

(Including final supervision)

| |
|----------------|
| Data populated |
| Data Entry |

Project Information:

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------|
| <i>Region:</i> ASIA | <i>Country:</i> Mongolia | <i>Sector:</i> X - Other (For Non-Investment Projects) | |
| <i>Business Line:</i> Environment and Social Sustainability | <i>Business Line sub-area(s):</i> Biodiversity and Sustainable Natural Resource Management: Nature-based products and services: (100%); | | |
| <i>Primary (Originating) Dept/Division:</i> CESBD - Environment & Social Development/Bio-diversity | <i>Implementing Dept/Division:</i> | | |
| <i>Client Name:</i> Taimen Conserva (513833) | <i>Project/Transaction Leader:</i> Juan Jose Dada | | |
| <i>Project ID:</i> 503476 | <i>Project Short Name:</i> BDGEF Mong. EgUr | <i>Project Long Name:</i> Mongolia: Conservation of the Eg-Uur Watershed | |
| <i>Original Approval Date:</i> Mar. 7, 2007 | <i>Total Funding:</i> 0 | <i>Actual Project Duration:</i> 64 months | |
| | Original (i) | Revised (i) | Actual (i) |
| Project Implementation Start | Apr. 14, 2003 | Jul. 29, 1999 | Jul. 29, 2003 |
| Project Completion | Apr. 14, 2008 | Oct. 22, 2008 | Oct. 22, 2008 |

| <i>Relationship to IFC Project(s)</i> | <i>Relationship Type</i> | <i>Project ID</i> | <i>Project Long Name</i> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| IFC TAAS Project | None | | |
| IFC Investment Project | None | | |
| <i>Recipients</i> SME Company | <i>Beneficiaries</i> SME Company | | |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Objective | Original (Mar 07, 2007) - See Project Document. Block IV, page 10. Most recent update - N/A |
|------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Key Highlights (i) <i>Summarize key project highlights</i> | <p>Entire Project:</p> <p>(1) The project achieved its main goal of advancing integrated watershed management in the Eg-Uur Watershed and conservation of the taimen salmon (<i>Hucho taimen</i>) in particular. In contrast to other areas in Mongolia, the taimen population is stable and robust in the Eg-Uur at the close of the project.</p> <p>(2) The project completed the first integrated scientific assessment in the world of the taimen in its native habitat.</p> <p>(3) The project spurred the development of watershed management plans and councils, which raised awareness of importance of biodiversity conservation in local communities, and improved the enabling environment for nature based tourism in the project environment.</p> <p>(4) Patrolling by rangers was strengthened throughout the Eg-Uur Watershed Area (EUWA).</p> <p>(5) A widescale environmental education program was implemented through Ecoclubs in local schools and working with the local Buddhist community to build environmental stewardship.</p> <p>(6) After encountering roadblocks on developing a concession based approach to benefit local communities, the project pioneered the application of a user rights cooperative approach (Nokhorlol) to monetize the benefits of an eco-tourism activity based on sportive fly-fishing.</p> |
| | Reporting period since last supervision: 3 months |

Lessons Learned:

| Delete Row (i) | Lesson Area (i) | Comments and Suggestions (e.g. What worked well? What would you have done differently?) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Additional Lessons Learned Row |
|----------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Design/planning | The project design was overly ambitious with its plan to implement a concession system to monetize the tourism resource. However, the importance of flexibility and adaptive management paid off after the project team encountered resistance in the national legislature to the use of a concession system for freshwater fisheries management. The team then decided to take advantage of existing regulations for community user rights systems and adapted this to fishery management. |
| | Pricing | This is not applicable to this conservation project as designed. |
| | Implementation/delivery | IFC signed a grant agreement with a local NGO, the Taimen Conservation Fund (TCF), to deliver the project. TCF was in fact also the client here. The project team worked closely with a large number of local, district and provincial government officials. While time intensive, this approach was particularly effective in establishing a coordinated approach to enforcement against poaching and in establishing watershed management plans and councils. The latter was important in fending off pressure for mining licenses in the EUWA, which could have threatened biodiversity conservation. |
| | Development Results | The project did not fully realize its development results due to delays in establishing the user rights system and delays on the part of private sector partners in signing the three party contract with the local community and district governor. On the other hand, the impact of the project on national conservation policy may in the long run still contribute to the sustainability of nature tourism in Mongolia and have a longer term development impact through this unexpected channel because it constitutes a better compromise with national laws and culture. |
| | Project team | There was a high turnover in the IFC project team, with 4 different task managers. The TCF project team had strong and consistent leadership with a single executive director throughout the project who worked well with conservation agencies, local governments and the sport fishing partners. |
| | Consultant work | The project benefitted from an independent mid-term review which emphasized the need to more sharply focus the project and reworked the logframe to make it more relevant for project management. There was also an effective management |

| Delete Row (i) | Lesson Area (i) | Comments and Suggestions (e.g. What worked well? What would you have done differently?) | <input type="checkbox"/> Add Additional Lessons Learned Row |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | | mission 7 months before the end of the project which focused the project staff on finishing strongly with an emphasis on replicability and sustainability. | |
| | Client commitment/satisfaction | The client was strongly committed to successful completion of the project and expressed appreciation to IFC for its support. Two issues were raised by the client in final discussions: (1) turnover in IFC staff reduced the effectiveness of supervision, (2) TCF would have benefitted from stronger involvement of the local IFC office. Details on both points however were not obtained and it is unclear what exactly would have been ideally needed. | |
| | Funding leverage | The project generated considerable co-financing from the private sector partners. | |
| | Experience with replicating | The project shows strong sustainability and replication potential. TCF will continue to operate after the project with a five year, \$400,000 grant from the Boroo Mining Company, a Canadian-Mongolian joint venture. TCF will continue to run activities in the Eg-Uur Watershed, and at least one additional watershed with a narrower focus on (1) management oriented science and (2) engagement of local communities in resource protection. The science camp will remain open with base funding from TCF. The science team from the University of Wisconsin and University of Nevada - Reno is pursuing other sources of funding to continue their research on taimen habitat and conservation. The Watershed Management Councils will continue to operate at the provincial level, with some district activity as well. Of the 17 rangers trained and employed by TCF in the past, at least 9 will be picked up on local government budgets for permanent positions. | |
| | Link with IFC Investment | There was no attempt to link the project directly to IFC investment because the private sector partners were already well capitalized and tourism was not a priority sector for the country office. | |

Follow up opportunities:

| | TAAS | Investment |
|---|---|------------|
| Are there new business development or replication opportunities? | Yes | No |
| <i>If yes,</i> 1. Describe opportunity | The client has requested additional IFC/GEF funding to continue the work of TCF in other watersheds. | |
| 2. Recommended follow up action | At this point, additional investment from IFC is not warranted since the private sector has agreed to support TCF activities for the next three years. There are however very valuable lessons learned from this project to replicate on all other eco-tourism projects with regard to concessions, users rights and value creation. These lessons can be used in a number of ESS AS products (eco-standards, sustainable forestry) but also in BEE and VA2F. | |

Summary of Supervision Performance Ratings:

| Performance Category (i) | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|----------|---------|
| Supervision Reporting Period | Development Results | Financial | Timeline | Overall |
| | | | | |



| Performance Category (i) | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Supervision Reporting Period | Development Results | Financial | Timeline | Overall |
| #1[As of Jun. 30, 2007] | | A - On or Under Budget | C - Significantly Delayed | B - Some Areas of Underperformance |
| | Rationale for overall performance rating assigned Indicators for assessing of development results are quite not measurable. These are being updated and will be reflected in a new logframe. This performance rating is based on the results of mid term review of December 2006 | | | |
| #2[As of Dec. 31, 2007] | | A - On or Under Budget | B - Slightly Delayed | B - Some Areas of Underperformance |
| | Rationale for overall performance rating assigned This performance review is based on revised logframe and a supervision mission in September 2007. | | | |
| #3[As of Jun. 30, 2008] | | A - On or Under Budget | B - Slightly Delayed | B - Some Areas of Underperformance |
| | Rationale for overall performance rating assigned This rating was based on the most recent progress report (March 2008). The project has made good progress in encouraging the development and application of natural resource management plans for 8 districts, strengthening development of collaborative management, improving the enforcement system, and encouraging a national dialogue on user rights systems for local communities. It has also generated some of the fundamental scientific information to define sustainable production and practical management of the fishery. It has not been able to create the legal basis for community-based concession systems which are important for the rapid replication of improved management practices. The project still needs to solidify the benefits of revenue sharing aspects of the user rights system and to complete a plan for encouraging sustainability of regional conservation activities after the project ends. | | | |
| #4 [As of Oct. 22, 2008] | B - Slightly Below Current Targets | A - On or Under Budget | B - Slightly Delayed | B - Some Areas of Underperformance |
| | Rationale for overall performance rating assigned A closing workshop held on September 5 reviewed the various activities and accomplishments of the project. Among those attending the workshop were scientists from the Ministry of Nature and Environment and Institute of Ecology, TCF staff, representatives from WWF, UNDP, the Asia Foundation, several district governors and other local government representatives, and participants from the tourism industry. The overall responses from the presentations and audience comments during the workshop were quite positive about the success of the project in achieving conservation of the taimen habitat and population, impacting national environmental policy, and creating a new model for working with local communities. As the project period ended, TCF received a grant from a mining company to continue its science, conservation, and community benefit sharing work in the Eg-Uur and other watersheds.. | | | |

Development Effectiveness:

| | Highly Unsuccessful | Unsuccessful | Mostly Unsuccessful | Mostly Successful | Successful | Highly Successful | Not Applicable |
|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Development Effectiveness- Synthesis Rating (Based on criterion 1-5) (i) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Rationale | The project was mostly successful in achieving its goals. It demonstrated a means for the sport fishing industry to work with local communities in conserving the natural resources necessary for nature based tourism. The project had a documented positive impact on conservation of the taimen fishery and its ecosystem. The project also has strong indications of sustainability and replication with the activities of the Taimen Conservation Fund continuing past the end of the project. | | | | | | |

| | Unsatisfactory | Partly Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Excellent | Not Yet Achieved |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Strategic Relevance (i) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| Rationale | The project addressed a market failure – poorly defined property rights for a fresh water fishery. It also responded to Mongolia’s national emphasis on tourism development as an | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | engine of economic growth. Both issues were successfully addressed by the client. | | | | |
| 2. Output Achievement (i) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Rationale | The project achieved its key deliverables at a satisfactory level. Natural resource management plans were developed for the various districts in the project area. In addition, a sustainable resource use plan was developed for a local community in the core project area. This was confirmed from client reports and interviews with stakeholders. | | | | |
| 3. Outcome Achievement (i) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Rationale | The level of achievement of the key outcome – a working user rights system – was at a satisfactory level, with additional testing planned post-project by the client in several areas. In addition, a national catch and release policy for taimen was adopted by the Ministry of Nature and Environment. This rating was based on presentations at a closing workshop and interviews with several stakeholders. | | | | |
| 4. Impact Achievement (i) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Rationale | The most important impact of the project was the conservation of the taimen fishery in the Eg-Uur Watershed. This was confirmed by extensive monitoring data carried out by the science team of the project. The counterfactual was what happened in other watersheds where healthy taimen populations were known to exist at the start of the project. While this project did not monitor in those rivers, national fishery agency personnel and members of the sport fishing industry reported that there were significant declines in fish catches in the other rivers, in contrast to what happened in the Eg-Uur during the same time period (2003-2008). The obtention of a national system by which local communities can derive benefits from tourism is however not 100% clear. | | | | |
| 5. Efficiency (i) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| Rationale | The project was very cost-effective. With a rather small staff, TCF was able to develop watershed management plans, pioneer a new user rights system, expand the enforcement system, change national fishery policy, and attract sustainable finance to keep the conservation activities going after the project. There was no formal assessment of the economic benefits generated by these activities and hence, no cost-benefit analysis, but the resulting health ecosystem for the taimen fishery should provide an ongoing flow of economic benefits from the sport fishery that depends on taimen. In addition, there should be ongoing direct benefits to the local community through the benefit sharing and user rights system established under the project. | | | | |
| 6. IFC Role and Contribution (i) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Rationale | IFC was clearly innovative in promoting and financing the project. This was the first time that the private sector, NGO sector and government collaborated successfully on natural resource conservation in Mongolia. It is very unlikely that the change in the Mongolian sport fishing industry toward greater benefit sharing with local communities to encourage conservation would have occurred in the absence of the project. As an “honest broker”, IFC was able to leverage expertise from the scientific community and foster a productive relationship between that community and the business and NGO community in Mongolia. However, there were times when the effectiveness of project supervision was diminished by turnover in IFC staffing. | | | | |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Post completion monitoring recommendation [Based on outcome and impact indicator level recommendation within Development Results section that follows] | |
| Recommended | No |
| Recommended duration for annual post completion monitoring | |
| Approach for post project completion monitoring (including estimated level of effort, resources and funding source) | No monitoring is recommended. |

Development Results

| Outputs (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Outputs Row | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|-------------|---------|-----------------|-------------|------------|
| Delete Row (i) | Component /Activities (i) | Discontinued (i) | Indicators (i) | Targets (i) | | Results (i) | | |
| | | | | Cumulative | | Prior to Period | This Period | Cumulative |
| | | | | Original | Revised | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Collaborative Management System | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A | Participation of stakeholders in the management of the EUWA natural resources through the convening of natural resource councils | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Collaborative Management System | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Number of entities that implemented recommended changes | 0.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 3.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Collaborative Management System; | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Establishment of tourism carrying capacity limits | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Natural Resource Management Plan | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Number of entities that implemented recommended changes | 0.00 | 1.00 | 9.00 | 0.00 | 9.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sustainable Use Systems and Alternative Livelihoods | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Number of entities that implemented recommended changes | 0.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Mining Activities vs. Conservation in the EUWA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A | Decreased of exploration and exploitation license numbers | 0.00 | 95.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Natural Resource Management Plan1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Number of entities that implemented recommended changes | 2.00 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Natural Resource management Plan | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Number of entities that implemented recommended changes | 3.00 | | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Collaborative management system: training of watershed councils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Number of entities receiving advisory services | 3.00 | | 8.00 | 0.00 | 8.00 |

| Outcome (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Outcome Row | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| Delete Row (i) | Component /Activities (i) | Discontinued (i) | Indicators (i) | Baseline (i) | | Targets (i) | | | Results (i) | | | Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding? | If yes, annually for how many years? |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|--------------|---------|-------------|---------|--------------------|-------------|------------|----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | Original | Revised | Cumulative | | Prior to Period | This Period | Cumulative | | | |
| | | | | | | Original | Revised | | | | Expect to achieve by | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Conserved biodiversity-rich taiga riparian, forest, and prairie ecosystems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Law enforcement system is in place | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 | | Project completion | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | Select one | Select one |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Conserved biodiversity-rich taiga riparian, forest, and prairie ecosystems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Number of entities that implemented recommended changes | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 5.00 | Project completion | 3.00 | 0.00 | 3.00 | Select one | Select one |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | To monetize a previously unvalued natural resource through implementation of a natural resource use concession and licensing system | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Number of entities that implemented recommended changes | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 1.00 | Project completion | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | Select one | Select one |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Enforcement system: catch and release regulations developed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Number of recommended laws/regulations/amendments/codes enacted | 0.00 | | 1.00 | | Project completion | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | No | Select one |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Collaborative management | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Number of community rangers trained and deployed | 0.00 | | 20.00 | | Project completion | 17.00 | 0.00 | 17.00 | No | Select one |

| Outcome (i) | | | | | | | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Add Outcome Row | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|--------------|--|-------------|--|--------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Delete Row (i) | Component /Activities (i) | Discontinued (i) | Indicators (i) | Baseline (i) | | Targets (i) | | | Results (i) | | | Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding? | If yes, annually for how many years? | |
| | | | | | | Cumulative | | | Prior to Period | This Period | Cumulative | | | |
| | system | | in joint patrols | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Collaborative management system | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Creation of a new community-based watershed user rights system (Nokhorlol) | 0.00 | | 1.00 | | Project comp | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | No | Select one | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Natural Resource Management Plans Being implemented | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Number of entities adopting sustainable practices based on advisory services | 0.00 | | 1.00 | | Project comp | 9.00 | 0.00 | 9.00 | No | Select one | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Concession lisenicing system: concession law developed and adopted | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Number of recommended laws/regulations/amendments/codes enacted | 0.00 | | 1.00 | | Project comp | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | No | Select one | |

| Impacts (i) | | | | | | | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Add Impacts Row | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--------------|---------|-------------|---------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Delete Row (i) | Component /Activities (i) | Discontinued (i) | Indicators (i) | Baseline (i) | | Targets (i) | | | Results (i) | | | Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding? | If yes, annually for how many years? |
| | | | | Original | Revised | Original | Revised | Expect to achieve by | Prior to Period | This Period | Cumulative | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Collaborative Management System | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Formation of CMS results in increased dialogue between local inhabitants and watershed decision-makers | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | Project comp | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | Select one | Select one |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Natural Resource Management | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped | Number of entities that implemented recommended changes | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 1.00 | Project comp | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | Select one | Select one |

| Impacts (i) | | | | | | | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Add Impacts Row | |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|--------------|--|-------------|--|---------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Delete Row (i) | Component /Activities (i) | Discontinued (i) | Indicators (i) | Baseline (i) | | Targets (i) | | | Results (i) | | | Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding? | If yes, annually for how many years? |
| | | | | | | Cumulative | | | Prior to Period | This Period | Cumulative | | |
| | Regime0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Collaborative Management Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Number of entities that implemented recommended changes | 0.00 | | 5.00 | | <1 yr post co | 8.00 | 0.00 | 8.00 | No | Select one |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Watershed management planning and implementation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Hectares of land managed sustainably | 0.00 | | 100,000.00 | | Project comp | 3,527,174.00 | 0.00 | 3,527,174.00 | No | Select one |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Watershed management plan development | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Completed | Number of people positively affected (indirect) | 0.00 | | 10,000.00 | | Project comp | 31,105.00 | 0.00 | 31,105.00 | No | Select one |

Comments on development results achieved

| | |
|---|---|
| Entire Project (including additional relevant results (positive and negative) other than those planned) | <p>The core element of the original project was to create economic value for a natural resource (taimen and a healthy taimen ecosystem) and enable local communities to capture that value through a commercial partnership with a private sector tourism company. Much of the early project focus was on development of a national concession policy that would encourage investments and joint ventures in community-based natural resources management. In order to move the pilot community-conservation ventures to scale, national policy change was required.</p> <p>While these national policy reforms were not achieved, due to political circumstances beyond the control of the sponsor, the development of a devolution model ("Nokhorlol") emerged which has increased the awareness and active engagement of communities in natural resources conservation through a user rights system. Because of this model, large areas and several communities are now under new forms of participatory planning, which lay the foundations for future investments. The planning capacity improvements have been further reinforced by significant improvements in the scientific basis for sustainable management of watershed resources, particularly fisheries management. The project model is now being replicated in other watersheds with private sector and governmental support.</p> |
| Reporting period since last supervision | 3 months |

Financial (USD):

| Funding | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|--|---|---------------------------|--|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Original (i) Mar. 7, 2007 | Revised (i) | Actual Expenses (i) | | | Outstanding Purchase Order Commitments (i) | Total Expenses + Commitments | | Funding Balance | |
| | | As of Jun. 30, 2008 | From Jun. 30, 2008 to Oct. 22, 2008 | Total Oct. 22, 2008 | | Amt | % | Amt | % |
| A | B | C | D | E = C + D | F | G = E + F | H = G/(A,B) | I = (A,B)-G | J = I/(A,B) |
| 1,095,000 | 1,180,000 | 1,159,277.90 | 14,791.89 | 1,174,069.79 | 0.00 | 1,174,069.79 | 99.00% | 5,930.21 | 1.00% |
| <i>Explanation for significant variances between (1) original and revised funding (A vs. B) and (2) approved/revised funding and total expenses + commitments (A/B vs.G)</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Revision Log | | Funding Revised to \$0 on Jul 19, 2008 | | | | | | | |

| Pricing Goals (i) | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Charging for Products/Services (Yes/No) | No |
| Charging details | |
| Comments <i>Describe the key factors in setting the charging structure. If No selected above, specify reason.</i> | Not applicable (To be revised by TTL) |

| Fees/Contributions | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| | Original (i) Mar. 7, 2007 | Revised (i) | Receipts (i) | | | | Fees/Contributions Balance | |
| | | | As of Jun. 30, 2008 | From Jun. 30, 2008 to Oct. 22, 2008 | Total Oct. 22, 2008 Amt | % | Amt | % |
| | A | B | C | D | E = C + D | F = E/(A,B) | G=(A,B)-E | H=G/ A,B) |
| Cash Fees from Recipients | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | 0.00 | |
| In-Kind Contributions | 0 | 0 | 139,614.63 | 0.00 | 139,614.63 | | -139,614.63 | |
| Other | 950,000 | 950,000 | 898,139.00 | 0.00 | 898,139.00 | 95.00% | 51,861.00 | 5.00% |
| <i>Explanation for significant variances between (1) original and revised fees/contributions (A vs. B) and (2) approved/revised fees/contributions and related total receipts (A/B vs. E)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Revision Log | | | | | | | | |

| WBS Status | | | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Add WBS Row |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Delete Row (i) | Discontinued (i) | WBS element | Name | Closed | Expected/Actual close date | Outstanding commitments | Outstanding Fees | Comments |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | IFC-00503476-BF000107-M7 | Mongolia: Eg-Uur | Yes | Oct. 22, 2008 | 0.00 | 0 | - |



| WBS Status <input type="checkbox"/> Add WBS Row | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------|
| Delete Row (i) | Discontinued (i) | WBS element | Name | Closed | Expected/Actual close date | Outstanding commitments | Outstanding Fees | Comments |
| | | | Watershed Conservation Initiative | | | | | |

Timeline:

| Delete Row (i) | Key Activities for Reporting Period | Activity Status | Timeline <input type="checkbox"/> Add Timeline Row |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | |

Explanation for delays in start and/or completion of key activities and resulting impact on overall project timeframe.

Consultants:

| Delete Row (i) | Consultant Name/Firm | Expertise/Comments <input type="checkbox"/> Add Consultant Row |
|----------------|----------------------|---|
| | | |

Project Team:

| Core Team Members | Primary | Proxies |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Transaction Leader | Juan Jose Dada | Thanh Thuy T. Nguyen, Florence E. Navarro, Maria Christina S. Javier, Vinitha R. Jayalal, Diana Mirzakarimova, Nazira Abdukhalilova, Maria del Rosario Rojas |
| Monitoring and Evaluations Officer | Baljit Wadhwa | Thanh Thuy T. Nguyen, Shir Ashar Naveh |
| Finance Officer | Nazira Abdukhalilova | CES Finance and Budget Team |
| Team Assistant | Maria Christina S. Javier | Vinitha R. Jayalal |
| Other Team Members | Cecilia Lim, David William Lawrence, Michael Knight Ipson, OEG Monitoring | |
| Management Team | Primary | Proxies |
| Unit Line Manager | Catherine Cruveillier Cassagne | |
| Unit Manager | Monika M. Weber-Fahr | Annie Go Dizon, Thanh Thuy T. Nguyen, Stacy A. Swann |

Additional Comment(s):

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Review and Approval Status:

| |
|--|
| <p>TL/M&E/FinO Initiate Completion - Initiate Completion by Baljit Wadhwa at 01/31/2009 04:57:57 PM Comment : Cleared</p> <p>Unit Line Manager Clear - Cleared to Unit Manager by Catherine Cassagne at 02/03/2009 06:21:46 PM Comment : Overall well written and interesting lessons learned which will be included into a larger knowledge management initiative later on on eco-tourism projects.</p> |
|--|



Unit Manager Approve - Approved by Monika M. Weber-Fahr at 02/10/2009 09:35:04 AM
Comment : Good PCR. Only question: Should there not be a follow-up activity by way of knowledge sharing/launch/also across IFC?
While important for biodiversity locally, the project may have never been of strategic relevance for IFC - but clearly IFC could play a role.