

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

Review PIF 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**

1/1/2020

**Review completed by PM**

9/4/2020

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## **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

**February 2, 2020**

Yes, the project aligns with CBIT objectives. Cleared.

## Agency Response

### 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

**February 2, 2020**

The project is comprehensive on its scope as described in Table B. Nevertheless, more clarity is needed when it comes to M&E system which will have an important role. The project description explains that Mauritania has already set up a "functional and robust M&E system" which will integrate the MRV system. Please explain with more clarity what is the existing M&E system (role, partners, modalities...) so that we can better understand how the project will articulate with this system.

**September 4, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**August 26, 2020**

Further information on the existing national M&E system on the environment and sustainable development has been provided under section 2 – *the baseline scenario*, as well as the added value to be provided by CBIT with regard to the MRV system and climate change information (p. 6-8; 13).

*Note: as requested, the edits have been highlighted in yellow in the updated version of the PIF uploaded on the portal.*

## 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  
**February 2, 2020**

This project does not required co-financing. Co-financing of \$161,450 in-kind from the government is listed. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**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  
**February 2, 2020**

Yes. The project is requesting funding from the CBIT set-aside. Cleared.

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
N/A. The project is requesting funding from the CBIT set-aside.

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A. The project is requesting funding from the CBIT set-aside.

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A. The project is requesting funding from the CBIT set-aside.

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A. The project is requesting funding from the CBIT set-aside.

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project is requesting a total of \$1,261,659 from the CBIT set-aside. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

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

**February 2, 2020**

Yes. Cleared.

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

**February 2, 2020**

The project is expected to benefit to 45 direct beneficiaries. Please clarify who the beneficiaries are and how this estimate was determined.

**September 4, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**August 26, 2020**

Further clarification has been provided below the table F. *Project's Target Contributions to GEF 7 Core Indicators* (p. 3).

**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

**February 2, 2020**

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**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

**February 2, 2020**

The root causes and barriers are described under the baseline scenario while these elements should appear under "a. The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed". Please follow the table of contents as proposed in the Portal.

**September 4, 2020**

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

**August 26, 2020**

The text in section 1a. (1) *The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed* now includes the overview of the country's gaps and barriers (p. 5-6).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**February 2, 2020**

The baseline scenario as referred as "national efforts" is unclear. It relies on developing a future Mauritania's Domestic MRV System which forms the basis for the requested GEF support. Please clarify what is actually already in place and planned with MRV System so that we can better understand the difference and the potential complementarity between this baseline and the project.

**September 4, 2020**

Thank you for the addition inputs and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response



**August 26, 2020**

Further information on what is already in place and planned steps with regard to the MRV system and climate change information has been provided under section 2 – *the baseline scenario*, as well as the added value to be provided by CBIT (p. 6-8; 13).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**February 2, 2020**

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**February 2, 2020**

Yes, the proposal is aligned with CBIT strategies. Cleared.

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

**February 2, 2020**

As already mentioned, the existing M&E System is not clearly described so the additional cost reasoning of the project remains unclear. Based on a more detailed description of the existing M&E System, please explain further what is expected contribution of the baseline and what is the added value of the GEF funding.

**September 4, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**August 26, 2020**

Section 5- *Incremental/Additional Cost Reasoning* has been amended with additional information on the expected contribution of the baseline (existing M&E system) and the added value of the GEF funding for this CBIT project (p. 23).

**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

**February 2, 2020**

Focusing on the enhancement of the national climate transparency capacity, the project is expected to benefit to 45 direct beneficiaries. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**February 2, 2020**

1. The description says that CCPNCC does not have sufficient human, financial and material resources to carry out its mission properly. Please explain how this issue will be addressed to ensure the sustainability of the results after the end of the project.

2. The proposal also explains that once the MRV system is piloted in the selected sectors (energy and agriculture), the activity will be scaled up to other sectors. Please explain how and with which support this expected scaling up can be achieved after the completion of the project so that all the relevant sectors are taken into account in the future ETF.

**September 4, 2020**

1 and 2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**August 26, 2020**

1. Further clarification has been provided in section 7. Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up (p. 25), referring to the integration of MRV activities in the legal framework, institutional arrangements and national budget.
2. Section 7. Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up has been amended with information on how the replication of sectoral experiences is expected to occur and potential additional sources of support (p. 25).

**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

**February 2, 2020**

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

Agency Response

**November 19, 2020**

The map has been updated on the Portal and on the uploaded PIF document, with the proper designation for “Western Sahara”. Our apologies for this oversight.

**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

**February 2, 2020**

Yes. Cleared.

**September 11, 2020**

The proposal mentions that there have been consultations on the project with civil society and private sector, prior to the submission of the PIF. However, there’s no description of those consultations. Please provide a description of the stakeholder consultations that took place with civil society organizations, and private sector entities, as indicated in the Stakeholders section (#2). Please note that the GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement (Nov 2017) requires that at PIF stage ‘Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...’. Please apology for not having raised this issue earlier.

**October 15, 2020**

Thank you for the additional information. Nevertheless, while the comment highlighted in particular the CSOs and private sector entities, the text still doesn't mention how these categories have been consulted and who they are. The conclave 1 only includes national institutions and there is no list of participants for the conclave 2. In addition, the mention of CSOs and private sector entities in the table 1 remains very vague about who these stakeholders precisely are. Please note that our previous comment requested to provide a description of the stakeholder consultations that took place with civil society organizations, and private sector entities. Please complete as expected.

**November 17, 2020**

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**October 7, 2020**

Further information on the consultations held at PIF stage has been provided under section “2. Stakeholders” (p. 26-28).

**November 9, 2020**

The section “2. Stakeholders” (pages 26-30) has been further amended with information on the names of private sector, CSO and other non-state stakeholders consulted during the PIF development. These stakeholders have been consulted as part of the 2nd conclave held on 19 September 2019.

*Note: the additional edits have been highlighted in yellow in the updated PDF version of the PIF uploaded in the "Documents" section of the GEF Portal.*

#### **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

**February 2, 2020**

Yes. Cleared.

**September 11, 2020**

The PIF references the 2012 GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming and the old GEF Gender Equality Action Plan. GEF's new policy and guidelines on gender equality have now been in effect for over two years and it is important that the project closely review the new requirements and guidelines. This is not critical but as the project is sent back for clarification about the stakeholder consultations, please include a reference to the latest gender policy and guidelines.

**October 15, 2020**

Thank you for updating the reference to the latest gender policy and guidelines Cleared.

Agency Response

**October 7, 2020**

The gender section was updated with reference to the latest new GEF Policy on Gender Equality (GEF, 2017c) (p. 30).

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**February 2, 2020**

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**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  
**February 2, 2020**

Relevant potential risks are taken into account. Please assess and incorporate climate change risks.

**September 4, 2020**

Thank you for the additional inputs. Cleared.

Agency Response

**August 26, 2020**

Climate change risks have been incorporated in section 5. *Risks*, with the risk level and mitigation measures assessed for Mauritania (p. 31-32). A risk related to the Covid-19 pandemic has also been included in the table.

**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  
**February 2, 2020**

The description says that the CCPNCC will be the Project Executing Agency at the national level and refers to figure 1 which describes the existing structure of the National Transparency Framework. Nevertheless, the institutional coordination and arrangements specific to the project remains unclear, notably as regard to the project monitoring and evaluation. Please explain further.

**September 4, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**August 26, 2020**

Further clarification has been provided in section 6. *Coordination*, with additional information on the national arrangements for project monitoring and evaluation, which will make use of the existing structure illustrated in Figure 1 so as to ensure cost-effectiveness and avoid duplication of efforts (p. 32-33). Moreover, the institutional arrangements for this project have been added as per Figure 3: Structure of CBIT Coordination (p. 33).

**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

**February 2, 2020**

Yes. The project is consistent with national strategies and plans. Cleared.

Agency Response

**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  
**February 2, 2020**

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
**September 4, 2020**

Even if the PIF was submitted in November 5, 2019, the Agency uploaded its ESS screening and estimated the overall risk as low. Cleared

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  
**February 2, 2020**

Yes. Cleared.

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

N/A

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

**February 3, 2020**

Not yet. Please address the comments. To facilitate the review process, please also highlight in yellow the changes in the text of the proposal.

**September 11, 2020**

Not yet. Please address the comments above in stakeholders and gender boxes.

**October 15, 2020**

Not yet. The comments above on stakeholders consultations has not been addressed.

**November 17, 2020**

Thank you for addressing the comment. Nevertheless, we see a map in the Portal and in the uploaded project document with the name of Morocco where the official maps of the UN show Western Sahara. To avoid any difficulty during the project design and implementation, please simply remove the name on this territory (better) or use UN official maps. Please apology for not having raised this issue in the previous reviews.

**November 23, 2020:**

Thank you for amending the map. The PIF and PPG are now recommended.

**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**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	<b>2/3/2020</b>	<b>8/26/2020</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/11/2020</b>	<b>10/7/2020</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/15/2020</b>	<b>11/9/2020</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/17/2020</b>	<b>11/19/2020</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

Context and problems to address

Mauritania has undertaken a wide range of activities as part of efforts to ensure an effective implementation of the UNFCCC. In particular, the country has prepared and submitted Four NCs respectively in 2001, 2008, 2014 and 2019; its First BUR in 2016, the first to be submitted by a Least Developed Country (LDC), the second one being expected in 2020; four national GHG Inventories. The country submitted its National Determined Contribution in September 2015 and joined the Paris agreement in February 2017.

Building on this experience, Mauritania has already designed a simple non-burdensome MRV structure easy to integrate and be accepted by the other institutions, while meeting the essential elements of an MRV system. Although the new structure has been developed for the preparation of the latest National Communication and BUR, it is not fully institutionalized, and it doesn't have the necessary modalities and procedures to ensure continuous MRV.

To comply in particular with the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement, the countries identified important gaps and barriers: Institutional weakness in the coordination of activities; Legal, regulatory and formal procedural limitation in establishing proper mandates and implementation tools particularly

regarding the MRV system; Lack of data and access to information for a robust and detailed M&E system; Lack of capacities and technical expertise; and Financial constraints.

The project objectives and components:

Addressing these gaps, the CBIT project aims to improve Mauritania's MRV system and institutional capacity. This will be done by strengthening Mauritania's capacity to collect and process climate change data into useful information for policy-making and reporting to the UNFCCC. To achieve this, the project will focus on 3 main outputs:

- - Output 1. National institutions strengthened to coordinate, manage and implement climate transparency activities.
- - Output 2. Technical support, training and tools provided to the country to submit transparent, consistent, comparable, complete and accurate greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories.
- - Output 3. Technical support, training and tools provided to the country to track Nationally Determined Contributions on Mitigation, Adaptation & Vulnerability and support needed and received.

Mauritania's CBIT project will build on the existing GHG inventory system and establish a functional and robust MRV system that will withstand long-term climate reporting both inside the country and to the international community. It will include the establishment of an online centralized climate change data hub, reporting tools, templates and training and capacity development of new and existing teams in transparency related activities.

Co-financing:

The Government of Mauritania will provide an additional in-kind contribution of \$161,450.