

Enhancing pastoral farming producers resilience in South East watershed of Mauritania

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10176

Countries

Mauritania

Project Name

Enhancing pastoral farming producers resilience in South East watershed of Mauritania

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

4/5/2019

Review completed by PM

11/12/2019

Program Manager

Katya Kuang-Idba

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/17/2019 - Clarification requested. The project is indicated to be aligned with framework objective CCA-1 under the 2018-2022 GEF Adaptation Strategy. The project design and components, however, seem to also align with objective CCA-2.

Recommended action: Please consider also including CCA-2 to Table A.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Cleared. The project will also mainstream adaptation adaptation practices at various levels.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

Noted with thanks.

4/17/2019

The project will Mainstream Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience for systemic impact. So, CCA-2 is added in Table 1.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Yes. The project design has been sufficiently described in the submission and is adequately detailed for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

Noted with thanks.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/17/2019 - Clarification requested. Table C indicates a mixture of investment mobilized and recurrent expenditure, but the current justification - "Recipient government (CNOEZA) has committed to mobilize USD 1.5 million from the government budget in support of this project. Furthermore, FAO will invest an additional USD 500,000 through a technical cooperation project in order to support assessments, analyses, diagnostics, and other baseline work for the LDCF project

to build upon" - does not suffice. While the current GEF policy on co-financing acknowledges that different entities may define current expenditures differently, this usually refers to goods and services which do not result in the creation or acquisition of fixed assets, and consists mainly of expenditures on wages, salaries and supplements, purchases of goods and services and consumption of fixed capital (depreciation).

Recommended action: Please either provide a further justification of how the two co-financing entries listed in Table C are investment mobilized, and/or reclassify the Investment Mobilized column accordingly.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Cleared.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

Noted with thanks.

4/17/2019

The CNOEZA is providing a co-financing that amounts to USD 1 500 000 distributed as follows: USD 500 000 as investment (cash) and USD 1000 000 as recurrent expenditures. FAO will provide USD 500 000 USD through a technical cooperation project (TCP, financing instrument) as a new investment. The Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development will provide USD 3 000 000 as recurrent expenditures coming from past projects and programs implemented in the same areas. GCF funds will be used for investing in capacity development activities but also for acquisition of fixed assets and equipment.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - Yes. Agency fees and PPG are within the appropriate limits and in line with current GEF policy and guidelines.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/17/2019 - Yes. Mauritania has USD \$5 million remaining under the current \$10 million cap for the LDCF.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/17/2019 - Yes, the PPG requested is within the allowable cap according to the current GEF policy.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/17/2019 - No, more information requested. The meta-information worksheet was left blank and not all the CCA core indicators were filled in, although it seems from the PIF submission indicative figures should be available.

Recommended action - Please ensure the meta-information worksheet is filled in, and please provide indicative information for all 4 CCA core indicators.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Partly cleared. The meta-information and core indicators for the LDCE/SCCF have been uploaded onto the roadmap section of the portal. However, the GEFTF core indicators are filled in, which will result in double counting.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Please remove all entries from the GEFTF core indicators section.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - More information requested. This item is partially cleared. The entries have been removed from the GEFTF Core Indicators table and the CCA core indicators and meta-data spreadsheet have been uploaded onto the roadmap section of the portal. However, the total number of direct beneficiaries is very low in comparison to other recently received submissions. As we have requested clarification for another FAO project which had a similarly low figure, some background and context would be highly appreciated.

Recommended action: Please provide some basis for the relatively low estimate for total number of direct beneficiaries provided in the core indicators worksheet.

GEFSEC, 7/16/2019 - Cleared. The agency has provided the basis justifying the number of beneficiaries, which is below. One factor for the number being low is that direct beneficiaries receiving targeted support from the project will be selected on a voluntary basis and must adhere to a set of pre-existing criteria. An estimated 45,000 people will benefit indirectly from the project.

Agency Response

6/27/2019

In the project area, 7,200 pastoral households and 1,800 agriculture households live. This adds up to an approximate 45,000 persons. Though these people will be benefiting from planning and management activities of the natural resource base of the target project area, this figure, 45,000 persons, is considered to represent the direct consequential or indirect beneficiaries. These 45,000 persons are not all participating directly in project activities. Instead, from these agro-pastoral households, a large portion will be involved directly in project activities through engagement in planning and monitoring activities and/or training/capacity development/skills development activities such as the agro-pastoral field schools. Therefore, the 10,000 direct beneficiaries reported in the core indicators worksheet are the individuals that receive targeted support (both monetary and mostly non-monetary).

These individuals will be selected on a voluntary basis, and based on a set of criteria to ensure equal participation of women and men, while also maximising opportunities for these individuals to become agents of change in their communes. The learning and upscaling approaches adopted by the project facilitate such dissemination role of early adopters and therefore, even though the project directly assists an initial group of 10,000 persons, a much wider uptake is expected in the medium term through replication by other agro-pastoral families in the project area and adjacent areas.

4/29/2019

The entries have been deleted to avoid double counting.

4/17/2019

The meta-information work sheet is filled in and provided in attachment. The 4 CCA core indicators have been informed.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - More clarification requested. The project is marked with a Rio Marker of "1" for mitigation, but a "1" indicates a significant objective of the project.

Recommended action: Please justify how mitigation is a significant objective of this project according to the extent to which the themes are explicitly addressed at the level of problem analysis and objectives, activities, and results.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Cleared, the agency has removed the mitigation tag in Table G.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

Noted with thanks.

4/17/2019

Point taken. Mitigation is not a significant objective of the project.

The project is more about adaptation to Climate Change and increase of the resilience of most vulnerable producers to Climate Change. The mitigation is an indirect effect of the solutions that will be provided. On one hand, the project will be enhancing Resilience by regenerating land, the vegetative cover, grasslands and wooded areas at catchment. On a second hand and under component 2, in APFS, climate smart agriculture techniques and practices are envisaged. Nevertheless, mitigation co-benefits will not be significant and the Rio marker has been revised accordingly

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/17/2019 - More information requested. The root causes and barriers are presented, but more detail on the barriers would be appreciated. It is understood that climate change, combined with unsustainable resource management practices, is forcing local communities to alter traditional production methods and pastoral migration patterns. This results into a shift from camels and sheep to less-mobile livestock such as cattle, which place pressure on water and fodder demands, which are exacerbated by rising temperatures and reduced rainfall. These impacts are particularly evident in riparian areas, which are quickly becoming degraded as pastoralists move into wooded areas for longer period of time, and competition for dwindling natural resources is resulting in increasing instances of conflict. However, the three barriers seem to capture more than one issue under each.

Recommended action - Please expound a bit on the barriers while making each barrier more concise. For example, the first barrier seems to capture issues related to both institutional and technical capacity; the second barrier seems to cover limited financial resources and access to capital while also touching upon low technical capacity again; and the third sounds like it encompasses weak political will, high fragmentation, and lack of understanding and/or coordination across different levels of governance and/or sectors.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Cleared. The recommended action has been taken and reflected on the portal submission.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

Noted with thanks.

4/17/2019

The text in the PIF document is revised.

Barrier One: Limited institutional and technical capacity to plan, mainstream and implement climate adaptation measures, strengthen the capacity to design and implement strategic land and resource use planning that is required to address climate induced challenges.

Barrier Two: Limited effective public and private finance mechanisms experience and knowledge regarding identification and implementation of climate adaptation innovative practices.

Barrier Three: Limited policies and programs that mainstream and integrate comprehensive and coordinated adaptation initiatives and limited ability to capture, mainstream and upscale best practices.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/17/2019 - Not quite. The way the section on the baseline scenario and associated baseline projects is written is confusing. The baseline scenario refers to the actual or assumed business-as-usual situation or state of affairs and iterated as the starting point to the presentation of the alternative scenario with GEF, or in this case, LDCF-financing and is a projection exercise. Some projects can be utilized as examples to describe the baseline scenario. The baseline projects, within the context of a proposed PIF, should lay out those projects which are being utilized as co-financing to the proposed LDCF-financing alternative.

Additionally, there is not much information provided regarding the GCF project, which is listed as providing co-financing. Utilizing GCF projects as co-financing is acceptable, but there must be a clear case for how LDCF financing is additional to what is being financed by the GCF.

Recommended action: Taking into account the comment written above, please consider restructuring section 1.2, the baseline scenario, to more clearly illustrate what the present situation in Mauritania is, taking into account the baseline investment(s); which would intuitively then lead to the the description of the alternative scenario - which describes how the proposed LDCF-financed activities will build upon the baseline investments. Please remove (projects which have closed) outdated initiatives and those not providing co-financing from "baseline" projects, and instead, if relevant, use them to describe the baseline scenario.

Please also provide additional information regarding the GCF-financed initiative, particularly the exact scope and activities, so that a strong rationale for additional LDCF investment is apparent.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Clarification requested.

Please address the comment written above regarding the baseline projects. Where is the description of the baseline projects which are providing co-financing to the proposed project? A brief description of the GCF-financed project has been provided, which is appreciated, but none of the projects listed in the matrix in the baseline section correspond with those in Table C. Please provide a brief description of each initiative which is providing co-financing to this initiative - under "institutional framework," co-financing amounts are listed without providing any description of the actual investment accompanying the co-financing.

Additionally, while the project activities between the LDCF-financed proposal and the GCF-financed baseline project are somewhat similar, the LDCF-financed project is targeting local and community-level activities while the GCF project is working at the national and regional scales, please clarify how the agency will ensure that the activities that are at the local scale are not duplicated.

Recommended action: The submission and the response below indicate that the GCF-financed baseline will also finance some local level activities. Please clarify how those activities will differ from those being financed by the LDCF. Additionally, please restructure the baseline section in a coherent manner to easily demonstrate which initiatives and investments are part of the baseline scenario and which are providing co-financing as baseline investments.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - More clarification requested. The inquiry on the GCF has been clearly answered and appreciated. However, there are several projects listed as baseline projects which are expected to contribute co-financing which are not listed in Table C.

Recommended action: Please rectify the inconsistency across the text in the section on the baseline scenario and Table C. Particularly which entities are providing co-financing.

GEFSEC, 7/16/2019 - Cleared. The agency has clarified that while the baseline projects account for the largest part of the co-financing contributions, some small amounts of additional co-financing are contributed by other initiatives.

Agency Response

6/27/2019

Additions have been made to the baseline projects section in the PIF. Please, allow us to clarify.

Not all co-financing is provided through baseline projects, even though these baseline projects account for the largest part of the contributions, i.e. USD13M out of the USD15M. This is the reason why there is a discrepancy between table C and the baseline projects table in the PIF.

Baseline projects are 4 in total:

- Enhancing the resilience to climate change of livelihoods and food security of agro-silvo-pastoral communities in south-western Mauritania (GCF – co-financing of USD10M);
- Resilience of food insecurity and nutrition in the Sahel of Mauritania P2RS (Ministry of Rural Development MRD – co-financing USD1M);
- BRIDGES (Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development MEDD – co-financing USD1M);
- AMCC-2 (Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development MEDD – co-financing USD1M).

Additional sources of co-financing include:

- CNOEZA will contribute with a USD1,5M co-financing. USD1M is coming from its regular budget to support data collection, analysis and monitoring on the state of the natural resource base in the project pilot areas and project management. An additional USD500,000 is made available as a cash new and additional contribution in support of further capacity development of CNOEZA and national institutes on assessing natural resource state.
- An FAO-Technical Cooperation Project is being designed ad hoc to complement the GEF investment. This TCP will aim at linking:
 - o the climate change adaptation work, which traditionally and more often addresses the slow onset of climate change (temperature increase and reduced precipitation) and the development work in support of climate resilient ecosystems and livelihoods, and
 - o climate emergency response efforts.

The TCP project will look into ways to build in the increasingly recurrent climate risks, such as pest outbreaks, droughts, erratic and unpredictable rains outside of the cropping seasons, into the landscape management plans developed under component 1. The TCP project will ensure climate risks are accounted for in the land and resource use resilience plans and the Community-based governance bodies are equipped to provide an early response to climate risks. The TCP builds upon a number of ongoing climate emergency related TCP projects in the country. It will be a 2-year project, financed by FAO's regular budget for a maximum amount of USD500,000.

4/29/2019

Section 1.2 has been reworked in order to better present baseline scenario and baseline projects. Furthermore, section 1.4 on additional cost reasoning has been amended. In order to address the concern of complementarity with GCF investments at the local level, amendments have been made in section 6 (Coordination) as well.

4/17/2019

The following paragraph was added to Section 1.2. The baseline scenario, Projects : Mauritania is involved in alliances (multi-country projects) against Climate Change with neighboring countries and the international community to developing strategies and national and international action plans (Great Green Wall National Agency). Mauritania is trying to face Climate Change challenges through adaptation and by enhancing resilience by implementing donor funded projects. The major problems underlined by the baseline projects are the risks due to the temporally and spatially erratic character of rainfall, frequently leading to general or local droughts with subsequent increase of human pressure on rangelands. Based on baseline projects, Mauritania is vulnerable to droughts and climate change extreme events, which affects agriculture (including pastoralism) which employs 77% of active labor and mostly the poor. The baseline projects also reflect poverty, low

technologies, lack of planning, low support, and limited scaling up of results and of lessons learnt. Planning, innovations, knowledge sharing, and climate finance are instrumented to be promoted to deal with climate change.

The following paragraph was added to Section 1.4. Additional Cost reasoning. The GCF project is entitled ‘Enhancing the resilience to climate change of livelihoods and food security of agro-silvo-pastoral communities in southwestern Mauritania’. It is implemented in the same target wilayas than the LDCF project. The objective of the project is to increase the climate resilience of 250,000 small-scale agro-silvo-pastoral producers in the wilayas^[1] of Trarza, Brakna, Guidimakha, and Gorgol in the Sahelian zone of Mauritania. The livelihoods and food security of local producers and communities are vulnerable to climate change (CC) induced increasing temperatures and erratic precipitation patterns. This project will increase the resilience of affected livelihoods through strengthening the capacity of government institutions to develop and implement climate sensitive policies and projects and through improving the capacity of smallholder producers to adapt agro-silvo-pastoral practices to CC. The project will be executed by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD), with support from the Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock. The GCF project will : (i) strengthen the capacity of government institutions by integrating informed CCA considerations in adopted and future policies, programmes, and extension services, (ii) Strengthening of Climate Change adaptation of agro-silvo-pastoral livelihoods through extension services and participatory Climate Change adaptation planning, (iii) Strengthening of livelihoods through climate-adapted agriculture practices and, (iv) Restoration of Agro-silvo-pastoral landscapes to support system resilience to climate change. The GCF project and the LDCF project have different scales and magnitude. The LDCF project will be mostly implemented at local level whereas the GCF project is a multi-scale project, implemented at national, regional and local level and includes infrastructure investments. Innovations promoted in the LDCF projects such as the Caisse de Resilience or Climate Smart Agriculture practices can be upscaled in the GCF project.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - Yes. The project design and structure is well described. The first component supports the development of more sustainable planning and decisionmaking tools; the second component focuses on piloting concrete adaptation actions which support vulnerable communities in coping with climate change and engages the private sector; and the third component focuses on M&E and KM.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/17/2019 - Yes, the submission is aligned with objectives 1, 2 and 3 of the 2018-2022 adaptation strategy.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - Not clear. Please refer to item 2 and provide additional evidence supporting the additionality of the LDCF investment to the GCF financed baseline initiative. Please also briefly describe the additional cost reasoning against the baseline investments in the appropriate section by reiterating (in slightly more detail) what is provided in column 3 of the matrix of the baseline projects.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - This item is not cleared. Please refer to item 2.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Partially cleared. The additional cost reasoning has been clarified for the GCF initiative, and some basis for additionality has been provided for several other initiatives listed in the baseline scenario section - BRIDGES (Turkey/EU), Resilience of food insecurity and nutrition in the Sahel of Mauritania (AfDB), AMCC (EU). However, these initiatives do not match Table C, so this is confusing.

Recommended action - Please correct me if I am mistaken, but not every initiative providing co-financing is included in the table text in the baseline section which provides a basis for additional cost reasoning. More detail on the additional cost reasoning for all sources of co-financing would be greatly appreciated. This can be brief, but should provide a clear basis for LDCF funding. While there is some explanation provided, it does not seem totally clear how the LDCF financing is additional to what's being financed by the baseline; neither in the table, nor in the section on "Additional Cost Reasoning."

For example, it is written that "*Under output 2.2, baseline projects will focus on providing inputs and technical support for production, processing and marketing of priority NTFPs (gum Arabic, desert date, among others) and agro-pastoral products in support of income diversification, while also supporting the development of climate resilient and sustainable value chains for these priority products. The LDCF project can learn from these processes, and through the Caisses de résilience replicate successes in other geographies and/or for other products, involving private producers that have benefitted from APFS training. Baseline investments and LDCF investments together assure a broader diversification of income and as a result more resilient livelihoods of vulnerable NR users in Southern Wilayas of Mauritania.*" Aside from "learning from these processes", how exactly is the LDCF adding value here?

GEFSEC, 7/16/2019 - The agency has clarified the additionality of the LDCF financing in detail in the table below, which has also been added to the Portal submission.

Agency Response

6/27/2019

In addition to the answer above, the following summary table should help clarify co-financing contributions and LDCF additionality, and spell out more clearly the coherency between table C and sections 1.2 The Baseline Scenario - Baseline projects and 1.4 Additional cost reasoning. This table has also been added in the PIF in section 1.4.

Co-financing	Specific deliverable	LDCF additionality	Comp 1	Comp 2	Comp 3	PM
GCF component 1	This component of the GCF project will provide support to capacity development of the extension services for climate change impact and vulnerability assessments and facilitated knowledge exchange between national and regional levels.	Further link the national and regional level to the local context, with participation in decision making, planning, implementation and monitoring facilitated through appropriate and innovative tools and approaches.	\$ 1,338,735		\$ 1,002,945	
GCF component 2	GCF project component 2 will help rehabilitate rangelands, introduce land use and infrastructure maintenance plans for livestock corridors, sustainable charcoal production reducing tree logging and associated land degradation, etc.	Innovations introduced by the LDCF project, such as the Caisses de Résilience, eventually will be upscaled by the GCF project.		\$ 7,658,320		

Resilience of food insecurity and nutrition P2RS (MRD)	This project provides inputs and technical support for production, processing and marketing of priority agro-pastoral products in support of income diversification. Furthermore, investments are made in infrastructure development and development/ integration into regional markets.	LDCF investments enhance the natural resource governance models by introducing tools and approaches that facilitate conflict resolution and participation, and offer concrete ways to replicate successes. Furthermore, introduce the landscape dimension for system resiliency.		\$ 1,000,000		
BRIDGES (MEDD)	The baseline project restores 5,000 ha of dryland forests and landscapes in the pilot areas using tried and tested approaches, strengthening seed centres and programmes and establishing networks of village-level technicians, while it also reinforces value chains of NTFP.	The LDCF project ensures climate resiliency is fully embedded in development efforts of vulnerable dryland forests and agro-silvo-pastoral systems such as the ones of the Mauritanian Sahel. Furthermore, the LDCF connects the grassroots to the regional and national level, where BRIDGES also successfully brings in lessons from other but similar dryland regions through improved South-South cooperation.		\$ 1,000,000		

AMCC-2 (MEDD)	In addition to the support provided to SLM and climate smart agro-silvo-pastoral production practices, the project also looks into tenure issues, and in particular barriers faced by women.	LDCF capitalises and disseminates successful practices and approaches using APFS, creating a network that eventually extends beyond the project pilot areas. In terms of conflict resolution, re-use of abandoned land and tenure issues, the LDCF project introduced VGGT as a successful approach, complementing AMCC-2 work thematically and geographically, and building upon study findings.		\$ 1,000,000		
FAO-TCP	Where the LDCF and baseline projects provide ecosystem and livelihood resiliency answers at the system level to predicted climate change trends, the TCP will carve out a space for, attention to and action on climate risk management, effectively engaging the governance structure and tools put in place by the LDCF project.	The LDCF project outputs 1.1 and 1.2 provide the basis to successfully apply multi-sectoral, bottom-up and place-based interventions.	\$ 428,570			\$ 71,430

CNOEZA	Data collection and analysis on status of natural resource base, improving understanding of environment issues. And contribute to capacity development of national and regional institutions to integrate NR and climate change adaptation into policies, plans and strategies.	Facilitate knowledge exchange and access to data and information for participatory monitoring, evaluation and learning, therefore linking the national, regional level to the local context.			\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000
TOTAL			\$ 1,767,305	\$ 10,658,320	\$ 2,002,945	\$ 571,430

4/29/2019

Additional information has been provided in section 1.4 to better illustrate the complementarity between investments in the project area.

4/18/2019

The following paragraph was inserted in Section 1.4. Additional Cost Reasoning. The GCF project is entitled ‘Enhancing the resilience to climate change of livelihoods and food security of agro-silvo-pastoral communities in southwestern Mauritania’. It is implemented in the same target wilayas as the LDCF project (Ref. Response to Item 2). The LDCF project will build on the results of the projects considered as baseline projects. The LDCF project will define its implementation strategy after having conducted an in depth analysis of the approach adopted by the baseline projects and their impacts. This analysis will be conducted using various criteria : (i) thematic areas covered by the baseline projects, (ii) the scale of the baseline projects and, (iii) and the magnitude of the projects. At design stage, the LDCF project will define further the thematic areas to be covered : (i) perhaps, there will be a need to develop specific financial inclusion mechanisms to strengthen resilience of most vulnerable categories, or/and; (ii) build the capacity or provide producers with a drought resilient crop species. At design stage, the LDCF project will define whether it will be implemented at commune or sub commune or village level and based on the resources available, the LDCF project will define the number of communes/ sub commune or village to be targeted, while trying to optimize the impacts of the project.

6. Are the project’s/program’s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - Not quite. Meta-information worksheet was not filled in and the information provided in the section detailing adaptation benefits is somewhat vague.

Recommended action - Please refer to item 6 in section 1 of this review sheet and please briefly describe the concrete adaptation benefits in this project in the appropriate section. I.E., does how does this project reduce vulnerability of people, households, and communities in the target areas.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Cleared. More detail regarding concrete adaptation benefits attributable to the target beneficiary groups is expected at CEO endorsement stage.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

Noted with thanks.

4/17/2019

The following paragraph was inserted in section 1.5. Adaptation Benefits. Target beneficiaries will become more resilient to climate change because alternative livelihoods will be promoted. Further investment in livestock or diversification of cropping systems including the adoption of drought resistant species or appropriate cropping patterns will contribute to more resilience to climate change. At the same time, technical and financial innovations that will be promoted in APFS and 'Caisses de Résilience' will contribute to reduce the vulnerability of ecosystems to climate change. The LDCF project is about promoting innovations in a specific context that will be up scaled in larger operations.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - Although the project builds upon proven models, such as agro-pastoral fields schools, the project will also introduce the watershed approach to addressing climate change. The project will deploy innovative technologies and approaches in order to support climate resilient agro-silvo-pastoral production and livelihoods options (see lists above). Also innovations will be introduced in the land use planning, management and monitoring, not only when it comes to tools and technologies, but also with respect to scale (landscape versus plot), and approach (multi-actor and participatory). Sustainability will be promoted through capacity building and mainstreaming of best practices within government and community institutions, and the proposal indicates that efforts will be made to ensure best practices are upscaled locally, regionally, nationally and globally, which will include the twinning of this project with similar regional efforts, e.g., Darfur LDCF investment.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - Yes. A preliminary geo-reference tag is provided.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - Yes. A detailed indicative matrix of stakeholders is provided and further analysis will be undertaken at PPG.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/17/2019 - Yes. Indicative information regarding how the project will address gender equality is provided. A gender analysis and action plan will be undertaken at PPG, which will guide a project specific gender mainstreaming plan with actions to be taken under each component and necessary budgetary provision as appropriate. The assessment will determine at the household and State levels: the number of female resource users; the number of women headed households; the differentiated impacts of climate change and drought on women; the different knowledge base of men and women; strategies for mainstreaming gender into natural resource management; strategies for optimizing the participation of women in natural resource management and optimizing their economic benefit.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - More information requested.

Recommended action - Please briefly expand on these "private sector" entities that are benefitting from the project. Are these micro-enterprises? Individual farmers? Please clarify also what venture capital is being referred to in under component 2. Are there already sources being targeted for this?

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Cleared. Further details regarding the Caisse de Resilience approach would be appreciated at CEO endorsement stage.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

Noted with thanks.

4/17/2019

The following paragraph was inserted in Section 1.6. Innovativeness, Sustainability and Potential for scaling up. Private sector entities are retailers, middlemen, small business and individual farmers/women: the concept of 'Caisse de Résilience' will be promoted. In the setting of the APFS, producers/Women will buy capital shares : members of the association will access to credit on the basis of the shares they purchased on a rotational basis. Venture capital will then be provided by group members.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - More information requested. A risk matrix is included in the submission but it does not include the possibility of fiduciary risk.

Recommended action: Please indicate whether there is any fiduciary risk and how this will be mitigated.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Cleared. The recommended action has been taken and reflected in the Risk section.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

Noted with thanks.

4/17/2019

A line including the Fiduciary Risk was inserted in the Table showing the risks. FAO procedures will be applied and a fiduciary assesment of potential operational partners will be undertaken at PPG thus informing the optimal project execution modality and to mitigate the risks.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - Clarification requested. The MEA/SDG project listed in the PIF submission as an LDCF-financed project does not seem to be a current LDCF project. There also several projects in the GCF pipeline, in addition to readiness activities in Mauritania could warrant coordination and cooperation as well.

Recommended action - Please clarify if the SDG project is actually being financed by the LDCF. Additionally, there are other projects being financed by the LDCF and implemented by the AfDB, IFAD, and UNEP. Please indicate whether project proponents will also coordinate with these projects to take advantage of any relevant lessons, while also preventing duplication, as well as with those projects in the GCF pipeline.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - The question regarding the GCF pipeline was not addressed.

Please address the above comment regarding the GCF pipeline.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Cleared. The project in the GCF pipeline was added and the agency has indicated that proper alignment and coordination will be ensured during PPG.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

The GCF pipeline (only 1 relevant project) has been added and provisions will be made during PPG to assure proper alignment and coordination.

4/18/2019

The SDG project is funded under the GEF Trust Fund. The other projects financed by LDCF and implemented by IFAD, AFDB and UNEP are respectively : Support to the Adaptation of Vulnerable Agricultural Production Systems in Mauritania Poverty Reduction Project in Aftout South and Karakoro - Phase II (3.5 USD Million), Improving climate resilience of water sector investments with appropriate climate adaptive activities for pastoral and forestry resources in southern Mauritania (6.350 USD million), and Development of an improved and innovative delivery system for climate resilient livelihoods in Mauritania (5 USD Million). These 3 projects are close to completion. But, project proponents will take advantage of the lessons learnt from these projects . Relevant information about these projects is provided in the table shown under the section GEF Financed projects

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 7/17/2019 - More information requested. Section 7 provides some information regarding alignment with national strategies, plans, and processes; but more information would be appreciated.

Recommended action: Please provide more information regarding which NAPA priorities this project addresses, as well as how this project will coordinate with and inform the in-country NAP process. The country has applied for NAP readiness funding from the GCF.

- Additionally, some of the national policies listed here seem outdated - please ensure policies presented in this PIF are up-to-date. For example, the third PRSP is used as an example here, but it only covered the period up until 2015. Are there any national climate change policies and/or strategies aside from UNFCCC-related workstreams? Please list them here.

- The GGW is listed here as a policy, which it is not. Please remove it from this section.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - This item is not cleared. The submission does not address the above comments.

Recommended action: Please address the above comments on the NAP process. Additionally, the agency indicates that a new NAPA will be formulated as part of NAP readiness. Is this the case? Please clarify because that does not sound likely, although I could be mistaken.

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - Cleared. The Agency has clarified that no new NAPA will be produced as part of the NAP process or readiness activities. Outdated policies have been removed, but it is expected that, by CEO endorsement, relevant strategies, plans, and policies will be updated accordingly.

Agency Response

4/29/2019

Apologies for the erroneous information and oversight. The confusion on the updated NAPA process stems from an activity in the GCF Readiness project, which reads as follows: *Adapt existing cost-benefit analysis (CBA) system to the Mauritanian context. Use CBA system to revise the adaptation options in the NAPA and NDC by considering the long-term perspective as well as economic, ecosystem and social costs and benefits for unintended impacts of adaptation interventions in Mauritania.* This does not entail a new NAPA formulation process though, and therefore, the paragraph has been removed from the PIF.

Other minor amendments have been made in Section 7 and alignment with the NAP process has been included in section 6 (Coordination).

4/17/2019

The following paragraphs were inserted in section 7. Consistency with National policies:

A new NAPA is being designed under the readiness project that is funded by GCF. UNEP supported Mauritania in applying to GCF readiness funding for the formulation of the NAPA (GEF Secretariat, 2018). GIZ supported Mauritania through its different channels of support, on the process to formulate and implement the NAPA and because of the existence of NAPA support projects and designated GIZ staff in the field. Mauritania is supported through selected activities relevant to the process to formulate and implement the NAPA such as through conducting workshops to initiate/launch the process (GEF Secretariat, 2018).

Integrated climate territorial plans elaborated in the setting of the program ‘Alliance Mondiale contre le Changement Climatique Mauritanie : Enclencher un processus de résilience en matière de sécurité alimentaire» (AMCC1) . This program is implemented in a partnership between GIZ, EU, the Government of Mauritania, the German Cooperation and UNDP. 1 phase AMCC1 is already completed and a 2nd phase (AMCC2) is under implementation.

The PRSP has been removed from the table. GGW has been removed from the table.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/18/2019 - Yes. Specific knowledge management activities are incorporated within the project’s components . The broader dissemination of experience and lessons learnt generated by the project will be also pursued through engaging national and regional technical and educational institutions, and regionally and internationally through South-South cooperation mechanisms.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/1/2019 - Yes. An LOE signed by the current OFP has been submitted.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 6/12/2019 - It seems that previous text in this box was deleted - this is a known Portal issue and has been reported to the IT team.


Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit for consideration.


GEFSEC, 7/17/2019 - Yes. The agency has adequately addressed all concerns from the Secretariat at this stage in project development. This project is being recommended for technical clearance.


GEFSEC, 10/24/2019 - GEF PPO has flagged the following issues. **Please address and resubmit for consideration.**


- 1) Project titles do not match (OFP LOE and title in the portal). Please change either the title in the portal or submit a new LOE with the correct title.
- 2) In Coordination – it is mentioned that “*At the national level, MEDD and FAO will be responsible for coordination.*” It is unclear whether that means that FAO intends to have any role in the project’s execution – Please confirm that this is not the case and remove FAO from this statement.
- 3) Lastly, the number of beneficiaries for a project requesting \$5 million is still a bit low, as discussed. Please revisit these indicative figures and provide an update if possible.

GEFSEC, 10/30/2019 - Cleared. The agency has addressed the above comments via email and updated the core indicators spreadsheet. A screenshot of the Outlook item containing the agency's responses is below.

 Mauritania LDCF review sheet

To  Katya Kuang-Idba

Cc  Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org

 You replied to this message on 10/25/2019 10:24 AM.
This message was sent with High importance.

[External]

Dear Katya,

Thank you for pushing this project forward in the review process. Please, note that we have addressed the concerns from operations as follows (we cannot insert this language in the Portal, but you'll see the PIF updates highlighted in yellow under the Coordination section).

GEFSEC, 10/24/2019 - GEF PPO has flagged the following issues. Please address and resubmit for consideration.

1) Project titles do not match (OFP LOE and title in the portal). Please change either the title in the portal or submit a new LOE with the correct title.

The title in the LOE has been retained, and corrected in the Portal to ensure coherency.

2) In Coordination – it is mentioned that “*At the national level, MEDD and FAO will be responsible for coordination.*” It is unclear whether that means that FAO intends to have any role in the project’s execution – Please confirm that this is not the case and remove FAO from this statement.

The PIF language has been revised. FAO does not intend to execute the project, and steps to be undertaken during PPG to secure the engagement of an execution partner that has the demonstrated technical and operational capacity to execute, are summarised in the PIF. This process of identifying the most appropriate executing arrangements will be an open and transparent one and the GEF secretariat will be consulted regularly as part of this process.

With kind regards,
Maude

GEFSEC, 11/11/2019 -

Point 2 has Not been fully addressed – while there is some language that aims to clarify, there remains an intent with the statement:

“In that case, selected project execution support services will be delegated to another execution partner, who fully meets technical and operational requirements for timely and quality project execution. **This latter may be FAO if no other cost effective and technically sound partners can be assessed positively during PPG.**”

In this case, as the procedure established during the Agency retreat has not been followed (early consultation with GEF Secretariat – Program Manager’s approval – GPU Manager clearance of such approval – letter of support from GEF OFP), **please either remove any intent of carrying out executing functions or include or explicitly acknowledge the below:**

“As the agency is well aware of, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate as per GEF policy and guidelines. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis, based on country requests. We strongly encourage the project proponents to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for project execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses or encourages any alternative execution arrangement.”

GEFSEC, 11/12/2019 - This item is cleared. The agency has removed the problematic language and clearly indicated that FAO will only serve as the implementing agency and in a coordinating capacity.

GEFSEC, 4/15/2020 - This project was cleared in November 2019, but for the June 2020 Work Program, we are reviewing the ESS for all PIFs. Section 5 of the PIF show that climate related risks screening has taken place, but the PIF does not elaborate on any other preliminary ESS potential risks and impacts. As such, FAO should provide the completed FAO’s Environmental and Social Risk Identification – Screening Checklist or FAO’s “Project Risk Certification” with explanation of risk screening. Please attach that review note and or indicate more clearly, in line with the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, the indicative information regarding any Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project or program; and any measures to address such risks and impacts.

1.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval