

Enhancing the resilience of agriculture and livestock producers through improved watershed management and development of environmentally-positive value chains in South East Mauritania

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10176

Countries

Mauritania

Project Name

Enhancing the resilience of agriculture and livestock producers through improved watershed management and development of environmentally-positive value chains in South East Mauritania

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

11/30/2021

Review completed by PM

4/12/2022

Program Manager

Tshewang Dorji

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement **Part I ? Project Information****Focal area elements**

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 12/9/2021:

Yes, it is aligned with CCA objective 1 and 2. Thank you for further refining outputs and indicators. However, please note that the project title has not been amended. We request agency to amend the title to accurately reflect its scope, by capturing "Agricultural" aspects.

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Update GEFSEC, 4/21/2022: Thank you. Please consider to shorten the title, while reflecting required changes.

Agency Response

Noted with thanks. The title has been amended as requested on the Portal as well.

4/27/2022

Well noted with thanks.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC: 12/9/2021:

Overall the project structure is sound and clear, and welcome allocation of significant percentage of LDCF grant to concrete on-the-ground adaptation investment. However, please clarify the following:

(1) Output 1.1, activity 1.1.2, the target beneficiaries of community-based water and land-use management group from each watershed area is expected to be 25 people. However, as you have documented in other parts of this document, the population varies in each watershed. Therefore, we suggest that agency revised the target to reflect population in the watershed, proportionately. Also, please confirm gender consideration while conducting awareness session to be more equitable.

(2) Output 1.2 establishes Watershed Development and Resilience Committees (WDRCs) in all four watershed, which is much welcomed. We hope that it will ensure durability of the LDCF and other investment beyond the project period. Therefore, kindly ensure that this committee is anchored within the local government system with relevant hook to the existing legislation, so that this important governing body continues to exist beyond the project period with the view to benefit the targeted population continuously. Also, the output describes that one of the activity for this Committee is to develop Integrated Watershed Management Plan (IWMP) for each watershed. Such plans and blueprints are important to guide the investment under the Outcome 2, hence, ensure that resources are allocated to prepare the plan or clarify, how this plans will be developed. Currently, the budget is allocated only for capacity building of the committee members and not for preparation of the plan.

Third, para 118 of the main document provides composition of the WDRC and gives an impression that current composition seems to be heavy on the representation from the Government. Experiences suggest that local knowledge are critical to make informed decision. Therefore, please ensure that participation of the local community in water and land-use management group is numerically not disadvantage in such forum.

(3) Output 2.1. Please clarify the linkage of APFS with Community-based Water and land-use management Group under Output 1.1. While we recognize some differences in functions of the two groups (such as mainstreaming versus awareness), there are more synergies than difference. To avoid undue burden on the community, while maximizing benefits from the project, it might be worth exploring ways in which these two groups can compliment each other.

(3) Output 2.3. We welcome proposal to support financial mechanism to catalyse investment in climate-resilient activities through establishment of Revolving Fund in each watershed. However, it is unclear how much of the LDCF grant will be provided as the seed money for these fund, if any. Further information on operation aspects of the Revolving Fund, such as interest rate, loan period, disbursement modalities etc, will be useful.

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Cleared. Thank you for the additional information and clarification

Update GEFSEC, 4/21/2022: On the proportionality of the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$14,500,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$725,000 instead of \$571,430 (which is 3.9%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

GEFSEC: 5/5/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response

1) Noted with thanks. The target for this activity has been revised under Output 1.1 as suggested. Additional emphasis (including in output description) on gender benefits has also been included.

2) Noted with thanks. The WDRCs will be fully embedded within existing local institutional settings and legislation; this will be facilitated by the fact that representatives of all relevant local authorities will be part of the WDRCs (see paragraph 118). In addition, the work of the WDRCs will be guided by the Communal Development Plans, which, as per Order 680 from 17 April 2011, are recognised as the main local development plans and include a description of the institutional settings relevant to local development. As the CDPs will be reviewed and updated under Output 1.3, this will be an opportunity to mention WDRCs in the CDPs and describe their role, thereby providing the WDRCs with additional official recognition and enhancing their sustainability (a mention to this has been added in the output description under Output 1.3). Regarding the budget, budget lines for the development of the IWMPs (Activity 1.2.3) have been set aside for approx. USD 39,000, including time from an Integrated Watershed Governance National Expert and a Climate Change Adaptation National Expert, workshops (4 per watershed) to discuss and finalize the IWMPs and domestic travel for the experts.

With regards to the composition of WDRCs, edits have been made accordingly under para 118.

3) Noted with thanks. As rightly pointed the APFSs together with the community-based water and land management groups will be mutually supportive to each other; although they will not serve the same purposes. While APFSs are learning groups guided by facilitators and dedicated to the dissemination of best agro-sylvo-pastoral practices with a focus on learning-by-doing, land and water management groups will be tasked with decision-making and implementation with respect to community resources. The decisions taken by these groups will likely entail the implementation of some of the best practices taught through APFSs and some APFS trainees will likely be part of the land and water management groups ? hence the complementarity and linkages between the two. This clarification has been inserted in a footnote under para 129.

4) Seed funding for the revolving funds will take the form of the initial allocations granted to the business plans selected under Activity 2.3.5 (roughly USD 160,000 in total). The savings and loans associations supported under Activity 2.3.1 will then be trained to operationalize each of the revolving funds capitalized through the reimbursement of the upfront investments under Activity 2.3.5. The modalities (interest rate, loan periods, etc.) will be determined during the inception phase of the project following a participatory and inclusive approach collectively with the savings and loans associations and other stakeholders; these modalities may vary across watersheds in line with local circumstances and the differentiated needs of beneficiaries in each of the target watersheds.

4/27/2022

Well noted with thanks. The cofinancing figures were updated and the Cofinancing portion contribution to PMC was increased from US\$571,430 to US\$ 747,000.00.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 12/9/2021:

Thank you for providing supporting documents on the co-financing. Please allow us to come back on the adequacy of the documentation. In the meantime, please clarify the following:

(1). The duration of support from the National Agency for the Great Green Wall's covers from 2014- 2023 (as per the para 104 of the document) while co-financing letter has duration 2022-2026. Also, it will be useful to clarify names of the overlapping watersheds under appropriate section of the document. Also, the information contained in the Table (c) is inconsistent with the information contained in the Table 4, under the para 104, with references to co-financing.

(2). The name of the project in the co-financing letter needs to be corrected. Alternatively, the title of the project needs correction.

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Cleared. Thank you for the additional information and clarification

Agency Response

1) Noted with thanks, the inconsistency has now been corrected under Table 4. The overlapping catchments have been added in the same table. Regarding the Cofinancing figures reported under Tables C and 4, the ANGMV cofinancing reported in Table 4 is USD 4.5M (which is the sum of the three ANGMV lines in Table C) and the GCF/FAO

cofinancing is USD 10M (as reported in both Tables C and 4). The FAO cofinancing figures of respectively USD 300,000 and USD 271,430 presented in Table C have not been included in Table 4.

2) Noted with thanks. The amended name of the project was updated in the cofinancing letters as well.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 12/9/2021:

In the proposed budget, it is foreseen to purchase 2 vehicles and 4 Motorbikes at \$ 98,000. It is unclear whether this is the most cost-effective approach. As mentioned in para 172 of the document, the standard approach would be to utilize existing stock of vehicles from co-financing or baseline initiatives, instead of purchasing a range of vehicles just for this project. Please revised the budget and upload as a separate Annex E in the portal.

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Thank you. While fully understand the need for transportation, kindly review merits of two vehicles for the project.

Update, GEFSEC 4/21/2022: As mentioned before, the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Please provide additional justification of its value addition to the project beneficiaries.

Update, GEFSEC, 5/5/2022: Thank you for the additional justification. Given that the vehicles will be used for transporting inputs and materials, kindly consider to revise the cost allocation.

GEFSEC, 5/6/2022. Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response

Noted with Thanks.

Given the high rental costs, without a minimum of 2 vehicles the project may fail to properly deliver its interventions on the ground. The vehicles are needed to cover long distances across the target landscapes within the 4 Wilayas covered by the project. Vehicles will be used to transport inputs and materials, as well as the technical teams in charge of implementing field interventions. With regards to cofinancing for vehicles, the available fleet of vehicles is already mobilized to serve specific duties. It was also indicated that Gov. budget does not foresee the purchase of vehicles for projects as the practice showed over the last years.

The budget is now also uploaded as a separate annex.

4/27/2022

Noted with thanks. The cost associated with purchasing a minimum of 2 vehicles, was decreased from US\$90,000 to US\$80,000. A minimum of 2 vehicles will enable the project to transport the necessary inputs and materials to be procured for various field interventions, as well as to ensure the mobility of the technical teams in charge of providing technical backstopping and trainings in line with project targets. By doing so, the added value of procuring these 2 vehicles to cover the 4 Wilayas spanning about 198,640 km², will be translated into a better ability for the project teams to deliver timely interventions and sound results to project beneficiaries. The purchase of at least 2 vehicles was found to be the best value for money compared with applicable high rental costs, without such means of mobility the project may end up paying more on rental costs to deliver inputs and expertise, the same resources (i.e., about USD 97/day with an annual average of roughly USD 25,000 - 35,000 per year for one vehicle) would be better channeled into core interventions benefiting project stakeholders.

5/6/2022

Noted with many thanks. The cost associated with purchasing a minimum of 2 vehicles, was decreased from US\$80,000 to US\$65,000.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 12/9/2021:

Yes. Thank you

Agency Response Noted.

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 12/9/2021:

Yes, changes have been made to the core indicators. While acknowledging enhanced figure for the core indicator 1 and proposed new figure for core indicator 2, the core indicator 3 and 4 seems to have reduced significantly. Please clarify on the change in indicator 3 & 4.

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Cleared. Thank you for the additional information and clarification

Agency Response

Noted with thanks. The target for CI 3 was reduced as no national plan is anticipated to be revised through project interventions. Plans to be revised will be at the local level (CDPs and creation of IWMPs).

With regards to the target for CIs 1 and 4: at PPG stage, it was deemed clearer to distinguish between direct beneficiaries who will directly benefit from training (i.e. 10,000 trainees through APFS + other trainees on the management of natural resources etc.) and who should be counted towards the target for CI4, and indirect beneficiaries who be trained indirectly through APFSs (being exposed to best practices through open days, exchange visits, communication efforts, etc.) and who should be counted towards the target for CI1.

This clarification has been added in the 'Changes from the PIF' section.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 12/9/2021:

Yes. The project elaborates adaption problems, root causes and barriers. However, please upload better resolution maps with clear legend for Figure 1, referred under para 11.

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response

Noted with thanks. A map for historical precipitation with a legible legend was added. Unfortunately it is not possible to have a higher resolution of the project area.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 12/9/2021:

Yes. However, please correct the inconsistency on the figure related to the population of country. While para 1 of the main document mentions as 4.4 million people, para 193 says 3.5 people.

Also, the document presents number of interesting baseline projects in the country under the baseline scenarios and any associated baseline projects, under para 104. For LDCF to make meaningful impact, we would like request agency to explores ways to further minimize duplication of efforts, while maximizing the synergies, complementarity and coherent delivery of support. This may include exploring feasible and pragmatic arrangement with other projects and investments in the area, such as regular information sharing through establishment of forum, as an example. Such flow of information should help in improving efficiency and effectiveness of climate finance delivery. In this case, for example, LDCF support can prepare Integrated Watershed Management Plan that can be implemented by another agency or vice-versa. Even the resources for capacity and awareness building program can be pooled for greater impact.

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Cleared. Thank you for the additional information and clarification

Agency Response

Noted. The population statistics have been harmonized based on the latest (2020) World Bank data.

Noted with thanks. Consultations with key partners will be conducted during the inception phase and throughout project implementation during the PSC meetings. These will support the exchange of information and mutual supportiveness with other baseline

projects and partners across the target landscape, including by identifying synergies, and opportunities for joint efforts through cost-sharing and pooling of resources.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC 12/10/2021:

Please see comments for review item 2 part I of the review. In addition, please address:

(1) Para 107, where it mentions that there are "four fully-integrated component" while the actual document has only three. Please clarify

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Cleared. Thank you for the additional information and clarification

Agency Response

Noted, please see responses to comments above.

Noted with thanks, this has been corrected to 3 components under para 107.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC: 12/10/2021.

Yes

Agency Response Noted

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 12/10/2021.

Yes

Agency Response Noted

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
SEC, 12/10/2021

Yes, given the context, the project is innovative and has potential for scaling up.

Agency Response Noted

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
N/A

Agency Response
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021

Yes, information on the stakeholder, their role and status of the consultation has been provided. However, please discuss whether and how traditional knowledge will be incorporated in project design and implementation.

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Cleared. Thank you for the additional information submitted via revised paragraph 192.

Agency Response

Noted with thanks. Traditional knowledge will be mainstreamed into project interventions through the APFS curricula, which will incorporate traditional agro-sylvo-pastoral practices that can help achieve climate adaptation objectives. In addition, restoration protocols will also build on traditional knowledge, especially on the use of local species best fit for different adaptation contexts. The project partners in charge of the development of these protocols (academic institutions) will blend the latest scientific evidence with existing traditional knowledge to produce these protocols; this will not only ensure that the protocols incorporate the best available evidence and practices, but it will also enhance social acceptance of project interventions. This has been mentioned in the Stakeholder section under para 19.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021

Yes

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 12/10/2021:

Yes. The private sector is identified as the stakeholder and beneficiaries.

Agency Response Noted
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 12/10/2021:

Yes, the table also includes execution risk due to COVID-19. However, please upload the climate risk assessment into the portal

GEFSEC 5/5/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response
Noted with thanks. The in-depth climate risk assessment is now uploaded.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes. However, it would be highly desirable to confirm the members of PSC. Also, please strengthen the coordination with other projects and investment as suggested under Item2 of Part II.

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Cleared. Thank you for revised table 18

Agency Response

Noted. Table 18 has been completed. Point well taken to enhance the coordination arrangements as in responses to comments above.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes, the project has focus on improving local livelihood and enhancing resilience for the farmers and pastoral communities, vulnerable women and grassroots organizations. It will deliver adaptation benefits including socio-economic benefits as well as enhancing green recovery.

Agency Response Noted
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021.

Please upload budget table, and climate risk assessment table

GEFSEC: 4/10/2022. Thank you.

Update: GEFSEC 4/21/2022: Project Coordinator is being charged across components and PMC. Please kindly consider charging the cost of the project coordinator to the PMC. As the co-financing portion to PMC is expected to increase up to 725 K, and considering that the grants portion of co-financing is 11.1 million (74% of the total co-financing) , it may be feasible to cover the costs of the Project Coordinator from co-financing.

GEFSEC: 5/5/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response

Noted. The budget table and climate risks assessment were uploaded, the excel format of the budget table is also embedded in the updated version of the ProDoc.

04/27/2022

Noted with Thanks. The project coordinator is charged to PMC.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

Yes

Agency Response Noted

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/10/2021:

GEFSEC, 4/10/2022: Cleared

Update, GEFSEC, 4/21/2022. Please provide clarification to the updated comments.

Update, GEFSEC: 5/5/2022: Please provide clarification to the updated comment.

Thank you

GEFSEC: 5/6/2022: Recommended for CEO Endorsement

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/10/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/21/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/5/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Mauritania is a Least Developed Country. Approximately 44.4% of the population lives in poverty[1]¹ and more than 75% of the country's poor depend upon agriculture and livestock for their livelihood [2]², which is highly sensitive to the changing climatic condition. The climate impact on the livelihood is left more severe in country's southern Sahelian zone as most of its population of 4.6 million[3]³ lives in this area. The proposed LDCF project will intervene in the four regions/ Wilayas in the Saharan-Sahel

zone to strengthen the resilience of vulnerable rural populations by improving watershed-level planning of natural resources and implementing innovative, climate-resilient livelihood options. The project area is also a part of the Mauritania's eastern and southern agricultural belt situated along the uplands of the Senegal River

COMPONENTS AND RESULTS

To achieve this objective, the project designed around three fully-integrated components as follows:

- **Component 1:** Adaptation and resilience practices secured through community-centred watershed management planning and participatory governance schemes;
- **Component 2:** Climate-sensitive practices and innovations applied to support the uptake of resilience measures by vulnerable communities and promote sustainable use of resources in watershed ecosystems; and
- **Component 3:** Lessons learned are captured, mainstreamed and upscaled using adapted Monitoring & Evaluation and Knowledge Management approaches

The project will build capacity for mainstreaming climate adaptation into the local land-use plans. It has a strong focus on empowering local community to participate in the adaptation decision makings, as well as through the direct implementation of on-the ground activities for enhancing resilience to the impact of climate change. In addition, the financial barriers will be addressed through innovative financial mechanisms, which will pave the way for private investment in a number of climate-resilient value chains.

The project has been designed with a strong focus on gender equality and empowerment as well. Overall, it will directly benefit 100,000 people (50% women), enable the climate resilient management of 71,500 ha of land, and train 10,000 (50% women) people about climate risks and adaptation measures. The project will work closely with communities and government towards reducing reliance on climate vulnerable resources and building resilience.

On COVID-19, the project is expected contribute to the objectives of the National Multisectoral Response Plan for Covid-19 by strengthening the overall resilience of local communities, thus aligning with the 'Build Back Better' approach.

[1] Source: World Bank.

[2] Source: IFAD

[3] As of 2020. Source: World Bank