UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report for the LD-offset project; they are referenced by commenter and track change comment number ("#" column):

Commenter	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken
Buyandelger U. (BU) M&E Officer, UNDP Mongolia CO	Annexes	Annexes	Be sure to include the following in the Annexes of the final MTR: - Completed Audit Trail - Relevant Tracking Tools - The Ethical Code of Conduct form signed by local consultant - Narangerel	Up-dated tracking tool not available yet at completion of TE report. Completed audit trail, and signed ethical code of conduct form for national consultant were included in Annexes
	1	Page 5	Delete "date project began"	Deleted, the date given is the date the prodoc was signed, but as explained on page 25, the project began later. We used dates for signatures and "project start" as in Project Document.
	2	Page 9	Re-phrase executive summary	Re-phrased executive summary according to this comment, and HQ comment
	3	Page 10	Delete license number	We deleted it at page 5, and moved detailed information to Annex 10 Its public information though, available at https://cmcs.mrpam.gov.mn/and information is

				needed by stakeholders to address the issue.
	4	Page 10	Add information for the recommendation to up-date competency standards to include mitigation hierarchy and offsets	Have added details/information
	5	Page 10	Include more clarification on cost effectiveness of Local Technical Committee	Have added information Local Technical Committees, page 31
	5	Page 10	advisory board	Changed into project board
	5	Page 11	Regarding "close working relationships" with individuals at MET to bring forward approval process of draft amendments prepared by project." Contractual or strategic partnerships? Elaborate in main report.	Added information in report
	5	Page 11	"these innovations"	Replaced with "land degradation offsetting"
		Page 13	"To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and needed attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues" was questioned why this was include under purposes of the TE	It was listed with the general purposes as defined in the UNDP/GEF guidance.
		Page 16	Project start July 2015.	Changed into "June 2015" (date of government signature)
		Page 16	Condense the part on "problems that the project sought to address"	Condensed

		Page 24	Regarding" alignment of project design with Mongolia Sustainable Development Vision – 2030, which was approved only 2016 (after prodoc development)	Changed phrasing, explained how project objectives are in line with the Mongolia Sustainable Development Vision - 2030, and added that drafting of vision coincided with project design stage.
		Page 25	"formulating baselines and targets"	Changed into "defining baselines and targets"
		Page 25	GEF terminology	Provided footnote on GEF terminology on SLM
		Page 27	Completion of stakeholder involvement plan was "identified" as an activity	Changed into: completion of stakeholder plan was "planned" as an activity
		Page 28	Paragraphs on UNDAF and UNDP Mongolia rather apply to "relevance" than "comparative advantage"	Modified and added paragraphs under section Relevance, page 46
		Page 30	Paragraphs on management arrangements	Changed future tense to present tense
		Page 30	PIW	Included in abbreviations list
BU	20	Methodology	It is a standard business practice in the CO to have an exit briefing with the evaluation team. I wonder if it's done. If so, please indicate the relevant information in the methodology. I maybe not be aware of that… Presentations to the stakeholders on the findings	Exit meeting proposed on June 3rd, and options for dates provided

			are normally agreed in the inception report ahead of time depending on the availability of the eval. team and timing.	Presentation to stakeholders by TE team was made on April 19
			Annual planning was successfully adjusted to fit planning and implementation cycles	Changed into: Annual plans were prepared and implemented covering all activities that were originally designed for a 4 year implementation period.
		Page 31	Explain the benefits and functioning of the Technical Coordinating Committees	Added paragraphs on Technical Coordinating Committees. Added orders on establishment of technical committees, and lists of committee members in Annex 10
		Page 31	The PMU demonstrated high level of ability to foresee and pre-emptively address potential risks while the political environment was changing with the risk of key members for project implementation and oversight being replaced	Changed into: The PMU addressed the potential risk of key individuals for project oversight being replaced following changes in the political environment. The risk was mitigated by the National Project Director being appointed by position, not a certain individual.
		Page 31	Close working relationships…	Elaborated with examples in the main report
		Page 31	Local Technical Committee on Aimag level in the three pilot landscapes.	Added "three" Local Technical Committees on Aimag level in the three pilot landscapes
		Page 31	Elaborate more: Functional partnerships for the	Changed to: The partnerships for the

			implementation of key activities under both outcomes were a prominent feature and success factor in achieving project targets	implementation of key activities under both outcomes were a prominent feature and success factor in achieving project targets, as the partner organizations had long term experience in-country, and a track record of successful activity implementation and innovation in their specific fields
		Page 32	Feedback from M&E activities for adaptive management.	Described here is the project response/adaptive management following recommendations of the Mid Term Review.
		Page 32	Publications by the project	Added details on titles and distribution of publications in text and annex 10
		Page 32	Videos on MET website, TV programs, videos on YouTube and facebook page. Comment: add statistics on website traffic and TV audience	The TE team considers this is beyond the scope of the ToR
		Page 33	Paragraph on Consultative meeting in South Gobi organized by TNC	Deleted, as it was not under project framework
		Page 33	Paragraph on: MTE recommended to enhance outreach of the project across ministries and government agencies. Comment questioned whether outreach was enhanced	This was reported with the understanding that inclusion of NDA expert itself was an enhancement of project outreach across government agencies

			through adding an NDA expert as Board Member	
		Page 34	No significant delays in cash advances or other issues in financial management came to the attention of the TE.	Changed to: No issues in financial management came to the attention of the TE
		Page 35	Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation. Comment suggests content under this heading should be under 3.1.	TE team interprets this heading that the Monitoring and Evaluation is to be evaluated as it was designed at entry, and as it was implemented.
		Page 36	Local Technical Committees, ….meeting regularly	Changed to regularly twice annually and ad hoc
		Page 37	Reference to stakeholder collaboration while previously there were "adversarial attitudes"	Added: such as between mining companies on the one hand, and local government and local communities on the other hand
		Page 38	To date, ERA results incorporated in land use planning for 22.8 mio ha.	Added: With ERA as a basis for planning, ecologically sensitive areas are set aside and spared from development, and local development can be planned while preserving conservation values and ecosystem services
		Page 38	Level of institutional capacity for implementation of mitigation and offsetting framework as indicated by	Added: The capacity of local governments to apply mitigation hierarchy in planning and to work with mining

			capacity scorecard increased against baseline over 13 %.	companies in developing offset activities has been strengthened.
		Page 39	Request to elaborate on significance: The area under approved integrated land management plans incorporating results of ERA far exceeds the target. 3 Aimags and 13 Soums prepared land use plans and landscape development plans incorporating ERA, and the total area covered is 22.8 mio ha.	Added: The area under approved integrated land management plans incorporating results of ERA far exceeds the target. 3 Aimags and 13 Soums prepared land use plans and landscape development plans incorporating ERA, therefore considering the protection of conservation values and ecosystem services in planning local development. The total area covered is 22.8 mio ha.
	43	Page 43	Under output 1.2: 13.34 mio ha (= 29.6 % of 41.5 mio ha)	Changed to 13.34 mio ha (= 32.15 % of 41.5 mio ha)
		Page 43	End of project status: Total area under protection will be 19.04 mio ha, equaling about 46 % of 41.5 mio ha Comment questioning whether it is equaling the overall total protected area about 46 % of 41.5 mio ha	TE maintains that the "Total area under protection will be 19.04 mio ha, equaling about 46 % of 41.5 mio ha". (46 % of the total territory of the 5 Western Aimags will be under protected area status)
	43	Page 43	Request to reformulate: The GEF funds allocated for 2015 (of which only USD 4500 were used for translation, and previously USD 10,000 for project formulation) were	Reformulated: Due to the delayed project start, few project funds were used in 2015 (total of 14,500 USD for translation and project

			added (PB decision June 22, 2016) to the annual GEF allocations for the remaining years.	formulation), the remainder of the 2015 allocation was distributed to the annual allocations for the remaining years, following a PB decision of June 22, 2016)
		Page 47	two financial audits in 2017 and 2018 confirmed compliance of financial management with requirements, the M&E plan was implemented as designed.	Re-phrased: two financial audits carried out in 2017 and 2018 for FY 2017 and FY 2018 confirmed compliance of financial management with requirements, the M&E plan was implemented as designed.
		Page 47, Country Ownership	Comment: The content under 3.3.4 seems to be more of relevance question	TE team decided to keep the content under "Country Ownership", based on definition of Country Ownership in UNDP/GEF Guidance: "Relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable."
		Page 49	Comment: CPAP is no longer in use. If its (relevant to) CPD, please specify outcomes/outputs	Modified paragraph to clarify relevance to CPD outcome and outputs

		Page 50	Offsetting activities under the EMP plans of the involved mining companies will have to be financed under the new legislation Comment: re-phrase	Re-phrased as: Allocating funding for offsetting activities under their EMP plans will be mandatory for the involved mining companies under the new legislation.
		Page 50	There are also national NGOs playing a watchdog role in monitoring extractive industry and holding mining companies accountable. Comment: please insert name	Inserted: Such as OT Watch, and the Mongolian Environmental Civil Council (MECC)
		Page 51	Land use plans and ERA in the Western region, the Green Development Policy of Khovd Aimag, and a strong presence and ongoing program of WWF, and TNC, in the pilot landscapes, reduce environmental risks. Comment: What does it mean? Reducing the environmental risks?	Re-phrased/added: Land use plans and ERA in the Western region, the Green Development Policy of Khovd Aimag, and a strong presence and ongoing program of WWF, and TNC, in the pilot landscapes, reduce the potential impacts of environmental risks, such as extreme weather events, namely drought and dzud
		Page 51	Reference to exploration license. Comment: deleted the license number, and commented that evaluation reports are public documents	TE team comment: Exploration license coordinates, number, owners are public information too, online at website of MRPAM

		Page 51	Improvements in ecological status in the rangelands of Mongolia are hardly achievable in a timeframe as short as the project, though preliminary results of photo monitoring in the Green Gold project report indicated improvements in the pasture land in the offsetting area in Durvuljin Soum. Comment: any indication coming from our own monitoring (project data)?	TE team comment: No. Green Gold was a contracted partner, and has the expertise, in M&E of rangelands, and has worked long-term with the relevant government agencies (NAMEM and ALAMGAC) to establish agreed methodology to assess rangeland health. It is therefore most efficient to use the "Green Gold" indicators for rangeland health
		Page 54	The project had remarkable success in having findings on key biodiversity areas and drafted guidelines introduced into the legal framework, as new state protected areas recommended by the ERA and four out of five regulatory drafts were already approved by lawmakers before project closing. Comment: what does it mean?	TE Team: The project was successful in introducing, even before project closing, into the legal framework the new protected areas recommended by the ERA, and four out of five drafts/amendments prepared by the project
		Page 54	The project had some weaknesses, related to its innovative character and therefore very comprehensive capacity building needs, and related to the way SLM under the	TE team: The weaknesses are referred to in the same and following paragraph

			GEF framework was applied in the project design, or the interpretation thereof, for activities in Mongolia. Comment: what are these weaknesses	
		Page 54	it should be considered in project design whether to include the above activities into an already complex and innovative project in Mongolia, where rangeland management is the primary activity to address land degradation and local livelihoods. Comment: clarify. Was it too ambitious to include this?	Added: Climate and soils in the project landscapes are not conducive to crop farming for which high inputs, such as irrigation, and specialized skills are required under these conditions. Livelihoods are based on extensive livestock husbandry. To rehabilitate land and prevent land degradation, improved pastureland management (and livestock) management have a much greater potential at scale
	68	5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations	Conclusions and recommendations should be listed separately. Each recommendation should specify who the responsible party is.	Conclusions and recommendations are separated, responsible parties for immediate follow up are identified
Khishigjargal KharKhuu, UNDP CO Programme Officer		Page 9	Recommendation on conducting workshops on"Sustaining and Scaling up Land Degradation Mitigation and Offsets" in each of the project Aimags to jointly review the findings of the	The recommendation was for project management: Project management to organize meetings,

			TE, to assess needs for capacity building and to plan forward. Is this recommendation to MET	or request Aimag governments to organize participatory meetings, and share the findings with UNDP to inform programming in case of following up activities being undertaken as a stand alone project, or if ENSURE project can support follow-up
		Page 18	The lack of a pasture land law	Replaced by "lack of an incentive to protect pasture land through livestock management"
		Page 18	At the same time, breed quality and thereby productivity of livestock declined. Only in recent times have successful financial models (savings and credit cooperatives), and improvements in animal health, traceability, and marketing created real incentives for pastoralists to reduce livestock numbers and thereby grazing pressure on rangelands. Replace with" through implementation of successful pilot projects at local provinces."	TE team retained the original phrasing as we believe it is important to name these important measures for reducing grazing pressure on rangelands
		Page 18,19	The mitigation hierarchy approach, including offset,	Added in report:

			provides an opportunity to avoid negative impacts and to mitigate or compensate for land degradation caused by prospecting and mining operations including associated infrastructure installation. Comment: describe the Mitigation hierarchy, avoidance will be the key for increasing Protected areas network. The project has contributed to the Avoidance measures by assisting to approval of 22 SPAs by the Parliament in 2019. Therefore, all 3 parts of the hierarchy can be explained in more detail.	The project was designed to contribute both through avoidance measures, such as assisting to establish new protected areas, as well as through putting into practice offsetting. The principle of mitigation hierarchy is described in more detail in Annex 10. Included detailed description in Annex 10
		Page 19	Request to include activities by Green Gold project, and innovative SLM measures . Request to include: "Legal frameworks were analysed for mining licence, Land use management for Degraded land, etc"	The purpose of Chapter 2.3. is to summarize the "immediate and development objectives of the project" as per design. Comments rejected
			Page 20 Comment: Various cross sectoral issues were addressed by the project such as livestock health, alternative income generation by supporting local communities in restoring wild seabucktorn bush, creating artificial water pond, fencing and rehabilitation of arid land.	The purpose of Chapter 2.3. is to summarize the "immediate and development objectives of the project" as per design. Comments rejected

		Page 30	Better to mention the key responsibilities of the mining companies as it was agreed in MOU, and actual performance of the responsibilities can be assessed. Here we need to have an assessment of the pilot mining companies, including their challenges and opportunities for planning and implementing Offsetting activities. What can be learned from the project in achieving private and public partnership, including meaningful public participation in decision making both at national and local level. What are the difference between the companies in terms of their governance and functionality.	The purpose of Chapter 3.1.8. is to describe the management arrangements as per project design. All participating companies are private companies. There is no difference with regard to their "governance or functionality", nor with regard to their obligation to follow regulations. The differences between the companies is their size, and experience in developing offsetting activities. It is beyond the ToR to analyse the companies' internal governance/management/functionality
		Page 30	Specific responsibilities and commitments of the mining companies in each pilot landscape were agreed in an MOU to be signed with MEGDT during the inception phase. Comment: Better to mention the key responsibilities of the mining companies as it was agreed in MOU, and actual performance of the responsibilities can be assessed	Information on content of MoU and responsibilities of mining companies were added, on page 30, and information on performance is included in achievements against targets (offset area information) Example MoU for Zavkhan Aimag pilot

				landscape was added as Annex 10.4.
		Page 30	Work in the pilot landscapes was to be facilitated through a Local Technical Adviser for each pilot landscape. Comment: Members and their representation purposes in the LTA can be explained here. What were the main successes in coordination of land use management, other development at the aimag level? How can we improve this form of local coordination mechanism in the future UNDP projects? Is there any other preferred mechanism for better management and coordination between stakeholders at national and local level?	The purpose of Chapter 3.1.8. is to describe the management arrangements as per project design. The Local Technical Advisor, one in each project Aimag, was one person, and a member of the PIU. We have elaborated more on Local Technical Committees on page 36, and in Annex 10.
			Page 31 Eco Regional Assessment though TNC Comment: Contract made between UNDP and TNC for completing ERA. Details of the completed inputs from the TNC contract can be assessed in terms of their contribution to the project outcome	The TE assesses the project achievements according to the results framework. It is beyond the ToR to assess details of inputs under the UNDP-TNC contract. ERA was completed, and end of project targets for integrated land use planning, LPAs and SPAs achieved.
			Page 31 On central level, the project worked closely with ALAMGAC as a key	Elaborated to describe the change in planning

			partner in guiding and furthering landscape level planning in the pilot areas, as well as in mainstreaming mitigation hierarchy and offsetting into the Soum level planning procedures Comment: Need to add more on the development of Landscape based soum development plans and involvement of local herders in the planning.	approach, and its significance: ALAMGAC's new approach to preparing Soum Landscape Development plans marks a change to greater participation of local resource users, namely herders, in the planning process. An important step of the process is the initial resource assessment and the recording of customary use patterns of natural resources, namely pasture, and the allocation of customary rights to herders. With that, a mechanism has been introduced to enhance tenure security and access for local communities to resources that they customarily used to sustain their livelihood
		Page 33	The MTE recommended to enhance outreach of the project across several ministries and key government agencies,	Added: Apart from providing advice on how to implement the guideline on offset

			including the National Development Agency (NDA) in order to increase opportunities to introduce offsetting into national policy documents, and to include representatives of these institutions in the PB. This was followed up through an official letter by PMU to the NDA, and the expert of Sector Development Policy Coordination Department of NDA became a board member. Comment: How was the representation of NDA in terms of coordination of policies at the national level to reduce mining land degradation?	measures to reduce land degradation through mining, the NDA representative reviewed assessments and reports produced by the project for the development of the "Regional Development Policy Document".
		Page 38	3.3. Mio ha (LPAs) and 2.4 Mio ha (SPAs) added in Western Region, amounting to total of 5.7 Mio ha additional area under protection. This represents an increase of over 42 % of protected territory. Comment: This should be linked as an avoidance measures of the mitigation hierarchy, as mentioned above.	Added: With formal protection status, these territories are managed for their conservation values. Both state and local protected area status provides protection from development of extractive industries, and for state protected areas protection from most development activities according to the protected area legislation
		Page 40	All Soums (90) of five Western Aimags trained on	Re-phrased as:

			incorporatiog ERA into land use planning.	Land officers of all Soums (90) of five Western Aimags were trained on incorporating ERA into land use planning
		Page 43	2.4 Mio ha are pending approval as SPAs	Updated to: 2.4 Mio ha in the Western Region were approved by the National Parliament as SPAs, as part of 22 SPAs nationwide.
		Page 43	End of project target: 10% increase in Aimag centres and 30% increase in pastoral communities at pilot landscapes Comment: please clarify that this is to be assessed according to the capacity scorecard of UNDP	Added: this is to be assessed according to the capacity scorecard of UNDP
		Page 44	Offset areas cover 12,000 ha (Bayan Airag), 12,200 ha (Khotgor) and 4219 ha (Khushuut). Specific SLM practices were applied, namely rangeland improvements (through rotational grazing (78600 ha), and including water source protection, cropland rehabilitation and agroforestry Comment: As a result of the selection of offset areas according to the planning. Development of the plan involved participation of local stakeholders	TE team believes that the text adequately reflects the description of end-of-project status
		Page 44	All 3 participating mining companies signed MoUs on	Added:

			developing offset plans, and all 3 have developed offset/EMP. Comment: Approval of the EMP with budgets on offsetting can be added	And allocated budgets to implement the plans
		Page 45	Add number of beneficiaries of small projects	Added available data on numbers of benefitting households, total and by small project activity
		Page 50	There are also shortcomings in coordination among ALAMGAC and MRPAM, to align the registration of Local Protected Areas and of mining licenses. Comment: Can you please propose another potential to work on improving coordination between agencies on database registration, and overall procedure applied for granting exploration licenses? More elaboration is needed in mineral resources exploration policy and coordination with environmental conservation policies, strategies. We want to know key issues to be addressed in order to change recent practice of land use planning coordination with mineral resource use.	Added: This suggests that a review of the procedure for granting licenses is needed, and a procedure be developed whereby ERA findings are in fact considered for development planning, and the granting of exploration licenses undergoes a rigorous review process even in areas that are not formally gazetted as local or state protected areas, but where conservation values and ecosystem services are at risk.
		Page 53	The project had remarkable success in having findings on key biodiversity areas and drafted guidelines introduced into the legal framework, as new state protected areas	Re-phrased: The project had remarkable success in having key biodiversity areas as identified by the ERA placed under local or

			recommended by the ERA and four out of five regulatory drafts were already approved by lawmakers before project closing.	state protection, and in introducing drafts into the legal framework. New state protected areas recommended by the ERA and four out of five regulatory drafts were already approved by lawmakers before project closing. Approved drafts included those on developing general land use plans on provincial and municipal level, on developing Soum level annual land management planning, on M&E for land use plans, and on use of land and natural resources and registration, validation and formulation of landscape development plan.
		Page 54	A third immediate follow-up activity is to address the issue of exploration license (Xalzan Xoshuu, 2880.72 ha. ID 14381, Code: XV-014381, Holder: SDDG - Shin Dong Design Group) in Durvuljin Soum which overlaps with the selected offsetting area of Bayan Airag Exploration LLC and the pasture contracted by the Soum	This area is managed by the pasture user group/cooperative Janchiv. As is common practice, they have a contract with the Soum Governor, a Rangeland Use Agreement (RUA). The information on the license should be made available to the stakeholders so they can jointly address the potential conflict (offset

			Governor for management by Janchiv Cooperative. Comment: Pasture management? Or wild seabucktorn restoration work results? Who will follow up?	area and herder group area with sustainable pasture management and livelihood activities, and exploration license on the other hand)

Comments on draft TE report for PIMS 5287 (Mongolia) by UNDP HQ			
Page #	**Section**	**Comments**	
9-10	Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons	Indicate who the responsible party is for each recommendation that is listed.	Responsible party has been added, and explanation provided that UNDP CO had requested recommendations to inform programming on governance of mining
14	1.2. Scope & Methodology	It would be good to include more details about the methodology and data sources used. Include information on the rationale for selecting key informants and site visits. Describe how triangulation was done.	Included more detail on selecting sites, key informants, gender responsive methodology and triangulation, added to documents reviewed, and commented on limitations.

		Was a gender-responsive methodology used? Show how gender integration was to be assessed and include information on tools used to make such an assessment. Were there any limitations to the evaluation?	
24	3.1.1. Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)	Assess if/how principles of gender equality were integrated into the results framework	
30-31	3.2.2. Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)	Provide info on the difference (if any) between the planned arrangements with stakeholders and what actually took place with partnerships/stakeholders during implementation.	added information on the Local Technical Committees, and on the inclusion of NDA representation in the PB
34	3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)	The beginning of this section states that 'M&E Design at Entry' is discussed in Section 3.1.1. However, it is recommended that the M&E Design at Entry section should also include discussions of the following: -was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted? Were roles and responsibilities made clear/	Information on M&E plan including responsibilities and budgets for each activity has been included, in text and Annex 8.
45	3.3.2 Relevance	Include text on the project's relevance to GEF programming.	Added content on project contribution to LD3 Outcome 1 and 2
47	3.3.5 Mainstreaming	Examine any relevant environmental and/or social safeguards for this project.	Added comments regarding environmental and social risks as well as

			planned and implemented measures
52	3. Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons	Although the findings of the evaluation are provided throughout the report, it might be useful (for when the UNDP IEO reviews this TE) to include a concise set of findings in this section. The Conclusions would then be connected to the Findings and both should be supported by evidence.	A concise set of findings has been added
53-55	4.2. Recommendations	Indicate who the responsible party is for each recommendation that is listed.	Responsible party has been added
Annexes	Annexes	The Annexes are not included in this draft file. Be sure to include the following in the final version: -TE TOR -Itinerary -List of persons interviewed -Summary of field visits -List of documents reviewed -Evaluation Question Matrix -Questionnaire used and summary of results -Evaluation Consultant Agreement form -TE Report Clearance Form -Annexed in a separate file: TE Audit Trail -Annexed in a separate file: Terminal GEF Tracking Tool	TE team submitted the draft with Annexes, except the last three ones listed here.

Lisa Farroway	Page 5	Note that operational closing date will still be July 2019 unless the CO has actually operationally closed	Closing date changed to July 2019

		the project. CO to confirm.	
	Page 8	The HS for M&E plan implementation does not appear well justified at current, given that there were issues with the LD tracking tool and that baselines were not established until late in the project - ideally these should have all been completed in year 1 of implementation. If MTR team wants to retain a HS rating this will need to be better justified to show that the approach was best practice.	Changed rating to S (satisfactory)
	Page 9	Please put recommendations in table with numbers. (and at end of report with clear responsible parties)	Changed recommendations into table format and added responsible parties
	Page 20	Heading 2.4 does not seem to most accurately reflect the discussion - instead results framework? (It does not talk about baseline indicators being established, by baseline I think about the baseline values at time of project start)	Heading 2.4. changed to: Results Framework

	Page 24/ Page 30	Changes to results framework from inception. Note that ahead of 2017 PIR the PM advised the RTA that the Project Board decided not to make any changes to the results framework instead deciding to reinterpret indicators. This is why no changes were adopted to the results framework as none were presented to the RTA for approval (RTA approves, not GEF). Please confirm with PM and review the text in the report to reflect this.	Added: Ahead of the 2017 PIR, the Project Manager advised the RTA that the Project Board decided not to make any changes to the results framework instead deciding to reinterpret indicators. No changes were adopted to the results framework as none were presented to the RTA for approval.
	Page 25	Errors in baseline. On the 30% the need to correct/increase this target was never raised with RTA to my memory. Please review and confirm (per Buyana's comment). Please elaborate to say that the correction to capacity development baseline was made after MTR and adopted by PSC and RTA. The MTR report and 2018 PIR detail these issues.	Added: A correction to capacity development baseline was made after MTR and adopted by PSC and RTA. The MTR report and 2018 PIR detail these issues.

	Page 30	Please use MTR not MTE	
	Page 31	The LD tracking tool was completed prior to CEO Endorsement and submitted to GEF on 10 Jun 2015 at time of CEO endorsement as required by GEF policy. What was not done was a mid-term LD TT (although this is not a mandatory GEF requirement as an MSP and the MTR itself was optional), and the baseline TT was not validated during inception phase (which is why we discovered the challenges now in preparing for the TE TT). There was a lack of communication that we found at MTR when PM advised she did not have the baseline TT and RTA provided it. Perhaps also the TE team may wish to refer to the inappropriate values referred to in the LD baseline TT. Please review text to confirm this is accurately referred to in the TE report.	Changed paragraph on LD TT: The LD tracking tool was completed prior to CEO Endorsement and submitted to GEF on 10 Jun 2015 at time of CEO endorsement. However, there was a lack of communication, and the project manager advised at MTR that the TT baseline had not been received. It was then provided by RTA. The baseline therefore was not validated during the inception phase, and there was also no mid-term update of the LD TT. Also, the baseline values provided were not reliable, because most of the parameters to be measured according to the TT format, are not measured in Mongolia, or they don't apply to the Mongolian context. For example, the TT baseline provided a

			value for rangeland, and one for pastoral lands – it is not clear why and how these would be distinguished. The TE team discussed the TT with PIU and recommended to complete it with data that are meaningful and available in Mongolia, such as total area of rangelands (pasture land), reserve pasture, pasture land under rotational use. At the time of finalizing the TE report, PIU was working with ALAMGAC and Green Gold project to compile such data that are reliable and show changes generated by the project regarding land degradation.
	Page 31	In M&E discussion one omission appears to be mention that some baseline indicator values were not finalized until late in the project, when these were all scheduled to be finalized in year 1.	TE team has added a paragraph on the score card assessment. Otherwise, we refer to MTR comments on indicator baseline values.

		This should be captured and the TE team may want to elaborate on whether they consider this is a M&E design (e.g. indicators too data-intensive, poorly designed) and/or implementation (e.g. insufficient M&E budget, insufficient attention to M&E) issue	
	Page 32	Were project risks also accurately identified and reported in the annual PIR process?	Added paragraph referring to risk rating in PIR 2018
	Page 35	Results framework changes don't need to be approved by GEF, and none were provided to RTA who was informed PB decided not to endorse any changes. (as above)	Noted, and changed accordingly in the report
	Page 35	Reference on tracking tool does not match what is said earlier - earlier reference says that baseline was not done (incorrect).	Up-dated paragraph on TT
	Page 35	Were SESP matters adequately considered during PIR? What was the	Reviewed 2018 PIR and added relevant information

		rating during 2018 PIR - please add for completeness.	
	Page 39	Please report against targets achievement consistently. Some say HS, S and some say completed. Please add if they were achieved, e.g. achieved, partially achieved.	TE team followed TE guidance, ANNEX 5 : SAMPLE MATRIX FOR RATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES. And it was our understanding that the "End of Project Status" was to be assessed as "completed" (green), "expected to be completed by project end",(yellow) or "unlikely to be completed" (red). And that then based on these, the Rating HS, S etc. would be established for outcomes, objectives
	Page 43	Please QA that all baselines match the latest PIR as some were corrected/updated following MTR, e.g. 1.3, 2.3. Awareness wasn't measured by CD scorecard - please confirm. Note that for	Reviewed lastest PIR, and adjusted where appropriate. For 2.3., the PIR 2018 quotes the following baseline values: Khotgor mines $29,323, Bayan Airag mine $19,600, Khushuut mine $118,000). PM

		1.3 baseline is 3.43 m ha.	adviced these were not the correct baselines, but values provided by the companies as planned budgets, but eventually not approved by MET.
	Page 53	Recommendations: please assign a responsible party for each recommendation. Please number all recommendations.	Responsible parties assigned