



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5190</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Mauritania</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Improving climate resilience of water sector investments with appropriate climate adaptive activities for pastoral and forestry resources in southern Mauritania</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>AfDB</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,350,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$14,580,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$20,930,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Knut Sundstrom</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>MOUMNI, MONIA</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Mauritania is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point of Mauritania, and dated October 14, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. AfDB has a comparative advantage in investment projects in the areas of rural development, agriculture and water resources management.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. The project would build on AfDB's Integrated Rural Water Supply Project (PNISER), and it would benefit	

		rural development projects in Mauritania.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant (\$6.985 million, including Agency fee) is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is well aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) does not clearly cite the strategic outcomes and outputs, towards which the proposed project is expected to contribute.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: For clarity, please cite the number of each strategic outcome and output, towards which the project is expected to contribute (e.g. 1.1, 1.1.2).</p> <p>11/20/2012 – YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the	YES. The proposed project would	

	<p>strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>priorities in the areas of water resources management and forest conservation. The project is also aligned with Mauritania's Strategic Framework for the Fight Against Poverty (PRSP) 2012-2015, and the National Sustainable Development Strategy.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 below.</p> <p>In absence of a clear description of the additional cost reasoning, the sustainability of the expected outcomes cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>The PIF cites as a key risk the unsustainable use of natural resources, particularly by nomadic pastoralists. It is not entirely clear, however, how the project would address the adaptation needs of nomadic pastoralists, and thus ensure the sustainability of the investments proposed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please (i) ensure that the capacities developed contribute to the sustainability of the expected outcomes of the project. In particular, please (ii) clarify to what extent and how the proposed project would address the adaptation needs of nomadic pastoralists, and thus ensure the sustainability of the investments proposed.</p> <p>11/20/2012 - YES. The re-submission clarifies that the proposed project would</p>	

		that it would address the adaptation needs of nomadic pastoralists, particularly by increasing plant cover and water availability.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>YES. The proposed project would build on the Integrated Rural Water Supply Project, an AfDB investment that provides improved access to sanitation and water “ for domestic and agricultural use “ to some of Mauritania's poorest rural communities.</p> <p>The five-year, \$14.58 million investment project will begin implementation in 2013.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF notes that the baseline project does not fully address the effects of climate change on its beneficiaries, as it does not take an integrated approach to water resources management. To address these shortfalls, the proposed LDCF project would expand the scope of the baseline project and carry out specific adaptation measures to ensure the long-term resilience and sustainability of the baseline investments.</p> <p>While the overall approach is in line with the principle of additional cost, some of the outputs and components require further justification. In</p>	

capacity building activities under Component 1 could be further clarified to justify the grant request.

For the reforestation and re-vegetation activities proposed under Component 2, the PIF could further demonstrate that these are designed specifically with a view to enhancing the resilience of water supplies.

With respect to Component 3, the proposed livelihood diversification activities should be specified and justified for their relevance to adaptation, particularly given that the component requests for some 40 per cent of the proposed LDCF grant.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Please (i) clarify the scope of the capacity building measures proposed under Component 1; (ii) demonstrate that the reforestation and re-vegetation activities under Component 2 contribute towards the resilience of water supplies; and (iii) specify and justify the proposed livelihood diversification activities under Component 3.

11/20/2012 â€“ YES. The re-submission clarifies adequately the additional cost reasoning for the proposed adaptation measures, as recommended. In particular, the revised PIF clarifies the scope and intended activities under each component, and demonstrates how these activities complement and contribute towards the resilience of the baseline project.

	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please revise the project framework (Table B) accordingly.</p> <p>11/20/2012 “ YES. The Project Framework is sound and sufficiently clear.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please ensure that the expected adaptation benefits are described based on sound methodology and assumptions.</p> <p>11/20/2012 “ YES. The expected adaptation benefits are adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>YES. The expected socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 10 above.</p> <p>It is not clear to what extent nomadic pastoralists will be consulted and engaged in the design and implementation of the proposed project.</p>	

		<p>addressing the recommendations under Section 10, please clarify how nomadic pastoralists will be engaged in project design and implementation.</p> <p>11/20/2012 â€“ YES. The re-submission clarifies that nomadic pastoralists will be included in the upstream consultations.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 10 and 17 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how the project will address the risk associated with the unsustainable use of natural resources, particularly by nomadic pastoralists who are highly exposed to the effects of climate change.</p> <p>11/20/2012 â€“ YES. Please refer to Section 10 above.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>YES. Coordination with other related initiatives is adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>YES.</p>	
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		
	<p>23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. At \$400,000 or more than 6.7 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 4, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management appears somewhat high</p>	

		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the LDCF funding level for project management does not exceed 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components.</p> <p>11/20/2012 " YES. The LDCF funding level for project management has been adjusted to \$300,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 13, 14 and 23 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 13, 14 and 23, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly.</p> <p>11/20/2012 " YES. The grant and co-financing amounts per component are appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	At \$14.58 million, the level of indicative co-financing is adequate and appropriate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. AfDB is bringing \$13 million in indicative, grant co-financing.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		



	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 23 and 24.  11/20/2012 â€œ YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.