



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

GEF ID:	9294		
Country/Region:	Mauritania		
Project Title:	Integrated Ecosystem Management Program for the Sustainable Human Development in Mauritania		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 2; CCM-2 Program 4; BD-3 Program 7; LD-1 Program 1; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$8,222,505
Co-financing:	\$23,150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$31,372,505
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LD1 Program 1: OK; SFM3 Program 8: OK; - CC2 Program 4; Please, provide the way to estimate the gains in carbon and GHG reduction emissions; - The BD program 7 has mainly be developed to target Vavilov centers (Mauritania is not included). It is possible to use BD resources under this program out of Vavilov centers, but the demonstration should be made 	

¹ 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
		<p>that the project will target priority genetic reserve locations for wild relatives. Could you please provide a shorter list of plants and animals that will be the focus of the project and for which Mauritania (and not the West and Central Africa sub-region as a whole) can claim having significant genetic biodiversity?</p> <p>- For BD1 Program 2, please confirm that the creation of new protected areas will target globally significant sites for biodiversity conservation (or Key Biodiversity Areas, IUCN senso). Can the output be delivered with the relatively low level of resources allocated to this?</p> <p>- We take note of the mention of the Aichi Targets 2, 3, 7, 11 and 14. Can you provide quantifiable (SMART) indicators that will be used to track the project contribution to these targets?</p> <p>August 24, 2015</p> <p>- Addressed for the BD programs 7 and 2.</p> <p>- For the Aichi targets, please include in the text the indicators that will be used for each (now Target 7, 11, and 14).</p> <p>- For CC2 Program 4, see cell 5, and please revise the way to estimate the gains in carbon.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design		September 8, 2015 Addressed. Thanks.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes (see PIF, p23).	
	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes, The project focuses on the root causes of environmental degradation, especially land degradation and soil erosion. Mauritania is at constant risk from droughts and desertification, and its natural environment, human population, fauna and flora suffer. The situation is aggravated by limited rainfalls, high population density, and inappropriate practices by pastoral communities. The project is tackling the lack of integrated and ecosystem approach to support a sustainable human development. Cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	The baseline scenario is described, including parallel interventions from other donors and partners. The GEF resources will be incremental, proposing a holistic strategy combining a set of complementary activities in selected ecological units (planning, capacity development, ecological restoration, livelihoods,	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		financing, etc.). Cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>The components are clear and appropriate to achieve the project objectives and the GEBs. However, please address the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please note that the GEF will not finance coordination activities in the component 4 in addition to management costs. Please, remove the mention of such coordination. - Can you be more specific on the type of PES you are planning to develop? The level of information is very low in the PIF, and the experience at the GEF shows that a few PES become a reality if the main framework is not identified in the concept (service providers, service users, sources of financing, nature of transactions...). - In the section 5) on Global Environment Benefits, please provide metrics for the different GEB: Nb of ha of productive landscapes under SLM, Nb of ha of forests restored, increase of an agrobiodiversity indicator, increase of diversity of globally significant cultivated plants and domesticated animals, diversity status of target species, gains in carbon, GHG emission reduction, etc. 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- Because of the use of CCM and SFM resources, please include at PIF level the expected gains in carbon (storage, avoided emissions) and GHG emission reductions. Provide an approximation at PIF level and include a more accurate calculation at CEO endorsement. Also include the monitoring of carbon and GHG emission reductions in the monitoring activities.</p> <p>August 24, 2015</p> <p>- The point is taken for the component four. However, please, make the rest of the text coherent (see section 4, p.18, the title of the component and the text giving the GEF contribution).</p> <p>- The clarifications given for the PES do not make us optimistic - the source of financing is not defined, the nature of the transaction is not detailed and there is no information on the technical and financing capacities of the young national Great Green Wall Agency that is identified as the service user. Based on the experience acquired on PES at the GEF, without this information at the concept level (before PPG), there are few chances for a PES to be materialized. Please, provide the missing information or revise the project ambitions.</p> <p>- For the carbon calculations, please</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>refer to our exchanges by emails and provide more reasonable estimates in number of ha and tons of carbon equivalent. All in all, less than 4\$ million will be used for ecosystem restoration under the component 2 (including forests, but also water bodies, rangelands, and agricultural perimeters). How will these \$4 million be used to generate 500,000 ha of land under SLM and 200,000 ha of restored forests? Please, make the distinction between the restoration work financed by the GEF and the cofinancing partners. Please, provide the expected cost per ha of land and forest restoration.</p> <p>September 8, 2015 Addressed.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Addressed.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	Yes, the proposed grant is using all the remaining STAR allocations for Mauritania.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or 	NA	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	<p>The project is triggering \$3,364,365 from the SFM incentive programme.</p> <p>July 12, 2016 The SFM resources cannot be guaranteed and will be confirmed at Work Programme Inclusion.</p>	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not yet. Please, refer to the comments included under the items 1 and 5.</p> <p>In addition, please, check the coherence of financing information in the different tables (e.g. different numbers are mentioned for the fees: \$894,879 in the part I, \$894,878 in the table D).</p> <p>August 24, 2015 Not addressed. Table D, p4, \$1 is missing in the column with the fees to make \$894,878.</p> <p>September 8, 2015 All points have been addressed. The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF/PFD clearance.</p> <p>July 12, 2016 The SFM resources cannot be guaranteed and will be confirmed at Work Program Inclusion. Please reduce the SFM budget by two (SFM in the project grant: \$1,682,182; fees:</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		\$151,396; PPG: \$0). Thanks for your understanding. Upon receipt of a document with the revised amounts, the PIF will be recommended for clearance and WPI.	
Review Date	Review	August 19, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 24, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 08, 2015	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

³ 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.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		