



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

GEF ID:	5580		
Country/Region:	Mauritania		
Project Title:	Development of an Improved and Innovative Delivery System for Climate Resilient Livelihoods in Mauritania		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$11,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,000,000
PIF Approval:	January 02, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes, Mauritania is a Least Developed Country, Party to UNFCCC, and has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes, a letter from Mr. Mohamed Lafdal, dated June 24, 2013, is on file.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes, Mauritania may access the requested funding under the principle of equitable	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?  <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Not clear. The focal area objectives listed include CCA-2 and CCA-3. However, the project framework clearly includes "increased ecosystem resilience for the provision of ecosystem services and climate resilient livelihoods" as an expected outcome, which is aligned with CCA-1.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please include CCA-1 among the FA Strategic Objectives addressed through this project.</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: This has been done.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Not entirely. It appears that a significant rationale of this project has to do with addressing the climate change dimension of the wildfires, as evidenced by the main baseline project. However, wildfires are hardly mentioned in the NAPA, and have clearly not been considered an adaptation priority. Evidence of other key national strategies that prioritize wildfire management is not presented.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide the rationale for alignment with the key strategies and plans for this project.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Update 11/6/2013:  Broadly, the project is in alignment with the NAPA, and is also in line with the Mauritania National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Management. Specifically concerning bushfire management, further information has been provided in the revised proposal, namely that bush fires are a baseline problem and threaten Mauritanian communities and ecosystems, as cited by Direction Protection de la Nature, and a number of other references. This text includes information on number of fires and area burned, and the impact on soil productivity, livestock carrying capacity and food insecurity of Mauritanian communities. This is satisfactory.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>No. The baseline project is well defined, and the environmental problems and economic context are well described. A number of studies and assessments are referenced in describing the predicted effects of climate change and other pressures on the Sahelian Acacia Savannah Ecoregion. However, none of these descriptions provide any discussion of wildfires, and no studies or assessments indicating the urgency and importance of prioritizing wildfire management are presented. Furthermore, while the relationship of the wildfire regime to the ecosystems is described, there is no indication that this is based on sound data or science. The current rationale presented for undertaking an investment towards building wildfire</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>management capacity and infrastructure is insufficient.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Kindly provide further justifications, clearly based on any assessments or studies of the role of wildfires as current and projected threat to this ecosystems, the linkage to climate change, and why is investment by the LDCF in this issue (rather than others, such as those prioritized by NAPA) justified.</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: Additional information has been provided, as discussed under the review update under Section 5.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Not clear. The components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework and clear, sound and appropriately detailed. However, please see the preceding comments which might have implications on the revision of the project design. If so, this question will need to be revisited.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address the comments under Questions 5 and 6.</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Not clear. The additional activities appear innovative and sound, and involve promising techniques to address drought and fire-related problems. However, the additional reasoning cannot be judged sound in absence of a solid justification for selection of this particular issue to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>address, as discussed under Question 6 and others.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address the comments under Questions 5 and 6.</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Yes, the plans for stakeholder participation appear to be strong.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Not entirely. In particular, at this time, there appears to be no basis to rate the risk concerning the cost-effectiveness of interventions as low to medium. This is particularly relevant in the case of wild-fire management investments, consistent with the comments made under Question 6 and others.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please revisit the risks framework following the resolution of pending questions concerning the baseline and additional activities, particularly relating to wildfire management.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Update 11/6/2013: Given the resolution of questions on the baseline and additional activities, this issue is now considered resolved as well.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>No, in its current form the project does not appear to coordinate with any disaster risk management initiatives, even though this is a major theme of this project. However, please note that upon consideration of previous comments, particularly relating to the design and choice of baseline, the relevance of this comment may also change.</p> <p>Recommended action: Kindly provide further information in the proposal, namely which shows that a review of and coordination with all relevant initiatives, including plans, has taken place. If there are none additional to those carried under APCBF, please make that explicit.</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: A list of relevant initiatives has been supplied, mainly relating to natural resource management, adaptation, and social development. While this is a good list, a mention of any specifically fire or broadly disaster risk management-related initiatives is notably absent. It is unclear if this is because of absence of any such initiatives on the ground, or if it is an oversight.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please include a review of existing or planned disaster risk management</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>initiatives, if any, with a view of ensuring complementarities and avoiding incoherence.</p> <p>FI, 12/2/13: More information is requested, as the originally-asked question has not yet been addressed. Information is still missing on disaster risk related initiatives that the project can coordinate with. Given that the proposed project relates to management of drought, flash floods and wild fires, it will be important to link up with programs and actions that are currently targeting these hazards in the project area. If such (disaster risk management related) initiatives do not exist in the project area, please state this.</p> <p>12/5/13: Yes. In follow-up communication with the Agency, satisfactory explanation was provided to indicate that the project is well-coordinated with related initiatives in the country.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> </ul>	<p>The project may be very innovative, however please see the comments/concerns about the validity and justification of the choice of intervention. Project's strategy for sustainability is not yet well-developed, and likewise, this has implications for the potential for scaling up. However the latter two points can be adequately considered not before the previously raised issues concerning the baseline problem, project, and intervention are addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>Update 11/6/2013: Please elaborate on the project's strategy for ensuring sustainability.</p> <p>FI, 12/2/13: Yes. The project will employ a multi-pronged approach to building sustainability of processes and outcomes, namely: (i) developing an upscaling strategy for EbA; (ii) implementing locally-appropriate EbA measures; (iii) mainstreaming EbA into policies and strategies; (iv) building institutional capacity for EbA; (v) building the capacity of local communities to implement EbA; (vi) involving communities in EbA decision-making to ensure their buy-in; (vii) demonstrating the benefits of EbA to communities; (viii) providing a knowledge base and guidelines on EbA to encourage widespread uptake; and (ix) building public awareness on the benefits of EbA.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to	Not clear. Considering the issues raised concerning the baseline problem and, by extension, project, this cannot be assessed	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	at this time.  Recommended Action: Please review this aspect of the proposal consistent with previously made comments.  Update 11/6/2013: This is now cleared.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes, however please see previous comments.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, \$100,000 is being requested, in line with the standard amount.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>Not at this time. There is a fundamental question concerning the identification of the problem and casting it as a priority, without presenting evidence, such as any strategies, plans, or assessments and other, that confirm and support this approach, including how changes in fire regimes would affect the ecosystem. While many of the activities proposed seem to be low- or no-regret and in some cases quite innovative, the proposal could be strengthened considerably by presenting the basis -- studies, assessments, strategies -- why this particular issue merits investment of LDCF funding at this time. The proposal can be reconsidered following the inclusion of such information, and other requested revision, as per comments 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 16.</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: The improvements to the project description are substantial, and many of the critical issues previously raised have been fully clarified. This project will be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		considered for PIF approval upon the resolution of issues raised under 12 and 13.  FI, 12/2/13: Not yet. Approval is pending additional information for Item 12.  FI, 12/5/13 Yes.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	September 12, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	November 06, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 02, 2013	

\* 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.