UN-REDD PROGRAMME

National Programme
Submission Form – MONGOLIA

UN-REDD PROGRAMME TWELFTH
POLICY BOARD MEETING

7-9 July 2014
Lima, Peru

National Programme (NP)
Submission Form to the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board

1. Policy Board Submission	
Policy Board Meeting ☒ No. 12	Inter-sessional Meeting ☐
Date of Meeting: 7 - 9 July 2014	Date of Inter-sessional Decision:

2. National Programme Summary	
Details of National Programme	
Country	Mongolia
Programme[1] Title	Mongolia REDD+ Readiness Roadmap
Implementing Partner(s)[2]	Ministry of Environment and Green Development
Details of Participating UN Organizations' Representatives	
UN Resident Coordinator: *Name*: Ms. Sezin Sinanoglu	Contact details: *Telephone:* + 976-11-327585 *Email:* sezin.sinanoglu@one.un.org
FAO: *Name:* Mr. Sheikh Ahaduzzaman *Title:* Deputy Country Representative	Contact details: *Telephone:* +976-11-310248 *Email:* sheikh.Ahaduzzaman@fao.org
UNDP: *Name:* Mr. Thomas Eriksson *Title:* Deputy Resident Representative	Contact details: *Telephone:* + 976-11-327585 ext. 290 *Email:* Thomas.eriksson@undp.org
UNEP: *Name:* Mr. Thomas Enters *Title:* UNEP/UN-REDD Regional Coordinator	Contact details: *Telephone:* + 66-2-288-2126 *Email:* thomas.enters@unep.org
Type of National Programme	
Full NP: ☒ New Full NP ☐ Continuation from an Initial NP ☐ Other (explain)	Initial NP ☐ New Initial NP ☐ Continuation from previous funding ☐ Other (explain)

[1] *The term "programme" is used for projects, programmes and joint programmes.*
[2] *Refers to National counterparts. List the lead entity first.*

3. Executive Summary

As a signatory to both the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, in 1992) and the Kyoto Protocol (1997), Mongolia is fully aware of the causes and potential impacts of climate change. Mongolia is therefore striving to reduce its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions while maintaining its path of economic development.

The Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UNFCCC has taken a number of decisions to encourage developing country Parties to take forestry climate change mitigation actions. These measures relate to '*policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries'*, known as "REDD+". The COP decisions set out a process by which the voluntary actions of developing country Parties may be rewarded through results-based payments.

Although still largely a poor country, Mongolia has recently experienced rapid rates of economic growth due to growth in the exploitation of mineral resources. However, there is a risk that the benefits of this boom will be unequally distributed to all of Mongolia's people. Moreover, unless astutely managed, the growth may have negative impacts on the environment and the natural resource base. Compounding this, climate change threatens to reverse socio-economic advances. Recognizing these inter-related challenges, the Government has recently committed to a green development path, notably through the creation of the Ministry of Environment and Green Development and the preparation of the Green Development Concept and Mid-Term Programme. REDD+ has the potential to contribute to green development by protecting global environmental resources (forest carbon stocks and biodiversity), helping to reverse land degradation, promoting the improvement of rural livelihoods and aiding adaptation to climate change.

Mongolia's vast surface area includes approximately 13 million hectares of forest – an area roughly the size of Nepal. These forests can be categorised into two broad zones: northern boreal forests and southern Saxaul forests. The northern boreal forests cover approximately 10.9 million hectares, and are being lost at an annual rate of 0.74%, or just over 80,000 hectares. The southern Saxaul forests cover 1.9 million hectares, and are estimated to be lost at the alarming rate of 6.5% per year[3].

Mongolia is the first country with significant boreal forest cover to become a partner country of the United Nations collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation in developing countries (UN-REDD Programme). Mongolia has significant potential to reduce its forest carbon emissions, and enhance and sustainably manage its forest carbon stocks, through the implementation of REDD+ activities.

[3] These statistics are taken from *State of the World's Forests* (FAO, 2011), and are consistent with the figures provided in Mongolia's FAO Forest Regional Assessment report for 2010. The Government's figures in *State [of] Forest Land in Mongolia 2011* (Forestry Agency, 2011) report total forest cover as being much higher at 12.9 million hectares, of which boreal forest cover is 10.6 million hectares, and Saxaul 2.2 million hectares.

3. Executive Summary

Summary of Roadmap components

Mongolia became a partner country of the UN-REDD Programme in June 2011 and has quickly taken steps to start implementing REDD+ readiness activities. This Roadmap sets out how Mongolia will implement its REDD+ Readiness activities and develop a comprehensive National REDD+ Strategy in Phase 1 of REDD+. The Roadmap has six components.

Under Component 1, Mongolia will establish the management structure to manage the REDD+ Readiness process and to develop its National REDD+ Strategy. A multi-stakeholder National REDD+ Taskforce will be created, which will be supported by three Technical Working Groups providing guidance and coordination support. A National REDD+ Programme Unit will be established within government to provide day-to-day operational support. The Division of Forest Conservation and Reforestation Management of the Ministry of Environment and Green Development (MEGD) will be at the core of the management structure, and it will Chair of the National REDD+ Taskforce.

The Government of Mongolia will engage a broad range of non-government stakeholders in the REDD+ implementation process. To achieve this, a Civil Society Organisation/Local Community Forum will be established. The Forum will be a mechanism for stakeholder consultation and engagement both within the non-government sector, and between the non-government sector and government. The Forum will nominate representatives to sit on the National REDD+ Taskforce. Key local stakeholder groups that will be represented on the Forum include herder communities, Forest User Groups, civil society and private sector representatives.

A Consultation and Participation Plan will also be developed under Component 1. This Plan will address the need for public awareness raising on REDD+ and for educating key stakeholders on REDD+. Related to this, National Guidelines on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) will be developed and field-tested. A REDD+ Grievance Mechanism, in line with existing systems, will also be developed and field-tested.

Under Component 2, Mongolia will prepare its National REDD+ Strategy. The first task is to identify the major drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in Mongolia. These drivers are expected to be different from tropical countries – due to the different ecological characteristics of boreal forest and the different pressures on Mongolia's forest resources. A preliminary analysis of drivers, undertaken during the preparation of this Roadmap, tentatively identified the main drivers of deforestation and forest degradation to be: forest fires (many of which are caused by humans), legal and illegal logging (a combination of fuel wood gathering, collection of timber for livelihoods and commercial logging), pest invasion, tree diseases and the impacts of mining and mineral exploration.

Under this Component, the drivers will be analyzed and verified through detailed studies. Three priority drivers will be selected, and strategies to address them tested through demonstration activities. Part of the analysis under this Component will include an assessment of the legal and institutional framework for forest management, leading to recommendations for policy alignment and institutional arrangements for REDD+.

Component 2 also includes the process to identify and elaborate effective REDD+ strategies to address drivers. Preliminary strategies have been identified and include: strengthening forest management and governance; supporting research into improved forest management (e.g. to address problems related to fires, pests and diseases); reducing external pressures on forests; and raising awareness on forest protection and sustainable forest management.

Component 2 will also establish the implementation framework for REDD+, including a National REDD+ Fund and a Positive Incentive Distribution Plan. This will also include the Social and Environmental Safeguard Policy Framework.

3. Executive Summary
A range of demonstration and pilot REDD+ activities will be implemented under Component 2, all in accordance with FPIC principles and processes. These activities will generate lessons and provide feedback to the REDD+ development and implementation process. *Under Component 3*, Mongolia will establish its national forest Reference Emission Level and/or forest Reference Level (REL/RL), with sub-national forest RELs/RLs as potential interim measures. RELs/RLs will provide the benchmarks against which future forest carbon emissions reductions and removals will be measured. The emphasis of this Component will be the collection of data on historical land-use and the analysis of relevant national circumstances, as well as the development of specific capacities to further develop, pilot and implement RELs/RLs under a full National REDD+ Strategy. *Under Component 4*, Mongolia will develop a national forest monitoring system, comprising a monitoring function and a Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) function. The monitoring function will serve to assess whether REDD+ activities are results-based, while the MRV function will be used to assess and report on the mitigation performance of REDD+ activities to the UNFCCC. This component also develops the Safeguard Information System to share transparently information on how Mongolia is addressing and respecting the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards, and generating co-benefits and reducing risks.

4. National Programme Budget (UN-REDD Fund Source only)*					
Outcomes	**National Total ($)**	**Pass-through Funding Allocations**	**FAO ($)**	**UNDP ($)**	**UNEP ($)**
1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements Established	730,000			730,000	
1c. Improved stakeholder awareness and effective stakeholder engagement	430,000			50,000	380,000
2. National REDD+ strategy prepared	1,100,000			1,100,000	
3. Forest Reference Emissions Levels and Forest Reference Levels Developed	600,000		600,000		
4. National Forest Monitoring System and Safeguards Information System Developed	875,000		675,000		200,000
Sub-total	3,735,000		1,275,000	1,880,000	580,000
Indirect Support Costs	261,450		89,250	131,600	40,600
Grand Total ($)	**3,996,450**		**1,364,250**	**2,011,600**	**620,600**

NOTES:

- A breakdown of the budget allocations using the UNDG "harmonized input budget categories" must be provided to the UN-REDD Secretariat (for onward transmission to the Administrative Agent) with the signed NP document. Please see Annex 1.

- If requested and agreed to by the three participating UN Agencies and the Government, budget allocations per agency may be revised, as long as the total budget allocation is not changed.

5. Secretariat Review		
Submission Criteria		
(a)	Is the NP consistent with the UN-REDD Programme Strategy?	Yes ☐ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(b)	Has the UN Resident Coordinator been involved in submitting the NP?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(c)	Is documentation of the in-country validation meeting(s) included?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(d)	Did the validation include the national government counterpart (or designate)?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(e)	Did the validation include civil society/indigenous peoples' representation as per the UN-REDD Operational Guidance[4]?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(f)	Does the R-PP comply with the required format *(version 6, harmonized FCPF and UN-REDD format)*?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(g)	Does the NP comply with UN-REDD Rules of Procedure and relevant Operational Guidance?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(h)	Is the required budget allocation provided (see section 3 above)?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(i)	Are the Indirect Support Costs within the approved rate?	Yes ☒ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(j)	Is the Programme Summary completed? *(for posting on website)*	Yes ☒ No ☐ Unclear ☐
(k)	Is the Progress Report included? *(for supplementary funding only)*	Yes ☐ No ☒ Unclear ☐
If the answer is 'No' or 'Unclear' to any question, or further explanation is required, please provide here: At this stage Mongolia's Readiness Roadmap is presented with the executive summary and fund allocation information; the full and detailed NP will be prepared and submitted subsequently therefore (a) and (g) will be assessed subsequently to the submission of the NP. (k) is not applicable in the context of this submission.		

[4] In this context, the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways:
i. Self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements:
• selected through a participatory, consultative process
• having national coverage or networks
• previous experience working with the Government and UN system
• demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society/indigenous peoples organizations.
ii. Representative(s) who participated in a UN-REDD Programme scoping and/or formulation mission and sit(s) on a UN-REDD Programme consultative body established as a result of the mission.
iii. Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or indigenous peoples organizations (e.g., the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Programme Steering Committee)

5. Secretariat Review	
Review Issues	
(l)	Ownership of the NP by the government and non-government stakeholders

The requested fund allocation represents a proportion of Mongolia's Readiness Roadmap (MRR) and constitutes the UN-REDD Programme's contritbution to the implementation of the MRR Programme. The MRR itself is a government owned produced, government produced and government promoted roadmap. In that regard it is indeed the choice of the government to produce a readiness roadmap rather than an R-PP. It should be noted that the roadmap does cover all the elements of an R-PP and therefore is in compliance with the framework agreed by the Policy Board. Drawing on the information provided in the MRR and through the validation minutes, there are clear indications of strong government ownership.

Process-wise government ownership is demonstrated through (i) the positive response by the government of Mongolia to the invitation for submission of the NP; (ii) the leadership of the government in the preparation of its MRR; (iii) the lead role played by government during the validation meeting – hosting, organizing and facilitating.

Conceptually speaking government ownership is demonstrated as the MRR is aligned with a number of national strategies and development priorities, above and beyond government obligations vis a vis the UNFCCC. Those policies and processes include the National Development Strategy, the National Security Strategy and the Green Development Concept, carried nationally by the Ministry in charge of the MRR as well. These provide a strong indication of government ownership of the process and content of the MRR and NP by extrapolation. As indicated in the stakeholder engagement plan of the MRR and in the independent reviews it will be necessary to broaden the base of consulted groups of stakeholders beyond forestry. This is of particular importance as the MRR itself identified political support and will as the prevalent risk; opening up to other administrations and institutions, particularly those that are not directly involved in the forestry sector will be critical.

Ownership by other stakeholders within and outside of government is difficult to establish. The Minutes of the Validation Meeting provide for a basis to assume the MRR has been signed off on by the different institutions and stakeholder groups present there. The level of ownership and broad-base will only be firmed through implementation, in view of the novelty of REDD+ in the country, and of the need to properly inform and consult in order to build ownership. In this regard the NP is understandably heavy on the awareness raising elements under component 1, which is to be implemented through UNEP.
Overall, ownership can be established and confirmed at this stage, with room for improvement across stakeholders which would be addressed through implementation of the NP.

(m)	Level of consultation, participation and engagement

Based on the MRR and validation meeting, there have been a number of consultative processes and consulted parties during the preparation of the MRR; these have included focus groups, technical teams and mandated regional administrations. As flagged as well in the independent reviews, there is scope for strengthening this in particular by clarifying roles, contributions and impacts of different stakeholders on forest resources so as to engage them constructively and effectively. As the national strategy is being developed, drivers are more finely identified and analyzed and REDD+ actions fleshed out, stakeholder groups associated with these drivers and actions will be more easily established and a robust engagement process should be put in place. The connection between different outcomes of the MRR is clear, and warrants sequencing in implementing those activities to enable maximum benefit should be thoroughly considered during implementation.

5. Secretariat Review	
Review Issues	
(n)	Programme effectiveness, coherence with country strategies and other relevant initiatives, and cost-efficiency

As detailed in the MRR, the programme is in coherence with a number of national strategies notably those related to development and forest management. It is difficult to establish, through the MRR, if there are any contradictions or conflicts with other country strategies as is often the case when different strategies are carried forward by different government institutions – such as the conservation strategy as flagged by one of the independent reviewers. Overall there is a good basis for a satisfactory alignment.

On effectiveness and cost-efficiency, some elements of the NP seem to be high in comparison with the expected outcomes. There is a limited allocation for FPIC process, none for the establishment of a grievance mechanism, however a high allocation for awareness raising; it would be important to clarify if FPIC will be further financed through other resources and if not how it will be put in place; the same applies to a grievance mechanism. In the NP it would be important to provide justification and the rationale for not including support to a grievance mechanism.

As the full NP is being developed, it will be important to properly assess absorbtive capacity so as to ensure that the rush and pressure to deliver the large fund allocation during the short timeframe does not affect quality of implementation and products. A more realistic budget in view of the timeframe would be recommended, even if it implies reducing the scope and focus of the NP to a few strategic and catalytic elements.

From an effectiveness point of view, the level of ambition expressed in comparison with the budget allocation seems high, in particular for component 3, which does not seem to result in a preliminary or indicative RELs as a tangible outcome of that component. The level of funding for awareness raising is likely justified by the sheer size of the country and associated costs for engaging and consulting with stakeholders driving deforestation at different levels or that could be change agents with regards to identified REDD+ actions. However further information is as well required with regards to component 1 with a significant funding for awareness raising however lack of clarity of what goal is specifically pursued through this awareness raising. Building on lessons generated from previous national programmes and their evaluations, there are some incompressible costs and incompressible timeframes once implementation starts. For instance, startup time for the establishment of teams, recruitments, workplanning, further consultations and constitution of a board invariably require between 3 to 6 months with low levels of disbursement as these processes unfold. Similarly, most evaluations have indicated that NPs tend to be overambitious in their announced results; while this NP seems to have incorporated that lesson in terms of the articulation of expected results and outcomes from the NP, the budget associated with this realistic ambition remains on par with previous NPs. A finer analysis of cost implications for this reduced level of ambition would be recommended during NP scoping and preparation.

(o)	Management of risks and likelihood of success

Overall risks have been identified and assessed in the context of the MRR, primarily focusing on political will and likelihood of support across different REDD+ elements. This is an overarching and prevalent risk flagged across the components of the MRR and would require a serious discussion and assessment with government. Identifying the potential sources and reasons for such low buy in will be critical to address them and it is recommended to undertake such an assessment building on the ICA conducted in the course of preparation of the MRR.

The risk of undoing conservation and other environmental gains in view of the proposed strategy needs to be carefully assessed and relating the safeguards work to the REDD+ strategy – for instance by undertaking a

5. Secretariat Review
Review Issues
strategic environmental assessment of the REDD+ strategy would be recommended or at the least a thorough review of impacts of the proposed strategy, building on the risk assessment done herewith in the context of safeguards. The concentration of functions at Ministry of Environment and Green Development would bring coherence and facilitate implementation with no doubt. However this same concentration may result in the isolation of REDD+ efforts within that ministry as opposed to identifying the proper entry points and hooks within other ministries and administrations. Furthermore, this puts the REDD+ programme at risk should the current commitment to green development falter. In preparing the NPD and implementing it, every effort could be deployed – potentially under outcome 2. The overall MRR fleshes out its timeframe over 3 years, the same as for the NPD. However co-financing resources for achieving the results and outcomes are not clear and the UN-REDD Programme provides only a partial proportion of funds. It is important to clarify where the remaining funding will come from, how the lack of it would be remedied and to identify ways to focus the UN-REDD work in such a way that remains coherent if it were to be stand-alone and to lay durable foundations for other donors or the government to build on once additional funding is secured.
Other points: The MRR and associated NP seem to take a step-wise, gradual approach to readiness. Drawing from lessons and evaluations of other NPs supported through the UN-REDD Programme, this is welcomed as a wise approach. Detailing further the rationale for the choices made – e.g. in terms of focus, prioritization of support, and level of ambition, would be welcome as the NPD is prepared. Lastly, and the MRR clearly states the need for purposefully conducting awareness raising and stakeholder engagement, however taking this a step further for instance by identifying stakeholders based on their connection to the 5 REDD+ actions and drivers would be recommended.

6. Independent Technical Reviews		
(a)	Were independent technical reviews undertaken?	Yes ☒ No ☐

Three independent technical reviews were undertaken for the Mongolia submission, covering all the areas of the MRR as well as focused technical assessments. The full reviews have been made available, with recommendations provided by the reviewers. The section below provides a summary and highlights key elements of the reviews.

Synthesis of Independent Technical Reviews

Examination of the processes and the relevant documents leading to the production of the MRR, demonstrate a high degree of interest from the Government of Mongolia to actively pursue REDD+ activities outlined in the readiness proposal. The programme is consistent with the UN-REDD Programme Strategy and in compliance with the UN-REDD Programme Rules of Procedure and Operational Guidelines.

- Consultations have been implemented at various levels ranging from government agencies to local stakeholders where clear documentation has been carried out. Additional stakeholder consultations, not necessarily of new stakeholder groups but expanding participation of current stakeholder groups would be beneficial. Involving affected communities in the design phase of a policy change is essential for effectiveness of a programme. To avoid any confusion and delays in programme implementation related to this, it might be useful to conduct targeted focus group activities with a smaller audience to test messages both for public awareness and FPIC prior to full implementation of both. "Lack of stakeholder interest" may have to be made into a 'high risk'.
- Good strategy to determine and define deforestation drivers before 'strengthening sustainable forest management and productivity'. This is mainly as the illegal and legal timber trade can be targeted.

If new institutions are to be established, as proposed in the MRR framework, there must exist clearly defined roles and responsibilities to avoid monetary constraints, implementation delays, and low confidence of the Mongolian REDD+ framework . Moreover, it is not clear how the current institutional structure is positioned making observations difficult. While the Ministry of Environment and Green Development will take on 'most' of the roles, this could create an internal bottleneck relating to organizational and operational difficulties and adequate coordination of personnel will be required to ensure the institutionalization will in itself, not be the problem. While other risks exist, corruption has been documented to be a serious problem in the country and strengthening the framework of forest governance to include legality, verification and monitoring amongst agencies may prove challenging.

These local institutions (Aimag and Soum) are vital to forest management. The R-PP does not describe an adequate approach to build local authorities capacity to engage in the REDD+ process, improve land use planning, and/or promote greater accountability.

The R-PP's recommended approach does not give adequate accounting or weight to valuable ecosystems services such as biodiversity conservation and water resource integrity. For instance, the recommended management regime (Task Force) is heavily weighted towards entity most interested in forest production. To make certain accountability exists, this Task Force should include institutions and stakeholders concerned with issues such as protected areas management, water resources conservation, and biodiversity conservation.

Compared with other UN-REDD countries, the budget for Mongolia is the highest for Phase 1 activities, which is likely due to the remote locations of forest areas and the lack of national REDD plus experts. The MRR will need to reflect changes in the budget to include the proposals from the National Validation meeting in June 2014.There is no identification of financial commitment from the Government of Mongolia in the MRR.

6. Independent Technical Reviews

The support and budget for this activity could be underestimated and without establishing a robust framework of sustainable forest management, there is a risk of operational failure for the Mongolian REDD+ framework. It is important for supporting agencies to coordinate the needs and requirements to initiate the MRR such that funding gaps are addressed where development partner experience will play an important role to link domestic implementation to international requirements.

There is a need to increase the collaboration with multilateral initiatives such as the GIZ whom have the demonstrated expertise to assist with establishment and improvement of the national forestry system.

The key component for the development of the FRELs/FRLs will be a consistent methodology to ensure comparability with future FRELs/FRLs and transparency to ensure all stakeholders have access to the process and information used in the development of FRELs/FRLs.

The R-PP reflects insights of parties interested in expanding the consumptive use of forest resources. This includes implying that increased forest use will lead to increased forest health.

The R-PP's analysis and conclusions do not fully reflect national stakeholder expertise and concerns regarding ecosystems services such as biodiversity conservation and water resources. An indicator of this gap is a failure to accurately describe the current system of protected areas and resource use within these protected areas.

The R-PP fails to identify the role and impact of grazing patterns and structures and needs to be strengthened in that regard, including in the context of the preparation of the REDD+ strategy. Identifying potential conflictual policies, in particular with the conservation agenda of the country.

7. Secretariat Response

- ☐ Provide comments and request re-submission to a future Policy Board meeting
- ☐ Provide comments to be addressed before forwarding to the next immediate Policy Board meeting
- ☐ Forward to the Policy Board (with comments if necessary) with a recommendation to fund specific portions or phases (including an inception phase) of the NP
- ☒ Forward to the Policy Board (with comments if necessary) with a recommendation to fund the NP.

Explanation of Response:

The MRR is ambitious in view of the envisaged duration for its implementation however it is recognized that the sheer size of the country justify the high budget allocation in particular with respect to stakeholder engagement. It is recommended for PB's approval, with a recommendation for further and finer assessment of absorptive capacity to be undertaken in the course of preparation of the NPD.

8. Decision of the UN-REDD Policy Board

Decision of the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board:

- ☒ Full NP approved, as per budget allocation in Section 4
- ☐ Initial NP approved, as per budget allocation in Section 4
- ☐ Approved with a revised budget of $
- ☐ Approved with modification/condition
- ☐ Deferred/returned with comments for further consideration

Decision by the Policy Board:

The Policy Board approved **Mongolia**'s funding request of US$ 3,996,450 for its National Programme, and associated budget allocation, as per the submission form, taking into account the recommendations from the Policy Board, independent technical reviews, and the Secretariat. These recommendations should be included in the R-PP and National Programme document prior to the finalization.

Comments:

The Full NP funding is approved by the Policy board. Comments and recommendations of the secretariat are included in the present submission form together with summaries of the independent reviews. The full details and comments of the technical reviews have been communicated to the national counterparts and agencies to be taken into account during the preparation of the NPD.

Comments of the policy board included:

1 – The need to determine the most effective measures for fire risk management given that these could have a high prevalence and impact on the performance of the national programme and readiness more broadly.

2 – The necessity to include a broad set of stakeholders including nomadic populations in view of their role in pasture and rangeland management which has a bearing on forest lands.

3 – Recognizing the size of the country and multitude of stakeholders and interests, the identification of roles and influences on drivers to be candidly done.

4 – Additional emphasis to be placed on safeguards and ensuring that the conservation gains of Mongolia are not undone; the readiness process would be valuable in addressing land issues, defining interactions between pasture lands and forests, and enhancing the social aspect in relation to IPs and other forest dependent stakeholders.

8. Decision of the UN-REDD Policy Board

Waduwawatte L. Sumathipala
Chairman, National Science Foundation, Sri Lanka
Co-Chair, UN-REDD Programme Policy Board

Signature
Date: *09.10.2014*

Eduardo Rojas-Briales
Assistant Director-General, Forestry Department, FAO
Co-Chair, UN-REDD Programme Policy Board

Signature
Date: 8. 10. 2014

9. Administrative Agent Review

Action taken by the Administrative Agent: Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office, Bureau of Management, UNDP

☐ Programme consistent with provisions of the UN-REDD Programme MPTF Memorandum of Understanding and Standard Administrative Arrangements with donors.

Administrative Agent:
Yannick Glemarec, Executive Co-ordinator, Multi-Partner Trust Funds
Bureau of Management, United Nations Development Programme - MPTF Office

…… ……
Signature Date

Annex 1: Standard Joint Programme Budget

CATEGORY	ITEM DESCRIPTION	UNIT COST	NUMBER OF UNITS	AMOUNT**
1. Supplies, commodities, equipment and transport	1. Supplies, commodities, equipment and transport	1	1	1,150,000
2. Personnel (staff, consultants and travel)	2. Personnel (staff, consultants and travel)	1	1	870,000
3. Training of counterparts	3. Training of counterparts	1	1	750,000
4. Contracts	4. Contracts	1	1	650,000
5. Other direct costs	5. Other direct costs	1	1	315,000
Total Programme Costs				3,735,000
Indirect Support costs***				261,450
GRAND TOTAL**		1	1	3,996,450

**** The AA requires only completion of 'AMOUNT,' 'Total Programme Costs,' Indirect Support Costs,' and 'GRAND TOTAL.' The Steering Committee may require additional details which can be included in this budget.

*** Indirect support cost should be in line with the rate or range specified in the Fund TOR (or Joint Programme Document) and MOU and SAA for the particular JP. Indirect costs of the Participating Organizations recovered through programme support costs is 7%.

All other costs incurred by each Participating UN Organization in carrying out the activities for which it is responsible under the Fund will be recovered as direct costs, in accordance with the UN General Assembly resolution 62/209 (2008 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review principle of full cost recovery).

Note: This budget format needs to be submitted for each Participating Organization's budget allocation within a National Joint Programme, in addition to the total budget for the entire Joint Programme.