



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

GEF ID:	4764		
Country/Region:	Regional (Mongolia, Russian Federation)		
Project Title:	Enhancing the Resilience of Pastoral Ecosystems and Livelihoods of Nomadic Herders		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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):	LD-1; LD-3; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,695,454
Co-financing:	\$15,080,000	Total Project Cost:	\$19,775,454
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Edoardo Zandri, Task Manager, BD, UNEP Nairobi

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?	12-06-2011 UA: Yes. Both countries are eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12-06-2011 UA: Yes. Both OFP's have endorsed the project.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	12-06-2011 UA: It needs to be discussed whether UNEP and other institutions that are involved in this project are best positioned to implement this project on the ground. Many of the institutions are research-oriented rather than working on the ground, and they need different skill sets. UNEP's capacity to implement such a remotely located project is particularly questionable, without country presence.	

		<p>UNEP has justified its comparative advantage, among other points with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- bringing together a wide range of complementary partners, with role and experience of each partner now clarified;</li> <li>- UNEP's country presence in Russia and co-ordinating role of the ARCTIC program;</li> <li>- partners such as the International Reindeer Centre (IRC) and World Reindeer Herder Association (WRH) having a network of local representatives working on the ground.</li> </ul> <p>Cleared</p>	
	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?	<p>12-06-2011 UA: To be discussed. Please refer to #3.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. Fits into UNEP's global program as outlined in revised PIF, section C.2</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	12-06-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	12-06-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCE (Adaptation or	n/a	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>12-06-2011 UA: Only partly. The project is aligned with the LD and BD results frameworks at outcome level. The link to BD objectives is less clear.</p> <p>Furthermore, please refer to #14 on some requested clarification at the output level.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. The revised PIF is aligned with the RBM. The link to BD objectives (BD-2) has been elaborated on.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	12-06-2011 UA: LD-1, LD-3, BD-2	
	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?	<p>12-06-2011 UA: Yes. In line with NBSAPs and with Mongolia's National Action Program for Combating Desertification (NAPCD). The project is also in line with Mongolia's National Action Program on Climate Change (NAPCC).</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>12-06-2011 UA: Yes. Mainly through the establishment of permanent information and knowledge centers on Reindeer and Yak husbandry (new and existing ones).</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

Project Design	<p>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>	<p>12-06-2011 UA: No. The baseline project/activities on which GEF could build its incremental funding are weakly described. This problem extends into the project framework, where baseline activities are sought to be financed (see #14) and the low co-financing ratio (see #25).</p> <p>There is one mentioning of a baseline project and related activities under B2. This should be moved to B1 and elaborated in a way that it constitutes a comprehensive baseline package on which the GEF funding can build.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. The revised PIF has provided additional detail on baseline activities in both countries.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>12-06-2011 UA: No. Since the baseline project description is weak, the incremental reasoning is not apparent.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. The incremental value of GEF support lies in its unique position to address the nexus between sustainable land management, Biodiversity conservation, and traditional cultural value of indigenous people.</p>	

		Cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>12-06-2011 UA: No.</p> <p>In general, the project is potentially interesting addressing both land management and biodiversity conservation challenges, while maintaining livelihood and supporting the survival of the last remaining groups of Dukha. However to do that, the project requires substantial revision by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) taking stock of what has already been done (situation analysis is very weak),</li> <li>2) clearly identify baseline projects (currently very vague and all in-kind);</li> <li>3) have a better articulation of global environmental benefits (which is actually significant but very poorly described) as well as socio economic benefits,</li> <li>4) what needs to be done on the ground (develop concrete and realistic management plan rather than new assessments and researches), and</li> <li>5) implement some of the priority activities together with the Dukha as well as the surrounding regular nomadic herders. This may include consideration on concrete alternatives and incentives towards herders to promote conservation, and</li> <li>6) by further clarification of the transboundary collaboration and activities. The Russian side particularly covers a huge area and would require more focus and prioritization.</li> </ol>	

focused on research/study and awareness raising. Numerous studies have already been conducted by many institutions and PhD candidates. IFAD and others have already done intensive studies on the CC impact to land/grazing mgmt in Mongolia due to several "zud" (dry summer and heavy snow, coupled with overgrazing) that killed millions of livestock. Moreover, the herders themselves are painfully aware of the changing climate/grazing patterns, decreasing wildlife for hunting, lack of mobility, etc.

The entire component 1 sounds like baseline activities, that is, that most of the activities should be covered as a precondition for a GEF investment to come in. Parts of the component 1 (e.g. identification of threats, assessment of legal status, analytical reports & recommendations, scenarios) could maybe be covered in a PPG phase.

Component 2 uses the term "pilot" several times and does not give the impression that Rangeland management tools are really applied at a significant scale. What is the number of herder family groups & communities that will benefit from the investment? The project seems to benefit the researchers more than the herders.

Component 3 is generally ok but should be more steered towards enabling learning and exchange. As currently designed the project works too much at a media level that is hardly accessible to

		<p>information centres, etc.). Participatory video techniques could be one way to better involve the target group in monitoring, learning, and awareness raising.</p> <p>Component 4 should focus more on regional collaboration, dissemination and replication. It shows some overlap with the project management costs (PMC) It is difficult to justify component 4 when at the same time the PMC are higher than 5% (see also #23).</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. The comments have been adequately addressed in the re-submission. There is one issue remaining that is raised under #24 &amp; #25.</p> <p>10 APR 2012 UA: Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>12-06-2011 UA: No. The incremental benefits (GEBs) are not described in a comprehensive way. Especially Biodiversity-related GEBs are not obvious.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Not fully. GEBs are better described and the PIF states that GEBs will be further specified during the PPG phase. The high biodiversity value of the targeted area is also acknowledged. However, the PIF needs to provide a brief statement in section B2 on which (and if possible provide a quantifiable</p>	

		<p>generated and if and how the project is going to monitor them.</p> <p>10 APR 2012 UA: Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>12-06-2011 UA: Not fully. This needs to be more concise and more directly addressing the question of socio-economic benefits. Socio-economic benefits are especially important for LD FA investments in production landscapes.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. Socio-economic benefits will be achieved through reducing the vulnerability of herder communities, local community empowerment, and gender-sensitivity in the approach.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>12-06-2011 UA: Not fully. Participation of indigenous people is addressed, but it is not fully clear how a participatory agenda will be pursued in project planning and implementation.</p> <p>The large list of contributors is not very meaningful - please consider to mention the KEY stakeholders and briefly describe their contribution and roles in the project. What about the role of NGOs?</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. The PIF provides now sufficient detail. The PIF has specifically outlined</p>	

		Cleared	
	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)	12-06-2011 UA: Yes. Risks are sufficiently analyzed.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12-06-2011 UA: Partly. The linkages and co-ordination with WISP and GIAHS are evident, but the link to the listed projects in the lower part of section B6 is less clear.  Moreover, GEF has already invested significantly in Khovsgol through the first biodiversity project/UNDP in the 90s, Khovsgol lake project/WB, and Altai Sayan Ecoregion Project/UNDP. These projects did not necessary work with the reindeer herders, but addressed grazing mgmt issue as core activity. Linkage and lessons learned through these investments need to be clearly articulated.  20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. Linkages to and lessons learned from previous and ongoing projects have been included.  Cleared	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	12-06-2011 UA: No. The presented arrangement (p.24) is not convincing. This has to be discussed.  The listing of four executing partners and the long list of 'other executing partners' raises the question on	

		<p>Please briefly outline those.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. Partners now distinguished by its clearly defined roles.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	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?	<p>12-06-2011 UA: The higher than 5% level for the project management costs is recognized. However, as discussed under #14, the project proponent might want to consider to cover the costs for regional collaboration and exchange under component 4.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: No. PMC are at a level of 7%. The provided justification is not considered satisfactory in view of the presented package with low co-financing of management costs, regional collaboration and exchange covered under component 4, and a high amount requested for the PPG.</p> <p>10 APR 2012 UA: Adjusted to 5%.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate	<p>12-06-2011 UA: No.</p>	

	<p>and outputs?</p>	<p>high (see comments on #14).  2) In general, please explore all options to increase co-financing, in particular new and additional money.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA:  No.  1) GEF funding for component 1 has not been adjusted. There are \$649,000 requested for GIS databases, maps, scenario-planning tools, and practical recommendations. This is considered too high. GEF support should focus on component 3 &amp; 4.  2) see under #25</p> <p>10 APR 2012 UA:  Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;  At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>12-06-2011 UA:  No. Please explore all options to increase co-financing, in particular new and additional money. Currently, only \$600,000 in grant co-financing is indicated.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA:  Has been adjusted and co-financing ratio increased to 1 : 3.24. However, only \$600,000 is grant money and all other contribution is in kind.</p> <p>10 APR 2012 UA:  Has been discussed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>12-06-2011 UA:  TBD</p>	

		UNEP contributes \$350,000 in kind.	
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?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>12-06-2011 UA: No. The project requires substantial revision. Apart from more general clarification requests, the following key issues need to be to addressed before further elaborating the proposal: -UNEPs comparative advantage to implement this project and appropriate execution arrangements - Creation of tangible benefits for nomadic herders - Solid baseline project funding and co-financing</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: No. Please address remaining questions/comments and re-submit.</p> <p>10 APR 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends the PIF for CEO clearance.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	10 APR 2012 UA: The project proponents indicated that	

		during PPG to increase co-financing, in particular grant co-financing.	
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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 06, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2012	
	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?	<p>09 DEC 2011 UA: No. Component 1 &amp; 2 are considered activities that should be provided as a baseline to this project.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: Yes. Has been revised.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>09 DEC 2011 UA: No. Please explain the costs of consultants. Why does costs for 77 weeks of consultancy add up to \$490,000?</p> <p>The total amount of \$658,000, including \$180,000 of GEF-funding is rather high for a PPG and not fully justified by the proposed activities.</p>

		<p>Figures have been corrected. Additional justification for the requested GEF amount of \$180,000 has been provided. However, the amount is still considered high in view of the entire PIF/PPG package that requests high PMC, high support for component 1 &amp; 4.</p> <p>10 APR 2012 UA: Has been discussed. In view of the entire PIF/PPG package for 2 countries, this is recommended for CEO consideration.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	<p>09 DEC 2011 UA: No.</p> <p>20 MAR 2012 UA: No. PPG request will be reconsidered after the entire PIF/PPG package has been re-submitted.</p> <p>10 APR 2012 UA: Yes. Recommended for CEO approval.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 09, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2012

\* 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.