Mid-term review of the project "Revitalizing oasis agro-ecosystems through a sustainable, integrated and landscape approach in the Drâa-Tafilalet region" (OASIL)

FAO ID: GCP/MOR/046/GFF
GEF ID: 9537

Final report

FAO Office in Morocco

March 2022

Evaluation team: Mr. Mohammed Bajeddi: Team Leader
Mrs. Naima Taghzout: Member of the team
Mr. Moha Haddouch : Team member

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The oases were considered a cradle of biodiversity and resilience in the face of the scarcity of water resources and the increasingly marked effects of climate change. This agro-silvo-pastoral ecosystem, once sustainably managed, has been called into question by numerous recent transformations of complex biophysical and socio-economic factors (MAPMDREF)[1].
2. Aware of the importance of preserving the environment and biodiversity and safeguarding the oases, Morocco has benefited, since its accession to the Global Environment Fund (GEF) in 1994, from sustained support from multilateral cooperation to honor its commitments to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030.
3. In this context, Morocco has benefited, since December 2016, from the support of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the GEF to "Revitalize the oasis agroecosystems of the Draâ-Tafilalet so that they are productive, attractive and healthy, and to support and makelivelihoods of local communities (OASIL Project)". The initial amount of the project was USD 50,601,050, including 82.94% co-financing and 18.44% FAO and GEF financing.
4. The financial allocation from the GEF is USD 8,631,050. The OASIL Project was approved by the GEF on November 14, 2016 for an initial duration of 5 years and received an extension to continue its operations until on December 31, 2023.
5. The objective of the OASIL Project is to "Revitalize the oasis agroecosystems of the Draâ-Tafilaletto be productive, attractive and healthy, and to support and make more resilient the livelihoods of local communities".
6. The global environment objective is to contribute to mitigating and reversing the current global trend in terms of land degradation by promoting sustainable land and water management practices and by conserving biodiversity in oasis systems in Morocco.
7. The project is structured around four complementary components which aim to promote political consultation; participatory development of investment plans; their implementation on a demonstration basis in a few pilot sites; and the production and dissemination of knowledge and results achieved as a model to be generalized for the sustainable development of oases (water, land, biodiversity and livelihoods).
8. The mid-term evaluation of the OASIL Project took place from November 15, 2021 to February 15, 2022.

[1]https://www.agriculture.gov.ma/en/node/59

Table A: Description of the OASIL Project

Project Title:	Revitalizing oasis agroecosystems through a sustainable, integrated and landscape approach in the Draâ-Tafilalet Region (OASIL)
FAO Symbol:	GCP/MOR/046/GFF
GEF-ID:	9537
Country	Morocco
GEF Agency	FAO
National Executing Agency	Ministry of Agriculture, Maritime Fisheries, Rural Development and Water and Forests (ADA, ANDZOA)
	National Institute of Agronomic Research (INRA)
	Minister of the Environment
Project duration	5 years
Locations (Communes / Province)	Aarab Sebbah Rheris, Jorf, Fezna and Mellaab / Errachidia
	Er-rich, Gourama, Guers Tiallaline, Guir, Mzizel and Sidi Ayad / Midelt
	Ighil N'Mgoun, Ait Sedrate Jbel Ouloui, Mesemrir, Tilmi /Tinghir & Iminoulaoune and Toundoute/Ouarzazate
	Iznaguen, Khouzama, Ouisselssate, Siroua and Taznakht / Ouarzazate
	Tagounite, Ktaoua and Mhamid El Ghozlane/Zagora
Implementation	January 2, 2017 (start-up meeting July 7, 2017) December 21, 2018: first meeting of the Steering Committee relating to the presentation of the project work plan)
Date of CEO endorsement	1erDecember 2016
NTE End Date	December 31, 2023
GEF funding	USD8,631,050
Co-financing committed	USD41,270,000 (MAPMDREF/ADA/ANDZOA) USD700,000 (FAO)

Findings

Relevance criterion: Satisfactory (S) [2]

9. Finding 1: The project fits perfectly into national priorities, those of the GEF and the FAO. Its objective of revitalizing the oases is aligned with national strategies and policies to ensure sustainable and balanced development between the different agro-ecosystems of the country. The foundations of GEF and FAO policy and strategies are taken into account in the design of OASIL.
10. Finding 2: The project is relevant to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries and stakeholders given the shared concern for the protection of the environment and the restoration, preservation of biodiversity in the oases. Faced with the magnitude of the needs expressed, this presupposes global action that tackles head-on all the threats posed through the organic heart of the problem, which is water.
11. Finding 3: The relevance of the project is also proven through its articulation with sectoral policies that reflect the political will for the implementation of relevant strategies for sustainable and integrated development.
12. Finding 4: The relevance of the OASIL project is noted through its institutional anchoring at the level of the National Agency for the Development of Oasis and Argan Zones (ANDZOA) as a Project Management Unit (PMU) in cooperation with the other institutions of the country at central and regional level.
13. Finding 5: Overall, the design of the project is inspired by the various projects carried out in Morocco in the field of water, soil protection and biodiversity, in particular the FAO-GEF projects.
14. Finding 6: The articulation of the four components of the project is relevant and underlies through a localized site approach to concentrate the work in space for the achievement of convincing results to be generalized as a model for the development of oases. Given the current level of execution, the target seems oversized and difficult to achieve.
15. Despite the weaknesses described above, the evaluation team finds that the relevance of the project is proven in relation to Morocco's strategies and its relations with the FAO and the GEF and its design which took into account all the accumulated experiences as well as the foundations of current strategies and policies. The relevance of the project could have been reinforced with a logic of intervention well dimensioned in its objectives (succeeding a pilot model of sustainable use of water, soil and biodiversity and the improvement of the income of the beneficiaries, the professionalization of agriculture and the promotion of products), its approaches (geographical targeting, choice of innovative activities, partners, and economic actors) and the duration of its implementation.

Efficiency Criterion: Relatively Satisfactory (RS)[3]

16. Finding 7: The design of the project was based on national investment forecasts and the contribution of the GEF and FAO and was able to establish a correct relationship between the general objective, the results and the means.

[2]The level of results achieved clearly exceeded expectations and/or there were no gaps or minor gaps (GEF Rating Scales).
[3]The level of achievements achieved corresponds more or less to expectations and/or has moderate shortcomings (GEF rating scales).

17. Finding 8: Funding through the GEF and FAO allocation reached 70.34% of the budget. On the other hand, due to financial procedures, the partners in the field note that the delays are quite long in terms of identification of needs and elaboration of the terms of reference as well as commitment and execution on the ground.

18. Finding 9: The co-financing of investments is largely exceeded compared to the forecasts (4 times more) and the resources have been put in place in quantity, quality and at the planned times. But faced with the scale of the threats, the needs expressed are enormous and require very significant structuring investments.

19. Finding 10: The Project Steering Committee (PSC), the PMU and the supervision by the various FAO/GEF services operated in accordance with the Project Document (Prodoc) and no problem in this regard was noted by the evaluation. Action is coordinated with all government institutions, local communities, and direct beneficiaries.

20. Finding 11: The composition of the technical assistance team, exclusively men, is not in line with the project design. The total absence of development agents (agricultural economist and gender and social issues specialist) and part-time absence of communications specialist reduced the efficiency of all the actions carried out.

21. Finding 12: The project has put in place a budget and physical performance monitoring-evaluation system, but its efficiency and effectiveness will depend on its ability to generate effects and impacts.

22. The quality of the financial design, budget planning, pilotage and execution proved to be adequate and satisfactory. Better choice of investment actions, improvement in the mobilization and redeployment of technical assistance, subtle definition of responsibilities depending on skills and qualifications of beneficiaries, better involvement of civil society organizations and interprofessional are likely to improve the efficiency of the project.

23. Despite the problems, which have weakened the efficiency of the project, in terms of mobilization of technical assistance in quantity and professional qualifications as specified in the Prodoc at an opportune moment, the efficiency of the project is relatively satisfactory at mid- term.

Effectiveness Criterion: Relatively Unsatisfactory (RI) [4]

24. Progress in achieving planned results is relatively unsatisfactory.

25. Component 1: Even if the policy dialogue has been initiated for the formulation of the charter of sustainable oases, it is noted that: (i) the knowledge exchange platform is under construction; ii) the training plan prepared according to the rules of training engineering is absent; and iii) the charter on sustainable oases is in progress.

26. Finding 13: The policy dialogue has been initiated in a structured and constructive manner in order to obtain strong support from political and institutional actors and civil society organizations and to lead to formal commitments to support the Sustainable Oasis Initiative.

27. Finding 14: The knowledge exchange platform is under construction to give good prospects for information flow and appropriate institutional convergence.

[4] Level of results achieved slightly below expectations and/or there were significant gaps (GEF Rating Scales).

28. Finding 15: Pending the development of the training plan according to the rules of the engineering of training, the project carried out a single training course on Yellow Saharan Bee (from May 27 to June 6, 2021).

29. Finding 16: The charter on sustainable oases is being finalized to crystallize the national consensus on the planning and development of oasis areas.

30. Component 2: It is noted that the results have not been completed or started i) water accounting and auditing continues in five sites with collaborations with the ABHs; ii) The Ecosystem Investment and Management Plans (PIGE) have been developed, but the political and consultation actors at the local level are, for the most part, newly elected lacking knowledge of OASIL project and the PIGEs; iii) the typology of the oases made it possible to identify 19 homogeneous zones and to select five widely dispersed sites for the implementation of project activities; and iv) the assessment of the resilience of oasis agroecosystems is not carried out.

31. Finding 17: Water accounting and auditing, together with various other studies and data generation devices, is continuing at the level of five sub-basins in collaboration with the WBAs. There is the risk of not achieving comprehensive water management information systems by the end of the project.

32. Finding 18: The PIGEs have been elaborated, but the political and consultation actors at the local level are for the most part newly elected officials without any knowledge of the OASIL project or the PIGEs.

33. Finding 19: The typology of the oases made it possible to identify 19 homogeneous zones and to select five sites for the implementation of project activities. These sites are scattered over a large territory and do not allow the concentration of actions for better visibility and the creation of the effects and impacts expected by the project.

34. Finding 20: The assessment of the resilience of oasis agroecosystems, which constitutes the basic study of the project, was not carried out, otherwise the other results remain incomplete and lack consistency.

35. Component 3: The results achieved at mid-term are unsatisfactory: (i) the system for monitoring outputs and the budget is functional but there is no system for evaluating progress and indicators of effects and impacts; ii) the hard actions carried out are not innovative, dispersed and do not favor the integrated and combined approach in a given space advocated by the project; ii) all the integrated and concerted demonstration actions of the PIGEs to revitalize the selected sites remains to be done; the absence of real signs of improvement and diversification of the livelihoods and incomes of small farmers in the oases has been noted.

36. Finding 21: The choice of 5 very remote pilot sites scattered over five provinces, each with enormous specific needs, makes it even more difficult to have a pilot model to generalize because of the limited financial and human resources of the project.

37. Finding 22: The choice of activities carried out to date or in progress by the project, before the development of the PIGEs, relates essentially to works carried out on a large scale by national institutions in the region. Therefore, the project is invited to focus on the implementation of the PIGEs in accordance with the logic of the project.

38. Finding 23: In 2018, the steering committee recommended hydraulic and agricultural infrastructure actions to meet certain needs of the populations and to create a dynamic favorable to the implementation of the project. These non-innovative and very scattered actions (sprinkling), if they manage to solve factual problems, they do not reinforce, on the other hand, the integrated approach advocated by the project so that the pilot oasis ecosystems are restored, safeguarded,

and managed in a global, inclusive and sustainable.

39. Finding 24: At the time of the assessment, there are no real signs of improvement and diversification of the livelihoods and incomes of smallholder farmers in the oases, and no signs are visible for mainstreaming biodiversity in markets.

40. Component 4: The results are being achieved, but special attention should be paid to: i) the system for evaluating progress and indicators of effects and impacts; ii) all the progress reports refer to the GEF-FAO allocation, whereas the project design is based on both Moroccan co-financing and the contribution of FAO and GEF with a single objective; and the absence of a communication expert.

41. Findings 25: A system for monitoring achievements and the budget is functional but there is no system for evaluating progress and indicators of effects and impacts

42. Findings 26: Some tools for presenting the project and the document on the ANDZOA sustainable oases initiative have been produced and disseminated at various events. However, the communication expert is not mobilized in the field and the communication strategy is not established.

43. General assessment of effectiveness: Relatively Insufficient (RI): The policy dialogue has been initiated for the adoption of the charter of sustainable oases and the integration into local and regional planning of agro-biodiversity, the sustainable management of land and water and climate-smart approaches. The progress toward achievement of the expected results is insufficient because the monitoring and information system is not operational, the five plans for investment and sustainable and integrated management of oasis agroecosystems are not known at the local level and require yet to be improved by the results of studies carried out by the project. Capacity building program including travel/study is not established despite its importance for human capital.

Sustainability Criterion: Relatively Unlikely (RI)5

44. The level of results achieved is below expectations and the sustainability of project actions remains subject to several factors, the most critical of which is the institutionalization of PIGEs. In the short term, the risk is that the project may not achieve its objective within the fixed time frame and, consequently, be unable to present a model for the revitalization of agroecosystems. In the long term, the idea and the approach developed during the design of the OASIL project will remain highly relevant so that ANDZOA can find the framework to implement them.

45. Finding 27: The PIGEs which should form the basis of the demonstrations are still at the finalization stage and the actions carried out at the initiative of the steering committee are too scattered and have not been the subject of an upstream feasibility and durability study.

46. Finding 28: The commitment and responsibilities of ANDZOA and national institutions for the revitalization of oases is a strong signal of sustainability. This is evident through co-financing and the involvement of other development aid agencies and donors.

[5]Existence of significant sustainability risks (GEF Rating Scales).

Cross-sectional dimensions: Relatively Unsatisfactory (RI)6

47. The project document planned to take gender aspects into consideration, but no "scan gender" system is implemented. There is also a low involvement of young people with regard to the aspirations of youth and decision-makers. Knowledge management through the dissemination and capitalization of project achievements on a larger scale is not entirely functional due to the delay observed in setting up the communication platform.

48. Finding 29: In general, Moroccan rural women, including oasis women, play an important role, particularly in adapting to climate change. As such, the project document has planned to take gender aspects into consideration in the implementation of activities and the contribution of women to the achievement of results, but no system such as "gender scan" to provide the necessary data was set up by the project.

49. Finding 30: Knowledge management through the dissemination and capitalization of project achievements on a larger scale is not entirely functional due to the delay observed in setting up the communication platform.

50. Finding 31: Environmental protection is at the heart of the project, however the management of the negative impacts necessary to consolidate investments and strengthen sustainability is not addressed through the implementation of physical actions. There is also a lack of an effects and impact monitoring system.

General conclusion

51. The OASIL project, in its conception, aims to innovate by advocating the rehabilitation of oases through a global and integrated action that tackles all the problems posed, through the organic heart of the problem: water, soil and biodiversity. This agro-ecosystem and integrated approach to the development of oases is built around the support of politicians, territorial communities, direct beneficiaries and civil society organizations. With the objective that this participatory work of the "Project Team" stakeholders can lead to a concerted identification and planning, and an implementation of actions in a concomitant and synchronized way between the project and the national institutions to arrive, in fine, to a model demonstration to generalize.

52. On the other hand, the implementation of the project suffered first from the delay noted at the beginning for issues of institutional arrangements and mobilization of technical assistance, then caught up by the Covid-19 pandemic which cornered the project, and the Steering Committee of the project has decided to launch hard facilitating actions outside the approach advocated by the project. This situation was also favored by the absence of a start-up mission for operational and meticulous planning of project activities, and especially the carrying out of preliminary studies such as the typology, the choice of sites and the development of PIGEs, before embarking on the actual implementation of the project.

53. Overall, the general assessment of the project at mid-term is relatively unsatisfactory (RI) because all the work to refocus the activities and achieve the results and the objective of the project remains to be done with an approach based on results, effects and the impacts.

Recommendations:

Regarding start-up aspects of projects (for FAO)

54. The purpose of the start-up phase is to ensure a rapid and efficient launch of the project, to carry out any basic studies, to identify an appropriate phasing and sequencing of activities, to ensure the establishment of good cooperation and appropriate management mechanisms to facilitate effective delivery and shared ownership of beneficiary needs, priorities and specificities by the stakeholders. This is also an important phase to establish the baseline study and install an M&E system. During this phase,

it was possible to anticipate the problem relating to the identification of project actions which was suspended from the completion of the typology study, the choice of demonstration sites and the development of PIGEs.

To this end, it is recommended, before initiating the activities of a project, to systematize for future projects the realization of baseline studies by specialized expertise in the field for a realistic planning of activities and the choice adequate partners.

Regarding policy dialogue (intended for ANDZOA)

55. The OASIL project has the characteristic of supporting policy dialogue at national, regional and local levels to lay the concerted foundations for the sustainable management of oasis agroecosystems exposed to real threats related to water scarcity, soil degradation and the loss of biodiversity. The dialogue is currently underway and is beginning to gain momentum at several levels of political responsibility.

Beyond the declaration, the charter and the sustainable oases initiative and taking into account the political environment of Morocco, it is recommended to move up a gear for the promulgation of the law relating to Oases (not provided for in the Prodoc) , which will be enforceable against all stakeholders in the regions concerned and above all to provide a legal basis for the development and implementation of the PIGEs.

Regarding the Ecosystem Investment and Management Plans (intended for the PMU)

56. The PIGEs have been established in the five sites selected by the project to implement the agro-ecosystem pastoral approach. However, the EXMP noted that the newly elected representatives of the territorial municipalities visited have little or no information on these plans. In addition, these plans are drawn up for each site comprising an average of 4 to 6 territorial municipalities (CT).

It is recommended to update, distribute by CT, translate into Arabic and disseminate the PIGEs to those concerned and to CSOs so that they are taken into consideration at the planning level for water, soils and the biodiversity. On the other hand, it is necessary to organize training sessions for the benefit of new elected municipal officials in terms of strategic planning and project cycle, and to coach them to include the actions identified in the PIGE in the Communal Action Plan (CAP) already in progress of elaboration.

Concerning the priority actions of the project (intended for the PMU)

57. Given the delay observed at the start of the project, and especially since its effective implementation coincided with the Covid-19 pandemic, and in the absence of PIGE, the project carried out several "hard" studies and facilitating activities to keep contact with beneficiaries. These actions, despite the shortcomings observed in terms of innovation and sustainability, were appreciated by the beneficiaries.

Now that the PIGEs exist, it is recommended to strictly comply with the implementation of the actions listed to achieve the objectives assigned by the project, and to generalize the carrying out of environmental impact studies.

Concerning biodiversity actions (intended for the PMU)

58. The project planned to carry out a complete assessment of the potential value chains to support the conservation of biodiversity while targeting the local species named in the Prodoc, namely: broad bean, durum wheat, lentil, alfalfa and fig tree in addition to pastoral species, aromatic, medicinal and tinctorial plants and the Saharan yellow bee. The objective of this assessment is to identify the value chains to be developed, to propose sustainable practices and resistant modes of exploitation in order to increase household incomes, and consequently, reduce the pressure on the natural ecosystem.

59. The project has taken the initiative to initiate activities to safeguard the yellow Saharan bee and intends to implement activities to safeguard the Drâa goat and the Seroua sheep. These activities have not been the subject of a feasibility study to ensure the rational exploitation of the planned investments or the sustainability of the action after the closure of the project.

    To this end, it is recommended to:

    - Rebalance the action of safeguarding the yellow bee in Rich to ensure the necessary sustainability and the rational exploitation of the equipment installed, to set up an institutional management structure in accordance with the operating standards of vocational training centers or agricultural training schools.
    - Carry out before the launch of the Draa goat safeguarding action, a technical, economic and financial feasibility study and the development of a business plan to ensure sustainability and autonomy at the end of OASIL.
    - To support the creation of groups of young people in the area, to train them in the shearing trade, put them in touch with dye houses outside the area to avoid the risk of water pollution, and to install a point of sale for "Siroua" certified wool.
    - To support the conservation of the biodiversity of plant species.

Concerning the localization of actions (intended for the FAO and the PMU)

60. Through the analysis of the PIGEs of the five selected sites, and with the aim of being able to present at the end of the project an approach and a model visible on the ground for sustainable development that is both economic, social and safeguarding, preserving and restoring biodiversity in the five sites selected for the demonstration (component 3), it turns out that the needs expressed are enormous and require a lot of funding and time, and therefore it is impossible to continue working in the five sites to catch up, concentrate investments and achieve the project objective accordingly.

    This is why it is recommended to refocus all the efforts of the project in a single hydraulic sub-basin with three bioclimatic stages representative of the Drâa-Tafilalet region: the mountain, the foothills and the other in the zone of the Saharan oases. To this end, the assessment proposes working in the Guir hydraulic sub-basin (see typology study carried out by the project).

Concerning capacity building (intended for FAO and PMU)

61. The project has planned to carry out training engineering activities to identify the needs of partners and beneficiaries in order to improve the technical reference system and activities. This very important work which, in principle, should be carried out from the start of the project has not yet really started.

    It is recommended to draw up a training plan as a matter of urgency, according to the rules in this domain, and to carry out a few priority modules as part of the relaunch of policy dialogue.

Concerning studies (intended for the FAO and the PMU)

62. The project has specifically planned in the Prodoc to carry out some studies for a better local characterization of the problems of water, soil, biodiversity in the oasis areas and socio-economic aspects. ANDZOA's partners recognize the usefulness of these studies. However, from the outset, the project embarked on carrying out several studies (see appendix 7).

    It is recommended, before embarking on carrying out the studies, to check with partners the existence of similar studies, and to carry out the studies which are likely to immediately reinforce the concrete action of the project on the ground to improve resilience in oases.

AGR sustainability aspects (intended for the PMU)

63. The project envisions making the livelihoods and income of oasis smallholders more resilient, diversified and strengthened (Result 3.2; Output 3.2.1). It is also planned to promote the integration of biodiversity into market mechanisms through various instruments such as labeling and relies on existing sectoral programs to support the value chains of oasis ecosystem products. This work is not done at this time.

    It is recommended to recruit an agro-economist specializing in the themes of marketing, the market and the improvement of livelihoods.

Recommendation to FAO as Responsible Agency for Implementation and Execution

64. The OASIL project, as it is conceived, tries to implement in a combined and integrated way the realization of several activities on a restricted space to forge a model of reinforcement of the resilience for, on the one hand, to revitalize the oases of Drâa-Tafilalet, and on the other hand, to develop a visible and replicable model. The piloting of this project constitutes a comparative advantage of the FAO. Only through the implementation of OASIL, it was noted a discrepancy between the initial planning of the project and its effective implementation in accordance with the logical framework, in particular on the results committed with the GEF.

65. To ensure the conformity of the activities with regard to the expected results and objectives, and to intervene in time in the event of a discrepancy, it is recommended:

    - For the FAO sub-regional or regional office to carry out a technical follow-up and give its prior opinion of non-objection on the drafts of annual activity planning reports and draft recommendations submitted for decision by the COPIL to ensure that their conformity for the achievement of the results and the objective of the projects defined in the logical framework. With this upstream action, it would also be possible to shorten the time between the identification of the activity and its effective implementation in the field.
    - For the country office, it is important to set up activities leading to follow-up on the indicators of results and impacts of the Project.

Table B: GEF Scoring Matrix for the OASIL Mid-Term Project

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating[7]	Reference to report
A. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE (S)		
A1. General strategic relevance	S	Paragraph 71
A1.1. Alignment with GEF and FAO strategic priorities	TS	By. 55-58
A1.2. Relevance to national, regional and global priorities and the needs of the beneficiaries	TS	By. 52-54 and 59
A1.3. Complementarity with existing actions	RS	By. 64-66
B. EFFICIENCY (IR)		
B1. Overall assessment of project results	IR	By 163
B1.1 Achievement of project outputs	IR	By 163
B1.2 Progress towards project achievements and objectives	IR	By 163
Result 1: Knowledge and information on the state and sustainable management of natural resources (water, land, biodiversity) in oasis agro-ecosystems are improved in the Drâa-Tafilalet region	IR	
Achievement 1.1.1. Policy dialogues and knowledge exchanges involving different stakeholders from multiple sectors are held at regional and national levels on critical factors and innovative approaches to ensure the sustainability of oasis agroecosystems	S	By 103 and 104
Achievement 1.1.2. A multi-stakeholder platform on oasis agro-ecosystems to exchange relevant information, data and best practices for integrated and sustainable management of oasis agro-ecosystems is developed to inform decision-making at national and regional levels	I	By 105 and 106
Achievement 1.1.3. Capacity needs assessment and training program developed and implemented to increase the capacity of agents of the National Extension Agency (ONCA), ORMVAT, ORMVAO, ANDZOA, INRA, ADR to integrate agro-biodiversity, management land and water sustainability and climate change mitigation approaches; The improvement of agro-sylvo-climate-resilient pastoralism in plans and policies	I	107 and 108
Achievement 1.1.4. A declaration (Charter of sustainable oases) is drawn up to inform sectoral policies and development strategies and plans	IR	108
Result 2.1: Knowledge and information on the state and sustainable management of natural resources (water, land, biodiversity) in oasis agro-ecosystems are improved in the Drâa-Tafilalet region		
Output 2.1.1 Participatory water accounting and auditing is carried out at regional level	I	Par.113 to 116
Achievement 2.1.2. Evaluationof land degradation carried out at the regional level	IR	By 117 to 118
Achievement 2.1.3. Assessment and monitoring of genetic diversity is carried out in selected oasis typologies	IR	By 119 and 120
Achievement 2.1.4. Oasis information systems enhanced through spatial analysis (GIS systems) at the regional level	I	121
Achievement 2.1.5. Oasis typology and mapping based on bio-physical and socio-economic factors (ecosystem and livelihood approaches subsistence) are developed	S	122 and 123
Achievement 2.1.6. Practices and technologies in agro-ecosystems oasis, including traditional agro-ecosystems, are collected and assessed, complementing other initiatives	IR	124 to 127
Achievement 2.1.7. The sustainability of each type of oasis is assessed in a participatory manner	I	Par.128

[7]The 6-point rating scale of progress towards results: TS, S, RS, RI, I, TI. GEF (GEF, 2017c).

Result 2.2: Investment and management plans for oasis agro-ecosystems are developed in a participatory manner using an integrated landscape approach		
Achievement 2.2.1. Sustainable and integrated management and investment plans, including an inclusive governance mechanism, in a pilot oasis	S	By 129 to 131
Result 3.1: Pilot oasis ecosystems are restored, safeguarded and sustainably managed through an integrated landscape approach		
Achievement 3.1.1. Training, supporttechnique and knowledge exchange for capacity building of local oasis agro-pastoral communities to enable sustainable management and sustainable intensification of production oasis agro-ecosystems	IR	137
Achievement 3.1.2. Some good agricultural practices are implemented in pilot oasis agroecosystems	RS	138
Achievement 3.1.3. Some traditional and innovative technologies with low emissions are restored and/or introduced in the pilot oasis agro-ecosystems, as identified in the plans	RS	139 and 140
Achievement 3.1.4. Some protection measures against land degradation are implemented in the pilot oasis agro-ecosystems, as identified in the plans	RS	141 and 142
Achievement 3.1.5. Agro-biodiversity is conserved in situ and used sustainably	IR	143 to 145
Achievement 3.1.6. Inclusive governance mechanisms are established in pilot oasis sites	IR	146
Outcome 3.2: Livelihoods and income of oasis smallholders are more resilient, diversified and strengthened		
Achievement 3.2.1. The development of a sustainable value chain of a selection of agro-pastoral products from oasis agro-ecosystems is supported	IR	147 to 150
Achievement 3.2.2. Diversification of rural livelihoods is supported	I	151 to 153
Result: 4.1:: Project progress and results are monitored and evaluated throughout project implementation		154 and 157
Achievement 4.1.1. Monitoring and evaluation indicators developed and collected during project implementation	IR	
Achievement 4.1.2. Project progress reports prepared	S	
Achievement 4.1.3. Intermediate and final evaluations conducted	S	
Results 4.2: Project results and information disseminated		158 to 162
Output 4.2.1: Project website developed	I	
Output 4.2.2: Project communication products developed	I	
Output 4.2.3: Technical project reports prepared and disseminated	IR	
Achievement 4.2.4. Project results and activities disseminated at national and international events	S	
General assessment of progress towards objectives - results	IR	
B1.3 Probability of impacts	Not evaluated during the EXMP	
C. EFFICIENCY (SR)		
C1. Efficiency	RS	Par.86,87, 97 and 163
D. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS (RI)		
D1. Overall likelihood of sustainability risks	IR	By. 179
D1.1. Financial risks	P	Par.173
D1.2. Socio-political risks	IR	By. 165 to 168 and 177
D1.3. Institutional and governance risks	IR	By. 169 to 172

D1.4. Environmental risks	Not rated at this stage	By 178
D2. Catalysis and replication	IR	By 170
E. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE (RI – relatively unlikely)		
E1. Project design and preparation[8]	S	By. 181-183
E2. Quality of project implementation	RS	By 185-192
E2.1 Quality of project implementation by FAO (BH, LTO, ESP, etc.)	S	By 190
E2.2 Project supervision (CPP, project working group, etc.)	S	By 192
E3. Quality of execution and management	RS	By 193-195
E3.1 Project execution and management (PMU and performance of implementing partners, administration, staffing, etc.)	IR	By 199
E4. Financial management and co-financing	S	By 193-195
E5. Project partnerships and stakeholder involvement	IR	By 196-199
E6. Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products	I	By 200-205
E7. Overall quality of M&E	IR	By 206-207
E7.1 M&E design	RS	By 206-207
E7.2 Implementation of the M&E plan (including financial and human resources)	S	By 206-207
E8. Overall assessment of factors affecting performance	RS	By 181-207
F. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (RI – relatively unsatisfactory)		
F1. Gender and other equality issues	IR	By 211-216
F2. Human rights issues	Not evaluated	
F2. Environmental and social safeguards	IR	By 220-222
Overall project rating	RI (Relatively Unsatisfactory)	

The 6-point rating scale for progress towards results: TS, S, RS, RI, I, TI. GEF (GEF, 2017c).