FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review
2019 – Revised Template
Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Asia and the Pacific (RAP)
Country (ies):	Mongolia
Project Title:	Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation, SFM and carbon sink enhancement into Mongolia's productive forest landscapes
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/MON/008/GFF
GEF ID:	4744
GEF Focal Area(s):	Multi-Focal Area Project focusing on: Biodiversity and Land Degradation, with SFM/REDD Incentive Mechanism
Project Executing Partners:	Government of Mongolia (Ministry of Environment and Tourism, MET)
Project Duration:	5 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	25 February 2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	1 November 2014
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE:	31 March 2020
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable)	
Actual Implementation End Date:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3,586,364
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc:	19,785,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	2,665,926
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019	16,428,000 (GIZ Inventory plus MET in kind)

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	29 March 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	n/a
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	Oct-Dec 2016
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	None

Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	**Yes** Planned to during September-October 2019
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	n/a
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required	**Yes**

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S	
Overall implementation progress rating:	S	
Overall risk rating:	L	

Status

Implementation Status *(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):*	4th PIR

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Solongo Tsevegmid, National Project Coordinator, FAOMN	Solongo.Tsevegmid@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Kenichi Shono, Forestry Officer	Kenichi.Shono@fao.org
Budget Holder	Vinod Ahuja, FAOR Mongolia, FAOMN	Vinod.Ahuja@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Yurie Naito, Program Officer, GEF Coordination Unit	Yurie.Naito@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating
Objective(s): *Sustainable forest management in Mongolia's forest landscape secures the flow of multiple ecosystem services and benefits, including biological diversity, reduced degradation, and carbon storage, while enhancing resilience to climate change*						
Outcome 1: Enabling institutional, policy and regulatory framework for Sustainable PFM (including increased revenue to local communities; reduced carbon emissions/increased carbon stocks, and; biodiversity conservation).	Issuance of legal or regulatory instruments on participatory management	Do not exist for co-management/PFM.		Ministry level order/resolution was issuance as solved below mentioned points. Hereof: 1. Revenue generation possibilities from management operations been enabled for FUGs 2. FUG forest management plans have biodiversity conservation activities Guidelines, instruction been issuance dedicating for province, *soum* authorities aimed to implement above mentioned new instruments Guidebook, recommendation been developed on carbon stocking and how to make the carbon stock calculation and been circulated.	1. All five target aimags have applied the Forest User group **Classification criteria** developed by the project to classify all FUGs. The result of the assessment was discussed at the PCC meeting and received positive feedback. The project is aiming to get an official endorsement from the Ministry on FUG classification and provide more rights for those FUGs who been classified at high level. 2. A draft outline of the Forest Management Plan has been developed and discussed at the stakeholders' level. Further it will be submitted to the Ministry for final discussion and approval.	MS
	New Unit established (probably in FRDC) responsible for both biodiversity and carbon in PFM	FRDC was recently established – it has a broad mandate for PFM, nothing for biodiversity (Currently only 1 MET (not FRDC) staff is in charge for PFM in national level)		Number of officer in charge for PFM been increased in project forest provinces Charging PFM specialist been enabled in project implementing provinces respectively	The project is closely collaborating with FRDC staff on refining policy/regulatory of PFM.. Under the existing LoA, FRDC is supporting with implementation of PFM (Management plan development, advocacy, policy issues). Task force team (with three staff) is working As result of the project support and assistance, a Staff responsible for PFM is operating in all five aimags.	MS

Outcome 2: Sustainable PFM is demonstrated that leads to improved livelihood, biodiversity conserved and reduced carbon emissions/increased stocks.	Extended enabled environment area (range) for and increases in population of indicator species (musk deer, saker falcon) at prioritized 10 FUGs	Result of 2010 national census of forest ungulates and saker falcon from National Biology Institute and information, result of Birds Red List (2011) shall be considered the rationale		Saker falcon population to increase by 30%. Habitat area and population of Musk deer has increased by 10% (If FUG forest area where the habitat area of musk deer is small, then spread in area/range size re roe deer, red deer, black grouse, nests of ants and increased coverage of indicator vegetable species shall also be considered a rationale as those species are considered the indicator species which define the conservation measures in the present forest area)	14 FUG members wildlife conducting monitoring and incorporating their data into national biodiversity database (BioSan) through the Institute of General and Experimental Biology and local department for Environment and Tourism. According to the monitoring data and report from the Institute of General and Experimental Biology, number of some species, including musk deer (Khuvsgul aimag), wild boar (Khentii aimag) have been increased. More comprehensive research needs to be undertaken by professional entity. With regard, to the Sacker Falcon, only 5% of the project target area is overlapping with the habitat area of sacker falcon (Biodiversity expert's report). Therefore, as per recommendation form the Institute of General and Experimental Biology, FUGs are conducting bird monitoring in open area.	S
	Level of biodiversity conservation in 80000 ha around (area of model 16 FUGs)	According to the project assessment made in the beginning period of project implementation, model 16 FUGs have 3-year Forest Management Plans (FMPS) but biodiversity conservation measures included/mentioned		Adhered clear planning of certain target, objectives, activities and implementation of biodiversity conservation when 10-year FMPs are developed by FUGs.	The Institute of General and Experimental Biology under the Academy of Sciences assisting all targeted FUGs to do monitoring and incorporate biodiversity conservation enhancement activities in FMPs. All 10-year Forest Management Plans developed with support of the project have included biodiversity conservation objectives and activities.	S
	Carbon stock amount of Model 16 FUGs forest area	**Baseline C emissions/ removals from the 16 FUGs** / Emissions from deforest.	**Emissions Removals (tCO₂e/yr)** / 77,370		Carbon stocks been enhanced compared to baseline indications when the stock calculation is made using calculations from modelling based on	Carbon stock enhancing activities (forest pest control, fire prevention, forest stand enhancement in 500ha) are successfully implemented during the reporting period.	S

		Emissions from forest deg.	1,617,934		forest changes derived by forest thinning, forest cleaning etc by FUGs	National expert is working on carbon stock calculation.
		Removals from forests	-264,937			
		Total baseline emissions/ removals	**1,430,366**			
	Average Income of FUGs' member household from forest management activities	Average income of FUG per household is less than 300'000 tugrug by 2014 (result of project evaluation made in 2015)			Average income has been increased by 100% as compared to baseline year	As result of series trainings on financial management and business plan development, in total 34 small grant proposals are successfully implemented, which resulted increased income generation of households. Wood processing unit has been established in Khentii aimag and supporting FUGs located nearby with income generation through selling wooden products. For example, in 2018 "Jargalant" FUG made an income of 17 million from producing wooden products which means one million per household. the data collection of economic activities of FUGs is under implementation by the project field facilitators.	
Outcome 3: Sustainable PFM that conserves biodiversity, reduces degradation and reduces carbon emissions/increases	Number of FUGs which implementing FMP in project target provinces	Model 16 FUGs in project target provinces implementing simplified 1-3 years FMP			Enabled condition for 10 years FMP implementation of 101 FUGs and some FMP implementations been initiated already. Awareness, knowledge understanding been emerged on greenhouse gas/carbon management	All target FUGs have developed and implementing Forest management plans with duration of 10, 3 and one year. Moreover, Forest Units have started to develop FMP for FUGs using the project approach.	S

carbon stocks expanded across significant areas of northern forests.	Area size for implementing of PFM which biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed	No mainstreaming of biodiversity in FUG FMPs		Initiated implementation of PFM, which reflected biodiversity conservation in not less than 454000 ha area belonging to 101 FUGs in total.	More awareness raising on biodiversity conservation delivered to all stakeholders during the project supported activities and information leaflets. All Forest management plans which covers more than 460 thousand ha of forest developed with support from the Project included biodiversity conservation activities.	S
	Capacity evaluation of every individual ISFU that selected in project collaboration	Capacity evaluation of ISFU and Soum Forest Unit selected in project collaboration 	Forest Unit	Score
---	---
Mandal, Kharaa	18
Erchimt-Ider	14
Delgermurun	15
Nars shinesen tugul	17
Khentiin shines	16
Batshireet	16
Khongor soum	11
Bulgan soum	12
Khutag-Undor	12
Khyalganat	10			Capacity evaluation of ISFU and Soum Forest Unit in project collaboration been increased by 20% minimum at the end of project implementation	Capacity building trainings (both professional and self-development) and experience-exchange activities were conducted during reporting period. Special training on thinning delivered for all forest engineers. Additionally, provided technical assistance (GPS, Camera and advocacy materials) to all Forest units.	S
	(in 84 FUGs forest area) Amount of carbon is absorbed direct or indirect way	Project short term expert makes the calculation based on indications of forest area existed currently (tree species, age etc)		Carbon stocks enhanced compared to baseline indications when the stock calculation is made using calculations from modelling based on forest changes derived by forest thinning, forest cleaning etc by 84 FUGs	REDD+ PAMs, e.g. re FUG thinning, forest pest and fire prevention activities being implemented. Project FUGs' carbon stocks calculation is on-going.	
Outcome 4: M&E and information dissemination	Number of information access regarding PFM in FRDC webpage	None or zero		Not less than 1000	The project website has been launched in under FRDC website. Data on FUGs, Intersoum forest units, as well as Forest Community Associations have been included. As of June 2019, totally 430 people have visited the project website. Additionally project supported Facebook	MS

					Group pages (8 groups) are operational with more than 400 active members.	
	Midterm and Final evaluations is made on time and adhered implementation of recommendations	None		Midterm review is made by end of third year of project implementation. Final evaluation is made by end year of project implementation	MTR successfully conducted in November 2016 and suggested implementation of recommendations supported by PCC et al	
	Number of "lessons learned"/" Best practice" documents published and disseminated	None or zero		At least 4	Collaboration with "Forest of Mongolia" national journal on forestry is continued. Each quarter article on sustainable forest management has been included. Additionally project activities are broadcasted through local press media.	MS

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Issuance of legal or regulatory instruments on participatory management	Organize regular meetings and progress updates	NPD, NPC	Thoughout the year
Information dissemination	Recruit communication expert and regularly update the project website	NPC, BH	By mid-July 2018

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs[1]	Expected completion date[2]	Achievements at each PIR[3]				Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[4] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR		
Output 1.1 National policy and decision-makers recognise importance of increased carbon storage and improved biodiversity conservation in PFM/FUG forestry	Q1 Y3	2 FUG-level biodiversity conservation & biomass/carbon monitoring plots established	Less national and local level political resistance, and more understanding after a series of Open Days at aimag level and International Day of Forests etc at national level	More support and committed from local stakeholders in implementation of forestry activities in target area	All local authorities are fully supporting importance of biodiversity conservation and carbon stock enhancement, by approving FMPs which includes wildlife conservation objectives and forest stand enhancement activities.	80 %	
Output 1.2 Strengthened national policy, legal environment on PFM/FUG forestry	Q4 Y4	Trials/pilots established to generate evidence for policy changes. Regulatory holidays granted in principle	Ministerial Order signed to authorize FUG 1st and 2nd thinning. Draft regulations for FUG thinning procedures Field tests of draft FUG classification system	MET and FRDC orders authorizing to do 1st and 2nd thinning in collaboration with FUG. FUG classification system has been adopted for all project implementing aimags and classification of all FUGs are on-going	Local authorities and Ministry officials are fully supporting forest thinning by FUGs. FUG Classification have been finalized in all aimags and submitted to the Ministry.	50 %	Ministry officials (NPD) and the project is working on finding optimal/possible solution on legalizing issuance of more rights for highly classified FUGs

---

[1] Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

[2] As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

[3] Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

[4] Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Output 1.3 Approved Forestry Planning Guidelines to Soum and Aimag governments (that promote sustainable PFM).	Q3 Y3	Trials/pilots established to generate evidence for new planning guidelines	Ministerial Order signed to authorize FUG 1st and 2nd thinning being 'translated' into aimag & soum level quotas/contracts for 97 Project FUGs	Compendium for laws for soum Governors has been developed and distributed. FRDC is working on preparing a guideline for developing FMP	First draft of FMP have been developed and discussed among local stakeholders. Further it will be submitted to the Ministry for final discussion and approval.	50 %	More discussions are foreseen at the national level and ministerial level in September and October 2019.
Output 1.4 A Unit in FDRC empowered to integrate biodiversity conservation and carbon storage into all participatory forestry in Mongolia	Q4 Y4	FRDC specialists working regularly with and being trained by Project	Increased ad hoc collaboration between Project/FUGs and FRDC officials re FMPs, pest control and thinning training. LOA operational. English language classes provided	Continues collaboration between FRDC and project. Increased capacity at local level- Participatory forest management officer recruited/working in four aimags (Darkhan Uul, Khentii, Khuvsgul and Bulgan)	Collaboration with FTDC is continues. Three junior and two senior staff are involved in the project activities.	80 %	
Output 2.1 Continually improving forest planning and management in 16 advanced FUGs.	Q2 Y4	16 Advanced FUGs being mentored by FRDC, FFs, ISFUs	25 advanced FUGs given mentoring and training re FMPs, biodiversity, thinning and income generation	12 FUGs have received 10-year Forest management plan and started its implementation.	Additionally 39 10-year forest management plans have been developed and stated the implementation.	100 %	
Output 2.2 Simple REDD+-related incentives demonstrated in 16 advanced FUGs.	Q3 Y3	Simple incentive system being trialed n 2 advanced FUGs	Thinning and thinning training implemented in all project aimags	All project aimags received trainings on forest thinning, pest control and fire preventions	All project aimags received trainings on forest thinning, pest management and forest fire prevention.	100 %	
Output 2.3 Biodiversity conservation practices demonstrated in 10 priority, advanced FUGs.	Q2 Y4	Biodiversity conservation demonstrated on plots established in 2 advanced FUGs	Biodiversity training given to advanced FUG members and plan to demonstrate practices in Khentii	14 FUGs from Khentii, Selenge, Khuvsgul and Bulgan conducting wildlife monitoring under the assistance from the Institute of	Wildlife monitoring is continuing in 14 FUGs. Additionally, the project is supporting wildlife inventory/management in	60 %	

				General and Experimental Biology. Some conservations activities have been included in the management plan	two FUGs in Khentii and Khuvsgul		
Output 2.4 Increased revenue from timber and non-timber forest products at the 16 advanced FUGs.	Q3 Y4	Adding-value/processing trials on-going in 2 advanced FUGs	The equipment procurement is finalized.	Conducting study on possible "final" products from wood processing equipment. Trainings on market, business proposal developments are given and 32 small scale proposals supported.	Wood processing unit has been established in Khentii aimag.	50%	More activities have been planned in during remaining period including market assessment, business plan devolvement.
Output 3.1 Eight PFM Extension Offices (established in inter-soum Forestry Units);	Q2 Y4	Initial training and equipment given to 8 ISFUs	Two more ISFUs were added as per recommendation from PCC and the equipment procurement is completed	Advanced trainings and meetings have been provided for the ISFU staff. Additional tools and advocacy materials have been provided to selected ISFUs.	Advanced trainings and meetings have been provided for the ISFU staff. Additional tools and advocacy materials have been provided to selected ISFUs.	100 %	
Output 3.2 FUG Associations at Soum, Aimag and National Level;	Q4 Y4	Negotiations started in all Project aimags, existing associations attending Project events/training	International and national experience exchange visits facilitated for FUG members.	Totally 6 aimag and soum level Associations have been established in project aimags and established close cooperation with the project. more capacity building activities are foreseen in coming year.	The project has financially supported four aimag based forest user groups associations though LoA. More training on institutional development are foreseen in August 2019	80 %	

Output 3.3 Result of plans implemented by FUGs (resulting in: revenues increase, forest ecosystems conserved, biodiversity conserved & carbon stocks enhanced);	Q2 Y4	2 series of FUG level plots established to provide evidence to enhance PFM methodology	Thinning for Project FUGs expanded, training given in all Project aimags, value-adding machine procurement underway	Thinning has been expanded in the FUG managed area, equipment and tools for value added products are given to FUGs	Totally 1000 ha forest have been managed (forest thinning) by FUGs in 2018. Number of wildlife have been increased in some regions	100 %	
Output 3.4 84 10-year SFM Plans prepared and approved.	Q4 Y4	Process to quickly and inclusively develop and approve simple 3 year FMPs being tested in 20 'new' FUGs	Process to design facilitate a more participatory and transparent process utilizing FRDC & GIZ data to produce 10 year FMPs with FUGs underway	12 10-year SFM Plans have been approved, 54 is under development	Totally 53 10-year management plans have been developed and approved.	100 %	
Output 4.1 Project M&E system developed and implemented	Q4 Y2	Results Framework amendments drafted/proposed	Amended Results Framework approved by PCC & uploaded onto FPMIS	Internal monitoring and evaluation system has been placed at the project level	Internal monitoring and evaluation system has been placed at the project level	60%	
Output 4.2 Project Midterm and final evaluations	Q4 Y2 Q4 Y4	Planning initiated for MTR	MTR successfully organized and conducted on schedule			50%	Final evaluation will be fielded in Q3-Q4 2019.
Output 4.3 Information dissemination	Q4 Y4	Ad hoc publications, magazines, books and articles	Books, leaflets, notebook, magazine articles, videos	Books, notebook, magazine and newspaper articles, videos	Books (2), notebook (1), magazine and newspaper articles, videos	60%	More public awareness activities have been planned during remaining period. Recruitment of Communication & Visibility Expert is on-going

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):
Max 200 words:

Higher levels of awareness about the Project among local stakeholders due to Open door events, publications and branded stationery. Increased capacity at FRDC and aimag level environmental department on participatory forest management. Increased capacity of FUGs in conducting wildlife monitoring and biodiversity conservation. Continued support from the Ministry in conducting first two level (pre-commercial) thinning by FUG through Inter-soum forest units. Team of journalist has been established focusing on forestry sector. 53 FUGs are started the implementation 10-year FMP.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?
Max 200 words:

Institutional (Difficulty with improving capacity of FRDC to deal with participatory forest management; number of staff has been reduced due to lack of financial resource as well as less interest and capacity to deal Participatory forest management)
Technical/marketing (finding optimal supply/value chain logistics and partners re biomass/wood chips and pellets for the UB coal-replacement market)

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating[5]	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating[6]	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	*During the reporting period the project worked to intensify on development of 10-year forest management plan, implementing activities that are addressing REDD+ (thinning, pest controlling and fie management). Additionally focused on setting wildlife monitoring and reporting process (data collection and management).*
Budget Holder	S	S	The project has been making satisfactory progress towards achieving the project objectives and completing planned activities with the revised NTE date.
Lead Technical Officer[7]	S	S	The project has been making satisfactory progress towards achieving the project objectives and completing planned activities with the revised NTE date.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	*Though the project will not complete in October 2019 as originally planned, the project team has been making a continuous progress with seamless follow up to achieve the project objectives and targets and building in-county capacity for other GEF-financed project teams.*

---

[5] **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

[6] **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

[7] The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	**Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[8].** If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Still valid.

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
*The following table summarizes risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflects also **any new risks** identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant**.*

---

[8] Important: please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	Risk	Risk rating[9]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[10]	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	The scope of forest activities that FUGs are permitted to undertake continue to be so restricted by Government policy that FUGs cannot generate enough revenues from PFM for it to act as an incentive.	Impact: 4 Prob: 2	The Project has several strategies to mitigate this risk: (i) continually increasing capacity of targeted FUGs; (ii) developing co-management mechanisms whereby FUGs do not directly harvest but receive much of the revenue from harvesting; (iii) seeking to pilot thinning and limited harvesting by the most advanced FUGs, and; (iv) undertaking advocacy and policy work at national level.	As the result of a series of project-supported training, 34 small grant proposals have been developed, funded and successfully implemented, resulting in increased income generation of rural households. These include harvesting, processing and selling of non-wood forest products as well as wooden products made from thinning woods.	
2	Climate change impacts may increase to the extent that even if the project implements activities to improve land conditions in forest lands it may not be enough to make a difference. Moreover, new climate change related threats could emerge, such as insect infestations or disease.	Impact: 3 Prob: 2	By improving management and monitoring, the project will directly increase the landscape's resilience and 'climate change adaptive' capacity. Increased capacity of FUGs to adapt to climate change will lower risks associated with climate change.	Project-supported FUGs have increased capacity to monitor and mitigate the incidence and impacts of climate change-related threats, including pests and fires.	

[9] GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

[10] If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating[9]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[10]	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Financially sustainable models of biodiversity conservation measures in northern forests cannot be developed.	Impact: 2 Prob: 3	The project has a major activity in Outcome 1 to determine innovative and sustainable financial models. This situation will be monitored and appropriate management responses implemented.	The project has been building capacity of FUGs to develop and implement financially sustainable models of forest management.	
4	Globally, the development of REDD+ is delayed leading to lower enthusiasm for REDD+ activities in Mongolia.	Impact: 1 Prob: 4	The Project treats REDD+ as one possible source of finance for sustainable forestry. However, it does not pin all hopes on REDD+.	The project is supporting FUGs to develop value chains for a range of forest products, including timber, fuelwood and non-wood forest products.	

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	There has been no changes in the political, socio-economic and environmental context in which the project is implemented to necessitate a change in the overall risk rating.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months[11]

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	YES	Shift resources from Outcome 2 to Outcome 1 in order to promote enabling policy development for second half of the project (As per MTR recommendations)
Project Outputs	YES	Revise the log frame and indicators with more clearly defined and appropriate 'goal posts' for all of the mayor project outcomes (As per MTR recommendations)

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: 29 Oct 2019 Revised NTE: 31 March 2020 Justification: as per decision from the PCC meeting from 29 March 2019

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

The project has developed gender mainstreaming strategy and following it by
- Segregating data collection and monitoring/reporting.
- Positive action re inviting female FUG members/leaders to the training events, study tours, etc.
- Inclusive meeting/interview facilitation skills training to Project and government partner staff.
Thinning etc. technology/equipment selected to reduce gender-related barriers to use/participation

---

[11] Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

NA

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable)

List of stakeholders	Category	Engagement mechanism
16 'Model' Forest User Groups		
85 'new' Project Forest User Groups		
FRDC	Government organization	Day-to-day collaboration, LoA
MET	Government organization	Coordination and consultation
Aimag Administration Offices	Local Government organization	Coordination at the local (aimag) level
Inter Soum Forest Units	Professional organization	LoA
Private (sector) forest entities/companies		Support/collaboration in conducting training for FUGs and other interested organization
Academics/Researchers		Developing training curriculums on forest thinning, organizing training on wildlife monitoring and analyzing collected dar
Eco Clubs		Jointly organizing public awareness activity
Journalists		Propomoting and advocation sustainable forest management

8. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

During the reporting period, the project has translated, and printed FAO developed learning book "Discovering Forest" into local language and supporting inclusion of forest issues in the training curriculum of secondary school. Moreover, training guidebook for conducting forest pre-commercial thinning have been developed and distributed to all Forest units.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[12]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	Ministry of environment and tourism	In-Kind Co-financing	12,825,000	11,542.000	6,800,000	12,825,000
Bilateral Donor/Partner	GIZ	In-Kind Co-financing	5,400,000	5,400,000	3,000,000	5,400,000
Bilateral Donor/Partner	Government of Finland	In-Kind, via universities	600,000	0	600,000	0
GEF Agency	FAO	In-Kind, services	960,000	864,000	600,000	960,000
		TOTAL	19,785,000	17,806,000	11,000,000	19,185,000

There is no specific information about the co-financing of the Government of Finland, however, there is some information about the project on Sustainable Forest Management have been implemented at the NUM before the project start-up.

---

[12] Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. DO **Ratings definitions: Highly Satisfactory (HS -** Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice"); **Satisfactory (S -** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS -** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU -** Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U -** Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU -** The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions**: **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as "good practice". **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.