

Strengthening Mauritania's national capacity for transparency and ambitious climate reporting

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10428

Countries

Mauritania

Project Name

Strengthening Mauritania's national capacity for transparency and ambitious climate reporting

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

10/11/2021

Review completed by PM

11/12/2021

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

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
October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
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
October 26, 2021:

We note that the co-financing contribution to the PMC is 6.6% of the project co-financing while the GEF contribution to the PMC is 10% of the GEF support to the project. These 2 ratios should be the same. If the GEF contribution to the PMC remains at 10%, then the co-financing contribution should be around \$15,143 (10% of the co-financing supporting the project) instead of \$10,020 as it is now. Please ensure the

contributions to PMC by the GEF and by the co-financing are at the same level, either decreasing the GEF contribution or increasing the co-financing contribution.

November 11, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

2 November 2021

We have increased the PMC fraction of the co-finance contribution to US\$ 15,000.

Note to reviewer: we have uploaded 2 PDF version of the CEO Endorsement Document on the GEF Portal: 1 with yellow highlights of our edits (for ease of review) and 1 "clean" version without any highlights.

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

October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 26, 2021:

The total amount of PPG spent and committed is \$45,827 out of \$50,000 made available. Please clarify what is expected to be done with the outstanding balance.

November 17, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. As the the spent amount (\$39,827) + the committed amount (\$6,000) don't add up to the budgeted amount (\$50,000), in order to clarify the table, please include the outstanding balance of \$4,173 as a place holder in a budget line namely "further preparation activities to be carried after CEO Approval", under the column "Amount committed".

November 18, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

2 November 2021

We would like to clarify that the planned PPG budget was affected by COVID-19 pandemic. Indeed, since traveling and in-person meetings were not allowed due to in-country restrictions, part of the budget allocated for these meetings and all of the budget allocated for traveling was not used (consultations were essentially done remotely).

In accordance with the GEF policy on this matter, if at CEO approval there is a balance of unspent PPG fund, Agencies can continue to undertake preparation activities with these PPG funds up to one (1) year of CEO approval date.

At the present time, Mauritania has not yet decided how they will use these leftover funds. It has therefore been agreed that during the project's inception phase, the Department of Climate and the Green Economy of Mauritania (the Executing Agency) will consult with UNEP (the Implementing Agency) to decide for which type of complementary preparation activity(ies) the leftover PPG funds could be used, to further inform and support the CBIT project. If these leftover funds are not used for preparatory activities within one (1) year of CEO approval, they will be returned to the GEF, as per the standard practice.

18 November 2021

Thank you for your comment. We have amended the table in Annex C as per your recommendations.

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
October 26, 2021:

The number of beneficiaries has increased to 120 (from 45 in the PIF). Cleared.

Agency Response

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
October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 26, 2021:

1. We learn that the CCPNCC has been redesigned into a directorate (Directorate of Climate and Green Economy) in 2020. Nevertheless, the CCPNCC is mentioned many times as if it was still existing ("data and information are stored simultaneously in the database unit of the CCPNCC", "information on MRV is available on a website managed by the CCPNCC", ...). Please clarify what is the CCPNCC today.
2. The GTNCC is mentioned twice in the description but we don't know what it is. Please explain.
3. In the baseline scenario, we find an extensive description of the gaps and barriers. This elements should be moved under the 1st section on "1. Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed".
4. The presentation of the Steps 1, 2, 3 and 4 is confusing as it is already the description of the alternative scenario and part of the CBIT project activities. Please move these steps in the following section on the alternative scenario and articulate them with the appropriate outputs and activities.

November 11, 2021:

Thank you for the clarifications and improvements. Cleared.

Agency Response

2 November 2021

1. The CCPNCC no longer exist as it has been replaced by the DCEV since September 2020, with the promulgation of Decree 165/2020. The text of the CEO Endorsement Document has been modified accordingly to better reflect the transition from the previous CCPNCC to the new DCEV. Whenever the "Baseline scenario" section refers to work / achievements that occurred before September 2020, the text naturally refers to the CCPNCC, since the DCEV did not exist at that time. However, for any work from September 2020 onward, the text now explicitly refers to DCEV.
2. The GTNCC was a team of national experts created for the development and implementation of the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and is now replaced by the GTSCC (Technical working groups) for all thematic areas. GTNCC stands for National Technical Expert Group on Climate Change (*Groupe de Travail National de Changement Climatique* in French). This has been clarified in the CEO Endorsement Document and in the Annex on acronyms.
3. Substantial portions of the text related to gaps and barriers that were in the "Baseline scenario" section have now been moved under section "1. Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed", as requested. Some elements related to gaps and barriers have still been left in the "Baseline scenario" section, since they build onto the preparation of the NC4 and BUR2 (considered as part

of the baseline) and because they also help make the transition between the baseline information and the subsequent *Alternative scenario* section.

4. The text on the 4 steps has been moved as proposed, in line with the appropriate outputs and activities.

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

October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 26, 2021:

There is no specific location as the project interventions are at country level. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 27, 2021:

There is no need to copy-paste from the PIF the description of the consultations and their results during the project identification phase. Please focus the description on the consultations and their results during the project design phase (PPG phase).

November 11, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

2 November 2021

Descriptions of the consultations held at PIF stage have now been removed. The section on 'Stakeholders' now focuses on consultations held during the PPG phase.

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

October 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

October 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 27, 2021:

Partially. In addition, please elaborate further on 1) how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan, and 2) how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact.

November 11, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

2 November 2021

Two paragraphs were added to the CEO Endorsement Document, one on 1) how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan, and another one on 2) how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact.

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

October 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 27, 2021:

Please add in this section the Annex J ("M&E Budget and Workplan").

November 11, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

2 November 2021

Comment taken. The M&E table from Annex J has been pasted in section 9. *Monitoring and Evaluation* of the GEF Portal field.

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

October 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 26, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 27, 2021:

Partially. Several outputs and their results are missing (trainings, guidelines, templates, MRV system, ...) and the description focuses mainly on the rating of some results. Please complete the description focusing on the main results for each of the 3 outcomes and taking into account the gender analysis and its related implication for the project results.

November 17, 2021:

Please include GEF Indicator 11 (Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender) into Annex A 'Project Results Framework'.

November 18, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

2 November 2021

Based on past guidance received from the GEF, it is our understanding that the Project Results Framework (Annex A) is meant to monitor / measure the project achievements and/or behaviour change induced by the project's intervention at the Objective and Outcome levels only - not at the Output level. This is why no reference is made to the 3 project Outputs in Annex A.

On the other hand, the expected results associated with the 3 project Outputs will materialize through the project 'deliverables'. As such, the different elements such as trainings, guidelines, templates, MRV system, etc., are simply 'deliverables' contributing to the different project Outputs, and their delivery will be tracked / monitored through the project Workplan (Annex L).

Finally, regarding the comment on gender implications for the project results framework, please note that Indicator & Target 1.2 does provide a gender disaggregated figure (i.e. 17 men and 9 women) for the number of national stakeholders that will be using the project's training and tools to elaborate climate change policies and report NDC activities, as a result of the project's intervention. In addition, to avoid redundancy, we have not included the GEF Core Indicator on Direct Beneficiaries disaggregated by gender in the Project Results Framework, since the CEO Endorsement Document already has a dedicated Annex for that (Annex F).

18 November 2021

GEF Core Indicator 11 has now been included in the Project Results Framework (Annex A) as Objective Level Indicator 'C'.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

October 26, 2021:

Please address the comment raised above on PPG utilization in Annex C.

November 11, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

2 November 2021

[Please refer to our earlier reply on the same.](#)

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 26, 2021:

There is no specific location as the project interventions are at country level. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

October 27, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

November 11, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the last 2 remaining comments on the PPG table and the Project Results Framework.

November 18, 2021:

The last comments have been addressed. The CEO approval is now recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/27/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/18/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations