



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

GEF ID:	4744		
Country/Region:	Mongolia		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation, SFM and Carbon Sink Enhancement Into Mongolia's Productive Forest Landscapes		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-2; BD-2; LD-2; LD-2; LD-2; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$3,586,364
Co-financing:	\$19,785,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,421,364
PIF Approval:	February 16, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Jeffrey Griffin

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes, with letter dated July 7, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes. FAO is a key player in Mongolia's forestry sector development since 2000.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes. FAO currently supports a small	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	in the country?	team with forest expertise in Ulaan Baatar.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes for SFM/REDD+ incentive.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes for SFM/REDD+ incentive.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes. The project is properly aligned.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: BD-2, LD-2, SFM/REDD-1	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. BD-2, LD-2, SFM/REDD-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?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes. Capacity building is a crosscutting activity; the project strives for institutionalization through FUGs, administration, regulations, etc.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Refer to prodoc page 61.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>Dec 7, 2011/UA: Not fully. Please shorten the sections with the description of the general situation in Mongolia. What is important to know is the baseline for this particular project. It is not relevant that "Mongolia is a land-locked country which covers an area ofetc.etc." The section describing the baseline project is basically a list of ongoing projects. Please provide a concise description of what is the baseline in the Mongolian forest sector on which this proposed project can build.</p> <p>6 FEB 2012 UA: Addressed. The baseline project description has been revised and linked to project co-financing.</p>	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>Dec 7, 2011/UA: Not fully. After having concisely described the baseline for this project, please elaborate on the incremental value that the project will add.</p> <p>6 FEB 2012 UA: Addressed.</p>	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes. The project framework is sufficiently clear for a PIF stage project proposal. However, the project	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>proponent might want to consider to better focus the project activities instead of spreading them to the listed 7 aimags.</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE: Table A requires listing of indicative funding amount for EACH Focal Area Outcome.</p> <p>6 FEB 2012 UA: Has been included.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes. FAO exact tool has been used for carbon benefit calculation.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	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?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes. Participatory forest management will help diversify rural livelihoods. Adequate at this stage. At CEO endorsement stage, more detailed information is required.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Detailed description of socio-economic benefits and gender dimension can be found in the produc page 60f.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Not fully. Please elaborate on the role of national and international NGOs as they potentially could play and important role in working with the FUGs. <p>6 FEB 2012 UA: Has been further elaborated.</p>	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	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)	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Not fully. The co-operation and co-ordination with bilateral projects/co-financers in unclear. Are the listed initiatives parallel projects? 6 FEB 2012 UA: Has been clarified.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Close coopreation with GIZ and KfW is acknowledged.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Not fully clear - please refer to #19 above. 6 FEB 2012 UA: Addressed.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Fully in line.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes. Indicative at 5%.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: No. GEF funding level is appropriate but higher co-financing of component 1 would certainly increase the chances to achieve the ambitious targets. 6 FEB 2012 UA: The overall co-financing has been increased to a ratio of 1 : 4.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Discrepancies found between Table A amounts per focal area and Table D totals. Please correct. Table A totals per Focal area must match Table D requested amounts.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Dec 7, 2011/UA: 1) Please provide better indication of the intent of bilaterals to co-finance this project, in particular for GIZ with e.g. a	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Co-financing confirmation has been provided.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>letter of intent for GIZ co-financing contributions.</p> <p>2) Please clarify which multilateral agency is the National Forest Program Facility /Forest Partnership Facility and the means of co-operation.</p> <p>3) Please explore all means to increase total co-financing.</p> <p>6 FEB 2012 UA: Addressed. A letter of intent from GIZ has been provided.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: Yes. FAO contribute \$1 million in grant.	Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. FAO's contribution of \$1 million is confirmed.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Refer to Annex 2 of the CEO endorsement document.
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• Council comments?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Dec 7, 2011/UA: No. Please address clarification requests in this review.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		10 FEB 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends PIF for CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Refer to Annex 3 of the CEO endorsement document.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Feb 12, 2014/UA: Yes. Program Manager will recommend the project for CEO endorsement subject to re-submission of a revised CEO endorsement template in which GEF grant amounts per Focal Area in Table A exactly match those in Table D.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 07, 2011	February 12, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 10, 2012	
	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?	Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	06 Sep 2012 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends the PPG for CEO approval.

	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 06, 2012
	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.