

Managing Peatlands in Mongolia and Enhancing the Resilience of Pastoral Ecosystems and Livelihoods of Nomadic Herders

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10545

Countries

Global (Mongolia)

Project Name

Managing Peatlands in Mongolia and Enhancing the Resilience of Pastoral Ecosystems and Livelihoods of Nomadic Herders

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/23/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Not fully.

- IUCN is a GEF agency and needs to be listed as such. However, it is questionable if this co-financing can be properly confirmed at CEO endorsement stage by IUCN and be made available for the proposed project in a timely manner. If this co-financing is retained in the table, please explain how "investment mobilized" has been identified and what concretely this regional project will contribute towards the objectives of the GEF project.

03/26/2020 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE 25/03/2020:

This IUCN initiative is a joint initiative of UNEP and IUCN that is expected to be funded by IKI. UNEP will be the lead agency and IUCN will coordinate the country programs. Since UNEP will be responsible for the overall coordination of the Project, we have decided to change the cofinancing agency as UNEP. We also corrected the type of the co-financier to GEF Agency. We provided additional explanation that all new demonstrations on peatland restoration, and actions on improving household livelihood will be the investment mobilized through that project. The amount may be bigger. However, we will be sure for the exact amount for Mongolia at the PPG phase.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a**Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Clarification requested: In Table F, the target for CO2 mitigation is listed as 6,000,000 (6 million) ton CO2 eq, which appears very high in view of the area of 20,000 ha targeted. Please check the entry. The PIF text says that 30,000 t are sequestered annually, which would add up to 600,000 t over 20 years. The two figures are not consistent.

Further, as the project has carbon benefits, please select the appropriate Rio Marker for CC-M. It is currently set to "Zero" (in Part I).

03/26/2020 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE 25/03/2020:

The total Emitted carbon for 20 years should be 0.6 million CO2 eq. The figure on the portal corrected.

Climate Change Mitigation Rio Marker changed to 'Climate Change Mitigation 2'

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Not fully.

In section 1a.4, please address the following issues:

- In the context of focal area alignment, please use the LD objective as identified in Table A (LD-1-4) to describe the alignment with the focal area so that the PIF text and the alignment in Table A are consistent.
- In the paragraph that describes the alignment with UNCCD, please also explain on how that contributes to the LDN implementation and potential contribution to voluntary LDN targets (this is mentioned in section 1a.6 further below, but should also be mentioned in section 1a.6)
- Please add one paragraph on the (potential) alignment with the Drylands IP in which Mongolia is participating. While it is clear that this peatland/nomadic herders project does not seek a close alignment with the drylands agenda, there may be potential synergies in some aspects, such as comprehensive land-use planning approaches. What should be made clear is that Mongolia is focussing its efforts on implementation of the UNCCD agenda within the Drylands IP, however, the peatland/nomadic herders project may contribute to these efforts in a complementary way.
- An editorial note: in the first paragraph, the sentence that "this will help the GEF to achieve GHG targets" is not really relevant.

03/26/2020 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE 25/03/2020:

Reference to LD Objective in Section 1a.4 corrected and now reads as : LD-1-4 Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape.

The following statement included in the first paragraph of 1a.4: Specifically, this Project will support Mongolia's LDN target of 'Promoting sustainable grassland management and halting further grassland degradation' and 'Ensuring no net loss of wetlands by 2030 compared to 2015' by putting 20,000 ha of landscapes under improved practices.

A short paragraph explaining the Project's contribution to Drylands IP provided in Section 1a.4:

"The Project is also aligned with the 'Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program on Dryland Sustainable Landscapes' (GEF ID 10206). It is worth to note that this Project does not seek a direct contribution to the drylands agenda. However, there exist significant potential synergies such as comprehensive land-use planning approaches. Both this Project and the Impact Program aim at enhancing intersectoral platforms and mechanisms for integrated land use planning."

The following statement deleted from section 1a.6: "This will help GEF7 to increase value of its global indicator to mitigate GHG emissions."

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Not fully. Please note above comments on the high estimate on indicator 6. (6 million ton of CO2 eq)

03/26/2020 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE 25/03/2020:

The target corrected as 0.6M C02 eq.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes. This has been adequately described in the PIF in the respective section.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes. However, in the description of tasks for the International Center for Reindeer Husbandry (ICR) it would seem more appropriate that ICR would "support" the development of the prodoc, but not "direct, plan, and manage the formulation" of the prodoc - please clarify.

03/26/2020 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE 25/03/2020:

The partner's role changed to 'supporting of the formulation of the Prodoc'.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Not fully.

Please elaborate further on the gender context by considering the following guiding questions:

- What is the project specific context for gender and women's equality (the PIF only describes the general context in Mongolia), and what are the challenges and opportunities in this regard?
- What are the plans for the project preparation phase to address above challenges and opportunities? Will there be a gender analysis? Are any gender specific consultations of stakeholder groups planned? Will the project involve gender experts in the PPG phase or later implementation?

03/26/2020 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE 25/03/2020:

There is not much study on gender roles in peatland communities. This gap highlighted in Section 3 and some mitigating actions such as in depth gender analysis proposed for the ppg phase.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Please address:

- As an editorial note: you may wish to delete the term "externally" in the context of project execution, because it could lead to misunderstandings.
- Where reference is made to the “Land Degradation Offset and Mitigation in Western Mongolia” (GEF ID 5700) and “Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions in the Construction Sector in Mongolia” (GEF ID 5830), please elaborate in 1-2 sentences what potential synergy can be achieved and/or what lessons learned can be applied.
- Further below, where reference is made to "The proposal is also informed by and builds on several projects that the partners contributed to in various ways: “Sustainable Reindeer Husbandry” which assessed circumpolar reindeer herding and husbandry in relation to ecological, economic and social/cultural sustainability[5]; “Nomadic Herders Mongolia” which provided a baseline report on the state and challenges of Dukha reindeer husbandry": This paragraph seems to indicate that there are many projects working on this topic. Are these ongoing projects? If so please make sure that no duplication of efforts is made.

03/26/2020 UA:

Addressed.

The Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Mongolia will execute Components 1 and 2 and the International Centre for Reindeer Husbandry (ICR) will be responsible for the execution of the Component 3.

As the component 3 is funded by a global set-aside, this arrangement has been discussed and agreed upon with the agency and the OFP and is considered the most appropriate and in line with GEF policies and regulations.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE 25/03/2020:

That statement referring to external execution removed.

Potential synergy and potential lessons from these projects summarized in section 5.

These were past initiatives that the project will benefit from. However, we agree that it gives the wrong impression that there are ongoing projects on this topic . Therefore, we removed that paragraph.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Please mention the LDN concept in context with the UNCCD strategy once more and note potential project contributions to voluntary LDN targets as appropriate.

03/26/2020 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE 25/03/2020:

The Project will contribute to land degradation neutrality efforts. More specifically, the Project will support Mongolia's LDN target of 'Promoting sustainable grassland management and halting further grassland degradation' and 'Ensuring no net loss of wetlands by 2030 compared to 2015' by putting 20,000 ha of landscapes under improved practices.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of

generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/24/2020 UA:

No. Please address comments made in this review.

03/26/2020 UA:

Yes. Program manager recommends the PIF for CEO clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/20/2020 UA:

Please note that the review question: "Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?" has been checked and found adequate / cleared. (The box is empty due to a technical issue).

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The UNEP/GEF project GEF ID 10545 “Managing Peatlands in Mongolia and Enhancing the Resilience of Pastoral Ecosystems and Livelihoods of Nomadic Herders” in Mongolia and globally has the objective to develop the capacity for enhancing ecosystem services of peatlands in Mongolia and the capacity of indigenous reindeer herders to reduce land degradation and improve the provision of ecosystem services and increase community resilience. The main premise of the project is that in order to sustain ecosystem services of peatlands and reduce land degradation, sustainable peatland management must be mainstreamed into policy frameworks

and sectoral policies, and nomadic herders capacitated to contribute to sustainable land management. This will be supported by generating knowledge and managing data on peatlands so that sustainable peatland management activities can be adequately implemented, reported and monitored. Nomadic herder communities' capacities will be enhanced so that these communities participate in rangeland management processes and indigenous knowledge becomes part of sustainable landscape management approaches. Cross-community exchanges at global scale will further facilitate dissemination of project's good practices, lessons learned on herders' contribution to sustainable landscape management globally so that Project's best practices will be replicated at global scale. The project will generate global environmental benefits through bringing 20,000 ha of land under sustainable management, sequestering 600,000 t of CO₂eq, and targeting directly 14,000 beneficiaries.