



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9294</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Mauritania</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Integrated ecosystem management project for the sustainable human development in Mauritania</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1 Program 2; CCM-2 Program 4; BD-3 Program 7; LD-1 Program 1; SFM-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$8,222,505</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$22,140,876</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$30,513,381</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>September 28, 2016</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>October 27, 2016</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Maude Veyret Picot</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LD1 Program 1: OK; SFM3 Program 8: OK;</li> <li>- CC2 Program 4; Please, provide the way to estimate the gains in carbon and GHG reduction emissions;</li> <li>- The BD program 7 has mainly be developed to target Vavilov centers (Mauritania is not included). It is possible to use BD resources under this program out of Vavilov centers, but the demonstration should be made</li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>that the project will target priority genetic reserve locations for wild relatives. Could you please provide a shorter list of plants and animals that will be the focus of the project and for which Mauritania (and not the West and Central Africa sub-region as a whole) can claim having significant genetic biodiversity?</p> <p>- For BD1 Program 2, please confirm that the creation of new protected areas will target globally significant sites for biodiversity conservation (or Key Biodiversity Areas, IUCN senso). Can the output be delivered with the relatively low level of resources allocated to this?</p> <p>- We take note of the mention of the Aichi Targets 2, 3, 7, 11 and 14. Can you provide quantifiable (SMART) indicators that will be used to track the project contribution to these targets?</p> <p>August 24, 2015</p> <p>- Addressed for the BD programs 7 and 2.</p> <p>- For the Aichi targets, please include in the text the indicators that will be used for each (now Target 7, 11, and 14).</p> <p>- For CC2 Program 4, see cell 5, and please revise the way to estimate the gains in carbon.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design		September 8, 2015 Addressed. Thanks.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes (see PIF, p23).	
	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes, The project focuses on the root causes of environmental degradation, especially land degradation and soil erosion. Mauritania is at constant risk from droughts and desertification, and its natural environment, human population, fauna and flora suffer. The situation is aggravated by limited rainfalls, high population density, and inappropriate practices by pastoral communities. The project is tackling the lack of integrated and ecosystem approach to support a sustainable human development.  Cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	The baseline scenario is described, including parallel interventions from other donors and partners. The GEF resources will be incremental, proposing a holistic strategy combining a set of complementary activities in selected ecological units (planning, capacity development, ecological restoration, livelihoods,	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		financing, etc.).  Cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>The components are clear and appropriate to achieve the project objectives and the GEBs. However, please address the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please note that the GEF will not finance coordination activities in the component 4 in addition to management costs. Please, remove the mention of such coordination.</li> <li>- Can you be more specific on the type of PES you are planning to develop? The level of information is very low in the PIF, and the experience at the GEF shows that a few PES become a reality if the main framework is not identified in the concept (service providers, service users, sources of financing, nature of transactions...).</li> <li>- In the section 5) on Global Environment Benefits, please provide metrics for the different GEB: Nb of ha of productive landscapes under SLM, Nb of ha of forests restored, increase of an agrobiodiversity indicator, increase of diversity of globally significant cultivated plants and domesticated animals, diversity status of target species, gains in carbon, GHG emission reduction, etc.</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- Because of the use of CCM and SFM resources, please include at PIF level the expected gains in carbon (storage, avoided emissions) and GHG emission reductions. Provide an approximation at PIF level and include a more accurate calculation at CEO endorsement. Also include the monitoring of carbon and GHG emission reductions in the monitoring activities.</p> <p>August 24, 2015</p> <p>- The point is taken for the component four. However, please, make the rest of the text coherent (see section 4, p.18, the title of the component and the text giving the GEF contribution).</p> <p>- The clarifications given for the PES do not make us optimistic - the source of financing is not defined, the nature of the transaction is not detailed and there is no information on the technical and financing capacities of the young national Great Green Wall Agency that is identified as the service user. Based on the experience acquired on PES at the GEF, without this information at the concept level (before PPG), there are few chances for a PES to be materialized. Please, provide the missing information or revise the project ambitions.</p> <p>- For the carbon calculations, please</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>refer to our exchanges by emails and provide more reasonable estimates in number of ha and tons of carbon equivalent. All in all, less than 4\$ million will be used for ecosystem restoration under the component 2 (including forests, but also water bodies, rangelands, and agricultural perimeters). How will these \$4 million be used to generate 500,000 ha of land under SLM and 200,000 ha of restored forests? Please, make the distinction between the restoration work financed by the GEF and the cofinancing partners. Please, provide the expected cost per ha of land and forest restoration.</p> <p>September 8, 2015 Addressed.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Addressed.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes, the proposed grant is using all the remaining STAR allocations for Mauritania.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>The project is triggering \$3,364,365 from the SFM incentive programme.</p> <p>July 12, 2016 The SFM resources cannot be guaranteed and will be confirmed at Work Programme Inclusion.</p>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not yet. Please, refer to the comments included under the items 1 and 5.</p> <p>In addition, please, check the coherence of financing information in the different tables (e.g. different numbers are mentioned for the fees: \$894,879 in the part I, \$894,878 in the table D).</p> <p>August 24, 2015 Not addressed. Table D, p4, \$1 is missing in the column with the fees to make \$894,878.</p> <p>September 8, 2015 All points have been addressed. The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF/PFD clearance.</p> <p>July 12, 2016 The SFM resources cannot be guaranteed and will be confirmed at Work Programme Inclusion. Please reduce the SFM budget by two (SFM in the project grant: \$1,682,182; fees: \$151,396; PPG: \$0). Thanks for your</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		understanding. Upon receipt of a document with the revised amounts, the PIF will be recommended for clearance and WPI.	
Review Date	Review	August 19, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 24, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 08, 2015	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	No significant change. Addressed.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	- Agrobiodiversity is an important element of this project. GEF financing for agrobiodiversity can be considered only in the areas where there is a demonstrated responsibility for some wild relatives and varieties. Several species are mentioned (millet, cowpea, fonio, yam, African rice, Bambara groundnut, but the status of these varieties is not clear.	



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Please provide the status of these different species, and identify those for which Mauritania has a responsibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Output 2.2 and 3.1: We take note that the project will "promote" solar pumps, biogas, and improved cook-stoves. However, we would like to see a better value chain analysis to figure out the whole succession of activities that are necessary, and how the project is going to help to improve the political, economic, and technical conditions for sustainability of these innovations. Awareness, demonstration, and training are certainly needed, but not sufficient.</li> <li>- Output 4.1: please explain the value chains that already exist and will be reinforced, and those which are new and would need a comprehensive support.</li> <li>- For the new value chains, please explain if there is a market or a demand.</li> <li>- Output 4.1 and 4.2: Please better detail the support provided by the existing FFS.</li> </ul> <p>June 5, 2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The first point is not addressed, please be more specific. Please, include a table and text in the project</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>document to clearly identify these species for which Mauritania has a responsibility. The response invites us to check para 75-77 and 78-80, but we do not find relevant information about our question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The change of wording from Crop Wild Relatives to Landraces may sound as an alert for us. The BD3 Program 7 aims to increase genetic diversity of globally significant cultivated plants that are sustainably used within production systems (by the way, the rationale for this objective was given by FAO, 2009, in the Second State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture). We knew at PIF level that Mauritania was not in the core of a Vavilov center, but there was a reasoning to support in-situ conservation of crop wild relatives for which Mauritania has a responsibility: Confirm this is still the reasoning and the project is still in the range of the BD3 Program 7.</li> <li>- In the para 82, there is a notion of "priority crops", but we do not know if Mauritania and the El Atf region have a responsibility for the considered species, including pearl millet, fonio, cowpea, yam and Bambara groundnut. Please, confirm.</li> <li>- Reading these sections 78-80, we</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>understand that baseline data are not available for monitoring at project start, but these data will be identified during the first year of the project. We already alerted FAO several times on this wrong way of doing: it was the practice in GEF3, but we have stopped this way of doing since GEF4. This is a GEF6 project: we would be pleased if you could confirm that it is your intent to systematize this point and include the identification of baseline data during the PPG.</p> <p>- Point related to the outputs 2.1 and 3.1: we take note that the market analysis and participatory selection process of key value chains are also planned for the year 1. We would like to get your attention that outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 4.1, as well activities 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.2.1, 4.2.1, 5.1.1, 5.1.3 all have to deliver the year 1. We are seeing a deep problem of project feasibility and management.</p> <p>- NB: For further reviews and projects, it would be preferable to propose short responses in the table of responses and make change in the project document. For instance, the responses made for the biogas and cookstove related activities would be welcome in the project document.</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		- Output 4.1 and 4.2: OK	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>- We did not find a demonstration of cost-effectiveness, or a justification of the selected implementation modes (in comparison with other modes). Please, justify the selected options.</p> <p>June 5, 2018 Addressed.</p>	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Addressed	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>- The details between in kind and in cash cofinancing are not included in the letters: how did you calculate this breakdown?</p> <p>- We did not find the justification for the \$4 million of cofinancing from the Ministry of Agriculture (3 million in grant and 1 million in-kind);</p> <p>- We did not find the justification for the \$1,390,876 from the government of Mauritania.</p> <p>June 5, 2018 Well, the changes are characterized as "minor" in the table of responses, but</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>they are not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A cash cofinancing of \$1 million was expected from FAO at PIF level and at the first submission, but it is now an in-kind contribution.</li> <li>- The only cash cofinancing comes from the national budget and on-going projects.</li> <li>- The total in kind has increased up to nearly \$3 million.</li> </ul> <p>Such change from cash cofinancing to in-kind cofinancing is a serious change, weakening all the project's ambition. We would like to have a dialogue with the agency and the GEF OFP to be sure there is a common understanding of this fact and hopefully to identify alternatives, notably from the FAO cofinancing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We are not seeing either as a positive signal the difficulty you have faced to obtain a letter of cofinancing from the Ministry of Environment - the Executing Agency. As mentioned in the previous review, there is no proof of evidence of a cofinancing of \$1,390,876 from the Ministry of Environment. We already have this discussion on other GEF/FAO projects: you must provide an evidence with the right amount, or remove this cofinancing. We</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		acknowledge receipt of the explanation, but the notion of future cofinancing does not exist at the GEF (it is a little bit comparable to the postponing of missing activities/data to the year 1 of the project - the experience shows that these activities are barely implemented during the considered time). Please, correct.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>- The direct carbon gains seem quite low in comparison with similar GEF investments, but acceptable; however, the indirect results appears high as compared to other similar GEF investments. It is probably because of the size of areas considered for indirect benefits. Some explanations/clarifications would be welcome. We recommend the Agency to use a conservative approach, especially if we consider the uncertainty of some factors and risks, as climate risks</p> <p>- Please, check the consistency of information between the CCM tracking tools and Ex-Act tables: in the CCM TT, there are 2 different areas of rehabilitated grasslands - 100,000 ha without improved management and 50,000 ha from severely degraded to moderately degraded; while in the Ex-Act tool there is only one considered area of</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>150,000 ha without improved management. The Ex-Act result should be higher (roughly 0.4 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>). We might have the same distinction between 2 categories of grassland in the indirect Ex-Act tool.</p> <p>- In the SFM tracking tools, the SFM objectives and outcomes should be informed in terms of ha (SFM3 box is empty).</p> <p>June 5, 2018 Thanks for the explanations and the changes. Addressed.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>Yes</p> <p>June 5, 2018 - We found out that several positions are financed under technical components, including those related to management and coordination (M&amp;E officer, national project coordinator, site coordination national consultant). Please, clarify the use of the project management</p>	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>costs and the application of the guidelines on program and project policy (GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01).</p> <p>- Please, confirm that the three international and ten national consultants are not considered as FAO personel/staff.</p> <p>- Two vehicles are financed under the component 3 "Reduction of pressure on ecosystems through income generation and funding mechanisms". These vehicles should be covered by cofinancing, or at the minimum included in the project management costs. Please, clarify.</p> <p>- Please, mention the number of vehicles provided by cofinancing.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Yes	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP	Addressed.	
	• GEF Council	Addressed.	
	• Convention Secretariat	NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.	

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		June 5, 2018 Some comments have not properly been addressed, please see the cells 2, 5, and 9. The project cannot be recommended.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	April 11, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 05, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		