GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9389**		
Country/Region:	**Mongolia**		
Project Title:	**Ensuring Sustainability and Resilience (ENSURE) of Green Landscapes in Mongolia**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5784 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1 Program 2; BD-4 Program 9; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$195,000**	Project Grant:	**$7,964,253**
Co-financing:	**$34,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$41,964,253**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**May 01, 2017**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**David Elrie Rodgers**	Agency Contact Person:	**Midori Paxton**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	Yes, however, considering projects significant focus also on rangeland management (in addition to forest management), full amount of SFM incentive could not be justified. Refer also to below comments and revise the amount for SFM incentive.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	No. Alignment to NBSAP is not mentioned. In addition, please provide brief information on how the project align with the NAPs on CCD and UNFCCC.	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Drivers: the section on threats are rather confusing as it is categorized under biodiversity loss, land degradation, and forest degradation, and many of the causes overlaps and interlink. The PM suggests to analyse the drivers of environmental degradation at the landscape level, and determine key drivers that are causing the degradation. Sustainability: Both institutional and financial sustainability are unclear. Please clarify institutional arrangement among the ministries, and how they will be sustained. While it is noted that sustainable financing mechanism will be explored during project implementation, it is unclear how the project will ensure long term financial sustainability to implement the green development policy at the national and regional levels. Please further clarify. market transformation: Component 3 is rather unfocused and unclear on how these community-based livelihood activities would make a transformational shift to reduce pressure to the rangeland and forest, based on market	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		opportunities/assessments. Further focus and realistic set of activities need to be identified based on lessons learned from similar initiatives. Scaling: Further thoughts are required on how this project could be scaled up based on increased institutional commitment and capacity of the responsible government entities, and communities engagement. Please clarify.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Please clarify the selection criteria of the project sites. Considering vast territory of Mongolia, and challenges to manage many different location that are far apart, please further review and focus on smaller number of sites and concentrate the areas. As noted above, considering significant focus of the project on rangeland mgmt (in addition to forest mgmt), pleaes review the incremental reasoning of the SFM incentive and reduce it as appropriate.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Please review and clarify/revise the following elements: 1) Outcome, output, activities to ensure sustainable financing. 2) Best practices on sustainable pasture management and restoration	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		activities: Mongolia has piloted and scaled up initiatives related to sustainable pasture and restoration management through numerious projects and programs. How would this project add value, and what would be the difference in approach? Number of GEF projects have already invested in similar type of activities. Please also clarify the incentives for the government and communities to be engaged in these activities in a long term. 3) Protected area system: please clarify that the expansion of PAs are in the KBAs. Is the project going to engage also in land use mapping at the landscape level to determine relevant land use management? The project provides an impression that many different type of activities are put together without much prioritization. Please review the project again, and improve both geographic and thematic focus. 4) Community livelihood component: this component has a large allocation of GEF resources while the GEBs generated from these activities seem limited. The PM suggests to reduce the GEF allocation, and also clarify the GEB linkages.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		5) Public Private Partnership: Please further elaborate on the type of and potential private sector involvement to the project, and how the PPP may be established. 6) Community-based forest mgmt: Please clarify the linkage of the activities to relevant policies, institution, and incentive mechanism. 7) GEBs: Please further clarify and provide tangible information on the GEBs that are expected through the implementation of the project.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	No. The gender element is generic and does not provide any local specific context. Please further elaborate with country/site specific information. Would indigenous peoples be involved in the project? Please clarify.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	Yes, appropriate. However, the GEFSEC recognize that the OFP endorsement letter was signed on the same day that the GEFSEC received a letter that informed about the OFP's departure and requested to remove her	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		name from relevant databases. Please kindly provide confirmation from the current OFP and/or PFP that the endorsement letter is valid. Further, as noted above, please review the SFM incentive amount and reduce.	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes, however please refer above. DER, March 27, 2017. The revised requested amount is $7,964,253 plus PPG of $195,000 and Agency fee of $775,129 for a total of $8,934,382. This revised amount is within the balance of available STAR resources in Mongolia. Comment cleared.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	No. Please refer to above comments and provide additional information and revision to the PIF. 6 April 2016 Yes. The GEFSEC has received a revised PIF that adequately responds to all comments provided earlier. The PM is technically clearing and recommend the project for work program inclusion.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		DER, March 13, 2017. All comments have been addressed and the project is ready for technical clearance. At this juncture we are unable to submit the project as a candidate for a future work program as we anticipate that sufficient resources may not be available for this project. Please note that council decision GEF/C.51/04 - Update on GEF-6 Resource Availability requests the Secretariat to effectively and proactively manage the projected shortfall in GEF-6. As mandated, the Secretariat will keep the issue under review and will advise of any changes that may arise. Until then, this review sheet will be logged and the project will be marked technically cleared in the GEF PMIS system. Please consult with the OFP regarding resource availability for this project. DER, March 27, 2017. A new letter of endorsement has been received. All comments cleared. The program manager recommends technical clearance and recommends the project for work program inclusion.	
Review Date	Review	March 10, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 08, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 13, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.