



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening capacity in the agricultural and land-use sectors for enhanced transparency in implementation and monitoring of Mongolia's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)			
Country(ies):	Mongolia	GEF Project ID: ¹	9834
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	645575
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Submission Date:	October 2018
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change (CBIT)	Project Duration (Months)	36
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of Parent Program	[if applicable]	Agency Fee (\$)	USD 82,008

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
(select) (select) CBIT	OI 3: MRV systems for emissions reductions in place and reporting verified data.	CBIT	431,621	230,000
(select) (select) CBIT	OI 7: Number of countries meeting Convention reporting requirements and including mitigation contributions.	CBIT	431,621	230,000
Total project costs			863,242	460,000

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: Mongolia is fully capacitated to report to the UNFCCC under the Paris Agreement's Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) with strengthened agricultural and land-use sector components including inventories of greenhouse gases by sources and sinks, and information necessary to track progress against priority actions identified in Mongolia's NDC for these sectors.

Project Components/Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
Component 1. Institutional arrangements enhanced to coordinate preparation of ETF reports for agricultural, land-use, and other relevant sectors.	TA	Outcome 1.1. Institutional arrangements enhanced for coordinating information and data from the agricultural and land-use sectors into ETF processes and reports.	Output 1.1.1. Assessment prepared on institutional, data-collection, analysis, and reporting capacity gaps and needs for meeting the requirements of the ETF with specific focus on the priority NDC actions for the agricultural and land-use sectors. Output 1.1.2. AFOLU MRV coordination mechanism strengthened, integrating relevant authorities from	CBIT	225,355	120,084

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#) and [CBIT programming directions](#).

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		<p>Outcome 1.2. Inter-sectoral, national, and international engagement strengthened regarding ETF-related processes.</p>	<p>agricultural and land-use sectors into national UNFCCC reporting processes.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3. National Climate-change Monitoring Framework for the agricultural and land-use sectors prepared and adopted.</p> <p>Output 1.1.4. National reports reflect the latest ETF guidance.</p> <p>Output 1.2.1. Multi-sectoral strategy and coordination mechanism strengthened integrating relevant authorities, data, and information systems into national UNFCCC reporting processes.</p> <p>Output 1.2.2. AFOLU MRV/ ETF lessons learned captured and up-scaled nationally and internationally.</p>			
<p>Component 2. Strengthened capacity to measure emissions, removals, and emission-reduction activities from the agricultural and land-use sectors.</p>	TA/ Inv	<p>Outcome 2.1. Strengthened capacity to measure GHG emissions, removals, and emission-reduction activities from agricultural and land-use sectors.</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1. Quality-control (QC) protocols established for regular, systematic measurement of emissions, removals, and emission-reduction activities in the agricultural and land-use sectors.</p> <p>Output 2.1.2. Information technology systems upgraded to integrate, analyze, and archive diverse data types.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3. Capacity and technology upgraded in relevant institutions to strengthen mitigation-related MRV, including country-specific emissions factors, activity data, and Tier 2 reporting for key sub-categories in the agricultural and land-use sectors. (Coordinates with 3.1.3.)</p> <p>Output 2.1.4. Relevant measures validated and piloted for key mitigation</p>	CBIT	282,555	150,567

			sub-categories in the agricultural and land-use sectors.			
Component 3. Strengthened capacity to measure climate-change impacts, vulnerabilities, and adaptation-related activities in the agricultural and land-use sectors.	TA/ Inv	Outcome 3.1. Strengthened capacity to measure climate-change impacts, vulnerabilities, and adaptation-related activities in the agricultural and land-use sectors.	Output 3.1.1. Measurement framework developed for climate-change impacts, vulnerabilities, and adaptation-related activities prioritized in the NDC for the agricultural and land-use sectors. Output 3.1.2. Information technology systems upgraded to integrate and analyze adaptation-related data. Output 3.1.3. Capacity and technology upgraded in relevant institutions to strengthen M&R for adaptation priorities identified in the NDC for the agricultural and land-use sectors. (Coordinates with 2.1.3.) Output 3.1.4. Relevant measures validated and piloted for adaptation priorities identified in the NDC for the agricultural and land-use sectors.	CBIT	276,855	147,530
Subtotal					784,765	418,181
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴				CBIT	78,477	41,819
Total project costs					863,242	460,000

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	Min. of Environment and Tourism	In-kind	100,000
Donor Agency	Mongolia's UN-REDD Program	Cash	300,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	60,000
Total Co-financing			460,000

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA, AND PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) ²	Total (c)=a+b
FAO	CBIT	Mongolia	Climate Change	Cross-Cutting Capacity	863,242	82,008	945,250
Total Grant Resources					863,242	82,008	945,250

a) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	<i>hectares</i>
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	<i>hectares</i>
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	<i>Number of freshwater basins</i>
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	<i>Percent of fisheries, by volume</i>
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO _{2e} mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	<i>metric tons</i>
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	<i>metric tons</i>
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	<i>metric tons</i>
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	<i>ODP tons</i>
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i> <i>1</i>
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i> <i>1</i>

⁵ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Fund) in Annex D.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

A.1. *Project Description.* Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁷ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

A.1.1. The rationale for the project as described in the PIF remains accurate. Additionally, feedback from the needs assessments and workshops conducted in the PPG phase suggested that the project would benefit from strengthening efforts to support financial sustainability. Therefore, some activities and approaches have been adjusted to provide this support, both in terms of reducing costs and of increasing opportunities for revenues. For example, the project’s design (i) builds on existing platforms where possible, (ii) seeks to identify and reduce operational redundancies among stakeholders (e.g., via formalization of ETF-related role distinctions), (iii) targets identification of wider areas for engagement with CSOs and NGOs doing relevant work, (iv) explicitly calls for identification, validation, and piloting of proxy measures, and (v) includes linkages to various potential sources of funding at different levels (e.g., establishing a sound MRV basis for access to international carbon markets, establishing an evidentiary basis for revenue-generation from enforcement or value-capture from resource extraction, working with banks to identify practical criteria for financial support, etc.). For more detail, please see Section 2.4.2 (Table 11, risk #4), Section 3.3, and Activities 2.1.1.1, 2.1.1.3, and 3.1.1.4 of the project document.

The needs assessments also highlighted short-comings associated with ETF-related measurements (e.g., completeness, accuracy, uncertainty, standardization, funding, etc.), which cascade to challenges in data-sharing, analyses, reporting, and decision-making. Therefore, the project’s activities therefore now have an increased focus on building technological and technical capacities to close those gaps, including significant portions of the budget for ETF-related technologies (e.g., for establishing emissions factors, validating proxy measures, etc.) and training (including training of trainers, training materials, QC guidelines, etc.).

A.1.2. The baseline scenario has been updated to reflect evolving circumstances (please see Section 1.5 of the project document) and will be updated again at the project’s inception, as well as throughout the project’s implementation as part of the on-going process of stakeholder engagement.

A.1.3. Aside from the elements discussed in A.1.1 above, the proposed alternative scenario is still substantially the same as that described in the PIF. There have been some adjustments to the wording of the log frame in order to parse more cleanly some of the conceptual distinctions between the components. In particular, Component 1 now focuses on coordination and reporting issues. Component 2 focuses on measurement and verification for climate-change mitigation. Component 3 focuses on measurement for climate-change adaptation. In the PIF, some of these considerations were blurred between the components.

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

⁷ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project’s consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

For concision and in order to align better with the other CBIT national projects, the project's title has changed from "Strengthening capacity in the agriculture and land-use sectors in Mongolia for enhanced transparency in implementation and monitoring of Mongolia's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) under the Paris Agreement" to "Strengthening capacity in the agricultural and land-use sectors for enhanced transparency in implementation and monitoring of Mongolia's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)".

The project's objective has also been edited for two main considerations: (i) the project will now end in 2021 rather than 2020 and (ii) the objective now focuses more explicitly on capacitation. Some elements of achieving full alignment with the ETF will take time beyond the end of this CBIT project (e.g., for the establishment of some of the land-use change emissions factors).

The PIF version of the project's objective read, "By 2020, Mongolia is preparing reports to the UNFCCC under the Paris Agreement Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) with strengthened agriculture, forestry and other land use sector components including inventories of emissions sources and sinks and information necessary to track progress against priority actions identified in Mongolia's NDC for these sectors."

The project objective now reads, "Mongolia is fully capacitated to report to the UNFCCC under the Paris Agreement's Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) with strengthened agricultural and land-use sector components including inventories of greenhouse gases by sources and sinks, and information necessary to track progress against priority actions identified in Mongolia's NDC for these sectors."

A.1.4. Incremental/ additional cost reasoning remain unchanged from the PIF. Regarding co-financing, the UN-REDD program was able to accelerate its support to the project more than expected, such that more was received during the project-preparation phase and less will now be received during the project's delivery. Whereas the PIF projected all expected co-financing, this document refers only to the co-financing that will be received during implementation. Thus, the total co-financing estimate has changed from USD 1,160,000 in the PIF to USD 460,000 in this document. However, the project will continue to identify opportunities for additional support. Additionally, consultations during the PPG phase have identified several opportunities for engagement and close coordination with up-coming projects that are not yet sufficiently finalized for co-financing commitments. Such discussions are underway with at least three additional partners.

A.1.5. No change from PIF.

A.1.6. Prodoc adds to what was described in PIF by expanding on efforts to strengthen sustainability, especially financial sustainability (as noted above for A.1.1). For greater detail, please see Section 3 of the project document.

A.2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact. N/A

A.3. *Stakeholders.* Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes /no)? and indigenous peoples (yes /no)?⁸

Please see the following sections of the project document:

- *Section 1.5: Institutional Stakeholders and Baseline Initiatives*
 - Provides an overview of institutional stakeholders as well as their programs and projects.
- *Section 2.1: Stakeholder Engagement*

⁸ As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.

- Notes stakeholder engagements to date and references Annexes 4 and 5, which provide documentation of the formal stakeholder workshops held during the PPG phase.
- *Section 2.2.1: Operational mode*
 - Describes anticipated partnerships with stakeholders for execution.
- *Section 2.2.2: Institutional framework*
 - Describes engagement with stakeholders as part of the project’s governance framework.

A.4. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.* Elaborate on how gender equality and women’s empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes /no)?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes /no)?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women X%, men X%)? ⁹

Please see Section 3.3.4 of the project document.

The project’s beneficiaries are estimated to be about half men and half women. For cases in which the project engages with a stakeholder group with uneven gender proportionality, the project will engage equitably with both sexes, seeking even representation in project activities or—at minimum—proportional representation.

A.5 *Risk.* Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

Please see Section 2.4 of the project document.

A.6. *Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.* Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

For institutional arrangements, please see Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 of the project document.

For coordination with other relevant projects and initiatives, please see Section 1.5 of the project document. (Coordination will also occur via the Technical Working Group, described under Activity 1.1.2.1 and in Appendix 5 of the project document.)

Additional information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 *Benefits.* Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF)?

This project is not expected to affect people’s livelihoods and employment status directly. Indirectly, the project is expected to contribute overall socio-economic benefits by supporting the effective and efficient management of natural resources as well as publicly funded initiatives to steward those resources. Given that the national and local economies intimately rely on environmental resources, this project’s benefits for the quality, transparency, and accessibility of related information will greatly benefit all citizens, especially those directly engaged in the AFOLU sector and vulnerable to climate change.

⁹ Same as footnote 8 above.

Mongolia's society and national economy heavily depend on agriculture, forestry, and other land uses. The country's globally important agrarian heritage—including traditional rural pastoral livelihood systems and arable farming—directly depends on natural resources and intact, functional ecosystems, which deliver numerous ecosystem services. Agriculture¹⁰ accounts for about 13%¹¹ of Mongolia's GDP¹², 28% of employment¹³, and 85% of child employment¹⁴.

Animal husbandry is the main source of livelihood and wealth for many Mongolians. Livestock support the livelihoods of more than one-third of Mongolian households and account for 82.5% of the country's total agricultural production. This reliance on agriculture entails substantial vulnerability to climate change.

Mongolia's forests also benefit diverse groups and provide substantial economic value to the country. For example, according to estimates from MET and UN-REDD,¹⁵ forests provide seasonal grazing areas¹⁶, contributing about USD 25 million per year to herders' livelihoods. Forest goods and services generate an annual net value of about USD 284 million (about USD 28/ ha of boreal forest). The forestry sector contributes about 3.1% to GDP and about 1.4% to tax revenues (about USD 3/ ha of boreal forest). Current forest harvests for timber and fuel wood generate about USD 48 million in profits based on about USD 142 million in sales, slightly more than half of which is unlicensed. About USD 12 million worth of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) are collected annually, about three-fourths of which is for home consumption and nearly all of which is unlicensed. In sum, NTFPs—including fuel wood and grazing—provide value to rural households equivalent to more than 12.5% of GDP per capita. Thus, improved information about forests and related land uses will contribute to more effective management of critical natural resources.

Moreover, an appropriate transparency framework can generate multiple social, economic and environmental co-benefits such as human capacity, local and national institutions, cost-effective national budgeting and planning, reduced vulnerability of its food systems, and the national resources and ecosystems that the food systems depend upon. Through improved and more transparent data, the project also supports improved and better targeted local, regional and national investment and decision making.

The project's activities and institutional arrangements (e.g., required NGO/ CSO representation on the project's steering committee) ensure that the project will directly benefit all levels of stakeholders by improving the quality of information related to climate change in the AFOLU sector. Better information will enable better decisions, and increased transparency improves governance and accountability.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

Please see all of Outcome 1.2 and Section 2.3.4 of the project document.

¹⁰ Includes crops, livestock, forestry, fishing, and hunting

¹¹ Estimates vary. 13.31% (National Statistical Office of Mongolia, 2016); 12.74% in 2016 (World Bank, 2017); 13.7% based on 2016 agricultural value added 1.622 billion (2010 constant USD) and 2016 GDP 11.825 billion (2010 constant USD) (both World Bank, retrieved Dec 2017 from <https://data.worldbank.org>)

¹² 2016 GDP ≈ 11.183 billion USD (current) (World Bank, retrieved Feb 2018 from <https://data.worldbank.org>)

¹³ 27.4% of adult female employment; 29.2% of adult male employment (ILO, 2017).

¹⁴ 85.37% of female child employment; 84.74% of male child employment; "child" = 7 – 14 years old (*Understanding Children's Work*, 2012, based on data from ILO, UNICEF, and World Bank).

¹⁵ *Forest sector financing flows and economic values in Mongolia* (2013).

¹⁶ However, these grazing areas are also used by wildlife. Expanded use of such areas further reduces the habitat and resources of some wildlife.

B. DESCRIBE THE PROJECT'S CONSISTENCY WITH:

B.1 *Consistency with National Priorities.* Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.:

This project directly assists Mongolia in fulfilling its commitments under the Paris Agreement and UNFCCC. The project's objective and outcomes also directly support several domestic priorities and initiatives, including:

- Green Development Policy 2014-2030 (2014)¹⁷
- Sustainable Development Vision – 2030 (2016)
- National Action Programme on Climate Change 2011-2021 (2011)
- National Agriculture Development Policy 2010-2021 (2010)
- State Policy on Forest 2016-2030 (2015)
- Recommendations of the *Environmental Performance Review* (2017)¹⁸
- Recommendations of the *National Report on the Rangeland Health of Mongolia* (2015)¹⁹

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

M&E activity	Responsible party(ies)	Schedule or Deadline	Budget
Inception Workshop & Report	PMU in consultation with the PTF and PSC	Within one month following project start-up	USD 5,000
Results-based Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B)	PMU in consultation with the PTF	Within one month of project start-up and on an annual basis thereafter covering the July to June reporting period	USD 2,500
Updated baseline information	PMU	Inception and end of each project year	USD 7,500 (PMU staff time)
Supervision visits	PTF	Annual	FAO visits via GEF Agency fees (others via project's travel budget as needed)
Project Progress Reports (PPRs)	PMU	No later than one month after each biannual reporting period (Jan-Jun and Jul-Dec)	USD 15,000 (PMU staff time)
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	FAO, in its role as implementation agency via the BH	1 August of each reporting year	GEF Agency fees
Co-financing Reports	PMU	Annual together with PIR	USD 7,500 (PMU staff time)

¹⁷ The Green Development Policy is the primary basis of Mongolia's NDC. Reference to this policy includes the Green Development Action Plan 2016-2030, the implementation of which is overseen by CCICD.

¹⁸ Produced by MET.

¹⁹ Produced by MoFALI, ALMGAC, and NAMEM.

M&E activity	Responsible party(ies)	Schedule or Deadline	Budget
GEF Tracking Tools	LTO	Mid-point and end-of-project	GEF Agency fees
Technical Reports	PMU (staff or LOAs); reviewed by LTO, TWGs	As appropriate	PMU staff time and corresponding LOAs USD 20,000
Final workshop	PMU and BH	At the end of the project	USD 5,000
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE)	BH	Six months prior to the actual project completion date	USD 20,000
Processing of Terminal Report	PMU, BH, LTO, GEF Coordination Unit, TCS Report Group	At the end of project implementation	USD 6,600
Total Project Budget for M&E			USD 89,100

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies²⁰ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Alexander Jones Director Climate and Environment Division			Nyamjargal Gombo Assistant FAO Representative in Mongolia	+976 11 310248	Nyamjargal.Gombo@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator, FAO GEF Coordination Unit			Yurie Naito Programme Officer, FAO GEF Coordination Unit	+39 0657053172	Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org Yurie.Naito@fao.org

²⁰ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please see Appendix 1 of the project document.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

The PIF approval included one request from the GEF Secretariat:

“By CEO Endorsement, please further refine how the project outputs will link with and support the overall transparency framework in Mongolia, beyond the AFOLU sectors, to respond to the enhanced transparency framework of the Paris Agreement.”

The project’s design has incorporated significant elements related to addressing this comment.

Please see all of Outcome 1.2 in the project document.

Additionally, please see Activity 1.1.2.6 regarding the establishment of an ETF-related portal.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT-PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS²¹

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 50,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent to Date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Project management (BL5011)	2,381	0	0
Consultants for preparation of project submission documents (BL5013)	33,550	0	33,550
Travel	9,331	2,343	1,111
Training (PPG consultation and validation workshops), stationary	4,738	5,573	0
Expendable procurement for office small equipment	0	11	0
General operating expenses	0	0	0
Total	50,000	7,916	34,661

²¹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A