyto-sanitary control in agricultural products.
- Lack of modern equipment in the phyto-sanitary service and the veterinary service.
- Modernization of the laboratory base: phyto-sanitary and veterinary.

Actions to address gaps

- Strengthening the capacity of the phyto-sanitary service.
- Introduction of state planning in agriculture taking into account economic, social and climatic conditions.
- Strict monitoring of livestock number in each pasture committee, depending on the availability of grazing land and population. Development a methodology of record keeping of agricultural livestock and normative legal act on the liability of livestock holders.
- Restoration of scientific and technical councils in the relevant ministries; Definition of the problem; Necessary research; Ways of implementation.
- Introduction of innovative technologies (CSACA); Lack of specialists; Modernization of the laboratory base: phyto-sanitary, veterinary, soil-geobotanical, biological.
- Amendments to existing legislation (primary and secondary); normative legal acts
- Introduction of innovative technologies (CSA, CA), training of specialists.
- Facilitate the transfer of lands to the forest fund from other categories.

Gender gaps

- Management of households by women from vulnerable groups of the population.
- Lack of women on senior positions.
- Lack of gender statistics.
- Misbalance in the profiles of specialists and in public authorities.
- Gender stereotypes.
- Misbalance of profile specialties (forestry faculty and other specialties).

Actions (approaches) to fulfill the gaps

- Capacity building of specialists, Evidence-based training, Program monitoring and evaluation.
- Work with decision-makers (parliament, ministries).
- Improvement of public-private partnerships; Attraction of investments in agriculture.
- Data collection (Data disaggregated by sex) methodology.
- Involvement of women in production in greenhouses, nurseries, etc.
- Strengthening of the value chains for processing products.
- The quota for female entrants in environmental specialties (forestry faculty, etc.).

Based on work of the second day, it was decided to include the results of the working groups in the project proposal for the Green Climate Fund.

50. On March 30, 2017 the FAO team and GCF representative Ms. Carmen Arguello had a meeting, where the results of the two-day workshop and further steps were discussed. In addition, the FAO team held meetings with other international partners, in particular, with GIZ, the World Food Program and the Russian-Kyrgyz Development Fund. Within the framework of these meetings, the agencies came to a common opinion on the need for further cooperation in the field of climate change, adaptation and agriculture.

51. The final stage of this day was the joint trilateral meeting of FAO-GCF-SAEPP. The parties considered the details of the project proposal, further steps, deadlines, and discussed the Readiness Program and posed questions to GCF Representative Ms. Carmen Arguello. As a result of this discussion, the parties agreed on the speedy preparation of the project proposal and forwarding it to the Green Climate Fund.

II. Minutes of the Meeting of the Working Group on discussion Green Climate Fund project proposal concept. Bishkek, 15 June 2017.

Objective

52. The UN FAO Representation in the Kyrgyz Republic held a Meeting of the Working Group on discussion Green Climate Fund project proposal concept on June 15, 2017 in the conference hall of the FAO office, Bishkek. The main goal of the event was to present the project proposal concept to the participants of the meeting, as well as to discuss the details of the concept with stakeholders.

Participants

53. The workshop was attended by representatives of the State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF) under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic, the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Reclamation of the Kyrgyz Republic (MoA), the Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Kyrgyz Republic (MES), the Government Office of the Kyrgyz Republic, the Agency for Hydrometeorology under the Ministry of Emergency Situations KyrgyzHydromet, Climate Change Center, Forest Institute of the National Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic, as well as experts and consultants from the FAO Country, Sub-Regional and Regional Offices, FAO headquarters.

54. The moderators of the meeting were Ms. Cholpon Alibakieva - National Project Manager and Mr. Oleg Guchgeldiev - Coordinator for Climate Change. Cholpon Alibakieva reminded the participants that this meeting was a continuing of the National Facilitation Workshop on Green Climate Fund Project Formulation, which was held on March 28-29, 2017 in Bishkek, and also presented the Agenda.

Minutes:

55. Oleg Guchgeldiyev told participants about the previous GCF Workshop, which was held in March, and the meeting of the GCF held in Georgia, as well as presented the presentation of the project idea "Forest and pastures in Kyrgyzstan: climate-smart conversion practices of land use" developed jointly by three FAO experts - Mr. Oleg Guchgeldiyev, Ms. Anne Mottet - Livestock Policy Officer and Mr. Jacopo Monzini - Natural Resource Management Specialist.

56. After the presentation the participants addressed questions and commented on the project idea. In particular, Mr. Hafiz Mumindjanov from FAO noted that it would be better to grow trees or fruit (alcha, plum) on empty hills to protect the hills from soil erosion, and to produce something at the same time. However, there is a law, which restricts the planting of forests on these fields, and he is glad that the project contains a component on improving the legislation and the application of resource-saving technologies.

57. Mr. Alexander Temirbekov from the Climate Change Center said that thematically this idea is very good. He also noted that FAO right mentioned that this project is not a development project. He asked what risks will be under the project. Since, on the topic of forest-pastures the country has developed materials, which describe all threats, even have the appropriate program of the MoA on the pastures and the Department of forest. They describe not only threats, but also have small calculates. He could not understand the maps on climatic threats. He said, that the program on the forest has not only the maps on climate threats, but also on aridisation, according to which Kyrgyzstan has three the most vulnerable regions. In regards of emergency situations, the MES website has a great map, where threats (landslides and mudflows), which are described here, have accurate localization and category. This concept should be based on national data and vulnerability should be described in accordance with standards (vulnerability, sensitivity and adaptive capacity). As in the sector of forest-pasture he saw only one indicator mitigation – reducing emissions, he would also like to see the adaptation indicator – reducing damage. It is the most difficult moment, which is faced by all developers of our country. The last point, which Mr. Alexander Temirbekov mentioned, was methods, since the project uses the adaptation method based on community, which means that all communities are related to the forest. They should be analysed from the point of view of communities, it is an additional and quite long-term work, and the question on pastures remains open. He told about the UNDP, which was trying to prepare a development project "Increasing resilience including to climate change through the development of pasture management plans". The data on risks and management of the pastures is available in the Third National

communication, and he asked to use this document as the basis of the concept.

58. Ms. Jyparkul Bekkulova from SAEPF reminded that at the meeting in March they paid attention to the fact that it is necessary to take into account and the FAO team have to analyze all the development projects in our country: implemented and ongoing –UNDP, World Bank, IFAD, WFP and etc, including the pastures and forest sector. She noted that in some projects there is a positive and a negative experience, it is important not to repeat what was in these projects, despite the fact that we have not a development project but on climate, we should not use the same measures. She said that they are waiting for this analysis. She also added that the main issue of the Agency, as the authority responsible for the Climate Convention – how much damage will be reduced. Even if it is estimated from the measures, which we will use in this project, it is important in the end how we will achieve them, as this is climate project. In addition, she said that since this adaptation project, which concerns the forestry sector, forest – these are two sides of the same coin: one is adaptive, the second is mitigation. And it is needed to think about it. She also asked whether the pastures of the state forest fund will be covered by the project.

59. Mr. Muslim Rajapbaev from the Institute of Forest of National Academy of Sciences addressed the question - whether Kyrgyzstan will be able to apply to the GCF. The representatives of the SAEPF explained him, that the country is now preparing three project applications from UNDP, WFP and FAO. Countries have no restrictions on submitting applications, but applications must be simple, clear, effective and efficient. And it is the guarantee that in the GCF Board will approve the project. SAEPF also advised the Forest Institute of the Academy of Sciences participate in the preparation of the project, since this is their topic too. SAEPF explained that only accredited organizations can apply – international organizations such as FAO, WFP, UNDP. In turn, Mr. Muslim Rajapbaev proposed to include in the project the Forest Institute, as a research organisation, along with such project implement bodies as MoA, SAEPF, SALSGIER (State Agency for Local Self-Government and Inter-Ethnic Relations of the Government of Kyrgyzstan). They could collect the necessary new data.

60. Mr. Kylychbek Jundubaev from the Government Office fully supported colleagues, who spoke about sustainable management of land resources through the rehabilitation of pastures and forest resources. He noted that it is necessary to define pastures of the state forestry Fund and pastures of the Committee. Thus, the key participants will be defined. In addition to this, it is important to identify the project sites, it is needed to make inventory and other preparatory work, compile a database. He said that from the GCF meeting in Tbilisi they have learned that projects should base on strategic documents for the restoration of pastures, restoration of forest resources in the territory of the state forest Fund, protective forest belts. He noted that all this affects the reduction of emergencies, which impact food security and well-being of farmers and local communities. He also supported this concept.

61. The Forest Department also asked to change the forestry organizations on forest institutions in the project document. SAEPF has also a request that all documents were accompanied by a feasibility study.

62. Mr. Armen Sedrakyan from FAO noted that in terms of resource mobilization component 3 will play a very important role. And he addressed a question, whether there are activities or some ideas of the measures, which are needed now to begin before the start of the project, as it affects policy and legislation. This work also requires money, how are we planning this moment.

63. Ms. Jyparkul Bekkulova added that the TCP project is to improve forest policy and provides legislative issues - this is the beginning. She also noted that the concept should include a section on monitoring of results objectives achievement, climatic indicators.

64. Mr. Alexander Temirbekov noted that in regards of SGDs Slide from Presentation, each agency develops its own SGDs indicators, which will be used by MoA, SAEPF.

65. The Representatives of the MES noted that in mapping the good professionals are needed and which sites will be selected. The representative of MES addressed a question on the component 1, Point 1.1, who will participate in mapping.

66. The participants discussed the project sites. Ms. Bekkulova Jyparkul warned that the Batken oblast is a pilot in the projects of UNDP and WFP. The Representatives of the Department of Forest and hunting management suggested the following sites where the most landslide-prone sites: Osh region: Uzgen district, Kara-Suu district; Jalal-Abad region: Suzak district, Bazar-Korgon district.

67. Mr. Alexander Temirbekov noted that it is necessary to consider climatic threats to forests and pastures, so he agreed with the Jalal-Abad district. In turn, Mr. Abdymital of Chyngojoev from FAO explained participants that selected sites will also be used for horticulture.

68. Mr. Kylychbek Jundubaev from the Government office said that this future project is a unique opportunity to avoid repetition and duplication of various projects. He also proposed to consider the Naryn oblast from the point of view of the degradation of pastures, which most are engaged in livestock sector and where forest resources are more effected.

69. MES representatives also noted that from the perspective of the emergency and the water regulation, the water-regulation plantings are required as well as from the point of monitoring view it is necessary to include MES in the number of beneficiaries or implementation agencies.

70. Then the participants received a table to fill stakeholders. See below.

71. In addition, the participants discussed the project budget. Ms. Baglan Salykmambetova of SAEPF noted that it would better to distribute the budget in stages, as thus consideration of the project in the GCF is faster, the GCF does not allocate a large amount, and this fact should be considered before start of the project.

72. Mr. Alexander Temirbekov said that some organizations have reduced their amounts by half on this basis. Due to the fact that the procedure will be faster, and then they could not find co-financing from another organization.

73. Mr. Kylychbek Jundubaev from the Government office said that the ratification procedure will be through the Jogorku Kenesh (Parliament) according to our legislation and credit part of the project also will be considered, so it is necessary to consider these issues with the Ministry of economy, Ministry of Finance, NDA.

74. Speaking about the structure of the implementation, the participants suggested to also include Forest Research Institute, MES and the Climate Change Centre under the Association of forest users, NGOs, Association of forest and land users. Ms. Jyparkul Bekkulova noted that the project or concept are agreed, then these documents will be sent to the Government office and then we ask them to direct. Mr. Alexander Temirbekov asked next time to provide analysis of the situation.

75. And the last discussed issue was the question of next steps. Ms. J. Bekkulova said that approval procedure should be included. Before concept will be applied, SAEPF will turn to the State authorities and the Government, and then the Government gives its decision.

76. Oleg Guchgeldiyev, Anna Motte, Jacopo Monzini responded to all the questions of participants of the meeting.

77. Mr. Dorjee Kinlay said that we have a preliminary draft of the structure of our project, and during the following week, we would like to receive comments from participants. He also hopes that by mid-July, we will be able to provide NDA final version of the concept note. He also hopes that NDA in a month or six weeks will give us their feedback on this concept note. The aim is that by the end of August to provide the document to the GCF, where it will be considered by the GCF Board in the October. Then, depending on the decisions of the GCF Board, we have already prepared a draft TCP, which will fully support project implementation. The draft TCP will go through all the procedures to be approved by NDA. Now we have colleague from investment center, which works on the preparation of such project proposals for approval by all agencies. And so they will work on this project proposal and in the future they will design it in accordance with the requirements. And at this stage he asked the representatives of the agencies to inform their colleagues about the project, to discuss, and to send comments, suggestions within one week to Cholpon Alibakieva.

78. In conclusion, Mr. Dorjee Kinlay thanked all participants for their support and expressed the hope that as a result it will be an excellent project.

Stakeholders and Partners

Partner Name	Role of partner
MES, UNDP, WB, WFP	Monitoring and forecasting, conservation of biodiversity during implementation of a green project
Institute of Forest and Nut Planting under Academy of sciences	Research, observations, reforestation and afforestation, Development of recommendations
IUFRO	Development of recommendations, increasing capacity of scientific organizations, knowledge
Department of forest ecosystems development of SAEPF	Support the implementation of the project and participation in the activities
MAFIM	Assist in the implementation on pasture issues
SAEPF	Forest sector, reforestation
MES	Risks
Institute of Forest	Research
MAFIM	Selection of pilot sites, Implementation of activities
SAEPF	Selection of pilot sites, Implementation of activities
Projects of the WB, FAO, GIZ, WFP and others	Use of best practices, experience, joint implementation
SALSGIER	implementing measures
Academy of sciences, Institute of Forest	Participate in project proposal development
SAEPF	Project coordination, climate component, reforestation, pastures of state forest fund (SFF)
MAFIM	Coordination, pastures
Climate Change Center	Climate component
Institute of Forest, Academy of Sciences	Research
MAFIM	Pasture management
SALSGIER	The involvement of local authorities, local communities
SAEPF	Management of forests and pastures SFF (forestry stations, parks)
Government Office of the Kyrgyz Republic	Coordination of state agencies
SAEPF	The forest sector, NDA
MES, HydroMet	Dangerous areas The meteorological data
SALSGIER	The involvement of local authorities in pilot sites
Institute of Forest, Academy of sciences	Scientific
WB project on sustainable development of forest resources	
MAFIM	Direct participation, coordination
Institute of Forest, Academy of Sciences	Conduct research, recommendations and offer improved methods and technologies of agroforestry, disaster
INFRO – International union of forest research organizations	
Forest Institute of Korea	
Sustainability research centre University of the Sunshine Coast	Joint research and recommendations in the areas of the emergency
KyrgyzHydroMet	Agrometeorological services for pasture rayons. The resumption of pasture hydrometeorological observations; Monitoring for pasture vegetation; Prediction of yield of pasture vegetation using GIS technologies The state of water resources and snow cover

Partner Name	Role of partner
MES of KR (Hydromet, Department of monitoring, Departments of MES in oblasts)	Monitoring of forecasting of dangerous natural processes and phenomena; The implementation of "Green projects"-agromelioration in dangerous sites
+ UNDP, WB, WFP	
Climate Change Center	Consultative
Association of forest and land users	Field work
SAEPF; State institution "Kyrgyz Forest and hunting management"; MES; SALSGIER MAFIM	Inventory and mapping of landslide-prone sites; Inventory and planning of forest planting, selection of tree species; Monitoring of forest sites; Remote sensing;

III. Initiating Funding Proposal Development (September-October 2017)

79. A Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) mission was fielded in Kyrgyzstan between 30 September and 18 October 2017 (individual travels varied), with the objective of initiating the design of the proposed Carbon Sequestration Through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands in the Kyrgyz Republic (CS-FOR).

Institutions met:

80. The mission's activities in Kyrgyzstan included meetings with the FAO Representative; officials and staff of the State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forestry (SAEPF); the Ministry of Emergency Situations (MES); the Agricultural Projects' Implementation Unit (APIU) and the Department of Pastures, Livestock and Fisheries (DPLF) under the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Industry and Melioration (MAFIM); management and staff of ARIS (Community Development and Investment Agency); the Association of Pasture User Unions "Kyrgyz Jaiyty" (AKJ); the Russian-Kyrgyz Development Fund (RKDF); local NGOs Rural Development Fund (RDF) and CAMP Alatau; the Kyrgyz Scientific-Research Institute of Livestock and Pasture (KSRILP); the Kyrgyz Scientific-Research Veterinary Institute (KSRVI) and the State Design Institute for Land Management Kyrgyzgiprozem. The mission also met with donors engaged in rural development, environmental protection and climate change adaptation and their projects' representatives including the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and World Food Programme (WFP). The mission visited Suzak and Uzgen districts of Jalalabad and Osh regions where it met with officials of *aiyl okmotu* (local government body (AO)) and *leskhoz*es (state forest enterprises), ARIS and AKJ district staff, representatives of *zhayit* committees (Pasture User Unions (PUUs)), agro-enterprises, and with private farmers, households and private veterinarians. The mission greatly benefited from the roundtable organized jointly by ARIS and AKJ where various approaches to and implementation options of integrated NRM were explored and discussed.

Outcomes:

81. As a result of this mission, a preliminary Aide Memoire was prepared, including a brief project description, rationale and implementation arrangements; summary of the project structure, results and activities; and a proposed Logframe (in the format of the GCF funding proposal).

People and Organizations met:

Organization	Name	Title
State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forests	Bakyt Yrsaliev	Deputy Director of Department of Forest Ecosystems Development
	B. Tolongutov	Director, Centre of Regulation in the field of Environmental Protection and Ecological Security
	Venera Surappaeva	Department of Monitoring and Information Systems
	B. Salykmambetova	Chief, Department of International Partnership
State Agency for Local Self-governance and Inter-ethnic Relations	Mr. Ikramov Sanzhar	State Secretary
Ministry of Emergency Situations	Gulmira Kalchakeeva,	Center for Crisis Management
Agricultural Projects Implementation Unit (APIU)	Mr. Sharshenbek uulu Elzarbek and staff	Coordinator of the IFAD-financed Livestock and Market Development Programme
Department of Pastures Livestock and Fisheries under the MAFIM	Mr. Bekenov Ms. Nagima Alymbekova	Specialists
State Design Institute for Land Management Kyrgyzgiprozem	Adam Tashtemirov	Head of the Department
	K. Isaev	Specialist
Kyrgyz Scientific-Research Institute of Livestock and Pastures	Ms. Natalya Kilyazova	Head of the Pasture Department

Organization	Name	Title
Kyrgyz Scientific-Research Veterinary Institute	Elmira Akmatova	Director
	Kudaybergen Abdykerimov	Head, Infectious Diseases Laboratory
FAO Representation	Dorjee Kinlay	FAO Representative
	Dinara Rakhmanova	Assistant FAO Representative (programme)
FAO/GEF project	Cholpon Alibakieva	Project Manager
	Abdymital Chingojoev	National Forestry Expert
	Dyikanbai Kenjebaev	National Expert on Land Degradation and Pasture Rehabilitation
GIZ	Saltanat Asan	Programme Professional
KOICA	Mr. Lee	Advisor
EBRD	Nurgul Esenamanova	Climate Finance Officer
WFP	Sharifbek Sohbnazarov	Programme Officer
	Dinara Abzhamilova,	Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping (VAM) Officer
	Tatyana Semenova	National Programme Officer
JICA Project for Development of Rural Enterprises with Forest Products	Nurlan Sultanov	National Expert
	Aisuluu Duishebaeva	National Expert
WB/GEF Integrated Forest Ecosystems Management Project	Umut Joldosheva	Director
	Gulmira Akhmatova	Monitoring Specialist
Russian-Kyrgyz Development Fund	Mr. Asrandiev Erkin	Board Member
	Ms Osmonova Nurzada and Mr Bakai Aidaraliev	Credit and Investment Specialists
Aga Khan Foundation	Mr. Arslanbek Miashev	Executive Director
	Jamil Uddin	Director Programs
	Marc-Antoine Adam	Regional Partnership and Donor Relations Officer
	Zholdoshibek Dadybaev	Manager of the Natural Resources Department, PF “MSDP” KG
ARIS	Almazbek Akmatoliev and staff	Coordinator for the LMDP
	Kuban Kanakaev	Economist/ Financial Analyst
CAMP Alatau (NGO)	Azamat Isakov	Director
Rural Development Fund	Ms. Akmatova Kuliypa and staff	Director
Independent Ecological Expertise (NGO)	Oleg Pecheniuk	Chairman
	Elmira Djumakadyrova	Programme Officer
Association of food industry enterprises		
LLC “Bishkek Expo”	Mr. Edil Myrzaliev	
ProdImpex company	Ms. Shailoogul Maylieva,	Director General
Taurus Genetics LLC	Mirbek Borubashev	CEO
Manager – consultant on Livestock/ agricultural entrepreneurship	Aydyn Dzhumadilov	
Pasture Users Association, Jalal Abad oblast	Kadyrbek Orozaliev	
Kara Alma Ayil Okmutu, Suzak district, Jalal Abad oblast	Ilimbek Alimov	Head of Ayil Okmutu
	Kamchibek Ailchiev	Vice/former Head of Ayil Okmutu
Kurmanbek Ayil Okmutu, Suzak district, Jalal Abad oblast	Abdymalik Suyunbaev	Head of Jayit Committee
Bagysh Ayil Okmutu, Suzak district, Jalal Abad oblast	Kazbeck Kydyrbaev	Head of Jayit Committee
Osh oblast	Abdulla Bakirov	Head of Regional Jayit Association

CS-FOR
Stakeholder Engagement

Organization	Name	Title
Zargir Ayil Okmutu, Uzgen district, Osh oblast	Muhtarali Abdullaev	Head of Jayit Committee
Zargir Ayil Okmutu, Uzgen district, Osh oblast	Abdyrahim Musurmonkulov	Deputy Head of Jayit Committee
Myrza ake Ayil Okmutu, Uzgen district, Osh oblast	Kamol Maturayimov	Head of Jayit Committee
Uzgen Leskhoz	R.Kadyrkulov	Director
Kara Shoro National Park	Koilubaev S. and Davletov S.	Staff

IV. Furthering Funding Proposal Development (December 2017)

Workshop of the project proposal concept for submission to the GCF Carbon Sequestration through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands in the Kyrgyz Republic (CS-FOR), Bishkek, 7 December 2017.

82. Building upon the priorities for investment identified during the a National Facilitation Workshop on Green Climate Fund (GCF) Project Formulation (March 2017), on the subsequent Concept Note, submitted for comments to the GCF Secretariat in September 2017 (and their comments received in November 2017), on expert reviews within FAO and in the country gathered during and between the missions, and on further discussions with the project stakeholders, a mission was fielded from 1-9 December, 2017. The purpose of the mission was to continue discussions with relevant stakeholders and to begin the process of formulation of the Feasibility Study. Results included refining of the project proposal and details of project activities.

83. During the period of project preparation, and in preparation of the feasibility study, a number of thematic studies were prepared, including: (a) the development of Earth Map, an open-source platform for climate change analysis (in collaboration with CBC, expected to be released to the public soon); (b) a livelihood and resilience analysis study, carried out by a national NGO with support from FAO using RIMA (Resilience Impact Measurement Approach) approach³. The survey and the analysis covered the project area as well as a control area with similar conditions; and (c) five working papers supporting the climate investment design, namely on: (i) NRM governance; (ii) pasture conditions and needs for investment; (iii) forests conditions and needs for investment; (iv) livestock production and productivity; and (v) market analysis of non-timber forest products.

84. During this December 2017 mission, a workshop was also held (7 December, 2017, Bishkek) where findings of the above-mentioned assessments and of the field mission were presented in a second workshop (December 2017) to discuss the climate rationale, the relevant climate change adaptation and mitigation targets, the proposed project approach including the investment criteria, the sustainability and the expected paradigm shift. Agreement was reached on needs to be addressed, targets, methodology, timeframe and budget. The resulting document was circulated among participants for comments and additional recommendations.

People and Organizations met

Organization	Name	Title
State Agency for Environmental Protection and Forests	Bakyt Yrsaliev	Deputy Director of Department of Forest Ecosystems Development
	B. Tolongutov	Director, Centre of Regulation in the field of Environmental Protection and Ecological Security
	Venera Surappaeva	Department of Monitoring and Information Systems
	B. Salykmambetova	Chief, Department of International Partnership
State Agency for Local Self-governance and Inter-ethnic Relations	Mr. Ikramov Sanzhar	State Secretary
Ministry of Emergency Situations	Gulmira Kalchakeeva,	Center for Crisis Management
Agricultural Projects Implementation Unit (APIU)	Mr. Sharshenbek uulu Elzarbek and staff	Coordinator, IFAD-financed Livestock and Market Development Programme
Department of Pastures Livestock and Fisheries under the MAFIM	Mr. Bekenov Ms. Nagima Alymbekova	Specialists
State Design Institute for Land Management Kyrgyzgiprozem	Adam Tashtemirov	Head of the Department
	K. Isaev	Specialist
Kyrgyz Scientific-Research Institute of Livestock and Pastures	Ms. Natalya Kilyazova	Head of the Pasture Department
Kyrgyz Scientific-Research Veterinary Institute	Elmira Akmatova	Director
	Kudaybergen Abdykerimov	Head, Infectious Diseases Laboratory

³ <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5665e.pdf>

Organization	Name	Title
FAO Representation	Dorjee Kinlay	FAO Representative
	Dinara Rakhmanova	Assistant FAO Rep. (programme)
FAO/GEF project	Cholpon Alibakieva	Project Manager
	Abdymital Chingojoev	National Forestry Expert
	Dyikanbai Kenjebaev	National Expert on Land Degradation and Pasture Rehabilitation
GIZ	Saltanat Asan	Programme Professional
KOICA	Mr. Lee	Advisor
EBRD	Nurgul Esenamanova	Climate Finance Officer
WFP	Sharifbek Sohibnazarov	Programme Officer
	Dinara Abzhamilova,	Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping (VAM) Officer
	Tatyana Semenova	National Programme Officer
JICA Project for Development of Rural Enterprises with Forest Products	Nurlan Sultanov	National Expert
	Aisuluu Duishebaeva	National Expert
WB/GEF Integrated Forest Ecosystems Management Project	Umut Joldosheva	Director
	Gulmira Akhmatova	Monitoring Specialist
Russian-Kyrgyz Development Fund	Mr. Asrandiev Erkin	Board Member
	Ms Osmonova Nurzada and Mr Bakai Aidaraliev	Credit and Investment Specialists
Aga Khan Foundation	Mr. Arslanbek Miiashiev	Executive Director
	Jamil Uddin	Director Programs
	Marc-Antoine Adam	Regional Partnership and Donor Relations Officer
	Zholdoshbek Dadybaev	Manager of the Natural Resources Department, PF "MSDP" KG
ARIS	Almazbek Akmatoliev and staff	Coordinator for the LMDP
	Kuban Kanakaev	Economist/ Financial Analyst
CAMP Alattoo (NGO)	Azamat Isakov	Director
Rural Development Fund	Ms. Akmatova Kuliypa and staff	Director
Independent Ecological Expertise (NGO)	Oleg Pecheniuk	Chairman
	Elmira Djumakadyrova	Programme Officer
Association of food industry enterprises		
LLC "Bishkek Expo"	Mr. Edil Myrzaliev	
ProdImpex company	Ms. Shailoogul Maylieva,	Director General
Taurus Genetics LLC	Mirbek Borubashev	CEO
Manager – consultant on Livestock/ agricultural entrepreneurship	Aydyn	
Pasture Users Association, Jalal Abad oblast	Kadyrbek Orozaliev	
Kara Alma Ayil Okmutu, Suzak district, Jalal Abad oblast	Ilimbek Alimov	Head of Ayil Okmutu
	Kamchibek Ailchiev	Vice/former Head of Ayil Okmutu
Kurmanbek Ayil Okmutu, Suzak district, Jalal Abad oblast	Abdymalik Suyunbaev	Head of Jayit Committee
Bagysh Ayil Okmutu, Suzak district, Jalal Abad oblast	Kazbeck Kydyrbaev	Head of Jayit Committee
Osh oblast	Abdulla Bakirov	Head of rRgional Jayit Association
Zargir Ayil Okmutu, Uzgen district, Osh oblast	Muhtarali Abdullaev	Head of Jayit Committee
Zargir Ayil Okmutu, Uzgen district, Osh oblast	Abdyrahim Musurmonkulov	Deputy Head of Jayit Committee
Myrza ake Ayil Okmutu, Uzgen district, Osh oblast	Kamol Maturayimov	Head of Jayit Committee
Uzgen Leskhoz	R.Kadyrkulov	Director
Kara Shoro National Park	Koilubaev S. and Davletov S.	Staff

V. Structured Consultations

V.1 District-level Consultation Meetings:

- Jalalabad (Uzgen and Suzak districts, 6 April 2018)
- Kazarman (Toguz-Toro district, 17 May 2018)
- Baetov (Ak-Talaa district, 18 May 2018)

V.2 Consultations with CSOs (Bishkek, 12 April 2018)

V.3 National Workshop (Bishkek, 13 April 2018)

V.1 District Level Stakeholder Consultation Meetings (Jalalabad, 6 April 2018)

85. Three consultation meetings at the district level were planned in the project target districts, inviting representatives from local self-governments (ayil okmotu), forest enterprises (leskhoze), pasture committees, women's councils and traditional councils of the elders. Three district consultation meetings were held: the first one in Jalalabad city on 6 April 2018 for the stakeholders from Uzgen and Suzak districts; the second one in Kazarman on 17 May 2018 for the Toguz-Toro district stakeholders; and the third one in Baetov on 18 May 2018 for the Ak-Talaa district stakeholders. 30-50 people participated in the meetings, of whom women constituted about 10-15%.



(Jalalabad, 6 April 2018; Uzgen and Suzak stakeholders)

86. In each meeting, the presentation of the project was followed by active feedback from the participants. Participants requested clarification and further details on such aspects as duration, its effects on climate change, selection of the target area and geo-referencing methodologies. Many participants spoke about how climate change impacts are affecting their everyday life and stressed importance of the project. Problems such as poor quality of pastures, danger of natural disasters such as landslides, absence of clean water, high number and low quality of livestock, overdependence on livestock production as the main source of income were among the most common topics raised during the discussion.



(Kazarman, Toguz-Toro district, 17 May 2018)

87. In each district meeting, participants were broken into groups and each group was requested to discuss the following four topics: (i) who should be in the Community Landscape Management Group (CLMG) at ayil aimak level; (ii) what should be included in the Integrated Natural Resources Management and Climate Resilient Plan (INRMCRP); (iii) what are potential risks in implementing the Plan according to their views; (iv) which groups require special attention for their participation and inclusion; and (v) how the project can involve youth. The table below summarizes the results of the group discussions, which were reported by the groups.

Recommendations and Suggestions from District Stakeholder Consultation Meetings

Topics for which feedbacks were sought	Responses		
	Uzgen and Suzak	Toguz-Toro	Ak-Talaa
Who should be members of the Community Landscape Management Group (CLMG)	Ayil Okmotu (AO) head Pasture committee Leskhoz representatives Local council (ayil kenesh) National Park representatives Council of the elder - <i>aksakar</i> women's council AO land specialist Pasture users Tenants (lessees) of forest land Water users association Youth council NGOs Large farm business operators Businesses Unions of Government employees Educated and respected people Ministry of Emergency Situations at Rayon level EcoTech Inspection at Rayon level State Registration Service at Rayon level Rayon administration	Forest enterprises (Leskhozoes) Ayil Okmotu Pasture users union National Park representatives Community members (councils of the elder, women and youth) Hunting enterprises Representatives of SRS (State Registration Service) Representatives of EcoTechInspection (Ecological, Technical security Inspection) Local council (ayil kenesh) NGO Local business Ecologists Veterinarians State Registration Service N/B: one group reported that at least 30% of the membership should be women.	Ayil Okmotu Pasture users union Forest users Water users union Farmers Business Hunting enterprises Emergency Situations Ministry representatives EcoTech Inspection Veterinarians Regional department of agrarian development Farmers Water department representatives Women's council Youth council Elders council Leskhozoes

Topics for which feedbacks were sought	Responses		
	Uzgen and Suzak	Toguz-Toro	Ak-Talaa
What should be included in the INRMCRP.	<u>Actions during the planning</u> Information on natural resources (inventory) Development of an NRM plan Development of budget plan Development of monitoring mechanisms Implementation of accepted work plans Monitoring group establishment Report of the results Social mobilization Information and awareness campaigns <u>Investments</u> Improvements of roads leading to pastures Measures to prevent landslides Forests preservation Forestation Clean drinking water Measure to help reduce migration Preservation of newly planted trees (to protect from animal) Tree nurseries River banks strengthening Pasture rotation and improvement Transition from quantity to quality of livestock Tourism Establishment of small businesses Grass seeding for pasture improvement Infrastructure improvement (bridges, road and water points)	Pasture rotation Sustainable water resources use Sustainable forest resources use Infrastructure improvement Pastures monitoring Improvements work according to pastures monitoring, relocation to remote pastures Ban on use of degraded pastures Planting trees to increase forest areas Planting trees in areas with high natural disasters danger Fencing to protect newly planted trees Identifying pasture borders Building roads to remote pastures Building bridges Sowing herbs on degraded pastures Preservation of water resources Identifying a number of livestock on pastures	Fencing Pasture quality improvement Planting fruit trees Restoration of lands affected by erosion Fencing newly planted trees Relocation of livestock to remote pastures Provision of sufficient amount of water Pasture rotation Building roads to remote pastures Building bridges Building water points Providing water for irrigation

Topics for which feedbacks were sought	Responses		
	Uzgen and Suzak	Toguz-Toro	Ak-Talaa
What kind of risks are there for implementing the plan.	Irrigation improvement may cause landslides Pasture area reduction after planting trees Destruction of newly planted trees by animals Conflicts in the process of implementation of the plan Transition from quantity to quality of livestock while preserving pasture lands Lack of shared understandings among different groups in the same community/between neighbouring communities on interventions Personal interest vs. community interest Unstable funding Risk of becoming a campaign without results (advocating same activities only every year) Political instability Poor quality of laws and regulations Low levels of awareness Absence of qualified experts High turnover of employees (mostly AOs) Low level of government support to business, farmers, etc.	Unfulfilled agreements lead to misunderstandings Poor financial management N/B: two groups reported that they do not foresee any risks	Financing and timing that may hinder the project from reaching its goals. N/B: two groups reported that they do not foresee any risks
What groups in the community need special attention?	Low income families People in need People affected by natural disasters on pastures and in forests, particularly landslides The disabled The elderly without attention Widows Orphans	People in need Low income families Widows left with no financial support The unemployed The disabled	Low income families Unemployed

Topics for which feedbacks were sought	Responses		
	Uzgen and Suzak	Toguz-Toro	Ak-Talaa
Suggestions to involve the youth	Involvement in the INRMCRP development process Involvement of youth groups Incentivizing youth work camps Providing youth with clear and transparent information Providing opportunity for youth to gather information from mobile Internet Planting fruit trees with a 30% quota for youth Tree planting Small businesses establishment Tourism Involvement of NGO in information process to youth	Cooperation with youth groups is very important project implementation Involvement of youth in competitions Involvement of youth in the project at least at 20% level Information campaign among tyouth Support of young and unemployed families Organization of study courses on project design	There is a need for a quota for youth Involvement of youth in planting and fencing trees Providing incentives for business and youth

88. The FAO team presented an outline of the ESMF and GRM, to which the participants showed good understanding and support. Questions and comments included: the wide spread of hawthorn and how to eliminate this weed; solutions to decrease number of livestock on pastures to prevent overgrazing through such measures as fencing, tax increase and changes in the legislation; and potential roles of religious leaders.



(Baetov, Ak-Talaa district, 18 May 2018)

List of Participants in District Consultation Meetings

Jalal-Abad meeting (for Uzgen and Suzak Districts)

	Name	Organization/Title
1	Baidaliev A	SAEPF
2	Osmonaliev R	CAMP Ala-Too
3	Asanbekov M	Ortok leskhoz
4	Mamatov K	Jalal Abad oblast pasture users association
5	Aitieva B	Ortok leskhoz
6	Turusbekova M	Kara Alma AA
7	Jeenkulova Z	Kyz Kol AA
8	Bakirov K	Kyzyl Too AA
9	Samidinov R	Kyzyl Too AA
10	Karaev S	Kolduk AA
11	Inashov E	Salam Alik AA
12	Chybyshev T	Salam Alik AA
13	Kulmatov P	Karool AA
14	Abdullaev M	Zerger AA
15	Ubukeyev R	Jylaldy AA
16	Mamatov N	Changet AA
17	Turkbaev T	First deputy head of Suzak District Administration
18	Alaychiev B	Deputy head of Uzgen District Administration
19	Koilubaev S	Kara Shoro National Park, Director
20	Kurmankulov R	Head of Myrzaake AA
21	Ahmedov I	Farmer
22	Matkasymov J	MAFIM, Suzak district office
23	Kadyrkulov R	Uzgen leskhoz
24	Hodjabekov B	Tash Bulak AA
25	Sultanov G	Barpy AA
26	Zulushev D	Uzgen
27	Shaimkulov SH	Lesik Yug
28	Sarymsakov Z	Lesik Yug
29	Isanov T	Kyzyl Tuu PUU
30	Asanov T	Kara Darya PUU
31	Kudaiberdiev Sh	Head of Kok Art AA
32	Alimov I	Head of Kara Alma AA
33	Abdrahmonov A	Agrolid
34	Murzamamytov S	Ak Jar AA
35	Abdukarimova	Ak Jar AA
36	Tenizbaev M	Urumbash leskhoz
37	Nazanov K	Kara Alma leskhoz
38	Bakirov D	Kurmanbek AA
39	Murzabekov R	Bagysh AA
40	Keneshbaev I	Lenin AA
41	Ajikulov Ch	Atabekov AA
42	Alimbekova Y	Bagysh AA

Toguz-Toro Meeting

	Name	Organization/Title
1	Mametkulov Ch.	"Saimaluu Tash" state park
2	Akuluev T	"Saimaluu Tash" state park
3	Bobukeev B	Atay
4	Atkulova Anara	Atay
5	Moldalieva A	Atay
6	Moldobekov U	"Kan Achuu" state park
7	Sultanov R	Toguz Toro forestry
8	Baatyrbek u. Askar	Toguz Toro forestry
9	Kambaraliev A	"Kan Achuu" state park

10	Nurgaziev A	Regional department of agrarian development
11	Jumadil uulu B	Regional department of agrarian development
12	Baimanbet uulu M	Sary Bulun
13	Totuev J	Kargalyk
14	Kochorbaev U	Toguz Toro
15	Toktonaliev A	Sary Bulun
16	Abyshbaev A	Atay
17	Manapbaeva K	Atay
18	Apiiev A	Kargalyk
19	Kazybaev J	Kargalyk
20	Akmatbekov M	Kargalyk
21	Ornoshov B	Sary Bulun
22	Abdyldaev B	Atay
23	Toktonaliev B	Sary Bulun
24	Moldaliev N	Toguz Toro
25	Eneev K	Kok Irin
26	Musa uulu J	Kok Irin
27	Kaparov J	Kok Irin
28	Naimanova P	Kok Irin
29	Kanbolot k. P.	Kok Irin
30	Anikeev E	Kok Irin
31	Oljotoev M	Toguz Toro district administration
32	Sultangazieva G	Deputy head of Toguz Toro district
33	Alymbek B	Toguz Toro

Ak-Talaa Meeting

	Name	Organization/Title
1	Abdyrahmanov B	Ak Chiy
2	Nurmanbetov Sh.	Ak Chiy
3	Ayipov E	Ak Chiy
4	Aldeev R	Jany Talap
5	Beisheev S	Kosh Dobo
6	Jeentaeva A	Kosh Dobo
7	Satyndiev U	Kosh Dobo
8	Dosmuratov S	Baetov
9	Bayaliev Ch.	Baetov
10	Kurmanaliev A	Kosh Dobo
11	Degenbaev T	Baetov
12	Akmataliev	Baetov
13	Ajiev A	Ak Talaa leskhoz
14	Medetbek uulu N	Ak Talaa leskhoz
15	Monolov T	Togolok Moldo
16	Orozobekov A	Togolok Moldo
17	Kalykov T	Togolok Moldo
18	Mamytov D	Togolok Moldo
19	Suiunbekov R	Ak Tal
20	Satarov E	Ak Tal
21	Shergaziev A	Kyzyl Beles
22	Abdyldaev A	Kyzyl Beles
23	Chylymdaev B	Kara Burgon
24	Duishembiev A	Ak Tal
25	Seidakmatov T	Konorchok
26	Esengulov Y	Ugut
27	Nasyrbaev M	Konorchok
28	Moldokmatov Sh	Jerge Tal
29	Ashyrbekov B	Jerge Tal
30	Uchugenova G	Jerge Tal
31	Nurakov K	Terek

CS-FOR
Stakeholder Engagement

32	Jusubaliev J	Ugut
33	Kojoev T	Terek
34	Rysbaev T	Kosh Dobo
35	Solpuev S	Kok Jar
36	Satkynov S	Jany Talap
37	Kalmuratov E	Kok Jar
38	Tologonov M	Kok Jar
39	Akiev A	Konorchok
40	Soodonbekov N	Kara Burgon
41	Kulov A	Togolok Moldo
42	Tashmatov J	Baetov
43	Satynaliev T	Baetov
44	Baiteriev N	Kyzyl Beles
45	Esenamanov K	Kara Burgon
46	Omurov M	Togolok Moldo
47	Buzurmanov T	Ugut

V.2 Meeting with Civil Society Organizations

89. The CSO meeting was held on 12 April 2018 at the FAO office in Bishkek, inviting representatives from about 10 CSOs active in related areas (forestry, pasture, community development and value chain). Feedbacks from the participants to the project were positive – they provided strong support to the project by confirming the current challenges which the project attempts to address (such as un-harmonized policies and conflicts between State Land Fund and State Forest Fund pastures), as well as presenting success stories in similar interventions (pasture management of communities and value chain development).

90. Comments and suggestions from the participants were related to a wide range of topics, including: importance to include the regional administration; need for coordination with businesses; need to include representatives from women's and elders' councils; importance for communications at all levels; need for special attention to poor families; need to pay attention to non-timber forest resource users (nuts collectors, beekeepers, etc.); and importance of organic certification for Climate-sensitive Value Chain.

91. The participants' comments on GRM included: acknowledgement of existence of corruption; potential roles by *aksakar* (traditional councils of the elders) and women's councils; importance to involve the existing formal institutions at the subnational level (such as district administration, leskhoz, and land management authorities); and need to consider different resources/channels for different types of grievances.

List of Participants in CSO Meeting

	Name	Organization
1	Azamat Isakov	CAMP Ala-Too
2	Gulnaz Kaseeva	Agrolead
3	Akylbek Kasymov	Bio-Muras
4	Nurdin Kumushbekov	DPI
5	Kuluipa Akmatova	RDF
6	Abdymalik Egemberiev	Kyrgyz Jayiti
7	Damira Raeva	HSI
8	Iskender Amanbaev	FMS
9	Nurlan Isabekov	ARIS
10	Aitkul Kurkhanov	KAFLU

Workshop with government agencies for consultation of the FAO project proposal for submission to the GCF Carbon Sequestration through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands in the Kyrgyz Republic (CS-FOR)

Venue: SAEPF Department of Forest Ecosystems Development Conference Hall, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
April 13, 2018

9:00 am – 12:00 pm

ANNOUNCEMENT

92. Ms. Dinara Rahmanova greeted participants, thanked them for participation, introduced FAO team members - experts in different fields, stressed importance of participants' opinions and that all of them will be included in the design.

93. Ms. Jiparkul Bekkulova expressed hope for a good cooperation, asked to share ideas, ask questions and actively participate in the discussion. Forest sector is very vulnerable and projects such as CS-FOR are needed, but copying other projects must be avoided.

94. Mr. Bakyt Yrsaliev informed that experts of the project met with communities in their field trips and expressed hope that the project design paid attention to people's needs. He also stressed importance of avoiding of copying projects.

95. Participants introduced themselves.

DISCUSSIONS

96. Mr. Tommaso Alacevich gave a detailed presentation about the project proposal concept: main problems, national commitments, Core project area, vulnerability to natural disasters, the ecosystem approach, project components, outputs, impact, georeferencing strategy, investments monitoring, work plan.

97. Mr. Jacopo Monzini. The first investment of the CS-FOR project is already at disposal of Kyrgyzstan - Earth Map atlas. It is a very clear and proactive monitoring tool. It is updated automatically, high resolution international data with downscaling ability to oblast level. All project activities can be tracked on the map with no additional software or equipment needed, nevertheless this is not a forecasting tool.

98. Ms. Aijan Jakshylykova. Very needed project for the country. Forestation of pastures will require change in legislation. Planting herbs on pastures can be a good option for income diversification. The World Bank project on pastures inventory could benefit the project.

99. Mr. Tommaso Alacevich. No changes in status of lands is planned, forestation will be in areas where it can be done.

100. Ben Norton. Unfortunately we cannot plant trees on pastures, shelter belts would provide shade for livestock. Pasture rotation is a good tool to improve pastures.

101. Inna Punda. Added value chain component: herbs planting depends on market demand, communities to decide whether to plant or not.

102. Ms. Elena Taranova. It is a difficult to prove status of eco products. There is a need for laboratories and certification. There is also a problem of weed invading pastures. Bigger groups of livestock should be formed in order to take to far pastures. Keeping livestock in barns will not benefit pastures improvement since forage will still be needed.

103. Ms. Inna Punda. Investments in the project will aim to buying only green technology equipment. Informing communities to keep funds in banks instead of investing in livestock is important, we will support to comply with all requirements.

104. Ms. Jiparkul Bekkulova. Certification of products, building laboratories to support export, green equipment such as drip irrigation, solar panels should be included in the project.

105. Ms. Mambetova A. Gender question, as well as support for businesswomen should be included.

106. Ms.Venera Surapaeva. Forestation is important, but research on whether trees will grow or not, status of lands, planting trees in emergency situations without changing status of a land should be done. Improving pastures via improving quality of livestock is included in the Kyrgyz Republic's Government "40 steps" program. The atlas could be a very effective tool in the project. FAO has a big experience and data on country forests that could be useful for the project.

107. Mr. Kauri Sparff. SFF lands in focus for planting trees, national legislation allows forestation on small areas. Improving forests around national parks, implementing best international and local practices, paying special attention to endangered endemic trees - in focus of the project.

108. Ms. Asyl Undeland. The project is in the design stage. More detailed work will be done on the ground: work on harmonization of legislature including all stakeholders.

109. Mr. Robert Bierkandt. Atlas tool and data should be available to public. Communities involvement in decision making process is important.

110. Mr. Bakyt Yrsaliev. MES project "Jashyl Dolboor" includes 600 thousand trees in areas with landslide danger. There is a problem of using different mapping systems in agencies which leads to different numbers on pasture borders. Government representatives in oblasts should be included in steering committees in order to work directly with oblast administrations.

111. Ms. Dinara Rahmanova. The project needs support from all stakeholders especially from government agencies.

112. Ms. Jiparkul Bekkulova. FAO brings real changes by different projects. No objection process in government agencies needs to be facilitated. Hope for future cooperation.

Participants

	Name	Organization
1	Duishenbieva	EcoTechInspection
2	Djitishikova	EcoTechInspection
3	Dyikanbai Kenjebaev	FAO/GEF
4	Abdymital Chyngojoev	FAO/GEF
5	Sulaiman Berdikeev	FAO
6	Sekimov A	MES
7	Kenjebaev T	MES
8	Tania Santivanez	FAO
9	Yoojin Jeong	FAO
10	Ben Norton	ARIS
11	Ruslan Ermatov	KyrgyzHydroMet
12	Kasymova M	KyrgyzHydroMet
13	Robert Bierkandt	KyrgyzHydroMet
14	Jacopo Monzini	FAO
15	Omurzakova Sh.	KyrgyzHydroMet
16	Barieva A	SAEPF
17	Salykmambetova B	SAEPF
18	Mambetova A	Ministry of social development
19	Karagulov A	MAFIM
20	Jakshylykova A	MAFIM
21	Elena Taranova	MAFIM
22	Mamyrov R	Climate Finance Center
23	Venera Surappaeva	SAEPF
24	Tommaso Alacevich	FAO
25	Bekkulova J	SAEPF
26	Aliev M	SAEPF
27	Dinara Rahmanova	FAO
28	Bakyt Yrsaliev	SAEPF
29	Kauri Sparff	FAO

CS-FOR
Stakeholder Engagement

	Name	Organization
30	Asyl Undeland	FAO
31	Cholpon Alibakieva	FAO/GEF
32	Cholpon Esenbekova	FAO
33	Karina Abdylidaeva	FAO
34	Inna Punda	FAO
35	Kurmanova G	KyrgyzHydroMet
36	Jen Stephens	FAO
37	Zoya Kretova	KyrgyzHydroMet
38	Daniar Akmataliev	FAO
39	Karymshakova G	Interpreter
40	Chokchonova B	Interpreter