



# UNCCD Mongolia COP17 Legacy Project

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**  
12309  
**Countries**  
Global (Mongolia)  
**Project Name**  
UNCCD Mongolia COP17 Legacy Project  
**Agencies**  
IUCN  
**Date received by PM**  
3/18/2026  
**Review completed by PM**  
  
**Program Manager**  
Ulrich Apel  
**Focal Area**  
Multi Focal Area  
**Project Type**  
MSP

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: Not fully.

- The project is listed as both Global and Mongolia but designed as a national project for Mongolia only. Please design in a way that justifies the investment of \$3 million of global set-aside funding. Please also note that dual execution by IUCN can only be accepted if this is predominantly a global project. For a national project, the dual execution policy would apply with a different set of criteria.

- Co-financing amount is missing.

04/29/2026. Addressed.

### Agency's Comments

The project has been reframed as a predominantly global project, anchored in Mongolia's UNCCD COP17 Presidency. The revised PIF presents four global components addressing three global barriers with Mongolia positioned as the anchor country rather than the sole target country, with Components 1, 3 and 4 operating across Asia, Africa and Latin America through the Global Coalition of Rangeland States, the Rangeland Flagship Initiative, and the Global IYRP alliance.

Co-financing has been added to the PIF Indicative Project Overview table and Annex A4 in the form of monetary and in-kind contributions provided by project partners and bilateral and multilateral donors. Co-financing will be in the form of both in-kind contributions (e.g. logistics, technical support) and monetary contributions, totalling USD 8,000,000 (in-kind: USD 750,000; grant: USD 7,250,000) in value.

### 2. Project Summary

**Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required. The project summary has nonetheless been rewritten to reflect the global framing, the updated objective and the four revised components.

### 3 Indicative Project Overview

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

### Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: Not fully.

(i) Project Objective: The project objective should be specific, measurable, and well defined in the time. Remove the first sentence: ?The Mongolia COP17 Legacy Project will catalyze transformative action on land degradation neutrality (LDN) at national and global scales?.

(ii) Please design components and outcomes/outputs in a way that justifies the investment of \$3 million of global set-aside funding.

(iii) Co-financing will be essential to justify the GEF grants proposed for the different components.

(iv) Under 2.3, please explore collaboration with the Mongolia Business Council during PPG.

(v) Gender dimensions have not been considered. Women are absolutely central the functioning and resilience of rangelands. We suggest highlighting the role of women in value chains and social systems, especially in Mongolia. Women are known to be custodians of social cohesion and community networks through solidarity between herder families, mutual aid systems ? especially during harsh winters. Women also have a role as knowledge brokers. Please elaborate and develop gender dimensions throughout the proposal.

(vi) Similarly, traditional organizations and customary institutions should be involved.

(vii) Please elaborate and highlight importance and empowerment of indigenous peoples and local communities (in view of bottom approaches and not only top-down processes from the government).

04/29/2026. Addressed.

### Agency's Comments

(i) The introductory sentence has been removed. The revised objective reads: " To catalyze durable global action on sustainable rangeland management and Land Degradation Neutrality objectives by generating knowledge on best practices, mobilizing investment, and strengthening South-South cooperation on agreed UNCCD COP17 actions (2026 to 2028).? The time frame (2026 to 2028) is now explicit in the objective itself.

(ii) Components, outcomes and outputs have been changed to be more globally-oriented in scope, activities and outputs.

Component 1 supports the inclusive delivery of the COP17 Presidency programme and ministerial dialogues;

Component 2 catalyses rangeland investment globally through the Rangeland Flagship Initiative pipeline;

Component 3 produces global public goods including a Common Nature Finance Taxonomy for rangelands, endorsed rangeland health monitoring guidelines,

Component 4 delivers structured South-South cooperation across Asia, Africa and Latin America and supports the institutional development of the Global Coalition of Rangeland States.

(iii) Addressed under 8.3 below: Indicative co-financing has been inserted in the PIF Indicative Project Overview table and Annex A.4, disaggregated by component as follows: USD 6,500,000 for Component 1; USD 250,000 for Component 2; USD 250,000 for Component 3; USD 850,000 for Component 4; USD 50,000 for M&E; USD 100,000 for PMC.

The total indicative co-financing for the project is USD 8,000,000.

(iv) Business Council of Mongolia (BCM) has been identified as a stakeholder (section D.2). BCM will be engaged during the PPG stage.

(v) A dedicated gender narrative has been embedded throughout the revised PIF. **Section A.2** now includes a paragraph on the central role of Mongolian herder women in pastoral production and dairy, wool and felt value chains, in social cohesion and mutual aid systems during dzud and harsh winters, and as knowledge brokers transmitting traditional ecological knowledge. **Section D.1** commits to a full Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan at PPG. Gender is integrated across the outputs of Components, including a women-to-women exchange programme and a 40 per cent women delegate target for Coalition events.

(vi) Customary institutions are now explicitly recognised in the revised **Section A.2**, including the khot ail cooperative herding system, 1,445 registered Pasture User Groups (PUGs) across 156 soums, and over 1,200 community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) groups. The text commits the project to working with and through these existing institutions rather than creating parallel structures.

(vii) Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities are treated throughout as partners, not beneficiaries. The revised PIF references in project summary section (page 4) the COP16 decisions establishing new Caucuses for Indigenous Peoples and for Local Communities within the UNCCD and engages these Caucuses directly under Component 1 (participation support) and Component 4 (South-South exchange). IPLC knowledge holders are co-developers of the rangeland health monitoring guidelines and case studies under Component 3. Bottom-up governance is reflected in the project's commitment to work through existing pastoralist organisations (WAMIP, the International Land Coalition, Dana Declaration signatories) rather than through government channels alone.

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: Not fully.

(See above):

- Gender dimensions have not been considered. Women are absolutely central the functioning and resilience of rangelands. We suggest highlighting the role of women in value chains and social systems, especially in Mongolia. Women are known to be custodians of social cohesion and community networks through solidarity between herder families, mutual aid systems ? especially during harsh winters. Women also have a role as knowledge brokers. Please elaborate and develop gender dimensions throughout the proposal.

- Similarly, traditional organizations and customary institutions should be involved.

- Please elaborate and highlight importance and empowerment of indigenous peoples and local communities (in view of bottom approaches and not only top-down processes from the government).

04/29/2026. Addressed.

Agency's Comments Addressed under 3.1 (v), (vi) and (vii) above. Gender is now embedded structurally across outcomes, outputs, activities and indicators rather than treated as a cross-cutting annex. Knowledge management is treated as core project business under Section E.1, which states that knowledge management is not supplementary but the project's core purpose, with three of the four components (components 2, 3 and 4) focused on knowledge generation and dissemination. A full Knowledge Management Plan will be developed during PPG.

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: Not fully.

Can only be assessed after co-financing has been included. Please explore potential for co-financing with International Financing Institutions, as the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank, and establish collaboration on this project.

04/29/2026. Co-financing has been included. HOWEVER, the PMC co-financing ratio is not proportional to the overall ratio. Please revise.

Agency's Comments Addressed under 8.3 below: Indicative co-financing has been inserted in the PIF Indicative Project Overview table and Annex A.4. The total indicative co-financing for the project is USD 8,000,000, coming from IUCN, Mongolia, and partners to the COP17 Presidency, including multilateral partners like ADB and the World Bank, as well as bilateral government partners. Formal letters of commitment will be prepared during the PPG phase and presented for CEO approval.

#### 4 Project Outline

##### A. Project Rationale

#### 4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: Not fully.

- Rangelands and traditional activities are threatened by irreversible activities as mining, infrastructures, energy, as well as the evolution of the rural economy, including migration to cities. To be included in the drivers.

04/29/2026. Addressed.

Agency's Comments **Section A.3** (Drivers, Root Causes and Key Barriers) has been expanded. It now includes two new global drivers of environmental degradation: **Mining, extractive industries, and infrastructure expansion** (with documented examples from sub-Saharan Africa, Central Asia and Mongolia's mining sector); and **Rural-urban migration and demographic change** (covering the weakening of customary pastoral governance, the loss of intergenerational knowledge transfer, and the documented trend of young women leaving pastoral life across the Sahel, the Horn of Africa, Central Asia and Latin America). At the national level, sub-sections 4 and 5 under National Drivers in Mongolia address how mining and infrastructure fragment seasonal pasture rotation corridors in Mongolia and how rural-urban migration (with Ulaanbaatar now holding nearly half the national population) erodes the khot ail system.

#### 4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required. Section A.4 has nonetheless been refined to strengthen the framing of the COP17 Presidency as a catalytic lever for durable global outcomes and to articulate the incremental case more clearly.

## **5 B. Project Description**

### **5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE**

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026:

- There is an analysis of drivers and a focus on a "whole government approach", especially involving line ministries in charge of agriculture and environment. However, we would also like to see a "whole society approach": the private sector is identified, but the project is relatively silent on CSO and NGOs active on rangelands: pastoralists and herders? organizations, smallholder farmers, rangelands users, community-based organizations, cooperatives, etc.

- On the same line, traditional organizations and customary institutions should be involved.

- The case should be made on the importance and empowerment of indigenous peoples and local communities (in view of bottom approaches and not only top-down processes from the government).

04/29/2026. Addressed.

Agency's Comments

The Theory of Change (Section B.1) has been revised around three causal pathways, each explicitly integrating a whole-of-society approach. Pathway 1 (Presidency Leadership Enables Policy Momentum) embeds civil society, pastoralist organisations, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (through the new COP16 Caucuses), youth, women, and the scientific community as active partners rather than observers of UNCCD processes. Pathway 3 (Cooperation Accelerates Delivery) draws directly on existing pastoralist networks including the World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP), the International Land Coalition, and Dana Declaration signatories.

The stakeholder engagement table in D.2 now includes Civil Society and IPLCs as a distinct category covering Mongolian pastoralist organisations, the IYRP Global Alliance, environmental NGOs, women's groups and youth organisations, with specific means of engagement (travel grant support, dedicated exhibitions, structured dialogues, community validation of knowledge products). Customary institutions (khot ail, PUGs, CBNRM groups) are now recognised in the barrier and driver analysis. IPLCs appear throughout as co-designers of monitoring guidelines, case study partners, and direct participants in South-South exchange.

## 5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

## 5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

**d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026:

(i) Please refer to the updated [Guidelines](#) for Agency dual role (p. 52-57). All requests for an exception waiver to the Council's prohibition of Agency dual roles must be based on at least one of the five criteria. Please further note that the GEF Council has decided that execution capacity of EAs and not execution risk is critical to assessing any requests based on said exception (?limited or inadequate fiduciary and/or procurement capacities in potential EAs?). Additionally, the GEF Risk Appetite for execution is moderate.

(ii) At this time, and according to the process laid out in the Guidelines, it is not appropriate to list the Agency as an EA in the LoE.

(iii) GEF Secretariat should not be on top of the governance of the project (see figure 2). GEFSEC may be involved in the Steering Committee as usual.

(iv) We appreciate the identification of GEF projects related to the theme or the approach. During PPG, please review the lessons and best practices.

(v) There is an obvious complementarity with the GEFID 10816 (STELARR) and the GEFID 10993 (MSP with CSO on LDN): to be developed.

04/29/2026. Addressed.

Agency's Comments

(i) The response to the question in Section B.3 has been changed to NO at PIF stage. The revised text notes that MECC will serve as the main Executing Agency, and that the UNCCD Global Mechanism and IUCN may have a potential co-execution role given the global scope of the project. Any such co-execution arrangement, including justification against the five criteria in the updated Guidelines for Agency Dual Role, will be assessed during the PPG phase, following a detailed evaluation and completion of the required micro-assessment of the implementing partner. All available options, including third-party execution support, will be explored.

(ii) Consistent with the NO response above, IUCN is not listed as an EA in the LoE at PIF stage. The Mongolia OFP endorsement letter names MECC as the Executing Agency.

(iii) The project governance diagram (Figure 2) has been redrawn. The GEF Secretariat is no longer placed at the top of the structure. IUCN MFU (as GEF Agency) sits in the oversight and fiduciary accountability role; GEFSEC is shown as a Steering Committee participant in the usual manner.

(iv) Noted.

(v) Noted. The complementarity will be further developed in the PPG stage.

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments Not applicable.

**5.6 RISKS**

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**

**b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026:

(i) Under the Innovation Dimension, Institutional and Policy category, it is not clear if the narrative is innovation-specific or focused on execution, warranting a rating under this category. If not, the content should be rephrased or potentially moved under the Execution dimension. In addition, under the same category, IUCN is listed as a co-executing entity. Please remove or rephrase the description of IUCN as a co-executor at this PIF stage.

(ii) Under the Innovation Dimension, Financial and Business Model, the project aims to pilot a new investment pipeline model for rangeland finance, which is exploratory by nature. Consider whether a Moderate rating should be more appropriate with mitigation measures from the investment facilitation approach.

04/29/2026. Addressed.

#### Agency's Comments

(i) The Institutional and Policy risk narrative has been rephrased to focus on coordination across multiple executing entities and the need for clear roles, streamlined communication and strong programme management. The reference to IUCN as a co-executing entity has been removed; the revised text refers neutrally to coordinating across MECC, UNCCD GM and IUCN, consistent with the NO response in Section B.3.

(ii) The Financial and Business Model risk rating has been revised from the previous rating to Moderate. The revised narrative clarifies that the USD 1 billion target is aspirational and refers to the broader Rangeland Flagship Initiative pipeline rather than direct GEF leverage alone. Mitigation measures now explicitly include: a phased investment facilitation approach; partnership with established IFIs (ADB, World Bank); building on proven UNCCD investment frameworks (DRIF, LDN Fund); and pilot testing before scale-up.

#### 5.7 Qualitative assessment

**a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**

**b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**

**c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

#### 6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

##### **7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

##### **7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: We note that IUCN has attached Preliminary ESMS Screening. An overall ESS risk is classified as Low.

(i) Please clarify how the project consulted with Indigenous Peoples and local communities in Mongolia and global about project concept, particularly related to Component 1, 3 and 4, and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project concept (PIF).

(ii) Please ensure the project obtained free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from Indigenous Peoples during project implementation particularly related to integration of traditional pastoralist knowledge.

(iii) Please consider Indigenous Peoples and local communities as partners of the project particularly Component 1, 3 and 4.

04/29/2026. Addressed.

Agency's Comments

Noted that the Preliminary ESMS Screening classifies the overall ESS risk as Low.

(i) The revised PIF is transparent in Section D.2 that IPLC, CSO and private sector consultations were not completed during the PIF preparation window, given the compressed timeline between the GEF programming decision and the COP17 Presidency start date. A full Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be developed during PPG. The IPLC engagement pathway will leverage the newly established UNCCD Caucuses for Indigenous Peoples and for Local Communities (COP16 decision), the World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP), the International Land Coalition, and Dana Declaration signatories. In Mongolia, engagement will proceed through registered Pasture User Groups, CBNRM groups, and the khot ail cooperative herding networks identified in Section A.2.

(ii) FPIC protocols, consistent with IUCN's Environmental and Social Management Framework, will be applied throughout project implementation, particularly for activities involving the documentation and integration of traditional pastoralist knowledge under Components 3 and 4. The full ESMS assessment prepared during PPG will include the FPIC procedures to be followed.

(iii) IPLCs are now treated as partners across Components 1, 3 and 4. Under Component 1, dedicated participation support is provided for IPLC Caucus members and pastoralist organisations at COP17 Presidency events. Under Component 3, IPLC knowledge holders co-develop the rangeland health monitoring guidelines and contribute traditional ecological knowledge to the Rangeland Flagship Initiative knowledge platform. Under Component 4, pastoralist leaders and IPLC representatives are lead participants in South-South learning exchanges.

#### **8 Annexes**

## **Annex A: Financing Tables**

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

### **STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments 04/29/2026. Yes.

Agency's Comments No comment provided. No action required.

### **Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments 04/29/2026. Yes.

Agency's Comments No comment provided. No action required.

### **LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments No comment provided. No action required.

### **SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments No comment provided. No action required.

### **SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments No comment provided. No action required.

### **Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments 04/29/2026. Yes.

Agency's Comments No comment provided. No action required.

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

**8.3 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?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: No.

- Please insert co-financing figures.

04/29/2026. Have been included.

Agency's Comments

Indicative co-financing has been inserted in the PIF Indicative Project Overview table and Annex A.4, disaggregated by component as follows: USD 6,500,000 for Component 1; USD 250,000 for Component 2; USD 250,000 for Component 3; USD 850,000 for Component 4; USD 50,000 for M&E; USD 100,000 for PMC.

The total indicative co-financing for the project is USD 8,000,000. Of that, USD 250,000 will be in-kind from IUCN, USD 750,000 will be as grant from IUCN, USD 500,000 will be in-kind from MECC, and 6,500,000 will be as grant from MECC. Additional co-financing will be mobilized through UNCCD GM during the PPG phase.

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

The OFP endorsement letter is on file and uploaded in the GEF Portal; the endorsed amounts are consistent with the PIF totals.

**Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments The OFP endorsement letter is on file and uploaded in the GEF Portal; the endorsed amounts are consistent with the PIF totals.

**Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026:

Footnote is missing, please advise whether it can be provided by OFP email.

04/29/2026. A revised LoE, including the footnote, has been uploaded.

Agency's Comments Regarding the missing footnote, IUCN will submit an updated LOE.  
**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

No comment provided (NGI not applicable). No action required.

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments 04/29/2026: The global project will not have specific field implementation sites.

Agency's Comments No comment provided. No action required.

**Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: We note that IUCN has attached Preliminary ESMS Screening. An overall ESS risk is classified as Low.

(i) Please clarify how the project consulted with Indigenous Peoples and local communities in Mongolia and global about project concept, particularly related to Component 1, 3 and 4, and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project concept (PIF).

(ii) Please ensure the project obtained free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from Indigenous Peoples during project implementation particularly related to integration of traditional pastoralist knowledge.

(iii) Please consider Indigenous Peoples and local communities as partners of the project particularly Component 1, 3 and 4.

04/29/2026. Addressed.

Agency's Comments Addressed under 7.2 above. The Preliminary ESMS Screening classifying overall ESS risk as Low is on file. A full ESMS assessment and ESMF will be prepared during PPG, including FPIC procedures for activities involving the documentation and integration of traditional pastoralist knowledge.

#### **Annex E: Rio Markers**

##### **8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

#### **Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

##### **8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments 03/23/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments Noted. No action required.

#### **Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments Not applicable.

## 9 GEFSEC Decision

### 9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

#### Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: No. Please address comment made in this review.

04/29/2026: PM is requesting OP check on previous comments. The project needs to be returned to adjust the PMC co-financing. Please check for other outstanding issues.

Agency's CommentsThe revised PIF addresses each substantive GEFSEC comment as documented in these responses.

### 9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

#### Secretariat's Comments

03/23/2026: Please acknowledge comment:

We request the Agency that in the development of the Gender Analysis and Action Plan, please ensure that the activities developed are included in the project documents, and that the GAP aligns with the project components. Please ensure that in the development of the results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

04/29/2026. Has been acknowledged.

Agency's CommentsAcknowledged. Section D.1 of the revised PIF now explicitly commits that: a full Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan will be prepared during PPG and submitted with the MSP Approval Request; the GAP will be aligned with the project's component structure with gender-specific activities integrated into project design; gender-specific indicators will be included in the results framework; dedicated budgetary provisions, regular monitoring and adaptive management measures will support GAP implementation; and reporting on gender-specific results, including GAP implementation, will be integrated into PIRs, the MTR and the TE.

#### Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	3/23/2026	4/27/2026
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	4/29/2026	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		