

# Climate change adaptation and livelihoods in three arid regions of Mauritania

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10103

**Countries**

Mauritania

**Project Name**

Climate change adaptation and livelihoods in three arid regions of Mauritania

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

8/10/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/19/2021

**Program Manager**

Katya Kuang-Idba

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

## PIF

### CEO Endorsement

#### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/12/2020 - Clarification requested. Under the current CCA framework objectives, there are only 2 outcomes, but CCA outcome 2.3 is listed under Table A. Please rectify. Additionally, project activities seem to correspond with CCA-3 as well. Please consider.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - This is cleared, thank you.

#### Agency Response

#### **UNEP Response:12/02/2021**

The alignment with the GEF focal area elements is in line with the GEF-7 Climate Change Adaptation Results Framework (tracking tool), which has an outcome 2.3. The project activities do not seem to directly contribute to CCA-3, as formulated in the tracking tool Results Framework.

The confusion seems to arise from differences between the GEF-7 Adaptation Programming Strategy (published in July 2018), which does not have an Outcome 2.3, and the Results Framework (tracking tool) (from October 2019) which does. Also, the focus of CCA-3 is different in these two documents. In the tracking tool, Outcome 3 is related to the NAP process. As the project will be reporting against the targets set in the Results Framework (tracking tool), we have used that document as the basis for indicating alignment with Focal Area Outcomes and no changes have been made.

#### Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 -  
Yes, the individual components of the project approach is well designed to achieve the objective.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/17/2020 - Clarifications requested - there are 8 projects described in the co-financing section and only 7 entries in Table C. Please clarify and ensure the table is consistent with the body text. Additionally, please ensure that the implementation dates are included with the description of the co-financing initiatives so ensure concurrence. Lastly, the co-financing letters do not seem to be on the roadmap. Please advise.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - Further clarification requested: A number of these projects are expected to reach completion by 2022. Considering that this project will only be CEO endorsed and begin implementation toward middle of this year, it does not seem that they timelines are compatible to claim them as co-financing. Will these co-financing initiatives be extended in light of COVID or what is the justification for choosing these projects as co-financing?

GEFSEC, 3/30/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

**UNEP Response:12/02/2021**

6 sources of co-financing are described in the co-financing section, in alignment with Table C. Co-finance from the PDDO initiative (\$110,000) was removed, due to the lack of detailed information on the activities planned in the initiative's latest phase. The MEDD in-kind co-finance was increased by \$160,000 to include two vehicles. The project closing dates have been added to the NAP and PRCPNA co-finance projects (in 'co-financing plan' section of CEO endorsement request and Section 7.2 of the Project Document). The other sources of co-financing are ongoing initiatives, that do not have a set closing date. All 6 co-financing letters have been added to the project roadmap on the portal.

**UNEP Response: 22/03/2021**

The implementation timelines of the two co-finance projects with an original 2022 completion date have been extended, due to COVID-related and other delays: 1. For the 'Awleigatt National Park ecological capacity building project' (PRCPNA), the planned completion date has been extended from Dec 2022 to Dec 2024 (with a possibility of a second phase), and 2. For the 'Building capacity to advance National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process in Mauritania' project, the planned completion date has been extended from October 2022 to February 2023. For the latter, this would result in about 18 months of overlap in implementation with the LDCF project. This will be sufficient for the significant contributions of the NAP process to the implementation of the LDCF project to materialize (include contributions from already-completed NAP project activities).

These project timelines have been revised in the CEO Endorsement Request and Project Document.

**GEF Resource Availability**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 8/17/2020 -  
Yes.

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 GEFSEC, 8/11/2020 -  
Yes, this is cleared.

Agency Response  
**Core indicators**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/11/2020 - Yes.

GEFSEC, 4/2/2021 - Two points: 1) Please remove the core indicators from the portal table to avoid double counting; and 2) Why has the number of hectares been decreased from 1,300 at PIF to 550 now? Thank you for an explanation.

GEFSEC, 4/19/2021 - OK, cleared.

Agency Response

**UNEP response, 14/04/2021:**

1) It is not possible to remove the core indicator values from UNEP end. We will therefore request the GEF secretariat IT team to do so.

2) Considering the crucial importance of strengthening access, management and distribution of water resources in the arid target regions, the focus of the project interventions on these aspects has been strengthened during the PPG phase. These interventions have been captured under a separate component (Outcome 2) (while at the PIF stage they were merged under a single component with EbA / ecosystem restoration interventions). Some budget was also shifted from EbA / ecosystem restoration interventions to water provisioning and distribution systems. As a result, the target number of hectares was decreased from 1,300 to 550.

**Part II ? Project Justification**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/17/2020 - Yes. The information on the adaptation problems, root causes and barriers specific to Mauritania and the target areas is clear.

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

GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 - Information requested - More information regarding measures to ensure there is no duplication with the NAP baseline activities would be appreciated.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

**UNEP Response:12/02/2021**

More detailed information on the complementarities between the proposed project and the NAP process has been added to the 'Co-financing plan' section in CEO ER (Section 7.2 of the Project Document), as well as under project Component 1 and 4 descriptions, to illustrate their respective roles and the lack of duplication between their activities. Complementarities will be ensured and any potential duplication avoided through MEDD and UNEP's roles as the lead agencies for both projects, and the participation of the NAP Project Director in the LDCF project's Project Steering Committee (PSC).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 8/17/2020 - Yes.

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

GEFSEC, 8/17/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 - Clarification requested. The way this section is structured now, it is difficult to determine the additional reasoning of the activities in relation to the

baseline co-financing. Is it possible to briefly outline the co-financing and how the LDCF financing is deploying additional adaptation activities and benefits above and beyond what is being financed by the co-financing in this section?

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - Clarification requested. It is not clear exactly where this information has been added -- please can you highlight? Thank you

GEFSEC, 3/30/2021 - Thank you, this is cleared.

Agency Response

**UNEP Response: 12/02/2021**

In order to more clearly link the co-financing information with the project activities, the detailed co-finance project information for each project component has been moved from the 'baseline scenario' section to the 'proposed alternative scenario' section of the CEO ER. Furthermore, the additional cost reasoning of the LDCF-financed activities, vis-à-vis the co-finance projects, has been further clarified in this section.

**UNEP Response: 22/03/2021**

The revised and added text has been highlighted in the portal entry (as well as in the attached CEO Endorsement Request and Project Document).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/11/2020 - Cleared. The adaptation benefits to the target communities is articulated clearly.

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

GEFSEC, 8/11/2020 - Cleared, these aspects are well captured in the proposal.

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

GEFSEC, 8/11/2020 - Yes.

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

NA

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/11/2020 - Not cleared. More information requested - it is indicated in the CEO ER that Appendix 14 of the prodoc includes a report on stakeholder engagement carried executed during PPG - this is missing. Furthermore, this should be included as a summary on the portal entry. Lastly, the Stakeholder engagement plan provided on the portal is not a plan -- and the stakeholders listed are too general for this stage of project development. Such as "local associations." At this stage of project development, the Secretariat would appreciate more specificity regarding the entities being consulted and engaged as part of the process, accompanied with a concrete plan to undertake this process.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

**UNEP Response:12/02/2021**

On stakeholder engagement during PPG, the inception and validation workshop reports as well as a report of the main field consultation mission have been inserted as files in Appendix 14 of the Project Document. They have also been included in the portal entry.

A more detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been provided in Section 2 to of CEO ER. Stakeholders have been described in more detail, for example, the key NGOs consulted have been listed. A comprehensive list of the stakeholders engaged during the PPG phase is available in the three consultation reports included under Appendix 14 of the Project Document. Furthermore, the stakeholder consultation report included in Appendix 14 also lists the key civil society organizations at each of the eight project sites, identified during the consultations.

#### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/11/2020 - Yes. The agency has included a Gender Action Plan, and a gender analysis detailing the gender dimensions of this project within the context of Mauritania.

#### Agency Response

##### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/17/2020 - Yes. Private sector entities will be directly involved in project implementation, and will also benefit from project interventions (i.e. Mauritania Copper Mines).

#### 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

GEFSEC, 8/11/2020 - Yes. There is a risk table with relevant mitigation measures.

#### 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

GEFSEC, 8/17/2020 - This item is mostly cleared. There is good information for coordination with all ongoing LDCF-funded initiatives in the region and the ongoing GGW as well as GCF Readiness activities. Please indicate (i) possibility of coordination with any forthcoming GGW initiatives in the country; and (ii) any additional GCF investments that are in the pipeline and/or ongoing (aside from Readiness/NAP programming).

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - This is cleared.

#### Agency Response

##### **UNEP Response:12/02/2021**

(i) Information on the GGW initiative in Mauritania has been updated, and details on coordination and collaboration between it and the proposed project added in Section 6 of the CEO ER (Section 3.7 of the Project Document).

(ii) On GCF programming, information on the recently-approved concept note ?Strengthening the resilience of ecosystems and populations in four regional hubs in northern Mauritania? has been added to Section 6 of the CEO ER (Section 3.7 of the Project Document). While several other concept notes have also been submitted for GCF review, this is the only one that has been approved to date.

##### **Consistency with National Priorities**

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/12/2020 - One clarification - is there any updated national climate policy in Mauritania aside from those related to the UNFCCC?

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

**UNEP Response:12/02/2021**

There is currently no national climate change (or adaptation) policy in place in Mauritania. The only process currently underway in this area is the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process.

**Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 - Yes. KM approach is clear.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/17/2020 - Yes, this is 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

GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 - Yes, this is cleared.

Agency Response

**Benefits**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 - Yes. This is cleared.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 - The GEF PIF review could kindly be added to Annex B on the portal is possible.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

**UNEP Response:12/02/2021**

The GEF PIF review has been added to Annex B on the portal.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 -

Yes, this is cleared.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 - Please remove all vehicle-related costs from the LDCF budget. The GEF Secretariat strongly prefers that this cost is covered by co-financing. Please indicate what is covered under the budget line for "Staff and Personnel" under the PMC budget (line 120) - according the the GEF project and program cycle policy, staffing costs are not eligible for funding by the GEF portion of the PMC. Please clarify.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - Clarification requested: Vehicle costs still seem to be billed to the GEF in Appendix 2, column 1. Please indicate whether I am reading the table incorrectly?

GEFSEC, 4/2/2021 - Cleared.

#### Agency Response

##### **UNEP Response: 12/02/2021**

All vehicle-related costs (a total of \$37,500) have been removed from the LDCF budget. This amount has been reallocated to extend the position of Administrative and Financial Assistant to cover the full project duration (as it had been previously erroneously budgeted for only 24 months), and to increase the monthly salary of the Project Manager from US\$2,300 to US\$ 2,500 (to enable the recruitment of a PM with 10 years of experience). Two vehicles will be provided through co-finance from MEDD (project Executing Agency), and Government transport rules and protocols will be followed for any travel-related costs.

The amount budgeted for the "Staff and Personnel" cost category under the PMC budget (\$158,400) covers the salaries of the Project Manager (\$120,000) and the Administrative and Financial Assistant (\$38,400), which are project positions.

##### **UNEP Response: 22/03/2021**

There are no vehicle costs billed to the LDCF budget. In the UNEP accounting system, "equipment, vehicles and furniture" is a single cost category. Entries under this category in the LDCF budget consist of only equipment, specifically for the DRS interventions in Component 2, and for regional nurseries, dune stabilization, agroforestry planting, and value chain development in Component 3.

##### **UNEP Response (22/03/2021) to GEF review comments in section "GEF Sec Decision / Recommendation"**

UNEP, 22/3/2021 ? Revised text has been highlighted in the portal entry (as well as in the attached CEO Endorsement Request and Project Document). COVID-19 risks have been added in the "risks" section, and opportunities to contribute green recovery and resilience building have been outlined in the "benefits" section of the CEO Endorsement Request.

#### **Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 3/30/2021 - Yes. Annex B contains adequate responses to comments from the German Council member.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 3/30/2021 -

Yes, STAP comments and responses are included in Annex B.

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 -

This is cleared.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 -

This is 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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

**UNEP responses to comments dated 4/26/2021 under Section "Recommendation", below:**

**5/10/2021:**

1. The Costed M&E Plan included in the Portal (as Section 9 of the CEO Endorsement Request) has been revised to be fully aligned with the M&E Budget, as presented in the Excel budget (and in the budget table in the Portal). After the addition of the part-time national M&E officer (\$48,000) and the Operations Costs related to PMU missions for project oversight and monitoring (see response to review comment 2, below), the total revised M&E budget is \$271,430.

The Excel budget had already been uploaded as a file in the Documents section. The reviewer may have been only looking at the **first sheet** of the Excel file (activity-based budget), rather than the **second sheet** (UMOJA budget). The budget table in the Portal is identical to the second sheet of the Excel table (?UMOJA budget?), which is broken down by UNEP's budget categories. The first Excel sheet presents the activity-based budget.

2. The Operation Costs previously charged to Components 2 and 3 (PMU / M&E specialist / field officer travel and small equipment) have been moved to be charged under M&E costs. The vehicle maintenance costs (\$57,485) have been removed, and the budget instead allocated to climate change and impacts modeling under activity 1.1.1. \$20,000 previously allocated for M&E specialist travel has been re-allocated to increase (i) the Terminal Evaluation budget (by \$16,000) to comply with UNEP Independent Evaluation Office *pro forma* costs for Terminal Evaluations, and (ii) the activity 1.1.1 budget (by \$4,000). These budget revisions have been cascaded to the budget tables in the CEO ER: Table A and Table B. Appendix 1 of the Project Document (project budget) shows the budget revisions.

In terms of the different tables, as mentioned above, the budget table in the Portal is the same as the second sheet of the Excel table (broken down by UNEP's budget categories). The first Excel sheet presents the activity-based budget.

3. The source of the NAP project co-financing has been revised to 'GCF'. The co-financing letter from MEDD for the PRCPNA project (US\$7,200,000) has been added on the Portal, and is also included in Appendix 9 of the Project Document.

4. The gender tag 'closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources' has been un-ticked.

5. More details on the process for the development of the E&S management plan and the associated monitoring and reporting processes has been included in the relevant sections of the CEO Endorsement Request (p. 46-47) and Project Document (p. 102). Please note that details on the assessments and actions suggested for each relevant project activity are also included in the table that follows the narrative text.

#### **GEFSEC DECISION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

GEFSEC, 8/18/2020 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 2/23/2021 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit. Please highlight or otherwise indicate which text has been changed, as it is unclear on the portal where the updated sections are? Additionally, in light of the current challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Secretariat is requesting that all CERs include a section risks detailing how this project is addressing risks and opportunities presented by COVID-19. Please kindly add this information to the portal. Projects should consider both short term needs such as risk mitigation or longer-term actions such as 'green recovery' and resilience building strategies and actions. Green recovery strategies and actions include investments in sustainable, inclusive, resilient, low-carbon, low-polluting, nature positive and circular economy-based pathway for society to withstand future shocks coming from climate change, natural and manmade disasters, and other global challenges.

GEFSEC, 4/2/2021 - Thank you for adding the information regarding the COVID response. Please refer to the item on Core Indicators and resubmit for consideration for technical clearance.

GEFSEC, 4/19/2021 - This project is being recommended for technical clearance.

GEFSEC, 4/26/2021 - Please address the following:

1. On the M&E Budget: Kindly note that the M&E Budget table included in the portal shows a total of \$157,300. When adding all activities in the table the total calculated is \$147,300 ( $\$12,300 + \$40,000 + \$45,000 + \$50,000 = \$147,300$ ). Please correct.  
In addition, although the total amount corresponds kindly note that there are some differences in the categorization between the budget table uploaded in the Portal and the Budget table provided in the Document section. Please see below. Please upload in Portal the table in the excel document, as requested in Guidelines.
2. On the Budget: Given the description of the Operations Costs (charged to component 2 and Component 3) kindly note that these expenses should be charged to M&E or PMC. The vehicle maintenance should be taken out as per what was agreed in the Review Sheet. It is confusing to have two different budget tables (one in portal different from the one in excel) ? as mentioned, please unify.
3. Co-financing :
  - Co-financing from the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) originates from NAP. Please revise and use ?GCF? as source of these funds (donor Agency), even if the letter is submitted by the government?s implementation unit.
  - Co-financing letter for Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) / PRCPNA (US\$ 7,200,000) is missing.
4. Gender: the gender analysis and action plan is well noted. The submission states that the project expects to closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources. The measures and indicators provided in the action plan/ submission or indicators, do not provide sufficient information on the project?s plans to do so. Please provide further information on plans and measures to improve women?s access to and control over natural resources and or revise the ticked gender tags accordingly.
5. Environmental and Social Safeguards: It is noted that the project overall ESS risk is identified as moderate, and UNEP attached UNEP Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). In the SRIF, the Safeguard Advisor suggested ?Carry out further assessments (e.g., site visits, experts? inputs, consult

affected communities, etc.) and management framework/plan.? and ?As the project hasn?t had sufficient time to develop an in-depth E&S management plan, the PCA should reflect the government?s responsibility to carry out assessments and develop a more detailed E&S management plan at the early phase of the project implementation. The government also should manage, monitor, report on the management plan implementation. Besides the risks identified, some safeguard risks issues may develop during the project implementation. Adaptive planning and management are encouraged.? However, it is not clear what kind of actions that will this take further. Please provide clear steps to identify environmental and social risk associated with the project (including further assessment) and to develop the appropriate E&S management plan and reporting and monitoring mechanisms.

GEFSEC, 5/25/2021 - GPU Clearance for PPO review.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>8/18/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>2/23/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/19/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/25/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**