



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

GEF ID:	5792		
Country/Region:	Mauritania		
Project Title:	Sustainable Landscape Management Project under SAWAP		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	144183 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,810,000
Co-financing:	\$19,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,010,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Dahlia Lotayef

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		
	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?		

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

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to ESPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	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?		
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		
	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?		
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		
	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)		
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		
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:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>We will be pleased to recommend the project for CEO endorsement as soon as possible. We would like to highlight four minor comments that you will find below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Between the letter of endorsement, the Program Framework Document, the GEF annex, and the PAD, there are slight different project names. Can you please make the titles coherent in the different documents (1) we suggest to remove the mention of PSG that is not relevant anymore and 2) the simplest option would be to name the project "Sustainable Landscape Management Project under the SAWAP"). - Can you please provide the letter of cofinancing or the minutes of negotiation for the LGDP/PNIDDLE project? - Can you please check the BD tracking tools for the objective 2, especially the sections IV and V? - Please confirm the number of beneficiaries (section 17: beneficiary

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			population of 480,000; direct project beneficiaries: 160,000; table p16: beneficiaries: 160,000; annex 6: 390,000). May 5, 2015 The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*		April 16, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		May 05, 2015
	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	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.