



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>8033</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Mauritania</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Continental Wetlands Adaptation and Resilience to Climate Change</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>IUCN</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-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$137,614</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,449,542</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$7,057,991</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$11,645,147</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>January 31, 2017</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>March 02, 2017</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Katya Kuang-Idba</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Jacques Somda</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objective CCA-1.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	YES. The proposed project is broadly in line with Mauritania's strategy and action plan for the implementation of the Great Green Wall Initiative; and the national strategy for the conservation of wetlands. The project would address several of Mauritania's NAPA priorities in the areas of	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		natural resources management, water resources management and agriculture.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p> <p>In absence of further clarity regarding the baseline scenario, the additional reasoning and the expected adaptation benefits, these aspects of the proposed project cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please ensure that the PIF provides a clear description of how the proposed project will ensure sustainability, and how it would promote scaling up.</p> <p>05/01/2015 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p> <p>05/12/2015 – YES. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p> <p>The proposed project is innovative in that it aims to reduce the vulnerability of globally significant inland wetlands and the people and livelihoods they support to adverse effects of climate</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>change. Moreover, the project adopts a participatory, community-based approach to the sustainable and resilient management of natural systems. The project presents an approach that holds considerable potential for scaling up across vulnerable wetland systems in Mauritania and beyond, and it builds on a credible baseline of investments by the National Government and the MAVA Foundation.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The description of the baseline scenario makes no reference to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing provided in Table C. What baseline investments will be carried out, by whom and within what time frame?</p> <p>Moreover, given that investments towards the Great Green Wall Initiative in Mauritania already constitute a baseline for GEF investments, the added value of the proposed project should be clarified.</p> <p>In absence of further clarity regarding the baseline scenario, the additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits cannot be adequately assessed at this time. It should be noted, however, that the selection of project sites under Component 1, and</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the adjacent communities under Component 2 should be driven primarily by their vulnerability to the adverse effects of climate change, and Mauritania's adaptation priorities.</p> <p>Please refer also to Section 5 below regarding the project objective.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b> Please (i) describe further what baseline investments will be carried out in the targeted areas, by whom, and within what time frame; (ii) ensure that relevant sources, amounts and types of co-financing are clearly reflected in the description of the baseline scenario; (iii) clarify how the proposed, additional measures will enhance current and planned investments, particularly given existing GEF support towards the Great Green Wall Initiative; and (iv) ensure that the selection of project sites under Component 1, and the adjacent communities under Component 2 are driven primarily by their vulnerability to the adverse effects of climate change, and Mauritania's adaptation priorities.</p> <p>05/01/2015 – NOT CLEAR. Please address the previous recommendation regarding the targeting of sites and</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>communities under components 1 and 2. Aside from their influence on biodiversity conservation, to what extent will site selection be guided by climate change vulnerability and alignment with national adaptation priorities?</p> <p>05/12/2015 – YES. The re-submission presents clear targeting principles for the proposed investments under components 1 and 2, with an emphasis on the vulnerability of the proposed sites to the adverse effects of climate change.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The project objective could be further specified, particularly in terms of how the proposed project would address climate change adaptation.</p> <p>Table B also provides a column for outputs, where some output indicators are included without any associated targets (e.g. number of persons trained).</p> <p>Finally, at \$400,000 or nearly 10 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed share of LDCF funding towards project management is quite high.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(i) specify further the project objective in terms of how the proposed project would address climate change adaptation; (ii) ensure that the share of LDCF funding towards project management does not exceed 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components; and (iii) specify the outputs in Table B, or remove the column entirely as it is not required in the GEF-6 PIF template.</p> <p>05/01/2015 – NOT CLEAR. Please address the previous recommendation regarding outputs. Please spell out project outputs rather than providing stand-alone indicators without any associated targets.</p> <p>05/12/2015 – YES. The proposed outputs have been clarified as recommended.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF does not specify the executing partners involved in the project.</p> <p>Otherwise the gender dimensions of the proposed project, and the participation of CSOs have been adequately considered in the PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please indicate, on p.1 of the PIF, the executing partners involved in the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>proposed project.</p> <p>05/01/2015 – YES. The executing partners have been specified as recommended.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 above.</p> <p>Moreover, the proposed PPG fee exceeds 9 per cent of the proposed PPG.</p> <p>05/01/2015 – NOT YET. Please refer to sections 3, 4 and 5 above.</p> <p>05/12/2015 – YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/ approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 15, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 01, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 12, 2015	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Yes. Aside from some re-wording, the principal project components and elements have not changed from what was presented at PIF submission.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Not yet. Some outputs are written as outcomes. For example: - Output 1.2.4. Capacity of key stakeholders in restoration and management of watersheds and wetlands improved (this is not currently written as an output, please ensure outputs are tangible and measurable); - Output 2.1.1. Climate-resilient livelihood strategies developed and	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>disseminated (Which strategies and how many exactly?);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Output 2.1.2. Climate-resilient livelihood strategies implemented and evaluated for their effectiveness (This output and the above could be consolidated into one. It would be more interesting to know which strategies and how many).</li> <li>- Output 2.1.3. Technical capacities to implement climate-resilient livelihood strategies strengthened ((this is not currently written as an output, please ensure outputs are tangible and measurable)</li> <li>-Output 2.2.4. Local stakeholders' understanding raised on the causes of wetland degradation, the effects of climate change and management solutions (See above comments)</li> </ul> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider re-articulating outputs so as to ensure they deliver tangible and measurable results in support of and against broader outcomes that benefit the target communities.</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 -Unclear. There is no information regarding cost-effectiveness included in the proposal.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please briefly describe how the proposed</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		activities are cost-effective in comparison with feasible alternatives.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	GEFSEC, 3/29/2018 - Yes. The risk matrix is sufficiently developed and available in section 4.4 of the PRODOC.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Yes. Co-financing letters confirming a total of ~\$7 million have been provided by the MAVA Foundation (\$3.05m) and IGMVSS/ANGMV (\$4m) respectively.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Yes. The tracking tool has been completed indicating the targets for relevant indicators - 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9, & 10.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - More information requested. While the CEO endorsement request indicates that the proposed project will be implemented in close coordination with current GEF interventions, it has not indicated whether it has coordinated with GCF funded initiatives in Mauritania. Additionally, while the proposal	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>indicates that the project is coordinating with the ACCMR projects, which supports the development of a NAP roadmap, it does not indicate how the proposed intervention will coordinate with the NAP process.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please indicate if project proponents are coordinating with proponents of any forthcoming or recently funded GCF projects in Mauritania to avoid duplication and maximize complementarity. Please also indicate how the project will ensure that results and information are integrated into the NAP process as it continues to develop.</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Yes. There is a budgeted M&E Plan in Section 7 of the Prodoc.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Yes. The project integrates numerous outcomes and outputs that are designed to assure the project is well communicated, and that knowledge generated by the project is openly available and applied to achieve project objectives. A series of communication and education materials will be developed by the project using messaging that will	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		integrate traditional knowledge with new techniques to spread or mitigate risks related to climate change and anthropogenic pressures, including concepts of sustainable natural resource management and livelihood diversification. Additionally, Component 3 aims to improve the knowledge base and access to information on Mauritania's wetlands by supporting the creation of an exhaustive and detailed national database and GIS on wetlands.	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Yes.	
	• STAP	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Yes.	
	• GEF Council	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Unclear. Please provide responses to comments received from USG, Canada, and Germany if available.	
	• Convention Secretariat	NA	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	GEFSEC, 3/28/2018 - Not yet. Please refer to Items 2,3 and 8 and resubmit for clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 28, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.