



# Integrated Natural Resource Management of three Wetlands landscapes, two of which is located on the route of the Great Green Wall in Mauritania (Male, Djelliwar and Karakoro (PGIRN/3ZH)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11128

**Countries**

Mauritania

**Project Name**

Integrated Natural Resource Management of three Wetlands landscapes, two of which is located on the route of the Great Green Wall in Mauritania (Male, Djelliwar and Karakoro (PGIRN/3ZH)

**Agencies**

IUCN

**Date received by PM**

6/20/2024

**Review completed by PM**

8/21/2024

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**CEO**

**Part I - General Project Information**

**1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

However, while the CCM benefits have been identified in the proposal, including in the ToC, the CCA benefits are missing. While the CC-M benefits of restoration and improved management practices are clear, please consider making the CC-A benefits of these practices clearer, particularly in the ToC.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

20 August 2024

CCA benefits are present in the ProDoc core objective under the paradigm shift GEB objectives *Enhancing ecosystem resilience to shocks such as climate change?* 4.1.1.

Additional mentions have been made for CCA benefits under ToC and RF:

- Ecosystem services contributing to *Climate resilience?* has been integrated as part of the main objective of the project (cf. ToC) and R2 underlined the ecosystem resilience to climate *and more resilient to climate shocks?*

Impact and climate co-benefit indicator have been added as *producer's improved perception of their capacity to face climate shocks?*. From Low to Medium. Indicators is based on producer sensation easier to measures; Few technical aspects will be considered to reinforce the objectivity of the indicator.

## 2. Project Summary.

- a) **Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**
- b) **Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**
- c) **[If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Not fully.

Please include a paragraph that informs that the the project is part of the Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Program (ERIP), including the specific role and strategic contribution of the child project to the program.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

20 August 2024

Under the relevant section in both the CEO endorsement and the Prodoc, a paragraph has now been amended to clarify this as a child project under the ERIP.).

### **3. Project Description Overview**

- a) **Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) **[If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) **Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- d) **Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- e) **Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- f) **Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Editorial comments:

- The document includes many acronyms which have not been spelled out the first time they are being used in the document, making it difficult to understand for the reader. Please edit.
- Some sections of the CEO Endorsement document could be further elaborated/strengthened, such as for instance the projects components/outputs, project alignment with national priorities and prioritization of selected sites. Useful information on these topics has been provided in the Agency Project Document. However, since only the GEF CEO Endorsement is published in the GEF website, please consider to elaborate on these topics by copying/pasting from the ProDoc.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

20 August 2024

All first acronyms have been spelled out.

CEO sections update. Detailed and sections have been added to CEO on the three aspects: (i) Components/Outputs; (ii) Project alignment with National Priorities; (iii) Site prioritization. Please see CEO section B and C

### **4. Project Outline**

#### **A. Project Rationale**

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Not fully.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

20 August 2024

Diagrams on the vicious circles of degradation of the wetland's ecosystems and the virtuous circles of restoration have been added to clarify the current situation and the adequacy of the project rationale. ProDoc and CEO have been updated. Please refer to the ?B of the CEO on the section namely ?Vicious circles of degradation and virtuous circles of restoration?.

#### **5 B. Project Description**

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?**
- d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits**

identified?

**f) Other Benefits:** Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

**g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**

**h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**

**i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**

**j) Gender:** Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

**k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**l) Policy Coherence:** Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

**m) Transformation and/or innovation:** Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Not fully.

On ToC and benefits:

- While the CCM benefits have been identified in the proposal, including in the ToC, the CCA benefits are missing. While it is clear the CCA benefits of restoration and improved management practices, please consider making the CCA benefits of these practices clearer, particularly in the ToC.

On gender:

- Although specific indicators have been added for gender, overall gender aspects could be better mainstreamed across the outcomes and outputs of the project. In addition, please ensure that the KM and communications products to be developed feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming and other gender inequalities, such as gender-based violence (e.g. Output 3.1).

- In all activities engaging stakeholders, please ensure that gender experts and representative of women's groups are involved. Under M&E, ensure that gender dimensions are integrated, monitored and reported on.

- As a good practice, it is recommended to align the GAP activities with the project's components and outputs, to facilitate an easier implementation by the implementation and executing partners.

On policy coherence:

- Please briefly elaborate on the topic of proactive drought management: Does the project contribute in any way to the implementation of the National Drought Plan (if so, please also mention this in the policy alignment section).

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

20 August 2024

ToC has been updated with the integration of CCA in R2 and the main objective.

**On Gender.**

- **Outcomes and Outputs** have been reformulated to better mainstream Gender aspects:

*Outcome 1 ? Gender transformative national and local governance of wetland landscapes are improved based on scientific evidence*

*Output 1.2. Inclusive, gender transformative and participatory wetland governance and management systems are in place*

*Outcome 2: Wetlands are restored and made more resilient to climate shocks, using innovative technologies, gender approaches and sustainably managed resulting in GEBs and sustainable livelihoods*

*Output.2.1. 4,700 ha of degraded landscapes/wetlands are restored through Nature Based Solutions and filling gender gaps*

*Output 2.2 Innovative financial opportunities established on gender basis, support wetland landscape sustainable management*

*Outcome 3 - Monitoring, Evaluation, Knowledge and Learning supports broader adoption and upscaling of restoration and gender sensitivity*

*Output 3.1. Monitoring and evaluation system for Project and Gender Action Plan*

*Output.3.2. Gender sensitive knowledge management at local, subnational, national and regional levels is improved to support policy making and institutional learning*

- **Knowledge management.** Gender activities has been reinforced in Output 3.2 of gender mainstreaming in all publication and few materials with primary objective on gender (GBV, etc.) contribution in material. Gender aspects have been added as green class thematic. Quota for women staff has been integrating in GCP IP meetings and events.

- Particular attention has been integrated on M&E in activity 3.1.1: *?The Gender expert will work closely with the M&E Officer to ensure the disaggregation of all indicators on a gender basis as well as reintegrate all the indicators from the Gender Action Plan. She will also be reporting every 6 months the GAP implementation status to the M&E and the Technical assistant to the Coordinator. She will also ensure Gender approach sensitization for project staff and partners as well as establish a GBV management system sensitize partners on GBV.?*

- **Stakeholder engagement and gender.** A paragraph has been added in CEO to synthesize gender aspect and emphasis the key stakeholder principle for gender inclusion

-

*?Stakeholder engagement and Gender approach. The project has been designed based on a gender analysis and a strong mobilization of women. Women involvement in the project are mainstreamed in all activities on decisional aspects from the higher level (PSC) to the local structures (AGLC Board, VDC, Environmental Commission). It triggers the barrier of women workload by tackling reproductive tasks (water accessibility) and productive burden (NTFP availability through plantation and accessibility through land tenure agreement and AGLC NTFP access rules, NTFP transformation equipment?s; individual trainings). It also tackles the lack of women power in commercial negotiation through social structuration. It answers to financial short gaps through HIMO activities. Finally, it contributes to fill usual project implementation gaps through partners sensibilization, quotas for women technician involvement as well as a dedicated gender expert. All stakeholder engagement process should be made in the presence of the project gender experts or the women technician of partners as well as the representative of women's groups. Relevant women groups are either UFG, women independent cooperatives, women associations, etc.?*

- **GAP structure** has been readapted to fit the good practices of clear alignment with project structure.

-

On policy coherence:

Reference have been added to the 2002 National Action Plan to combat desertification (PAN LCD) as the only official validated document under the UNCCD. Mauritania commits to UNCCD 2018-2030 strategy. With this regard, the National Drought Plan objectives and the Land Degradation Neutrality Targets are on-going process with the support to UNEP. The



official reference to these two elements are considered under the SNEDD 2030. ProDoc and CEO have been updated accordingly.

### **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

### **5.3 Core indicators**

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Not fully.

- Core Indicator 6 ? the GHG mitigated as per the ?Core Indicator? section of the CEO Endorsement document and the Results Measurement Framework, i.e., 727,800 tCO<sub>2</sub> eq, doesn't match the GHG mitigated as per the Ex-Act Tool, i.e., 858,345 tCO<sub>2</sub> eq.

- The GHG estimated, i.e., 858,345 tCO<sub>2</sub> eq, are in line with the amount of ha targeted under the project. The following assumptions have been made for the calculations:

- o Grassland ? 110 ha
- o Silvopasture ? 90 ha

- o Annual cropland ? 188 ha
- o Grassland ? 187 ha
- o Tropical dry forest ? 770 ha
- o Tropical shrubland ? 10 ha
- o Tamour Excavation - 28 ha

Please briefly explain how these areas have been estimated. An explanation in the CEO Endorsement document would be useful for the reader.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

20 August 2024

Core indicator 6. The Core Indicator section has been updated according to the EXACT Tools, ie 858.000 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq.

Project superficies have been all estimated based on a georeferencing work and satellite imagery (see ProDoc Annex 18). The EXACT land use presented are the final expected usage of restored land. An additional hypothesis considered that CES/DRS restored land would be affected for 50% for agricultural use and 50% pastoral use, as per the lesson learned from PASK II.

For more detailed: Grassland 110ha correspond to the dune fixation superficies in Mall and Ould Boukseiss; 90ha silvopasture correspond to the prosopis replacement in Maal, Annual cropland and Grassland correspond to the 50% final usage of restored CES/DRS land, Tropical dry forest 770ha correspond to the Assisted Natural regeneration in Oued. Tropical Shrubland 10ha correspond to the Karakoro riverbank which has been estimated as 5km per 20m width. Tamour excavation 28ha correspond to Cerke Tamourt and Boulli pond excavation needs.

The relevant paragraph has been added to the CEO document and the ProDoc.

#### 5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Not fully.

- Please provide an explanation for the 'overall risk' in the key risk table.

- A contingency plan will be developed under the project due to the security situation and the potential increase of refugee in the Karakoro landscape. This is very much welcome. Please include this under the Risks Analysis and add the contingency plan as one of the mitigation measures.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

20 August 2024

Risk Table has been updated considering

Overall risk explanation:

*The project risks are highly dependent of the local complex social context in both landscape as well as the potential insecurity increase in confront to the regional context. It is also linked to the sensitivity of wetlands. The historical strong collaboration between NAGGW and IUCN as well as the strong commitment and mobilization of local partners (Mayors, INKA, NGOs and association) and flexible management of project (contingency plan, inclusive territorial planning). Finally, the project focus on biodiversity commitment and preservation of local species. All of these key aspects ensure a proper prevention and mitigation of risks?*

Security mitigation measures:

*?Strong Commitment of local governance in the project (INKA and Communes) and their conflict prevention and resolution processes.*

*Contingency Plan to quickly react to context security situation changes.?*

**5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

**6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

**b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: No.

- Alignment with country (Mauritania) and regional priorities (Great Green Wall) is missing in the portal section.

- Please also see comment on a potential linkage with the National Drought Plan and include here as appropriate.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

20 August 2024

A paragraph on the Country and regional priorities, policies strategies and plans has been integrated under ?C of the CEO page 37, namely ?*National policy coherency?*, behind the first part on the GEF8 alignment. Additional linkages with the PAN-LCD and under validation Drought Plan and LDN targets have been considered.

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

## Agency Response

### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

## Agency Response

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

As mentioned above, as a good practice, it is recommended to align the GAP activities with the project's components and outputs, to facilitate an easier implementation by the implementation and executing partners.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

20 August 2024

The GAP is informed by key gender inequality pillars such as decisional power, productive activities and social structuration, reproductive activities and workload decrease, GBV prevention and management. All gender activities are fully budgeted and included in all project activities.

GAP has been based on the comments to align with the Project structure. Please refer to the updated GAP submitted.

### **7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

## Agency Response

### **7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

## Agency Response

### **8 Annexes**

#### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes. However, please explain the difference between the total of \$200,000 and the utilized/committed funds. What is planned with the remainder?

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

20 August 2024

We will be using the remainder for dedicated ESMS related activities as well as support in the first year of implementation towards ensuring the inclusion of marginalised and vulnerable migrant groups in the sites / project areas. References have been made in both ProDoc and CEO documents.

The difference between utilized and committed amount are related to clauses with services providers to close the contract at the final validation of the GEF.

#### 8.3 Source of Funds

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024:

- In-kind is ?recurrent expenditure? normally. Please revise where in-kind is classified as ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures?



- Co-financing level is rather low. Please briefly explain the difficulties in raising co-finance under the respective table.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

20 August 2024

Investment Mobilised type by cofinancing partner has been updated accordingly.

An explanation of low co-financing level has been added to the document.

*?The investment mobilised is associated with restoration activities from the NAGGW as well as support from other stakeholders in restructuring of the INKA and finally the construction and equipment of processing and conservation office for the UFG. Major co-financing difficulties/decisions were:*

- *The PPG mission decision to reinforce the commitment of the local structure through deep dialogue and negotiation with Civil society (UFG, Local NGO), local Authorities (Communes, INKA) and University of Nouakchott which does not lead to important co-financing amount but contribute to proper appropriation of the project by themselves and ensure impactful activities.*

- *Structured private sector is mostly scarce in the area. The mission decided to rely on local private sector (small artisanal actors for youth professionalization) where cofinancing was not possible to mobilized officially.*

- *Most relevant cofinancing projects are under planning and not yet officially validated (PRADEL, SECURALIM). Others are at the end of their implementation (RIMDIR, PRODEFI, SAP3C 2).*

- *Governmental investment ProPEP just close in 2023 and not new investment program have been yet disclosed to properly identify cofinancing activities. The project therefore relies on the investment and recurrent expenses from Annual program from environmental services and NAGGW.?*

#### **Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFF/s of all GEF eligible participating countries**

**and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

**b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)**

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

**d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

**e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating**

**8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: Comments on the budget:

- Please explain abbreviations, i.e. FACI SM etc.

- For the doctoral and master thesis: please clarify in the budget notes whether this is applied research and in which way it contributes to achieving the project's objectives, and in which time frame.

- Office supplies and National Project Coordinator should be charged 100% to PMC but not to project component, please revise.

- Please justify purchase of motorized vehicles for the reviewer's consideration.

08/21/2024: Addressed.

- Program manager approves purchase of motorized vehicles (4WD and motorcycles) based on the justification, which is considered adequate.

Cleared

## Agency Response

20 August 2024

Many comments have been added to explain each budget line. Here the few elements.

- Doctoral and master thesis: *?This is applied research as focussing on scientific gaps over both landscapes to ensure proper implementation of activities. Few identified thematic are (i) quantitative and qualitative biocenose inventory; (ii) terrestrial and aquatic faunal and floral inventories and their dynamic in the ecosystem (rivers, etc.); (iii) Germination test of endangered forest essence to ensure right afforestation of degraded areas; (iv) traditional knowledge over ecosystems services valorisation and especially NTFPs; (v) additional birdlife inventory or specific research; (v) additional studies and analysis on micropollutant in water and biological tissue; etc. By reinforcing the knowledge over the wetlands (floral, faunal, hydrological, etc.), it directly contributes to the Output 1.1 as evidence-based information for highest strategic decision making. It also contributes to the Output 2.1 through scientific orientation over endemics species and restoration practices adapted to local context (habitat, soil, etc.)?*

- FACI SM means: *Integrated communitarian agricultural Farms (FACI) Small Model (SM). It is based on the NAGGW definition of model of FACI. Name has been explained in the budget with detailed of the activities (hole, pumping system, agricultural inputs, protection and technical initial assistance).*

- Office supplies: *?Currently Communal offices are not functional. As the project build on the Commune as a major actor, the equipment of the Communal office is a prerequisite for the activity?s implementation. This support aims to ensure the functionality of the Commune in its activities: (i) Coordination among local actors; (ii) Trimestrial meetings between DREV-AGLC-Commune; (iii) Civil control. ?*

- National Project Coordinator: *?The ratio of 60% PMU and 40% on technical components is aligned with the project implementation reality. The National Project Coordinator will have a technical profile and their tasks will be to support through scientific and technical advice, the project. 40% of their time will be dedicated to providing scientific and technical advice as specified in the Job description Annex 14 of ProDoc. They will also spend 20% of their time in field for technical support through*

*quarterly mission. This approach builds on existing practices in other GEF projects and is aligned with best practice in areas where national capacity is limited.?*

*Motorized vehicles: ?Vehicle needed due to remote and daily field work (harsh context in Guidimakha and Brakna, multiple field mission from coordinator and the Assistant to the coordinator to support and monitor consultancy and partners, punctual equipment transport for regional team)? / ?2 Motorcycles needed due to harsh context during rainy season and the importance of continuous support in Djelewar and Chlekra where access is limited and difficult.?*

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/08/2024: No. Please address comments made in this review.

08/21/2024: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement. In order to circulate the project for GEF Council for the required 4-weeks period, please submit the following:

1) A final version of the portal template **without yellow highlights**.

2) A **public** version of the agency project document to be circulated to GEF Council. (note that "GEFSEC only" category cannot be circulate).

09/03/2024: All comments adequately addressed. Program manager recommends CEO endorsement (after the required 4-weeks GEF Council circulation period.)

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	7/8/2024	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	8/21/2024	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	9/3/2024	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		