



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4562		
Country/Region:	Mongolia		
Project Title:	Network of Managed Resource Protected Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4393 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,309,091
Co-financing:	\$3,700,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,009,091
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Midori Paxton

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes; with letter dated June 8, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes; UNDP has long-standing experience with this type of projects in Mongolia.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes. This fits well and staff capacities in the country are appropriate.	
Resource	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

	• the STAR allocation?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	06-30-2011 UA: Please insert figures for (number) and (hectares) into Table A. 08-05-2011 UA: Done.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	06-30-2011 UA: BD-1	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes. The project is in line with the country's National development Strategy and National Master Plan for Land Use.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	06-30-2011 UA: Not fully. The outstanding question is how the financial sustainability of the expanded PA network can be ensured. It is understood that for example SPAN is working on financial sustainability of the PA network; however, it still appears as one of the main barriers to effective PA management in Mongolia and therefore needs further elaboration. 08-05-2011 UA: Has been adequately addressed.	
	11. Is the description of the baseline project/economic activities...	06-30-2011 UA: Not fully. Several baseline projects are	

Project Design	without GEF project – reliable?	<p>proposed project builds on these listed baseline projects and lessons learned from ongoing and former PA projects, in particular on SPAN.</p> <p>08-05-2011 UA: Has been adequately addressed.</p>	
	12. If GEF does not provide funding, is the rest of the project funded by other partners viable?	<p>08-05-2011 UA: No. GEF funding is essential.</p>	
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>06-30-2011 UA: Yes. The identified problem will be certainly addressed; however, to which extent - given the limited resources allocated to the project?</p> <p>08-05-2011 UA: Has been clarified.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>06-30-2011 UA: The framework is clear. The main question that arises is whether it should be a priority focus to expand the PA network given the fact that the existing PA system is insufficiently managed and funded?</p> <p>In this context, the question arises: If both a better management effectiveness and expansion of the PA system are government priorities, why are not more STAR resources allocated to address this in a more strategic way?</p> <p>08-05-2011 UA: Has been clarified.</p>	

	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes. The project's outcome to create a new PA category that allows for inclusion of herders and their livelihood activities will deliver socio-economic benefits to the local population.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes, has been outlined at this stage; more detailed information is expected at endorsement stage.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	06-30-2011 UA: Yes; and the risks have been assessed as low - medium.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	06-30-2011 UA: Not fully. Please provide more specific information on how the project will actively seek co-operation, in particular with WWF, WCS, TNC, and GIZ. Which complementary activities do the agencies presently implement in the country and the proposed project region? How would a co-ordination look like in more concrete terms and stronger linkages established? 08-05-2011 UA: Has been addressed. WWF, WCS, TNC have all expressed interest in cooperation, which will be further explored during the PPG. Has the possibility explored whether these organizations could co-finance the	

	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes, has been outlined at this stage; more detailed information is expected at endorsement stage.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes. The PMC for this project are less than 10%, which is appropriate for a project < \$2 million in GEF resources.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	06-30-2011 UA: The total co-financing is \$2.7 million in cash, which seems rather low for the scope of the project. Please, 1) clarify if there is any co-financing in kind 2) explain whether other co-financing sources have been explored 3) elaborate on options to broker additional co-financing 08-05-2011 UA: Additional \$1 million have been committed by GIZ. In kind resources and other possible co-financing will be explored during PPG stage.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in	06-30-2011 UA: UNDP contributes \$1.3 million in grant	

		role. Please check consistency of this figure with text, which mentions \$1.5 million. 08-05-2011 UA: Done.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	06-30-2011 UA: No. Please address issues and clarification requests in this review. 08-05-2011 UA: Yes. The PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	08-05-2011 UA: Has co-operation with WWF, WCS, TNC materialized during PPG? Has additional co-financing been mobilized?	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		

	Additional review (as necessary)	August 05, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	06-30-2011 UA: Yes; provided that PPG activity 3 is not mainly financed out of GEF resources as they constitute mainly baseline activities. 08-05-2011 UA: Has been clarified.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	06-30-2011 UA: No. PPG needs to be co-financed in the same ratio as the project. Table E only lists \$36,000 co-finance. Please make table C and E consistent. 08-05-2011 UA: Corrected.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	No. Please make requested revisions. 08-05-2011 UA: Yes.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 30, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 05, 2011

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.