5. ANNEXES

Annex 1: List of persons interviewed / consulted

Individuals interviewed/consulted during the Mission			
Date	Position/Stakeholder	Name	Location
Briefing with PIU, UNDP CO, and GEF TRA at TE Commencement			
March 13	GEF RTA	Lisa Farroway	Ulaanbaatar
	UNDP CO	Khishigjargal Kharkhuu	
	UNDP CO M&E	Buyandelger Ulziikhuu	
	Project Manager	Erdenebayasgalan Ganjuurjav	
Stakeholder Meetings Ulaanbaatar			
March 21	Bayan Airag LLC, Environment Director	Dan Michaelsen	Ulaanbaatar
	Bayan Airag LL, Environmental Superintendent	Sarantuya M.	Ulaanbaatar
March 21	Khurel Erdene A.	Coordinator Zavkhan Aimag	Ulaanbaatar
March 22	Director, Dept. of Investment and Development, Zavkhan Aimag	Mr. Battsengel	Ulaanbaatar
March 22	Director, Env. And Tourism Department, Zavkhan Aimag	Mr. Munkhbat	Ulaanbaatar
March 22	Officer, Audit and Monitoring Department, MET	Mr. Batbayar	Ulaanbaatar
March 26	Head. Local Technical Committee, Zavkhan Aimag	Ms Lkhamsuren	Ulaanbaatar
March 26	Former Chairman, MECC (environmental NGOs umbrella organization)	Mr Damdinsuren	Ulaanbaatar
March 26	Senior Expert, MonEnCo LLC	Mr Ganbold	Ulaanbaatar
March 27	Senior Expert, Rangeland Management, SDC Green Gold Project	Ms Bulgamaa	Ulaanbaatar
March 27	Legal Expert, MET	Ms Sainbayar	Ulaanbaatar
March 27	Chief, Division of Cadastre on Forest, Water and Protected Areas	Mr Batzaya N	Ulaanbaatar
March 28	Director, Land Department, Zavkhan Aimag	Ms Erdenetsetseg	Ulaanbaatar
April 1	Director of Science, TNC	Mr Bayarjargal Y.	Ulaanbaatar
April 4	Meeting at UNDP CO Resident Representative's office	Ms Beate Trankmann (RR), Ms. Daniel*a* Gasparikova (DRR), Ms Erdenebayasgalan G.	Ulaanbaatar

		(PM), Mas Khishigjargal Kh. (CO), Mr Erdenebileg (PM ENSURE project)	
Khovd Aimag Center			
April 6	Head, Department of Environment and Tourism, Khovd Aimag	Mr. Batbayar	Khovd
April 6	Officer of Investment Department, Khovd Aimag	Mr. Baasankhuu	Khovd
Meeting with Darvi Soum Government Officers			
April 7	Khural Chair	Mr Erdenechuluun	Dariv Soum
	Soum Governor	Mr. Gantsooj	Dariv Soum
	Head of Administration	Mr Munkhjargal	Dariv Soum
	Land Officer	Mr Samdan	Dariv Soum
	Agricultural Officer	Ms Erdenechimeg	Dariv Soum
Meeting with local citizens, and members of CSO/Savings and Credit Union			Darvi Soum
April 7	TnC local coordinator	Ms Bayarmaa	
	Member	Molomjamts	
	Member	Batbayar	
	Member	Battsengel	
	Member	Norovbanzad	
	Member	Undral	
	Member	Saruul	
	Member	Nergui	
	Member	Dorjsuren	
	Member	Eregjiibuu	
	Member	Ganbaatar	
April 7	WWF Altai Sayan Field Office Manager	Ms Baigalmaa	Darvi Soum
April 8	Environmental Officers, MonEnCo LLC	Mr Enkh-Amar Mr Usukhbaya	Khushuut Mine
Meeting with Durvuljin Soum Vice Governor, and Government Officers			Durvuljin Soum
April 10	Vice Governor	Ms Lhkagvasuren	
	Environmental Inspector	Mr Batbileg	
	Financial Officer and Sustainable Development Council Member	Ms Ariuanaa	
	Social Worker/officer	Ms Narangua	
	Veterinarian	Mr Munkhbaatar	
	Agricultural Officer	Ms Urantsetseg	
	Officer in Charge of Implementation of Sustainable Development Plam	Ms Gantsetseg	
	Buural bagh governor	Mr. Alzahgui	

Meeting with citizens of Durvuljin Soum			Durvuljin Soum
April 10	Buga bagh	Tsogzolmaa	
	Tavan tolgoi bagh	Azjargal	
	Tavan tolgoi bagh	Ulaanaa	
	Onts bagh	Nina	
	Onts bagh	Batnasan	
	Buga bagh	Erdenetsetseg	
	Tsogt bagh	Chimedregzen	
	Tsogt bagh	Purevnyam	
	Tavan tolgoi bagh	Tserenbat	
	Onts bagh	Davaajargal	
April 10	Company Director , Seabuckthorne processing	B. Byambasuren	Durvuljin Soum
	Janchiv Group member	Mr Shinebayar	Durvuljin Soum
	Janchiv Cooperative Leader	Mr Batsaikhan/Yondon	Durvuljin Soum
April 11	Environment Department Officer Bayan Airag Exploration	Ms Erdene Tuvshin	Bayan Airag Mine
	Director, Environment, Bayan Airag Exploration	Mr Dan Michaelsen	Bayan Airag Mine
	Offset Officer, Bayan Airag Exploration	Ms Tungalag	Bayan Airag Offset Area
April 16	Head, Public Administration and Cooperation Department, ALMGAC	Mr Gankhuyag R	Ulaanbaatar
April 16	Officer in charge of Western Region, ALAMGAC	Mr Enk Erdene	Ulaanbaatar
April 16	Officer, cadastre registration of licenses and LPAs, MRPAM	Ms Otgonsuren	Ulaanbaatar

Annex 2: Evaluation Criteria Matrix

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
To what extent was project design relevant to national priorities? More Specifically, what was the contribution to: • Green Development Policy • Development of Mitigation Hierarchy/Offsetting as Priority to address Lad Degradation from Mining) • Safeguarding Key Biodiversity Areas	Consistency with national policies, strategies and action plans Active role of government agencies and their representatives in guiding project design and in planning, implementation and oversight of activities	Project inception report Project Document Minutes of meetings of Project Board National Policy Documents National database(s), cadastre on (local) protected areas	Document reviews Interviews Online research, verification
To what extend was project design relevant to regional (Western Aimags) priorities? Specifically its contribution to: • Landscape level planning strategies • Aimag Land Development Plans • Aimag level Green Development Strategies	Consistency with Aimag policies, strategies and action plans Active participation of Aimag government officers in planning, implementation and oversight of activities Newly developed or up-dated strategies and plans	Project Document Aimag Policy Documents, Development Strategies	Document reviews Interviews
To what extent was project design relevant to local priorities (Soum, Bag, rural citizens)? Specifically its contribution to: • Soum land development/strategy planning • Sustainable Land Management, and Livelihoods	Consistency with Soum Development Plans, Governors Action Plan. Newly developed or up-dated Soum Development strategies and plans, pasture land management plans PUG pasture land management plans, Rangeland Use Agreements, Allocation of customary tenure rights to PUGs	Soum Development plans, other planning documents. Project reports. ALAMGAC cadastre	Document reviews Interviews Group meetings

To what extent was the project relevant to GEF 5 Land Degradation Focal Area Objectives, specifically to: • Objective 3 Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape, and its outcomes 1 and 2	Consistency with GEF 5 Land Degradation Area Objectives and outcomes	GEF strategy documents, ?Tracking Tool	Document review Discussion with project team Review/confirmation with GEF RTA
To what extent was the project relevant to UNDP Strategic Objectives, namely to: • UNDAF outcome 7 - Increased sector capacity for sustainable resource management, with the participation of primary resource users • UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome – Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded. • UNDP Country Programme Outcomes – Introduction of a holistic approach to the planning, management and conservation of land, water and forest resources and biodiversity What lessons can be learnt from the project for future UNDP programming	Consistency with UNDP strategic objectives including UNDAF and UNDP Country Programme	UN Development Assistance Framework 2017 – 2021 Mongolia UNDP Country programme document for Mongolia (2017-2021) CO Mongolia representatives	Document Reviews Meetings
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected objective and outcomes ?			
Objective To reduce negative impacts of mining on rangelands in the western mountain and steppe region by incorporating mitigation hierarchy and offset for land degradation into the landscape level planning and management	Indicators in Results Framework	Project documents Mid-term Review Project annual reports Aimag land use plans Project outputs (draft law amendments, regulations, methodologies) Project team Stakeholders (government, private sector, NGOs, research institutions, communities/citizens)	Document reviews Interviews Group discussions Site visits

	Outcome 1 Land degradation mitigation and offset framework operationalised, through eco-regional land use planning and capacity development	Indicators in Results Framework	Project progress reports Project outputs (draft law amendments, regulations, methodologies) Project M&E documentation Minutes of meetings to submit policy documents Contractor reports (TNC), Ecoregional Assessments, Aimag and Soum plans/strategies Offset plans of mining companies.	Document reviews Interviews Group discussions Site visits
	Outcome 2 Land degradation mitigation and offsets applied through SLM within selected landscapes	Indicators in Results Framework	Project progress reports, mid term review report, M&E documentation. Pilot landscape reports. Soum development and or annual land/pasture management plans. Rangeland Use Agreements. PUH pasture land management plans.	Document reviews Interviews Group discussions Site visits
	How was risk and risk mitigation addressed in project implementation?	Risk factors that were identified and mitigated/managed Quality/Features/Applicability of Information System to foresee and address risks Success of risk recognition and reduction strategies	Project Reports Project management Stakeholders	Document review Discussions
	Lessons learnt and success factors regarding effectiveness that are applicable for similar projects and general programming ?		Project team UNDP Stakeholders Project reports Publications/presentations/media news	
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
	Were project objectives, outcomes and outputs generated according to the original **time frame**?	Timeliness of reports on achieved activities, outcomes, outputs	Progress reports Project team	Document reviews Interviews

	What **approaches** were used, and what was their success, in project **management and monitoring**? • How/was adaptive management applied? • How/was results based management applied? • How/was the results framework (log frame, work plans) applied?	Evidence of changes, adaptations in project design and management Adequacy of choices made considering time, costs, and other external factors and changing circumstances Quality of results-based reports, M&E reports, including measurements of indicators		
	Was **co-financing** realised, as planned, less or more?	Co-financing contributions as compared to committed	Completed Co-financing table Project reports Letters from co-financing agencies, and MET Project management	Document reviews Interviews
	Were **funds** used efficiently, and project implementation as planned with allocated funds ? (planned vs. actual)	Financial reports Expenditures for implementation (in comparison to similar projects, and in relation to available options/alternatives)	Financial reports, Procurement records Project reports Project management	Document reviews Interviews
	Were **accounting systems** and generation of **financial reports** efficient?	Financial reports and procedures	Financial/audit reports Project team	Document reviews Interviews
	Were implementation **arrangements, partnerships and synergies** efficient?	Achievement of objectives, outcomes and outputs as collaborative efforts Evidence, examples of collaborative mechanisms and institutions, collaboration with other projects Specific activities to establish such mechanisms	Project reports Stakeholders Project partners	Document reviews Interviews Field/site visits
	Was **in-country (national and local) capacity** utilized efficiently?	Tasks fulfilled by experts, contractors on all levels of project implementation	Project reports Planning documents Contracting/procurement documents Training reports Stakeholders Local government NGOs	Document reviews Interviews

	What are **lessons and success factors** for efficient implementation, for similar project design, and for general programming ?	Outstanding achievements in the face of limited time or funds, or other circumstances Achievements or overachievements compared to plans	Project reports Local planning documents Results framework Local government (Aimag and Soum level)	Document reviews Interviews Group discussions
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				
	What are financial risks to sustain project results? • Will project achievements in developing planning procedures, methodologies, guidelines be funded beyond project life? • Will established committees, regular public events etc. be continued with government funding? • Will mining companies allocate funds to continue to develop/implement/monitor offset plans, EMPs • Will central and local governments budget for continued capacity building in agencies for integrated land use planning, monitoring offsetting	Evidence that activities may not be funded beyond project life	Planning documents Budget planning information from local and central government Members of Local Coordinating Committees Mining Companies, and their planning documents	Document reviews Interviews
	Will the relevant bodies further facilitate adoption of legislation, regulation and methodologies developed with project support?	Status and commitments of submitting drafts to next level for approval	Minutes of meetings Project team Resource persons in ministry	Document reviews Interviews
	Will state owned enterprises implement offsetting? What options are there to enforce/incentivize offsetting with SOEs?	Financial and technical capacity Awareness, and willingness to comply	Project reports Representatives of SOEs Project management	Document reviews Interviews
	Will compliance of mining companies (private and state owned), be monitored and enforced? (capacity, political will) By government, NGOs/local CSOs?	Capacity of monitoring bodies Public awareness	Project reports Agency representatives NGO representatives	Document reviews Interviews
	Will offset principle be mainstreamed in public awareness?	Awareness of the issue, its significance in the public	Project documents Publications, news items	Document reviews Online search
	Will mitigation hierarchy and offsetting principle, regulations and methodology become required competency of contractors undertaking EIA, of relevant officers in government agencies, and relevant officers in companies? Have the principles and methodologies been included in any curricula?	Training manuals, guidelines, requirements for EIAs Relevant curricula	Training institutions Government agencies Project team Project documents	Document reviews Interviews

	Is a project exit strategy in place and embraced by stakeholders and partners, and is their capacity to implement it ?	Exit strategy – content, status of implementation, challenges to implement	Exit strategy, Project documents Local planning documents Stakeholders- local governments, mining companies	Document reviews Interviews
	Has trust and cooperation among stakeholders be strengthened to sustain project outcomes?	Strength of partnerships to continue effective collaboration	Stakeholder representatives Planning documents Project team, project documents	Document reviews Interviews Group discussions
	Have local capacities been developed to continue integrated planning approaches, access databases, continue SLM practices etc.?	Technical capacities Data base availability (online, other)	Planning documents Local line officers of government agencies User groups Project reports	Document reviews Interviews Group discussions
	What is the degree of project ownership at all levels?	Level of responsibility for project implementation, handover of responsibilities and roles Knowledge of issues and status of implementation in agencies and among experts of local governments	Project reports Local planning documents Agency representatives Local governments Local citizens	Document reviews Interviews Group discussions
	How well known has the project and its achievements and significance become publicly? Locally and nationally? What publications (print, broadcast, online) have been generated?	Publications (past) and current	Public media	Search online
	Have mechanisms for experience sharing and scaling up been planned?	Plans of events or mechanisms in place	Project documents Local stakeholders	Document reviews Interviews Group discussions
	Are there examples/cases of good practices developed with project support already being replicated?	Replicated activities, or activities building on project lessons, in neighboring areas, with other projects, within communities and local areas	Project documents Local resource persons Local planning documents	Document reviews Interviews Group discussions
	Have links been established with ENSURE project, and other projects to build on project achievements? What are the opportunities and challenges in this regard?	ENSURE project documents, and ongoing planning for implementation Experience sharing among staff, continuity of staff	ENSURE project document and management	Document review, Interview
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?				

	What impacts did the project have on reducing environmental stress? • Developing and implementing off set plans (measurable outcomes, as under effectiveness for outcomes) • Rehabilitating degraded areas (measurable outcomes, as under effectiveness for outcomes)	Eco Regional Assessments completed Integrated landscape plans completed (Aimag and Soum) Offset plans developed and implemented Local and state protected areas established and included in cadastre Capacity for integrated planning, offset planning and oversight	ERA reports Offset plans and reports Project reports Land management plans PA data base(s)	Document reviews Interviews Field visit
	What impacts did the project have on ecological status, through: • Strengthened legal and regulatory framework • Establishing/registering state and local protected areas (measurable data) • Establishing procedures for landscape level planning based on eco-regional assessments • Identifying Key Biodiversity Areas (measurable information) • Capacity development of stakeholders (measurable improvements) • Public awareness	Drafts of legislation and regulations Protected areas approved (local and state), and included in cadastre Protected areas recognised as land use category KBAs identified	Status of approval of drafts Number of newly approved state and local Pas Registration in cadastre of PAs Management plans for Pas Capacity development plans	Document reviews Interviews

Annex 3: Guiding Questions/Issues addressed in Semi-structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions

Main achievements of project

- On output/activity level
- On higher/outcome level
- Unexpected impacts/achievements
- Any objectives not achieved?, why not?
- Success factors for achieving objectives

Impacts

- On natural resources (rangeland) condition and management
- On conservation of landscapes, wildlife, other values, protected areas
- On Local livelihoods
- On Stakeholders capacities to address land degradation through mining
- Stakeholder cooperation (local government, communities, mining companies)
- Understanding, awareness of mitigation and offsetting principle
- Other impacts

Implementation Arrangements

- Best practices, lessons, recommendations
- Any delays occurred during the implementation
- Difference to other projects you know of or have been involved in
- Recommendations

Risk Management

- Challenges and barriers for implementation
- How were risks and risk mitigation addressed in the project implementation
- Threats and risks to achieve objectives

Best practices, Lessons Learnt to share

- Implementation arrangements
- Stakeholder cooperation
- Lessons for project design
- Policies

Sustainability

- What is your assessment of sustainability of achievements
- Success factors for sustainability
- Follow-up support needs to enhance sustainability

Follow-up and Scaling-up

- Mechanisms for scaling up
- If there was a follow-up project, what would it be?
- What project concepts emerged from this, if any?

Any other comments, suggestions, or questions to the evaluators

Questions/Issues addressed with Mining Company Representatives

General changes for your company through participation in project

- Eco regional assessment, mitigation hierarchy – what did it mean for your operations and planning, EMP, community relations?

Environmental Management Plan and Offset Plan

- What does it entail? How is it being implemented?
- Who is responsible for implementation and oversight?
- Changes to EMP planning

- Current status of EMP and offset plan (developed, submitted, approved)
- Budgeting for Offset plan

Processes, Impacts

- How did your company get involved in this project? And why?
- What are your experiences and recommendations?
- Will it be scalable in the sector?
- What impacts on local cooperation, engagement with local communities and local government do you see?
- What impacts on land use planning?
- Did you see difference in the capacity of local stakeholders in engaging with your company?
- Impacts in the company (capacity, attitudes, cooperation)

Capacity Building Needs

- What capacity building/training necessary for local stakeholders to engage with mining companies effectively?
- Capacity building needs/awareness raising in company staff?
- Relevance for competencies, job descriptions

Best practices, Lessons Learnt

- What are good experiences to share, scale up?
- Relevant to mining sector
- Relevant to community engagement

Sustainability

- Will achievements, activities, mechanisms initiated by the project be sustainable?
- What recommendations do you have regarding sustainable outcomes?
- Support needs/follow-up to enhance sustainability

Annex 4: List of documents reviewed, or consulted for guidance

- UNDAF 2017 – 2021, Mongolia
- UNDP Country Programme Action Plan
- Mongolia CPD 2017-2021
- UNDP Handbook for Monitoring and Evaluating for Results
- UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects
- GEF Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming
- GEF Project Information Form (PIF) and Log Frame Analysis
- Project document (ProDoc)
- Annual Work Plans
- Annual Project Reports
- Final Project Report (draft)
- Project Result Report (Mon 2019)
- Report on verifying project results and indicators (Mon 2019)
- Project Implementation Review
- GEF Operational Quarterly Reports
- GEF LTD tracking tool final
- Midterm Review Report (MTR), and Management response to MTE;
- Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
- Project budget and financial data
- Inception Report
- Project Board Meeting minutes
- Knowledge and legislation related drafts and products.

- Reports of training, workshop and knowledge assessment
- Scorecard report
- Project draft exit plan
- Training report on developing offset plan (Mon)
- Reducing land degradation and adverse impacts in Western Mongolia annual report 2018 UNDP, Green Gold
- TNC reports
- Bayan- Airag Mine Offset report 2018
- Khushuut Mine Offset report 2018
- Offset training report in Khushuut Mine site
- Soum Landscape Development Plans of Durvuljin and Dariv Soums
- Janchiv Cooperative Plan and Activity Report

Annex 5: Summary of field visits

The field mission April 6 – 13 **visited two of the three pilot sites**, Khovd Aimag, Dariv Soum, where Khushuut mine is located, and Zavkhan Aimag, Durvujlin Soum, where Bayan Airag mine is located. The field mission traveled from Ulaanbaatar to Khovd (April 6), Dariv Soum (April 7/8), Durvuljn Soum (April 10/11), Khovd (April 12) and returned to Ulaanbaatar April 13.

The field mission offered opportunities to meet with representatives of **all local stakeholders** of the pilot landscapes, including local government, local communities and private sector to obtain their views on project impacts and results, implementation, sustainability, success factors, lessons learnt and risks and opportunities for sustaining and scaling up achievements. The field mission also included site visits, to the actual **mining sites** and to the related **offset areas** with different SLM practices.

In the pilot landscape of **Dariv Soum**, the mission first visited the main offset area of MonEnCo mining company, the previously abandoned cropland area, now fenced and rehabilitated as part of the Offset/EMP plan of MonEnCo LLC. Proceeding to Dariv Soum, the mission joined an ongoing meeting among soum government land officer, MonEnCo representatives and users of the cropland/offset area. Further meetings were arranged for the mission.

The next day (April 7) the mission met with the Soum Governor, Khural Chair, Head of Soum Administration, and government officers. In the afternoon, the mission met with local citizens, and members of CSO/Savings and Credit Union. On April 8, the mission visited the mining site of Khushuut Mine (MonEnCo LLC), and met with the Environment Department of MonEnCo LLC to discuss the status of their Offset/EMP plan.

In the pilot landscape of **Durvuljin Soum**, the mission had extensive field visits and meetings, after arriving on the evening of April 9, when a brief initial meeting with the environment officer of Bayan Airag LLC was held. On April 10, the mission met with the vice governor and government officers in the morning, visited one of the offset areas (Khar But, wild seabuckthorne area) with the leader of Janchiv Cooperatove, visited the seabuckthorn processing facility and met the company director, before closing the day with a group meeting with citizens (women) of rural bags and the Soum center and the bag governor or Buural Bag.

April 11 started with a meeting with Environment Department of Bayan Airag Exploration LLC, a mining site visit, followed by a visit to the offset area in the rangelands (Janchiv PUG/cooperative area) and marmot re-introduction area, accompanied/lead by the offset officer. The day closed with a de-briefing and clarifications with the Environment Department of Bayan Airag Exploration. The mission traveled back to Khovd during April 11, and returned to Ulaanbaatar by air, by mid-day April 12.

Annex 6: TE mission schedule and itinerary

Date	Activity	Location/Travel
Document review, meetings with UNDP and PIU, meetings with stakeholders		
March 13	Contracting Commence document review	Ulaanbaatar
March 19	Meeting of TE team with UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RTA	Ulaanbaatar
March 21 – April 5	Meetings with Stakeholders Ongoing document review	Ulaanbaatar
Field Mission		
April 6	Meetings with Aimag Government officers Site visit to offset area of Khushuut mining company	Flight to Khovd
April 7	Meetings with Soum government officers Focus group meetings with local community members	Travel to Darvi Soum
April 8	Visit to mine site Meeting with Environmental Department of MonEnCo Site	Dariv Soum, mine site, Khokhmorit Soum
April 9	Travel, Meeting with Environmental Officer Bayan Airag Mine	Khukhmorit to Durvuljin Soum
April 10	Meeting with Durvuljin Soum Government officers Meeting with PUG/Cooperative leader and his household Visit to Khar But Seabuckthorne area Visit to Seabuckthorne processing facility Meetings with local citizens, herders, bag governor	Durvuljin Soum
April 11	Meeting with director and officer of Environmental Department Bayan Airag Mine Visit to Bayan Airag mine, Visit to offset area, with offset officer of Bayan Airag Mine	Durvuljin Soum
April 12	Travel to Khovd Aimag Center	Durvuljin, Khovd
April 13	Flight to Ulaanbaatar	Khovd, Ulaanbaatar

Preliminary Evaluation of Field Findings, Debriefing, Stakeholder meetings, Presentation		
April 14 - 18	Document Review, Meetings	Ulaanbaatar
April 19	Presentation of Preliminary Findings in the project closing workshop	Ulaanbaatar
April 20 – May 12	Review/evaluation of documents and information, as they become available preparing draft TE report	
May 12, 2019	Submission of draft report	

Annex 7 – Co-financing Table

Summary of Co-financing – UNDP managed funds and partner managed resources as committed and as reported by the partners								
Co-financing (type/source)	**UNDP own financing (mill. US$)**		**Government (mill. US$)**		**Partner Agency (mill. US$)**		**Total (mill. US$)**	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	850,000	850,000					850,000	850,000
Loans Concessions								
In-kind support			3,900,000 MET and MoM	8,100,000 MET	150.000 TNC 50.000 MNMA 80.000 WWF	150.000 TNC 50.000 MNMA WWF 465.000	5,280.000	8,765,000
Other								
Totals	850.000	850,000	4,150.000	8,100.000	280. 000	665.000	5,280.000	9,615.000

Annex 8 – M&E Activities

8.1. M&E Plan – Activities and Budget Allocations as per Project Design

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ (excluding project team staff time)	Time frame
Inception Workshop (IW)	PMU UNDP CO UNDP HQ	4,000	Within first two months of project start up
Inception Report	PMU UNDP CO	Included in the workshop budget	Immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Outcome Indicators	PMU will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. Includes subcontracted awareness assessments at start and end of project	Indicative cost 21,000	Start, mid and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	Oversight by UNDP CO/GEF Regional Technical Advisor and Project Director. Measurements by national implementing agencies at central and local levels	Indicative cost 8,000	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans ($2,000 / year)
APR and PIR	PMU UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF	None	Annually
CDRs	PMU	None	Quarterly
Project Board meetings	PMU UNDP CO	8,000	Following Project IW and subsequently at least once a year
Project Technical Committee Meetings	PMU UNDP CO	8,000	At least twice a year during project duration
Periodic status reports	PMU	3,000	To be determined by the PMU and UNDP CO
Technical reports	PMU Hired consultants as needed	Tbd	To be determined by the PMU and UNDP-CO
Mid-Term Review	PMU UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor External Reviewers (i.e. international/ national consultants)	30,000	Two years after project implementation (project mid-point).
Terminal Evaluation	PMU UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor External Evaluators (i.e. international/ national consultants)	25,000	At the end of project implementation

Terminal Report	PMU UNDP-CO	None	At least one month before the end of the project
Lessons learned / Knowledge Management	PMU UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc)	15,000	Annually: – Y1 $1000; Y2 $4000; Y3 $5000; Y4 $5,000
Audit	UNDP-CO Project team	5,000	Annual financial audit by independent Audit Company and through UNDP CO
Visits to field sites	UNDP Country Office		As and when

8.2. Implementation of M&E Activities and Fund Allocations by Activity (table provided by PMU)

№	Report	Date	Responsible Party	Sent to	Budget
1	PIR monitoring	August of 2016	PIU	Regional office and UNDP, CO	-
2	QPR monitoring	December of 2016	PIU	UNDP, CO	-
3	Inception report	December, 2016	PIU	UNDP, CO	-
4	Annual report-Monitoring	December, 2016	PIU	Secretariat of Governmental Cabinet	-
5	Independent Audit	March, 2017	Ulaanbaatar audit LLC	UNDP, CO	2500 USD
6	PIR monitoring	June, 2017	PIU	Regional office and UNDP, CO	-
7	Spot check	2017 Zavkhan	PIU Board Meeting was organized in Zavkhan	UNDP, CO	5000 USD
8	Midterm review	December , 2017	PIU, UNDP CO	Regional office	7500 USD
9	Annual report-Monitoring	December, 2017	PIU	Secretariat of Governmental Cabinet	
10	Independent Audit	March, 2018	Sevilla and Growth consortium	UNDP, CO	2500 USD
11	Audit and Monitoring	2018	PIU, MET	UNDP, CO	-
12	Spot check	2018 Uvs, Khovd	MET	UNDP, CO	2500 USD
13	PIR monitoring	June, 2018	PIU	Regional office and UNDP, CO	-
14	Annual report-Monitoring	December, 2016	PIU	Secretariat of Governmental Cabinet	-
15	Terminal evaluation	ongoing	TE- team	Regional office	20 000 USD
16	Total	Roles and responsibilities made clear. All audit and monitoring reports were sent to responsible parties. Comments and suggestions reflected in further project activities as well as in project management direction.			Project budget 37 500 USD + 2500 USD from MET

Annex 9: Capacity Development Scorecard Results

The baseline knowledge level of the pastoral communities were identified as not adequate by 0%, thus, it was concluded that, the level of understanding of pastoral communities have increased by average 50%, throughout the project implementation years in 2017 and 2018.

*Explanation (**√**)- Have understanding (-)- No understanding at all*

Provincial level						
Year	Zavkhan, Uliastai		Uvs, Ulaangom		Khovd, Jargalant	
	√	-	√	-	√	-
2015	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2017	55%	45%	54%	46%	45%	55%
2018	54%	46%	56%	44%	48%	52%

Soum level						
Year	Zavkhan, Durvuljin		Uvs, Bukhmurun		Khovd, Darvi	
	√	-	√	-	√	-
2015	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2017	55%	45%	46%	56%	32%	68%
2018	58%	42%	54%	46%	33%	67%

Annex 10

1. EMP Budgets of Participating Mining Companies by Project Year (Mio. MNT)

Bayan Airag Mine				
2015	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**
135.9	132.2	137,3	137.5	196,0
Khushuut Mine				
2015	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**
349.7	396.2	401.1	1,424.5	434.0
Увс, Khotgor Mine				
2015	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**
7.4	7.2	13.0	8.4	53.6

2. Details on Exploration License in Durvuljiin Soum

The exploration license in Durvuljin Soum which overlaps with the selected offsetting area of Bayan Airag Exploration LLC and the pasture contracted by the Soum Governor for management

by Janchiv Cooperative is: (Xalzan Xoshuu, 2880.72 ha. ID 14381, Code: XV-014381, Holder: SDDG - Shin Dong Design Group).

3. Information on publications produced by the PIU, and by TNC

Brochures and handouts published and distributed by the project

#	Name of the brochure/handouts		Copies
1	Khovd aimag GDP	handbook	500
2	Introduction on offset measurement	handout	5000
3	Project introduction	brochure	5000
4	Translation of Guidelines on land degradation mitigation	Handout	1000
5	Mining rehabilitation	Handout	1000
6	Offset measurement	Handout	1000
7	Translation of mining rehabilitation	Handout	500
8	Environmental law	compendium	500
9	Sustainable land management	handout	1000
10	Land degradation	handout	1000
11	Offset	Handout	1000
12	ALAMGAC	Handout	800
	Total		**18.300**

TNC brochures and handouts

	Name	Number of copies
1	Manual on ArcGIS and QGIS and offset calculation programm	100
2	Planning mining with less environmental impact and participation of local people	100
3	Poster of PA and mining licenses area in 5 aimags of western region (by aimag wise)	100
4	Offset measurement handout	100

10.4. Memorandum of Understanding between Aimag Government, participating mining companies and Local (Soum Governments)

Provided here is the example of Zavkhan Aimag. All MoUs had the same content.

БАЙГАЛЬ ОРЧИН,
АЯЛАЛ ЖУУЛЧЛАЛЫН ЯАМ

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Bayan Airag Exploration LLC holds the mining concession for Bayan Airag mine in Zavkhan aimag, Western Mongolia. Though our environmental and CSR programs, we are committed to contribute to sustainable development though our mining activities, by contributing to the economy whilst mitigating and offsetting our impacts on the natural environment and local communities.

In response to your invitation in November 2014 we hereby express our intention to become a collaborating partner in the above-named project, as the responsible party for the mitigation and offset programme for the Bayan Airag mine.

Brief description of the Project

The project is financed by a US$1.289M grant from the Global Environment Facility. It is expected to be implemented from the second quarter of 2015, for a period of 4 years. The project aims to reduce negative impacts of mining on rangelands in the western mountain and steppe region by incorporating mitigation hierarchy and offset for land degradation into the landscape level planning and management. The project will pilot best practice application of mitigation hierarchy and land degradation offset mechanisms in pilot landscapes by selected mining companies in close cooperation with Local Government and communities. The overall aim is to conserve and enhance ecosystem services and functions, including pastureland, water quality and quantity, and biodiversity. The Bayan Airag mining landscape has been proposed as one of the pilot sites.

Principles of Cooperation

The project will trial innovative approaches and apply international best practices to mitigation and land degradation offsetting, particularly through participatory and ecosystem-based approaches. Whilst the existing regulatory framework sets the minimum standards, the project

will explore whether better outcomes can be secured by new ways of working, within the financial capacity of each partner company. Any measures and financial or resources commitment proposed by the company that go beyond minimum legal requirement will be voluntary. There is no obligation on the company to take these measures.

The project contribution at Zavkhan aimag will be as follows:

1) Establishment of a multi-stakeholders Local Coordination Committee to advise and support implementation
2) Facilitating dialogues between the mining companies and local communities, herder associations local NGOs etc., to promote community-based participation of local stakeholders in the mitigation and offset programs
3) Technical support, including:
   a. Capacity building on international best practices and Mongolian regulatory framework;
   b. Reviews of impacts and mitigation measures, including specific advice and support on rehabilitation/restoration of degraded lands;
   c. Identification of high-priority conservation areas in the landscape;
   d. Determination of residual impacts, offset criteria, offset opportunities and potential activities based on the eco-regional and local assessment;
   e. Detailed quantification of sustainable land management and biodiversity gains for preferred offset sites;
   f. Monitoring and evaluation

4) Facilitation of formal offset agreement between mining companies and local Government, as well as collection and reinvestment of offset funds
5) Setting-up implementation plans for mitigation and offsetting, including institutional arrangements and a monitoring and evaluation system
6) Free sharing of environmental information collected by the project
7) Sharing of experiences with other pilot sites
8) Publicizing results of the project, with acknowledgments to all partners, in local, national and international media

The contributions from Bayan Airag will include:

1) Commitment to the objectives of the “Land Degradation Mitigation and Offset in Western Mongolia” project
2) Agreement to be the responsible party in project activities for mitigation and offset for 71.8 hectares of land that will remain as residual impact after mine completion.
3) Active participation in the Local Coordination Committee for the project through as named focal point
4) Integration of the fundamental concept of the mitigation hierarchy thoughtout the life of mine, including in baseline assessments, mine planning, mine operation and expansion projects, mine closure and rehabilitation and in all environmental and social management programs.
5) Financial allocation for mitigation and offsetting as specified in our Environment Management Plan (EMP). We agree that this sum can be considered as co-financing for the project. The mechanisms and purposes for disbursement of those funds that are additional to that specified in our EMP will be ours alone, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Local Coordination Committee.

6. Sharing of environmental information and reports gathered by the company and Ensuring involvement of communities in monitoring and implementation of Environmental Management Plan of mining company that integrated efficient measures,
7. Implementing model project for land degradation offsetting in western region successfully,
8. Contribution of staff resources, within our capacity, to implementation of the project objectives and with the related communities.
9. Publicizing the aims and results of the project internally within the company, and externally.

The contributions from Local Government will include:

1. Commitment to the objectives of the "Land Degradation Mitigation and Offset in Western Mongolia" project
2. Implementing model project for land degradation offsetting in western region successfully

4. Local Technical Committees in the three project Aimags

Orders on Establishing Technical Committees, and Lists of Committee Members

Order by the state secretary of MET on establishing

PROJECT TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

The project National director – Environment and Natural Resource management department director of MET

Project technical committee consists of the following experts and individuals:

- Senior officer of National committee on reducing air pollution in MET
- Senior officer of Mining department in Ministry of Mining
- Environmental Inspector of National Inspection Agency
- Director of Land management department of ALAMGAC
- Science director of TNC
- Field manager of Altai Sayan program of WWF
- Professor of school of Biology at the National State University
- Senior teacher of Livestock and Biotechnology school at National Agriculture University
- Head of research team of Green Gold project

All three Aimags established a Local Technical Committee. Reflected here is the membership of the Zavkhan Aimag committee, as per the order by Zavkhan aimag governor on establishing Technical committee

- Head of aimag government administration
- Secretary of Aimag Citizen Representative Khural

- Expert in Aimag government in charge of Environment, Tourism and Mining of Development and Policy department
- Director of Environment and Tourism department
- Director of Land management and construction department
- Director of Khyargas lake and Zavkhan river basin administration
- Inspector in charge of mining at the Inspection Agency
- Durvuljin soum governor
- Environmental Inspector of Durvuljin soum
- Senior expert of Bayan-Airag Exploration LLC
- Director of Monitoring committee of Otgon Bor Khavtsal NGO
- Research and Biologist of Otgon bor Khavtsal NGO
- Expert in charge of rehabilitation in Environment and Tourism department
- Expert of Environmental and Tourism department
- Inspector in charge of mining at the Inspection Agency
- Environmental Inspector of Bukhmurun soum
- Directors in charge of local community/area in the mining companies
- Head of Gulgat Initiative NGO

5. Mitigation Hierarchy

Potential negative impacts of mining projects are mitigated in the following phases:

Avoidance: the first step of the mitigation hierarchy comprises measures taken to avoid creating impacts from the outset.

Minimization: measures taken to reduce the duration, intensity and/or extent of impacts that cannot be completely avoided.

Restoration/Rehabilitation: measures taken to improve degraded or removed ecosystems following exposure to impacts that cannot be completely avoided or minimized.

Offset: measures taken to compensate for any residual, adverse impacts after full implementation of the previous three steps of the mitigation hierarchy.

Source: Factsheet by UNDP CO on project "Land Degradation Offset and Mitigation in Western Mongolia."

Annex 11: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[1]

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: __Sabine Schmidt_____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant)**:** _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *Ulaanbaatar* on March 13, 2019

Signature: ___ Sabine Schmidt _____

[11] www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[1]

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Yansanjav Narangerel

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): Independent evaluator

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date* *Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia on March 2019*

Signature: _____

Annex 12: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____