

UN Environment GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2019
(1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020)

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Identification | GEF ID.: 5580 | Umoja no.: S1-32LDL-000045-SB-006602 |
| Project Number + Project Title | Development of an improved and innovative management system for sustainable climate-resilient livelihoods in Mauritania | |
| Duration months | <i>Planned</i> | 48 months |
| | <i>Extension(s)</i> | N/A |
| Division(s) Implementing the project | Ecosystems Division, Climate Change Adaptation Unit, Freshwater, Land and Climate Branch | |
| Executing Agency(ies) | National Programme Coordination Unit for Climate Change (CCPNCC), Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) | |
| Names of Other Project Partners | Ministry of Rural Development (MDR) | |
| | Ministry of Water Resources & Sanitation (MHA) | |
| | Ministry of Habitat, Urbanism & Landscape Management (MHUAT) | |
| | Regional administrations of the project target regions ("Wilayas"): Guidimaka, Assaba, Hodh El Gharbi, and Hodh El Chargui | |
| Project Type | Full Size Project | |
| Project Scope | National | |
| Region (<i>delete as appropriate</i>) | Africa | |
| Names of Beneficiary Countries | Mauritania | |
| Programme of Work | Programmes of Work 2018-2019 and 2020-2021, Climate Change Subprogramme | |
| GEF Focal Area(s) | Climate Change Adaptation | |
| UNDAF linkages | CPDD Outcome 1.3: Institutions and communities contribute to sustainable management of natural resources, and to anticipate/respond to crises and to the effects of climate change. | |
| Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) | Goal 13: Climate Action Targets: 13.1, 13.2, 13.3, 13.b Indicators: 13.3.2, 13.b.1 | |
| Date of CEO Endorsement | 26 January 2017 | |
| Start of Implementation | 15 September 2017 | |
| Date of first disbursement | 16 October 2017 | |
| Expected Mid-Term Date | March 2020 | |
| Completion Date | <i>Planned</i> | 31 December 2021 |
| | <i>Revised</i> | N/A |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date | June 2022 | |
| Expected Financial Closure Date | December 2022 | |

2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>UN Environment Subprogramme(s)</p> <p>Climate Change Subprogramme Programmes of Work 2018-2019 and 2020-2021</p> | <p>Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s)</p> <p>PoW 2018-2019 Expected Accomplishment (a): Countries increasingly advance their national adaptation plans which integrate ecosystem-based adaptation</p> <p>Indicator (ii): Increase in the number of countries that have technical capacity to integrate ecosystem-based management into national adaptation plans</p> |
| <p>Ecosystem-based adaptation measures (including the rehabilitation of degraded rangelands and protected forests, dune stabilization using native species and introduction of alternative ecosystem-based livelihoods) are being implemented across the four project regions (wilayas). The implementation of the selected adaptation interventions has advanced very well in the first 1.5 years of project implementation, with EbA measures currently in place across approximately 300 hectares. The country's capacity to integrate ecosystem-based measures into national adaptation plans is further enhanced through technical training provided by the project. The integration of EbA approaches into local development plans, as well as possibly into national sectoral policies, is planned to be undertaken by the project in close alignment with the ongoing National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process, which is supported by UNEP through GCF funding.</p> | |

For all GEF 6 and later projects:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>GEF Core Indicators</p> | <p>Indicative expected Results</p> |
| <p>N/A (the project was approved in GEF 5)</p> | <p>Indicative expected Results</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Planned linkages with UNDAF</p> | <p>The project interventions contribute significantly towards the UNDAF outcome 1.3: "Institutions and communities contribute to sustainable management of natural resources, and to anticipate/respond to crises and to the effects of climate change". In particular, the adaptation interventions planned and implemented under project Component 2 focus specifically on the sustainable management of natural resources as climate change adaptation strategy. The project has engaged institutions and communities in the sustainable management of natural resources through, inter alia, dune stabilization with native plants, reforestation of degraded rangelands and protected forests, and soil and water conservation measures. Through their participation in the implementation of these interventions, as well as through the training on EbA approaches provided by the project, institutions and communities have also built their capacity to better anticipate and respond to crises and the impacts of climate change. The introduction of livelihood diversification and income-generating activities has further increased the resilience of the target communities.</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Planned contribution to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)</p> | <p>The project is strengthening the resilience of communities in the rangelands in Mauritania to current and expected climate change and is building adaptive capacity to cope with its impacts at all levels (SDG target 13.1). The integration of EbA approaches into local development plans, as well as possibly into national sectoral policies (SDG target 13.2) is planned to be undertaken by the project in close alignment with the ongoing National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process. The project will create adaptive capacity among government and communities, from the local to the central administration level (SDG target 13.3), while ensuring that the local environment can be protected and managed in a way that allows it to withstand climate change impacts and to provide continued livelihoods.</p> |
|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Implementation Status | FY 2019 | | | | |
| | 1 st PIR | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Development Objective Rating FY | FY 2019 | | | | |
| | S | | | | |

Overall progress towards achieving the project results has been satisfactory in the first 1.5 years of project implementation. In particular, very good progress was made in initiating the implementation of ecosystem-based and other adaptation interventions on the ground (Outputs 2.2 and 2.3), with significant progress made already in the first year. A project baseline study was also completed in the reporting period. On the other hand, the full engagement, training and further establishment of local associations (Outputs 1.3 and 2.1) have been somewhat delayed. Further details on progress made are outlined below by project component.

Project **Component 1** focuses on strengthening institutional capacity at different levels to plan and implement ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) measures to address climate change impacts on forests and rangelands. Under this component, the project has provided training and awareness-raising to project stakeholders on EbA approaches (Output 1.2). The training workshops organized included a regional training on EbA guidelines and two 3-day regional trainings (each covering two of the four wilayas) on how to plan, budget, implement and monitor EbA interventions. Material (equipment) and capacity-building support has been provided to the Regional Delegations (DREDDs), including training on ecological monitoring. The DREDDs who have thus been significantly strengthened by the project to become key partners in the implementation and monitoring of its interventions in the four target wilayas. Furthermore, through the project outreach and stakeholder engagement activities, more informal types of awareness-raising have built the capacity of over 400 households to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of EbA interventions.

The project also initiated activities to strengthen the capacity of local associations and community-based organizations (Output 1.3). It undertook a review of civil society actors and community-based organizations (AGLCs, ADCs, etc) in the project intervention areas, which revealed a lack of AGLCs but a strong presence of cooperatives, which could be converted into AGLCs or ADCs with project support and trained on EbA approaches. A first training was organized for AGLC members to introduce the concept of EbA and its practical applications.

Finally, activities focused on the development of a national adaptation strategy and policy revisions (Output 1.1) have been postponed for the time being, due to new funding identified from the Green Climate Fund (GCF) for the development of a National Adaptation Plan (NAP). The NAP process funded by the GCF and implemented with UNEP support was launched in mid-2019. Consultations with sectoral focal points and other stakeholders are ongoing to establish the relationship and linkages between the NAP process and the proposed national adaptation strategy. The project Mid-Term Review (MTR) to be initiated in Q1 2020 will look into the need to modify some of the activities and indicators related to Output 1.1 accordingly.

Under **Component 2**, the project has made significant progress in the implementation of EbA interventions in pastoral and forest ecosystems to build climate resilience in the intervention sites. On the other hand, the engagement of AGLCs and other local associations in the development of local management plans (Output 2.1) has been delayed. A gender survey was undertaken in selected ADCs/AGLCs to identify opportunities to further integrate gender considerations into Component 2 field interventions (Output 2.1). The survey revealed the extent to which the lack of management plans for the associations was having a negative effect on natural resources and communities, in particular women. The project has been working with the AGLC steering committees to initiate the development of local natural resource management plans, that include EbA interventions and associated income-generating activities and climate-resilient livelihoods, with a particular focus on women.

The implementation of EbA and other adaptation measures to decrease the vulnerability of pastoral resources and communities to droughts, bushfires and dune encroachment (Output 2.2) has been significantly advanced by the project in all four target wilayas, with exceptional progress made considering the early stage of project implementation. These adaptation interventions implemented include the installation of 3,600 linear meters of stony rows for soil conservation (protection from rainwater runoff), implementation of set-aside for the restoration of 110 ha of degraded ecosystems with 55,000 plants produced, the fixation of 105 ha of sand dunes with local species (52,500 plants produced), restoration of 45 ha of protected forest and 36 ha of gum tree forests. Strong protection systems (fences with concrete poles) have been installed to protect the areas restored from animal encroachment.

Climate-resilient livelihood opportunities and income-generating activities have also been identified and initiated (Output 2.3). These activities have targeted women and young people to improve the income of the beneficiaries and thus enhance their food security. 10 vegetable gardens have been set up, with 5 of them equipped with solar water pumping systems. 45ha of agroforestry species have been planted. Income-generating activities introduced so far include community shops, butcheries, sheep fattening, and one bakery, couscous-making, and fabric dying cooperative each.

Activities under project **Component 3**, focused on increasing awareness and knowledge of climate change and EbA in Mauritania, are currently at inception phase (in line with the project work plan). The development of the project website and the collection of footage for a documentary are currently underway.

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Implementation Progress Rating | FY 2019 | | | | |
| | S | | | | |

The project inception workshop which was held in December 2017 marked the beginning of the project implementation. As a first step, the Project Management Unit (PMU) was put in place in early 2018, consisting of a Project Coordinator, Finance and Administrative Assistants, and a part-time National Technical Advisor and M&E Consultant. In its first year and a half of implementation, the project has made excellent progress, in particular in putting in place the necessary implementation arrangements in the four target wilayas (regions), and in advancing the implementation of adaptation interventions under project Component 2 (as described under "Development Progress Rating", above).

Strengthening the Regional Delegations of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (DREDDs) in the four target wilayas, both through the provision of equipment and training, has been instrumental for adequate technical support, supervision and monitoring of the project field activities. The progress in project implementation was realized also with significant participation from the project beneficiaries in the target communities, and has elicited their enthusiasm and further commitment in the project. In the one case where there was insufficient interest and ownership of the local community to the extent that the project results were compromised, the project activities were eventually moved to another site.

As the overall project progress and expenditures are on track, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) will be initiated in Q1 2020 as planned.

Challenges encountered in project implementation have been mainly related to the hostile nature of the arid environment of the project intervention areas. The extreme heat and the associated evaporation and evapotranspiration have necessitated significant water inputs for the development of the nurseries for ecosystem restoration interventions, as well as to ensure the survival of plants during reforestation efforts. Despite the infrastructure and equipment for watering and pumping provided by the project, the challenges have remained numerous especially for the survival of transplanted plants. The late arrival of rains also caused an extended period where the watering of the plants was necessary. Furthermore, this late start of the rainy season is associated with very intense rains which can cause damages, sometimes serious ones.

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Risk Rating | FY 2019 | | | | |
| | M | | | | |

The overall risk level for the project is assessed as "medium", due to the following risks identified during project development and implementation (these are further elaborated on and ranked in the risk table, above):

Arid conditions pose a risk to the survival of planted seedlings, and community water points are not always sufficiently close for easy watering of seedlings. On the other hand, heavy rains associated with the onset of rains can cause damages to seedlings. To address these risks, sufficient watering and protection of the seedlings are being ensured by the project teams in all target wilayas. Seedling survival and replacement rates are closely monitored and assessed. In case of any issues, corrective actions will be identified to improve survival rates. For example, improved access to water may be necessary, and different species or planting / watering protocols may need to be considered.

The limited technical capacity in the country to implement the project interventions may compromise the effectiveness of the adaptation measures. As planned at project development stage, this risk is being mitigated by building the capacity of national and local government to plan and implement EbA approaches. Various training opportunities offered by the project itself are building the capacity of local government actors, in

particular. The need for budget revisions to ensure sufficient international expertise and technical support will be considered during the 2020 work planning and budgeting exercise to further mitigate this risk.

The capacity of national institutions to undertake rigorous scientific research is limited, which may result in difficulties in monitoring the long-term efficiency of the project interventions. To mitigate this risk, as planned at project development stage, relevant government institutions such as universities and research institutes will be engaged in the development of the institutional framework for the long-term data collection, monitoring and archiving system under project Output 3.1. The roles and responsibilities in the implementation of this system will be agreed upon.

Stakeholder engagement

The project's stakeholder engagement plan for the implementation phase consists of four aspects: (i) stakeholders are consulted throughout the implementation phase; (ii) stakeholder consultation mechanisms include four categories; (iii) stakeholder consultations during project implementation are divided into three phases; and (iv) the Project Steering Committee plays a specific role in the coordination of this participation and consultation of the project stakeholders.

Significant progress against the stakeholder engagement plan was made in that the project stakeholders have been consulted throughout the implementation of the project so far.

(1) The project implementation strategy includes significant stakeholder engagement:

During the project launch workshop, all the stakeholders identified during project formulated were invited to participate. The workshop was an opportunity to share with these stakeholders the project's approach and to gather their observations and remarks on the best ways and means necessary for the implementation of the project. On the basis of the recommendations received, criteria were developed in collaboration with local actors (administrative, municipal, decentralized technical services, etc.) to choose project intervention sites. The purpose of the ongoing stakeholder consultation has been to achieve the following four objectives, all of which have shown good progress:

- (i) Promote community understanding of project results;
- (ii) Promote local community ownership by promoting their engagement in the planning, implementation and monitoring of interventions;
- (iii) Communicate with the public in a consistent, supportive and effective manner; and
- (iv) Maximize complementarity with other ongoing projects.

(2) All four stakeholder consultation mechanisms have been utilized:

- (i) initial meetings with the authorities of three sectoral departments: MEDD, MDR (ME, MA) and the MHA; and the regional, departmental and communal authorities during the launch workshop;
- (ii) consultations with coordinators of baseline and partner projects (DIMS, PARSACC, PRAPS, AMCC2 projects), etc;
- (iii) consultations with NGOs, local associations and cooperatives; and
- (iv) consultations with other local community members benefiting from the project. Local collectives participated in the decision-making processes and in the implementation of the project. For example, species selection for planting activities under Component 2 was based on local community preferences.

(3) During the implementation of the project, the stakeholder consultations are conducted in three phases:

Phase 1: First, the "mobilization" phase took place during the first year of the project. This phase focused on the engagement of stakeholders and planning their participation in the project. These include their involvement in the development of the detailed work plan for activities on a monthly basis. Stakeholders participated in all community activities, and the mobilization of the project beneficiaries in the project intervention sites was highly successful.

Phase 2: This phase of "consultative implementation" consists of applying the PP

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>participation plan to each of the activities defined during the mobilization phase. This has, to date, taken place for example through training activities and community participation in the implementation of the adaptation interventions. Phase 3: This “completion and upscaling” phase is scheduled to start in the beginning of the year 2020. This phase will support the sustainability of the project by transferring the responsibility of managing project investments at the local level to the local stakeholders.</p> <p>(4) A Project Steering Committee (PSC) comprising representatives of ministerial departments intervening in rural areas has been set up. The role of PSC is not only to validate the project work plan and approaches, but above all to ensure their coherence with national policies in the various fields of intervention, to seek synergies and avoid duplications.</p> |
| <p>Gender mainstreaming</p> | <p>The project document identifies gender inequalities in Mauritania and provides figures indicating the specific vulnerability of women. The project document, which is in full alignment with the country's National Gender Mainstreaming Strategy (SNIG), also recommends for the project activities to be developed with a focus on women's participation.</p> <p>The project has taken into account all these provisions in its implementation. The project undertook a study on gender considerations and reinforced them in the logical framework. Most of the income-generating activities target specifically women – some of them exclusively (e.g. couscous making). This support takes into account the country's political orientations, namely the National Gender Mainstreaming Strategy. It has been through these activities that vulnerable groups (women, youth and the elderly) are provided with livelihoods that are resilient to climate change.</p> <p>Gender considerations will be further concretized by the involvement of women in the training provided to the natural resource management associations. Furthermore, several wells and boreholes equipped with solar powered pumps have been set up for market gardening and household drinking water supply, mainly to relieve women's efforts to provide irrigation water. This has allowed women to multiply their cultivation areas and thus increase their production in order to better feed children while considerably reducing the time and efforts made for the provision of drinking water to households. All other income generating activities of the project also contribute to complement food security.</p> |
| <p>Environmental and social safeguards management</p> | <p><i>Describe progress, challenges and outcomes related to the environmental and social safeguard-responsive measures documented at CEO Endorsement/ Approval in social safeguard action plan or equivalent. Older projects that were designed before environmental and social safeguard mainstreaming should proactively report any possible social safeguard benefits, as appropriate. [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</i></p> <p>Suggestion from Anna: Although the project didn't identify any safeguards risks at the development phase, some potential risks (unintended negative environmental or social impacts of project) could be considered and discussed here. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainability of groundwater extraction (in the face of climate change change); is there a risk of water over-extraction? What can be done to mitigate these risks? - Use of invasive alien species, e.g. Prosopis – to what extent used, why, and what invasion management measures might be taken? - Anything else? Labour conditions? Health and safety? |
| <p>Knowledge activities</p> | <p>The knowledge management approach of the project is largely covered by project Component 3, which is scheduled to start implementation in the second</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <p>and products</p> | <p>year of project implementation. A knowledge management strategy is to be developed in the first half of 2020.</p> <p>To date, several studies and training / awareness-raising activities have been undertaken, which will feed into the project’s knowledge activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project baseline study drew attention to several themes and topics that were previously little known to the project beneficiaries; • Two awareness-raising and training workshops on the EbA approach have been organized; • A training on the EbA approach enabled communities to mobilize their empirical knowledge of EbA as a method of land management towards the sustainable management of ecosystem services with adaptation benefits; • Training on ecological monitoring has resulted in greater community cohesion for the shared management of the environment; • A study on gender aspects that highlighted the gender-sensitive approach of the project and was appreciated by women and other vulnerable groups; • A diagnostic study of community-based structures engaged in forest and pastoral resource management, which has highlighted the importance of engaging beneficiaries; • A study to support the process of setting up community development associations for natural resource management in the project area; and the relevance of building their capacity on the sustainable management of natural resources; • Empirical and traditional knowledge was shared during the workshops, and will be paid particular attention to in the implementation of the Component 3 activities. |
| <p>Stories to be shared</p> | <p>The project presents many good opportunities for communication products, due to the visually dramatic impacts that successful ecosystem rehabilitation interventions can have in these arid and semi-arid landscapes. The income-generating livelihood diversification activities, which target mainly women, would also provide good human-interest stories, in particular as there is significant engagement in and commitment to these on the part of the beneficiaries.</p> |

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**¹ will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project Results(s)

| Project objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones ² | End of Project Target | Observations/ justification on rating | Progress rating ³ |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| Objective: To reduce the vulnerability to CC of national government and local communities in the forests and rangelands of the Sahelian Acacia Savana Ecoregion | Total number of direct beneficiaries (% of which are women) of the project's EbA activities. | Zero | At least 400 (to be validated at inception) including 40% of women. | At least 1200 (to be validated at inception) including 40% of women (to be verified at baseline). | The project has benefitted more than 100 households in each of the four wilayas, i.e. over 2,000 individuals in total, that have benefited from climate change adaptation interventions, either through the rehabilitation of natural resources (forests and rangelands) or through the introduction of alternative income-generating activities (IGAs). Women constitute over 50% of the project beneficiaries, and about 83% of the community members engaged in the implementation of project interventions. | S |
| Component 1: Institutional and technical capacity to address climate change risks through EbA | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1: Strengthened capacity at the national, provincial and local levels to use EbA measures | 1.1.1 Degree to which capacity of targeted government institutions at national and sub-national levels is strengthened to identify | Current estimated level of capacity to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and assess effectiveness of EbA | Increase of 3 in the capacity score assessment of each public institution | Increase of 5 in the capacity score assessment of each public institution | The capacity score at project mid-point will be measured in Q1-Q2 2020. The baseline study concluded that while the concept of EbA is unconsciously applied, it is virtually unknown as a | S |

¹ For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

² Some projects are adopting/planning to adopt milestones for tracking the achievement of outcomes. Add the corresponding milestones in this column when applicable to inform the rating. Milestones are optional and may substitute for Mid-Term Target.

³ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (**HS**), Satisfactory (**S**), Marginally Satisfactory (**MS**), Marginally Unsatisfactory (**MU**), Unsatisfactory (**U**), and Highly Unsatisfactory (**HU**).

| Project objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones ² | End of Project Target | Observations/ justification on rating | Progress rating ³ |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| to address climate change risks in rangelands. | prioritise, implement, monitor and assess effectiveness of EbA interventions. | <p>interventions is 2. Institutions have limited capacity to monitor and identify climate risks. They are able to design, budget and implement restoration interventions but not EbA interventions. Increasing vegetation cover is prioritised by national institutions but not EbA.</p> <p>Baseline study to be conducted at the project inception stage (to verify the overall score).</p> | | | <p>scientific concept or approach on the ground and to most public actors. The baseline study did not specifically verify the capacity score of “2” estimated at project development phase.</p> <p>Targeted government institutions, in particular at the sub-national level, have benefitted for capacity building and training activities undertaken by the project, specifically under Output 1.2. All training deliverables have been disseminated to the stakeholders so as to increase technical capacity of national, provincial and local institutions to facilitate the use of EbA measures to address climate change risks.</p> | |
| | 1.1.2 Number of policy revisions proposed for sectoral strategies, plans and laws to integrate adaptation to climate change, and submitted to government for validation. | 1.1.2 Zero, the existing strategies, plans and laws in the sectors of management of natural resources and sustainable development makes minimal mention of adaptation to climate change (to be further defined during the baseline study). | 1.1.2 At least two sectoral strategies, plans and laws. | 1.1.2 At least six sectoral strategies, plans and laws. | <p>The development of proposed revisions to key sectoral policies, strategies and plans has been postponed, as it is seen that this falls under the purview of the recently-launched GCF-funded National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process (see below). However, the possibility of this LDCF project to propose revisions that feed into the NAP process still needs to be further considered.</p> <p>The project Mid-Term Review (MTR) to be initiated in Q1 2020 will look into the need to modify or replace this target.</p> | MS |
| | 1.2. National adaptation strategy developed. | The ACCMR project includes the development of a NAP road map that | N/A | One gender-sensitive national adaptation strategy | The implementation of activities focused on the development a National Adaptation Strategy (NAS) have been postponed for the time-being, due to the mobilization of | S |

| Project objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones ² | End of Project Target | Observations/ justification on rating | Progress rating ³ |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|------------------------------|
| | | should be produced in the near future. However, there is no national adaptation strategy to guide adaptation planning in Mauritania. | | developed. | GCF funds for the development of National Adaptation Plan (NAP) with UNEP support after the approval of this project. The NAP support project was launched in Q2 2019. As the NAP process is being advanced, the focus, relationship and sequencing between these two instruments (NAP and NAS) will be further discussed. It is possible that the NAS would only be developed after the NAP is in place. The project Mid-Term Review (MTR) to be initiated in Q1 2020 will look into the need to modify or replace this target. | |
| | 1.3. Number of local government officials, environmental committee members and local community representatives with capacity to plan, budget and implement and monitor EbA interventions (disaggregated by gender). | No trainings that have been provided to support national, provincial and local government in implementing appropriate adaptation measures, including EbA interventions. A more quantitative assessment of this indicator will be made at inception phase. | At least: i) 40 government technical staff members; ii) 30 NGO staff members; iii) 20 staff members from DREDDs and other relevant institutions have increased capacity to plan, budget, implement and monitor EbA interventions (of which at least 40% of women). | At least: i) 50 public technical staff; ii) 20 public decision-makers; iii) 40 NGO staff members; iv) 30 DREDDs staff members and other relevant regional delegations have increased capacity to plan, budget, implement and monitor EbA interventions (of which at least 40% of women). | A regional training was organized on EbA principles and approaches. The participants included: (i) 40 central government technical staff; (ii) 30 elected local decision-makers; (iii) 10 NGO staff; and (iv) 20 DREDD and other regional institutions' staff. Furthermore, two 3-day regional trainings were organized, each covering two of the four wilayas, with a total of 43 participants from the Regional Delegations (DREDDs) and village management committees. The trainings focused on how to plan, budget, implement and monitor EbA approaches and interventions. Furthermore, through the project outreach and stakeholder engagement activities, more informal types of awareness-raising have built the capacity of over 400 households to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of EbA interventions. The Regional Delegations (DREDDs) in each target wilaya have been fully equipped with data collection and monitoring equipment, and associated training on environmental monitoring was provided to 12 staff members across the | S |

| Project objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones ² | End of Project Target | Observations/ justification on rating | Progress rating ³ |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| | | | | | four DREDDs. The training was followed by an initiation and a practical field session on the use of ecological monitoring equipment provided. However, the need for further strengthening of both capacity and materials to ensure adequate ecological monitoring has emerged. Their capacity to monitor the impacts of the adaptation activities on communities, livelihoods and well-being also needs to be strengthened. | |
| | 1.4. Number of AGLCs established for the sustainable management of natural resources including pastoral resources using EbA. | There are ~45 AGLCs in the intervention areas that are located mainly in Guidimaka and Hodh El Gharbi. | 5 new AGLCs established for the sustainable management of natural resources including pastoral resources using EbA | 15 new AGLC established for the sustainable management of natural resources including pastoral resources using EbA. | <p>A mapping of civil society actors and community-based organizations, including AGLCs (local natural resource management associations) and ADCs (community development associations) was undertaken in the project intervention areas. The results of the review identified the presence of only three AGLCs, two local NGOs and six youth associations in the project areas. However, it also revealed the presence of a large number of cooperatives that were not targeted by the review (despite their institutional similarity with AGLCs), due to their very large number and lack of experience in natural resource management. In fact, it was concluded that most of the local associations (with the exception of the wilaya of Guidimaka) are cooperatives, mainly focused on economic activities such as vegetable gardening or other income-generating activities, with very little experience in natural resource management.</p> <p>In order to fill this gap, the project will work on converting some of these cooperatives into AGLCs or ADCs, including the provision of training on sustainable natural resource management</p> | S |

| Project objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones ² | End of Project Target | Observations/ justification on rating | Progress rating ³ |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| | | | | | and EbA interventions. The possible need to revise the project target (considering the limited presence of existing AGLCs) will be considered at project Mid-Term Review. | |
| | 1.5. Number of training events for AGLC committees on the use of EbA for the sustainable management of natural resources including pastoral resources. | Some of the existing local associations that will be targeted by the project will likely have received some training on ecosystem management and tree planting when they were created. However, these local associations represent a minority of those focused on by the project and EbA approach was not part of this training. | Six training events for at least 30 committee members from at least four AGLCs each on the use of EbA for the sustainable management of natural resources including pastoral resources. | Nine training events for at least 30 committee members from four AGLCs each on the use of EbA for the sustainable management of natural resources including pastoral resources. | <p>During the reporting period, a 3-day training was organized for AGLC members in the wilaya of Guidimaka to introduce the concept of EbA and its practical applications. The 30 participants included 24 AGLC members and six DREDD staff. The training covered the following modules: (i) General notions of ecosystems and ecosystem services, (ii) EbA definition, the three domains and five criteria that determine the EbA approach, and (iii) how to use the EbA approach in practice.</p> <p>The indicator will likely need to be modified to include not only AGLCs, but also other relevant local associations (e.g. ADC), as there are only very few AGLCs present in the project areas. This will be considered by the project Mid-Term Review.</p> | MS |
| Outcome 2: Increased provision of pastoral resources and climate resilient livelihoods via an EbA approach. | 2.1. Number of AGLCs with management plans for natural resources including EbA interventions in the four Wilayas of the project. | No management plans for natural resources including EbA interventions in the project intervention area. | At least six (6) management plans (1 for each individual AGLC) for natural resources including EbA interventions developed. | At least nine management plans (1 for each individual AGLC) for natural resources including EbA interventions developed. | <p>The development of the local management plans is delayed due to several factors, in particular (i) the lack of existing AGLCs in the project areas, and (ii) the delay in the establishment and training of new AGLCs and/or other associations (Output 1.3).</p> <p>In follow up to the findings of the project baseline study and a gender survey of AGLCs and ADCs, the project convened with every AGLC / ADC steering committee to plan the development of a management plan for natural resources for each AGLC /</p> | MS |

| Project objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones ² | End of Project Target | Observations/ justification on rating | Progress rating ³ |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|------------------------------|
| | | | | | ADC, including EbA interventions and income-generating activities / climate-resilient livelihoods for women in particular. | |
| | 2.2. Number of hectares of pastoral ecosystems benefiting from EbA measures (adapted from AMAT indicator 4). | Protection measures involving mechanical and manual firebreaks, and mechanical sand fixation techniques are being implemented mainly under the APCBF project. However, the use of EbA to combat the adverse effects of climate change is limited. | EbA measures implemented across at least 400 hectares within the management areas of the AGLCs selected under Output 2.1 to address climate change effects such as droughts, fires and sand dune encroachment. | EbA measures implemented across at least 1200 hectares – 150 hectares of watersheds, 300 hectares of rangelands, 390 hectares of sand dunes, 210 ha of <i>Acacia</i> forests and 150 hectares of protected forests – to address climate change effects such as droughts, bushfires and sand dune encroachment. | EbA measures are currently being implemented across 296 hectares. These measures include the planting of saplings towards the restoration of 110 ha of degraded rangelands through set-aside (with 55,000 seedlings produced), the fixation of 105 ha of sand dunes with local species (52,500 seedlings produced), and the restoration of 36 ha of <i>Acacia</i> (gum tree) forests and 45 ha of protected forests. Strong protection systems (fences with concrete poles) have been installed to protect these areas from animal encroachment. Furthermore, 3,600 lineal meters of stone rows have been put in place for soil and water conservation (protection from rainwater runoff and for increasing infiltration rates) in 2 watersheds. | S |
| | 2.3. Number of individuals receiving training, technical support and equipment to adopt climate-resilient livelihoods. | A limited number of individuals received training, technical support and equipment to adopt climate-resilient livelihoods in the targeted Wilayas (to be confirmed by the baseline study). | At least 100 individuals have received training, technical support and equipment to adopt climate-resilient livelihoods. | At least 300 individuals have received training, technical support and equipment to adopt climate-resilient livelihoods. | Opportunities to climate-proof and diversify the livelihood activities of pastoral communities have been identified, and approximately 100 individuals have received training, technical support and equipment to adopt these livelihoods. 10 vegetable gardens have been established to date, of which 5 are equipped with solar water pumping systems. The establishment and development of the following income-generating activities has been supported so far: 2 community | S |

| Project objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones ² | End of Project Target | Observations/ justification on rating | Progress rating ³ |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| | | | | | shops, 4 butcheries, 2 sheep fattening, and 1 bakery, couscous-making, and fabric dying cooperative each. Agroforestry is being implemented on 45 hectares, with the planting of traditional sources of NTFPs such as <i>Acacia senegal</i> , <i>Balanites</i> and <i>Ziziphus</i> . 22,500 seedlings were produced so far. | |
| Outcome 3: Increased awareness and knowledge of climate change risks, benefits of EbA and opportunities for climate-resilient livelihoods in Mauritania. | 3.1. Proportion of the population in the four Wilayas of the project with increased awareness and corresponding behavioural change on climate change effects and adaptation options. | There is limited awareness of climate change effects and adaptation options in the Wilayas of the project (less than 5%, to be confirmed by the baseline study). | At least 2 out of 10 people with increased awareness on climate change effects and adaptation options in the Wilayas of the project (of which ~50% are women). | At least 3 out of 10 people with increased awareness on climate change effects and adaptation options in the Wilayas of the project and at least 1 out of 10 people with corresponding behavioural changes (of which ~50% are women). | The full engagement of the local populations in the implementation of the adaptation interventions, as well as the informal and formal trainings conducted, are very likely to result in their increased awareness of climate change impacts and adaptation options, and in corresponding behavioural changes. The level of awareness of the local populations will be assessed by the project Mid-Term Review. | S |
| | 3.2. Number of knowledge management strategies on the benefits of EbA interventions to local communities developed to capture and share experiences from and between all adaptation projects developed. | There is no knowledge management strategy on the benefits of EbA interventions to local communities to capture and share experiences from and between all adaptation projects. | N/A | One knowledge management strategy on the benefits of EbA interventions to local communities to capture and share experiences from and between all adaptation projects developed and | The development of the knowledge management strategy has not been initiated yet. It is to be completed by Q2 2020, in line with the project work plan. | S |

| Project objective and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline level | Mid-Term Target or Milestones ² | End of Project Target | Observations/ justification on rating | Progress rating ³ |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| | | | | implemented – the knowledge-sharing element of the strategy will include specific guidelines to promote gender equity in access to information. | | |
| | 3.3. Number of communication tools developed to increase awareness of government staff and local communities on the benefits of an EbA approach and associated climate-resilient livelihoods. | The EbA approach is unknown in the country and there are limited communication tools to increase awareness on the benefits of an EbA approach and associated climate resilient livelihoods (to be confirmed during the baseline study). | At least one website developed/strengthened to increase awareness of government staff and local communities on the benefits of an EbA approach and associated climate resilient livelihoods. | At least one radio show, one TV show and one website to increase awareness of government staff and local communities on the benefits of an EbA approach and associated climate resilient livelihoods. | The development of the project website and collection of video footage for a documentary have been initiated. | S |

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project Result(s)

| FY2019 rating | Justification of the current FY rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods. |
|---------------|---|
| S | <p>Overall progress towards achieving the project results has been satisfactory in the first 1.5 years of project implementation. In particular, very good progress was made in initiating the implementation of ecosystem-based and other adaptation interventions on the ground (indicators 2.2 and 2.3), with significant progress made already in the first year. By the end of the reporting period, EbA measures were being implemented on 300 hectares of land. The arid conditions in the project sites pose a challenge for seedling survival, though, so this will need to be closely monitored and the provision of water ensured.</p> <p>The development of proposed revisions to key sectoral policies, strategies and plans (indicator 1.1.2) has been postponed, as it is seen that this falls under the purview of the recently-launched GCF-funded National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process. However, the possibility of the LDCF project to propose sectoral policy revisions that feed into the NAP process needs to be further considered.</p> <p>Furthermore, the progress made in the training and engagement of local associations (indicators 1.5 and 2.1) has been somewhat limited to date. This will need to be addressed to ensure the sustainability of project results.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| FY2019 rating | Justification of the current FY rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods. |
| | Several changes to the project target and indicators will need to be considered by the Mid-Term Review, for example due to (i) the mobilization of GCF resources for the NAP process, which will affect the activities and targets originally planned under Output 1.1, and (ii) the need to broaden the consideration of local associations to cover other types in addition to AGLCs. The project baseline study was completed in the reporting period, together with other studies on gender and mapping of local associations. |

Risks to the delivery of results

The second column should be completed by the Project Manager and the third column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. Projects should complete only the relevant sections and are free to add/delete problems/risks. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| Problems/risks identified | Description of the problem/risk | Agreed recommended actions |
|---|--|---|
| on achieving targets | Arid conditions pose a risk to the survival of planted seedlings, and community water points are not always sufficiently close for easy watering of seedlings. On the other hand, heavy rains associated with the onset of rains can cause damages to seedlings. | Seedling survival and replacement rates are to be closely monitored and assessed. In case of any issues, corrective actions will be identified to improve survival rates. For example, improved access to water may be necessary, and different species or planting / watering protocols may need to be considered. Mapping of community water points, water quality and depth would help to ensure that activities requiring water are placed close to access to suitable source of water. |
| | Due to new funding identified from the Green Climate Fund (GCF) for the development of a National Adaptation Plan (NAP) in Mauritania, there is a need to reconsider and revise targets relating to Output 1.1 on the drafting of policy revision proposals and the development of a National Adaptation Strategy (i.e. indicators 1.1.2 and 1.2). | Consultations with sectoral focal points and other stakeholders must be continued to establish the relationship and sequencing between the NAP process and the proposed development of a National Adaptation Strategy as well as sectoral policy revisions. The scope for the project to pursue recommendations for sectoral policy revisions in parallel (or as a contribution to) the NAP process will be identified. The project Mid-Term Review (MTR) to be initiated in Q1 2020 will look into the need to modify some of the activities and indicators related to Output 1.1 accordingly. |
| on stakeholder engagement and sustainability of results | Full participation of AGLCs (local natural resource management associations) in the implementation of Component 2 EbA interventions was originally foreseen. However, since only 2 AGLCs were identified in the project areas, this approach needs to be re-thought, in order to ensure | The establishment of new AGLCs and/or ADCs and their training on EbA approaches (Output 1.3) will be prioritized, including through the conversion of existing cooperatives into these associations. This will be followed by the development of the Local Management Plans, and the full engagement of |

| Problems/risks identified | Description of the problem/risk | Agreed recommended actions |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| | the engagement of local associations and the sustainability of project results. The delay in the establishment of further AGLCs or other associations and their training on EbA by the project also compounds this problem. | the associations in the implementation and monitoring of the project interventions. |
| on sustainability of results | The income-generating activities introduced by the project are being adopted with great enthusiasm in most project sites, with a high demand from women's cooperatives for further activities in this area. However, there are insufficient financial literacy and business skills currently in place for ensuring the long-term success and sustainability of such activities. | Financial management and business training will be provided to the (mainly women's) cooperatives in charge of the income-generating activities. The development of the small businesses will be closely monitoring in the course of the project, to identify possible risks to their long-term sustainability, and to undertake corrective actions (e.g. provision of support for identifying and accessing markets). |

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs

| Outputs ⁴ | Expected delivery date ⁵ | Implementation status as of 30 June 2019 | Progress rating justification | Progress rating ⁶ |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|
| Outcome 1. Strengthened capacity at the national, provincial and local levels to use EbA measures to address climate change risks in rangelands. | | | | |
| Output 1.1: A national adaptation strategy to inform adaptation planning developed | Q4 2021 | Not started | Activities focused on the development a National Adaptation Strategy (NAS) and the development of proposed revisions to key sectoral policies, strategies and plans has been postponed, for the time-being, due to the mobilization of GCF funds for the development of National Adaptation Plan (NAP) with UNEP support after the approval of this project. The NAP support project was launched in Q2 2019. As the NAP process is being advanced, the focus, relationship and sequencing between the two instruments (NAP and NAS), as well as between the NAP process and the planned policy and law revisions will be further discussed. Activities 1.1.1 – 1.1.5 will therefore need to be re-considered and modified accordingly at the project Mid-Term Review (Q1 2020). According to project work plan, activity 1.1.6 (integrating EbA approach in Local Development Plans) is scheduled to start in Q3 2019. | MS |
| Output 1.2: Training events organised to increase technical capacity of national, provincial and local institutions to facilitate the implementation of appropriate adaptation measures | Q2 2020 | Ongoing with minor delays | A regional training was organized on EbA guidelines. Furthermore two 3-day regional trainings were organized, each covering two of the four wilayas, with a total of 43 participants from the Regional Delegations (DREDDs) and village management committees. The trainings focused on how to plan, budget, implement and monitor EbA interventions. Furthermore, through the project outreach and stakeholder engagement activities, more informal types of awareness-raising have built the capacity of over 400 participants to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of EbA interventions. The Regional Delegations (DREDDs) in each target wilaya have been fully equipped with data collection and monitoring equipment, | S |

⁴ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

⁵ As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

⁶ To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---------------------|---|----|
| | | | <p>and associated training on environmental monitoring was provided to 12 staff members across the four DREDDs. The training was followed by an initiation and a practical field session on the use of ecological monitoring equipment provided. However, the need for further strengthening of both capacity and materials to ensure adequate ecological monitoring has emerged. Furthermore, their capacity to monitor the impacts of the adaptation activities on communities, livelihoods and well-being needs to be further strengthened.</p> <p>The DREDDs have also been provided with practical means for organizing awareness raising campaigns for rural communities. However, there is still a need to build their capacity to deliver such campaigns through further training and provision of awareness-raising materials (linked also to Component 3).</p> | |
| Output 1.3: New AGLCs established and existing AGLC management committees trained on the use of EbA for the sustainable management of natural resources including pastoral resources | Q3 2019 | Ongoing with delays | <p>A mapping of civil society actors and community-based organizations (AGLCs, ADCs, cooperatives, etc.) was undertaken in the project intervention areas. The results for the review identified the presence of only three (3) AGLCs, two (2) local NGOs and six (6) youth associations in the project areas. However, it also revealed the presence of a large cooperatives that were not targeted by the review (despite their institutional similarity with AGLCs), due to their very large number and lack of experience in natural resource management. In fact, it was concluded that most of the local associations (with the exception of the wilaya of Guidimaka) are cooperatives, mainly focused on economic activities such as vegetable gardening or other income-generating activities, with very little experience in natural resource management.</p> <p>In order to fill this gap, the project will work on converting some of these cooperatives into AGLCs and ADCs, and provide training on sustainable resource management and EbA. This was not started yet during the reporting period, so the original timeline for the establishment and training of the new AGLCs by Q3 2019 will not be met.</p> <p>During the reporting period, a 3-day training was organized for AGLC members in the wilaya of Guidimaka to introduce the concept of EbA and its practical applications. The 30 participants included 24 AGLC members and six DREDD staff. The training covered the following modules: (i) General notions of ecosystems and ecosystem services, (ii) EbA definition, the three domains and five</p> | MS |

| | | | | |
|--|---------|----------------------|--|----|
| | | | criteria that determine the EbA approach, and (iii) how to use the EbA approach in practice. | |
| Outcome 2. Increased provision of pastoral resources and climate-resilient livelihoods via an EbA approach. | | | | |
| Output 2.1: Management plans for natural resources including EbA interventions developed in collaboration with AGLCs. | Q2 2019 | Ongoing with delays | <p>The implementation of the activities under this output is delayed due to several factors, in particular (i) the lack of existing AGLCs in the project areas, and (ii) the delay in the establishment and training of new AGLCs and/or other associations (Output 1.3).</p> <p>As preparatory activities for the development of the local management plans, the project baseline study provided information of the rangelands and other ecosystems in the project areas, as well as their level of degradation and productivity. The project also undertook a gender survey in selected ADCs/AGLCs as to identify opportunities to further integrate gender equity into Component 2 field interventions. The results of this survey revealed the extent to which the lack of management plans for AGLC has a negative impact on the state of degradation of natural resources and on the lives of the communities, particularly women.</p> <p>In follow up to the study findings, the project convened with every project steering committee to plan the development of a management plan for natural resources for each AGLC / ADC, including EbA interventions and income-generating activities / climate-resilient livelihoods for women in particular.</p> | MS |
| Output 2.2: EbA and other adaptation practices implemented to decrease vulnerability of pastoral resources to droughts, bushfires and sand dune encroachment within the management areas of the AGLCs selected under Output 2.1. | Q4 2021 | Ongoing and on track | <p>EbA measures are currently being implemented across 296 hectares. These measures have so far included the planting of saplings towards the restoration of 110 ha of degraded rangelands through set-aside (55,000 seedlings of <i>Acacia radiana</i>, <i>Balanites aegyptiaca</i> and <i>Ziziphus mauritiana</i> produced), the fixation of 105 ha of sand dunes with local species (52,500 seedlings of <i>Prosopis</i>, <i>Panicum</i> and <i>Leptadenia</i> produced), and the restoration of 36 ha of <i>Acacia</i> (gum tree) forests and 45 ha of protected forests.</p> <p>Strong protection systems (fences with concrete poles) have been installed to protect these areas from animal encroachment.</p> <p>Furthermore, 3,600 lineal meters of stone rows have been put in place for soil and water conservation (protection from rainwater runoff and for increasing infiltration rates) in 2 watersheds.</p> | S |

| | | | | |
|--|---------|----------------------|--|----|
| Output 2.3: Training, technical support and equipment provided to rural communities for the establishment of climate-resilient livelihoods. | Q4 2021 | Ongoing and on track | Opportunities to climate-proof and diversify the livelihood activities of pastoral communities have been identified. 10 vegetable gardens have been established to date, of which 5 are equipped with solar water pumping systems. The establishment and development of the following income-generating activities has been supported so far: 2 community shops, 4 butcheries, 2 sheep fattening, and 1 bakery, couscous-making, and fabric dyeing cooperative each. Agroforestry is being implemented on 45 hectares, with the planting of traditional sources of NTFPs such as <i>Acacia senegal</i> , <i>Balanites</i> and <i>Ziziphus</i> . 22,500 seedlings were produced so far. | S |
| Outcome 3. Increased awareness and knowledge of climate change risks, benefits of EbA and opportunities for climate-resilient livelihoods in Mauritania. | | | | |
| Output 3.1: A knowledge management strategy – including long-term data collection, analysis and archiving – developed to capture and share information on the benefits of adaptation practices to rural communities. | Q2 2020 | Not started yet | Activities towards the development of the knowledge management strategy have not been initiated yet and are therefore somewhat behind schedule (preliminary activities were to be initiated in Q1 2019). The knowledge management strategy is to be completed by Q2 2020, in line with the project work plan. | MS |
| Output 3.2: Awareness-raising campaigns via different media – including radio and TV – on the benefits of an EbA approach and associated climate-resilient livelihoods developed and implemented for government staff and rural communities. | Q2 2021 | Ongoing and on track | The development of the project website and collection of video footage for a documentary have been initiated. | S |
| Output 3.3: A long-term strategy to upscale and sustain best adaptation measures including EbA. | Q3 2021 | Not started yet | The development of the long-term upscaling strategy has not yet been initiated. At the community level, there is a lot of scope to engage adjacent (non-target) communities, share experiences and lessons learnt, and disseminate best project approaches for replication and up-scaling. | S |

Overall project implementation progress ⁷:

| FY2019 rating | Justification of the current rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods. |
|---------------|--|
| S | The project inception workshop which was held in December 2017 marked the beginning of the project implementation. As a first step, the Project Management Unit (PMU) was put in place in early 2018, consisting of a Project Coordinator (PC), Finance and Administrative |

⁷ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Assistants, and a part-time National Technical Advisor (NTA) and M&E Consultant. In its first year and a half of implementation, the project has made excellent progress, in particular in putting in place the necessary implementation arrangements in the four target wilayas (regions), and in advancing the implementation of adaptation interventions under project Component 2.</p> <p>Strengthening the Regional Delegations of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (DREDDs) in the four target wilayas, both through the provision of equipment and training, has been instrumental for adequate technical support, supervision and monitoring of the project field activities. The progress in project implementation was realized also with significant participation from the project beneficiaries in the target communities, and has elicited their enthusiasm and further commitment in the project. In the one case where there was insufficient interest and ownership of the local community to the extent that the project results were compromised the project activities were eventually moved to another site.</p> <p>Some other the challenges in project implementation have resulted from changed circumstances since the development of the project document, which has required adaptive management. For example, the approval of the NAP project for GCF funding has required the postponement of almost all activities under Output 1.1, while discussions are ongoing to establish the respective roles and linkages between the NAP and the planned National Adaptation Strategy.</p> <p>As the overall project progress and expenditures are on track, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) will be initiated in Q1 2020 as planned.</p> |
|--|--|

Risks in implementation

This section should be completed by the Project Manager and summarize implementation risks (e.g. procurement delays, reputational risks etc). The first column should be completed by the Project Manager and the second column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| Problems/risks identified | Agreed recommended actions | By whom | When |
|---|---|--|---------|
| Progress reporting challenges: delayed submissions and incomplete information or entries that do not match with the project indicators or the planned activities / outputs. This is mainly due to the need for the project team to get accustomed to the reporting templates, as well as language barriers. | The July-Dec 2019 Half-Yearly Progress Report (HYPR) draft will be submitted by 31 January. The draft will be reviewed closely between the PMU and the UNEP TM to identify any areas of difficulties in interpretation, to arrive at agreement on expected focus of each output and activity to be reported on. | PMU (PC, NTA, and M&E expert), followed by review with UNEP TM | Q1 2020 |
| | The project Results Framework will be closely analysed during the MTR process, which will facilitate further discussion on the focus of each indicator. Indicators and targets will also be revised, as needed, for PMC approval. | PMU (PC, NTA and M&E expert) with MTR consultant and UNEP TM | Q2 2020 |
| | The 2020 PIR draft will be submitted by 31 July. | PC, NTA, and M&E expert | Q3 2020 |

3.3. Risk Rating

| Risk | Mitigation at CEO approval | Mitigation at implementation | Rank |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>Rural communities do not support the proposed EbA interventions.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local stakeholders will be engaged throughout implementation of adaptive management approaches and will participate in project planning, implementation and monitoring. Furthermore, the project stakeholders will be organised into AGLCs to ensure that they are empowered in making decisions about the management of natural resources in their management area. • The project will focus on raising awareness on the benefits of EbA for the sustainable management of natural resources in the four targeted Wilayas. • The project will develop and implement income-generating activities for pastoral communities that are socially viable and dependent on functioning ecosystems to increase incentives for ecosystem protection. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The support of local communities to the interventions is strong, in particular due to the project strategy of starting immediately the implementation of concrete EbA interventions that provide labour, and the introduction of income-generating and livelihood diversification activities for which there is high demand. In light of this, the risk ranking has been reduced to “low”. • Further development of income-generating activities that are directly dependent on healthy ecosystems is still needed (e.g. agroforestry, NTFPs), as this would help to further build the communities’ awareness of ecosystem-services and their importance. • Where there is insufficient interest, engagement and commitment of the local communities, the project may consider changing project intervention areas. This has so far been done at one project site. The project has clearly communicated that communities’ engagement is a pre-requisite for continued project interventions. • In line with the mitigation options identified at CEO approval, the engagement of local stakeholders in the project activities is ongoing. There is still a need to strengthen the training and engagement of AGLCs and other associations to this end. • In support to CEO mitigation options the project stakeholders already apply unconsciously EbA approach, as this is central element they consider when selecting a settlement for nomadic people in the desert area. | <p>CEO: M</p> <p>TM: L</p> <p>PC: L</p> |
| <p>High staff turnover in Project Steering Committee, project management team and responsible</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A principal and a secondary focal point will be identified in each relevant government institution (e.g. MEDD, ME, MAg, MHA) during the inception | <p>The mitigation options identified at the CEO endorsement stage have been implemented, and the engagement and motivation of the PSC and the project</p> | <p>CEO: M</p> <p>TM: L</p> <p>PC: L</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| <p>government departments.</p> | <p>phase of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue between stakeholders will be promoted during the implementation phase. • The processes of decision-making, design and implementation under the project will be well documented. • Established government structures have already been engaged with strong commitment during the PPG phase. This approach will be continued as much as possible during the implementation phase. | <p>management team is high. The ranking of this risk has therefore been reduced to “low”.</p> | |
| <p>Limited capacity of institutions to undertake rigorous scientific research.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional representatives from relevant government institutions such as the university and research institutes will be consulted to develop the institutional framework for the long-term data collection, monitoring and archiving system and agree on the roles and responsibilities in this system. • Lessons learned from the implementation of the research projects under the SCCF project will be used to maximise the efficiency and sustainability of the long-term research system under the LDCF project. | <p>As planned at CEO endorsement, with the start of project Component 3 implementation (and in particular activities under Output 3.1), relevant government institutions will be directly engaged in the data collection, monitoring and archiving activities, and in the development of the knowledge management system. This will also provide a concrete opportunity to learn from the experiences of the SCCF project and address this risk / challenge.</p> <p>To date, the project team has attempted to enhance the engagement of relevant universities and research institutions, e.g. the National Centre for Research on Agronomics and Agricultural Development (CNRADA) and the National Livestock and Veterinary Research Center (CNERV), with limited success. However, there are positive signs for better engagement from certain research institutions such as the University of Nouakchott (UNA), the Institute for Higher Technological Education (ISET) and the Graduate School of Education (ENS).</p> | <p>CEO: H TM: H PC: S</p> |
| <p>Limited technical capacity to implement the project.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity of national and local government will be substantially strengthened to enable the planning and implementation of EbA measures. • International experts will work closely with local | <p>Various training opportunities offered by the project itself will help to build the capacity of local government actors, in particular, to enable the successful planning and implementation of EbA measures.</p> | <p>CEO: M TM: M PC: L</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------|
| | <p>experts, PM and other relevant stakeholders to achieve timely delivery of project outputs and further increase in-country technical capacity.</p> | <p>The mitigation options proposed at CEO endorsement stage are sufficient, as long as there is international support working closely with local experts, the PC and other relevant stakeholders. The need for budget revisions to ensure sufficient international expertise and technical support will be considered during the 2020 work planning and budgeting exercise.</p> | |
| <p>Additional medium and high risks observed during project implementation</p> | | | |
| <p>Arid conditions pose a risk to the survival of planted seedlings, and community water points are not always sufficiently close for easy watering of seedlings. On the other hand, heavy rains associated with the onset of rains can cause damages to seedlings.</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>Sufficient watering and protection of the seedlings are being ensured by the project teams in all target wilayas.</p> <p>Seedling survival and replacement rates are to be closely monitored and assessed. In case of any issues, corrective actions will be identified to improve survival rates. For example, improved access to water may be necessary, and different species or planting / watering protocols may need to be considered.</p> <p>Mapping of community water points, water quality and depth would help to ensure that activities requiring water are placed close to access to suitable source of water.</p> | <p>TM: H PC: H</p> |
| <p>Overall Risk Rating Project Coordinator</p> | | | <p>L</p> |
| <p>Overall Risk Rating Task Manager</p> | | | <p>M</p> |

Assessment of Possible COVID-19 Impacts to the Project, GEF id: # _____

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| COVID-19 impacts | <p>a) Has the COVID-19 pandemic impacted project implementation? If so, how?</p> <p>b) Is there a pattern to the kinds of project activities/outputs that have been significantly impacted by the COVID-19 impacts? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If Yes, please explain:</p> <p>c) Is there a pattern to the kinds of project activities/outputs, if any, that have not been seriously impacted by COVID-19 and are somehow able to continue? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If Yes, please explain:</p> <p>d) Will COVID-19 impacts, as of 30 June 2020, have implications on the project's ability to finish by the expected completion date? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>. If Yes, please estimate the likely additional extension required: _____ months. (we realize that, until such a time that work conditions have returned to normal, this could likely be an underestimate).</p> <p>e) Will COVID-19 impacts have implications on the project's budget for PMC? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>. If Yes, please explain:</p> |
|-------------------------|--|

| FY2019 rating [current] | Justification of the current risk rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods. |
|----------------------------|---|
| M | <p>The overall risk level for the project is assessed as “medium”, due to the following risks identified during project development and implementation (these are further elaborated on and ranked in the risk table, above):</p> <p>Arid conditions pose a risk to the survival of planted seedlings, and community water points are not always sufficiently close for easy watering of seedlings. On the other hand, heavy rains associated with the onset of rains can cause damages to seedlings. To address these risks, sufficient watering and protection of the seedlings are being ensured by the project teams in all target wilayas. Seedling survival and replacement rates are</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>closely monitored and assessed. In case of any issues, corrective actions will be identified to improve survival rates. For example, improved access to water may be necessary, and different species or planting / watering protocols may need to be considered.</p> <p>The limited technical capacity in the country to implement the project interventions may compromise the effectiveness of the adaptation measures. As planned at project development stage, this risk is being mitigated by building the capacity of national and local government to plan and implement EbA approaches. Various training opportunities offered by the project itself are building the capacity of local government actors, in particular. The need for budget revisions to ensure sufficient international expertise and technical support will be considered during the 2020 work planning and budgeting exercise to further mitigate this risk.</p> <p>The capacity of national institutions to undertake rigorous scientific research is limited, which may result in difficulties in monitoring the long-term efficiency of the project interventions. To mitigate this risk, as planned at project development stage, relevant government institutions such as universities and research institutes will be engaged in the development of the institutional framework for the long-term data collection, monitoring and archiving system under project Output 3.1. The roles and responsibilities in the implementation of this system will be agreed upon.</p> |
|--|--|

High Risk (H): There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S): There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
Modest Risk (M): There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.
Low Risk (L): There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

Optional Annexes and/or Links:

- Project Steering Committee Minutes of the year reported
- Half yearly Report
- Quarterly Reports
- Risk Factor Table form previous template (recommended for substantial and high-risk projects)

Risks Factor Table

There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** or **High** and who is responsible to for it.

High Risk (H): There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.

Substantial Risk (S): There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.

Modest Risk (M): There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

Low Risk (L): There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

RISK FACTOR TABLE

*Project Managers will use this table to summarize risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflect also **any new risks** identified in the course of project implementation. The **Notes** column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant**. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (**PM**) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (**TM**). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The **UNEP Task Manager** should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.*

| Risk Factor | Indicator of Low Risk | Indicator of Medium Risk | Indicator of High Risk | Project Manager Rating | | | | | | Notes | Task Manager Rating | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|-------|---------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| INTERNAL RISK | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Project management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|------|--|
| Management structure [Roles and responsibilities] | Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood | Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others | Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems | | | | | | | | PM : | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | TM: | |
| Governance structure [oversight] | Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs | Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear | Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR | | | | | | | | PM : | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | TM: | |
| Internal communications | Fluid and cordial | Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good | Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment | | | | | | | | PM: | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | TM: | |
| Work flow Budget | Project progressing according to work plan | Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable | Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation | | | | | | | | PM: | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | TM: | |
| Co-financing | Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time | Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic | A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize | | | | | | | | PM: | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | TM: | |
| Budget | Activities are progressing within planned budget | Minor budget reallocation needed | Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget | | | | | | | | PM: | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | TM: | |

| Risk Factor | Indicator of Low Risk | Indicator of Medium Risk | Indicator of High Risk | Project Manager Rating | | | | | | Notes | Task Manager Rating | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|-------|---------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | | |
| INTERNAL RISK | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Financial management | Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for | Financial reporting slow or deficient | Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | | |
| Reporting | Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues | Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues | Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | | |
| Stakeholder engagement | Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners | Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners | Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | | |

| Risk Factor | Indicator of Low Risk | Indicator of Medium Risk | Indicator of High Risk | Project Manager Rating | | | | | | Notes | Task Manager Rating | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|------------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|-------|---------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | | |
| INTERNAL RISK | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| External communications | Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress | Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted | Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | | |
| Short term/long term balance | Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability | Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term | Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | | |
| Science and technological issues | Project based on sound science and well established technologies | Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks | Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | | |

| Risk Factor | Indicator of Low Risk | Indicator of Medium Risk | Indicator of High Risk | Project Manager Rating | | | | | | Notes | Task Manager Rating | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|------------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|-------|---------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | |
| INTERNAL RISK | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Political influences | Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven | Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated | Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | |
| Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary | | | | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | |

| Risk Factor | Indicator of Low Risk | Indicator of Medium Risk | Indicator of High Risk | Project Manager Rating | | | | | | Notes | Task Manager Rating | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|------------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|-------|---------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | |
| EXTERNAL RISK | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project context | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Political stability | Political context is stable and safe | Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation | Very disruptive and volatile | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental conditions | Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors | Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes | Project area has very harsh environmental conditions | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | |
| Social, cultural and economic factors | There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results | Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed | Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity issues | Sound technical and managerial capacity of | Weaknesses exist but have been identified | Capacity is very low at all levels and partners | | | | | | | PM: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Risk Factor | Indicator of Low Risk | Indicator of Medium Risk | Indicator of High Risk | Project Manager Rating | | | | | | Notes | Task Manager Rating | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|-------|---------------------|--------|-------------|------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined | | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| EXTERNAL RISK | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project context | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | institutions and other project partners | and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity | require constant support and technical assistance | | | | | | | TM: | | | | | | |
| Others, please specify | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the *Task Manager* should be provided below

| TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN | |
|--|--|
| Rank – importance of risk | |
| Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence) | |
| Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk | |
| Who – person(s) responsible for the action | |
| Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed | |

| Rank | Risk Statement ⁸ | | Action to Take | Who | Date |
|------|-----------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----|------|
| | Condition | Consequence | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

| FY2018 rating | FY2019 rating | Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period |
|---------------|---------------|---|
| | | |
| | | If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation |
| | | |

⁸ Only for Substantial to High risk.