



## UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

### 1- Identification

#### 1.1 Project details

GEF ID	9405	SMA IPMR ID	36408
Project Short Title	Niger Oasis IMO-E-NN	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000621
		Umoja WBS	SB-009259.02
Project Title	Integrated Management of Oasis Ecosystems of Northern Niger (IMO-E-NN)		
Project Type	Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	Planned
Parent Programme if child project	NA		Age
GEF Focal Area(s)	Multi Focal	Completion Date	Planned -original PCA
Project Scope	National		Revised - Current PCA
Region	Africa	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	20-Feb-20
Countries	Niger	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	21-Apr-20
GEF financing amount	USD 4,596,588	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	23-Apr-20
Co-financing amount	USD 21,072,881	Date of First Disbursement	9-Sep-20
		Date of Inception Workshop, if available	17-Jun-21
Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD 1,985,000	Midterm undertaken?	Yes
Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD 1,933,423	Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	20-Apr-23
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	3-Dec-24
		Expected Financial Closure Date	5/31/2025

#### 1.2 EA: Project description

With this process and through UN-Environment, Niger Republic has obtained financing from the Global Environment Fund (GEF) in order to carry out a preparatory phase of the project entitled "Integrated Management of Oasis Ecosystems in Northern Niger". The overall objective of the project is "to contribute to the improvement of the knowledge on the dynamics and functioning, and management of natural resources of the oases and the forest ecosystems of the arid valleys of Northern Niger so as to promote the conservation and improvement of the services provided by these ecosystems and the resilience of local communities living in six (6) Communes of three (3) departments of Agadez region. The project has three operational component: **Component 1** try to regulate the management of oases by creating an adequate legal framework, by setting up observatories and local structures for the integrated management of natural resources; **Component 2:** This component involve communities and local communities in taking ownership of the management of oasis ecosystems through the establishment of consultation frameworks, inter-municipal structures for the management of oases. It seeks to develop integrated ecosystem management plans oasis in the nic of the municipalities and to insert them into their planning tool. Component 3 implements all natural source resource management (biodiversity, soil, water and smart farming practices in gardens. Component 4 is dedicated to the project region. It concerns the administrative and financial management of the project and some supplies to technical deconcentred offices

### 1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division	Executing Agency(ies)	Ministry of Environment Niger
Name of co-implementing Agency	A/N	Names of Other Project Partners	NGO, territorial collectivities, universities, deconcentrated technical services, Ministry of the Environment, decentralized technical services, civil society and local local communities
TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Ersin Esen	EA: Manager/Representative	Yacouba Seybou
TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)	Adamou Bouhari	EA: Project Manager	Maman Hamidou
TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Paul Vrontamitis	EA: Finance Manager	Ali Daouda
TM: UNEP Support/Assistant	Eric Mugo	EA: Communications lead, if relevant	n/a

## 2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

### 2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)	Nature Action	TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)	Healthy and Productive Ecosystem	
TM: PoW Indicator(s)				
EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages	Contribute to Outcome 1 Resilience of Niger UNDAF 2019 -2021			
EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals	SDG 15	EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets	15.3	
TM: GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results				
Indicators	Targets - Expected value			Materialised to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	

2.2. GEE Core or Sub Indicators

4.1: Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity	20,000 Hectares	40,000 Hectares	40000 ha	15,680.0
3.2: Area of forest and forest land under restoration	50,000 hectares (40,000 ha of classified forests actively managed, 500 ha of reforested land and 9,500 ha of arable land)	60,000 hectares (40,000 ha of Production system actively managed, 1,000 ha of reforested land and 19,000 ha of arable land)	60000 ha	6750 ha of Production system actively managed (including 746 ha of arable land by PGIEO NN) and
6.5: Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector (Direct)	760 692 tons of Carbon	Avoided GHG emissions of 1,112,754 tons of CO2e and the sequestration of 2,097,235 tons of CO2e	2,097,235 tons of CO2e	Not yet evaluated
7.3: Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees	The legal framework clarifying the management of oasis and arid valley forest ecosystems validated technically by the involved actors	The legal framework clarifying the management of oasis and arid valley forest ecosystems approved by Niger	3	(i)The study on the inventory of oasis ecosystems which also gives the mapping of land use. (ii)The study on the legal framework and the decree on the integrated management of oasis lands.
3.2: Area of forest and forest land under restoration	observatories set up (Agadez and Zinder)	7 observatories of which 4 regional 1 national and 1 for Kawar	7	2 studies are carried out as a prelude to the installation of the observatories
7.3: Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees	A national strategy approved by the government		1	1
4.3: Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems	oases and arid valleys forests support fund set up	Oases and arid valleys forests support fund is operational	1	Not yet established
4.3: Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems	Existence of intercommunal planning	100% of communes have their ILMP	6	4
4.3: Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems	At least 20% of participants in intercommunal planning are women	At least 40% of participants in intercommunal planning are women	40%	
4.3: Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems	80% of planned monitoring structures are established	60% of the monitoring structures are operational	NA	12 teams of monitoring are set up
4.3: Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems	3 consultation frameworks supported by the project	A functional planning platform	3	1
	9.000 ha of land restored	19 000 ha of land restored	19000	6750
3.2: Area of forest and forest land under restoration	500 ha Forest area restored	1 000 ha Forest area restored	1000	746
3.2: Area of forest and forest land under restoration	20 000 ha of arid valley forests	40 000 ha of arid valley forests	40000	15680
4.1: Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity	At least 20% of recipients are women	At least 40% of recipients are women	NA	9%
3.2: Area of forest and forest land under restoration	farm income improved by 7% per year	farm income improved by 7% per year	7%	3%

Implementation Status

2023

3rd PIR

2.3 Implementation status & Risk

FY 2023  
 FY 2022  
 FY 2021  
 FY 2020  
 FY 2019  
 FY 2018  
 FY 2017  
 FY 2016  
 FY 2015

PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
3rd PIR	MS	MS	L
2nd PIR	MS	MS	L
1st PIR	MS	MS	L

**EA:** Summary of status  
 (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

In summary, the activities carried out by the project are:

- (i) Finalization of studies started for the establishment of the regulatory framework relating to component 1
- (ii) Support for the adoption of Decree No. 294-2022 setting the terms and conditions for the management of oasis lands and related natural resources
- (iii) Validation of the national strategy and its Action Plan
- (iv) Going on of land restoration activities
- (v) Organization of a side event on oases at COP15
- (vi) Training of group producers and their input support
- (vii) Support for communities (municipalities and the Regional Council)
- (viii) Coordination, planning and management of project interventions
- (ix) Reporting of activities
- (x) Holding of the steering committee
- (xi) support for the creation of the community reserve of Timia
- (xii) support for the RNNAT in the fight against poaching to protect wildlife biodiversity
- (xiii) conduct of the mid-term review of the Project
- (xiv) training of Project Management Unit
- (xv) Holding of extra steering committee

**EA:** Planned Co-finance

21,072,881 USD

**EA:** Actual to date:

2961090 USD

2.4 Co-financ

**EA:** Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.

PPR, PRAPS II, the State of Niger are the 3 main co-financing players of IMEO NN in the region. Other NGOs also timidly carry out sustainable management activities. This year partner investments in natural resource management activities have increased compared to previous years. The rate has improved from 12 to 14%. But land restoration activities have declined in favor of firebreaks opening activities in breeding areas. however, to achieve the objective assigned for integrated management of oasis ecosystems, investments must be increased in land restoration but the main project (Projets Poles Ruraux) is at term,

2.5. Stakeholder

**EA:** Date of project steering committee meeting

12/6/2022

**EA:** Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The partners officially committed to supporting the IMEO NN project did not honor the commitments despite the reminder made by the management unit. Also some projects and programs have closed. The main implementing partners of the project are the Ministry of Environment; local authorities, municipalities, the University of Niamey. The Ministry of the Environment, which provides supervision and the General Secretariat, is the Chairman of the steering committee. In this sense, a steering committee has already been held in 2022.  
The Ministry supported the signing by the Government of the draft decree for the integrated management of oasis ecosystems and its principal Directions have realized the monitoring of project activities. NGOs and others partners have implemented several land restoration, firewall strips opening and training activities.  
It also supports the Project in the organization of technical meetings and facilitates the search for co-financing with other donors. the partners , at all levels (NGO, university, partner projects, central directors of ministries) have participated and have also contributed to all workshop (steering committee, workshop) organized by the project  
Projects and programs such as the Rural Poles Project, Promap and NGOs in the region implement co-financing activities. They restored a total of 4482.56 ha of degraded land and opened 800 linear kilometers of firewall strips.  
They are also members of consultation frameworks for the management of ecosystems.  
Technical services are responsible for providing technical support for activities in the field through collaboration agreements.  
Local authorities are important partners because the work programs and priorities of the municipalities are discussed by mutual agreement.  
The University of Niamey is an institution that supports the Project in studies and intervention methodologies.

2.6. Gender

**TM:** Does the project have a gender action plan?

Yes

**EA:** Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Women participating in all land restoration, firewall strips and agricultural production activities.  
For natural resource management activities, these recovered 350 ha (27 ha for le IMEO-NN project) and opened 107 km of firewall strips (63 km for IMEO).  
These activities enabled the women to benefit from 131727 USD then 26 420 USD for IMEO.  
43 members of women's groups were trained in techniques for planting fruit trees and their maintenance. These members are also supported with improved seeds for market gardening.

M

**TM:** Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?

No

**TM:** If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?

**TM:** Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?

No

**TM:** If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes

**TM & EA:** Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?

No

2.7. ESS

**TM & EA:** If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including

**EA:** Environmental and social safeguards management  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

- Repair of land restoration half moon
- Tree planting
- Implementation of management plans
- Popularization of texts on the environment and social safeguard for the uptake by stakeholders
- Restoration of oasis ecosystems and the Air nature reserve
- land restoration
- Valorization of degraded land
- Integrated pest management and the use of organic matter
- During its activities, the project adopted preventive measures / Protection against injuries and accidents, respiratory diseases and covid-19 contingency plan. The project also contributes to job creation and increased income

2.8. KM/Learning

**EA:** Knowledge activities and products  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The project has produced key strategic documents which are contributing at national level to increase knowledge on natural resources management. These include:

- The study on the inventory of oasis ecosystems which also gives the mapping of land use.
- The study on the Environmental and Social Management Framework of The Integrated Management Project Of Oasians-Ecosystems In Northern Niger
- The study on the legal framework and the decree on the integrated management of oasis lands.
- The national strategy and its action plan are important project documents.
- Mid-term evaluation report of the Integrated Management Project for Oasis North Niger Ecosystems
- Diagnostic study of socio-economic and environmental trends in the PGIEO-NN Project area

For the national strategy document, it must be adopted by the government before being operational. The final documents are shared with the Ministry, universities, communities for personal or research use.

*Please attach a copy of any products*

**EA:** Main learning during the period

The project experienced a change of manager but this did not impact the quality of its implementation. The mid-term review made it possible to identify shortcomings in project implementation. The final document provided recommendations that will be taken into account.

2.9. Stories

**EA:** Stories to be shared  
(section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication)

Not yet produced

### 3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

#### 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
<b>Objective</b>							
Contribute to oasis ecosystems management and long-term sustainable measures in order to monitor and support restoration of the oasis		EA to fill	EA to fill	EA to fill	EA to fill	EA to fill	
<b>Outcome 1</b>							
	Area for the preservation of biodiversity and the globally important ecosystem goods and services it provides to society	0 ha	20,000 ha	40,000 ha	18650	This area was restored by co-financing partners who have an implementation agreement with the Regional Department of the Environment. We can cite as partners the State, NGOs, other development projects and programs in the Agadez region.	MS
	Sustainable management of land in production systems (agriculture, pastures and forest landscapes)	NA	50,000 hectares (40,000 ha of classified forests actively managed, 500 ha of reforested land and 9,500 ha of arable land)	60,000 hectares (40,000 ha of Production system actively managed, 1,000 ha of reforested land and 19,000 ha of arable land)	23217 ha	This area represents the space covered by the sustainable management actions carried out in the project area. They are led by the project and the other partners. These are land development activities, awareness raising, plantations, support for the conservation of wildlife biodiversity, training on the use of organic manure, the fight against bush fires, the fight against invasive plants.	MS
	Carbon sequestered or avoided emissions in the AFOLU sector	0	760 692 tons of Carbon	Avoided GHG emissions of 1,112,754 tons of CO2e and the sequestration of 2,097,235 tons of CO2e	not yet evaluated	The project team and the national directorate responsible for implementing the project do not have the technical skills to estimate carbon sequestration. the project provided for capacity building at all levels (national and decentralized) in the following semester (after disbursement of funds) to be able to evaluate the quantity of CO2 or carbon sequestered. All the same, many planting and sowing activities in the restored spaces have been carried out.	MU
<b>Outcome 2</b>							
The regulatory and enforcement framework relating to oasis biodiversity, ecosystem conservation and good land use management is set up	Texts of the legal framework clarifying the management of oasis and arid valley forests ecosystems approved by the government of Niger	Non-existence of a legal framework clarifying the management of oasis and arid valley forests ecosystems in Niger	The legal framework clarifying the management of oasis and arid valley forest ecosystems validated technically by the involved actors	The legal framework clarifying the management of oasis and arid valley forest ecosystems approved by Niger	the study on oasis inventory is available and the decree of specific text is signed par government	The texts of the legal framework clarifying the management of the ecosystems of oasis forests and arid valleys are finally approved by the Government of Niger.	S
<b>Outcome 3</b>							
Capacity building of national and local institutions in charge of natural resource management to promote sustainable development in the forest areas of Niger's oases and arid valleys through	Number of observatories set up	0 observatory	2 observatories set up (Agadez and Zinder)	7 observatories of which 4 regional 1 national and 1 for Kawar	2 studies available	Report on the baseline situation of bio-physical and socio-economic parameters available paving the way to the observatories setting up	MU

integrated natural resource management, as evidenced by the increase in the number of the sheets of adapted capacity development	An integrated national strategy for the conservation and management of oasis systems and arid valleys forests approved by the Government	No strategy	A national strategy approved by the government		1 validated document by partners is available	The project is just awaiting adoption by the government and the process is ongoing	<b>S</b>
<b>Outcome 4</b>							
Increased funding for the conservation of oasis and arid valley forests ecosystems.	Existence of an oasis and arid valleys forests support fund is set up and operational	There is no oases and arid valleys forest support fund	oases and arid valleys forests support fund set up	Oases and arid valleys forests support fund is operational	Not yet established	The oasis support fund has not yet been created, but the process is ongoing	<b>MU</b>
<b>Outcome 5</b>							
The pressures exerted by the overuse and exploitation of the oasis and arid valley forests of the Air Massif covering 40,000 ha are reduced through an Integrated Natural Resources Management Framework (INRM), illustrated by: regulation application of LD-PMAT (Monitoring and Evaluation of the portfolio of focal area "land degradation");	Participation of women in development of ILMP	0	At least 20% of participants in intercommunal planning are women	At least 40% of participants in intercommunal planning are women	The intercommunal planning committee is not set up	Process in progress	<b>MU</b>
	% of the communes with validated ILMP	0%	Existence of intercommunal planning	100% of communes have their ILMP	4 communes have their ILMP	The study on the diagnostic analysis concerning the two remaining municipalities and the work on the development of their ILMP are in progress	<b>MS</b>
<b>Outcome 6</b>							
The institutional capacities are established to promote the sustainable management of forests and lands in Air Massif through Integrated Natural Resources Management (INRM) across the landscape, as evidenced by the increase in the score of the capacity development sheet;	Percentage of operational monitoring structures	0%	80% of planned monitoring structures are established	60% of the monitoring structures are operational	1 committee set up	the remaining structures will be put in place after the holding of the communal forums and the installation of the communal committees for the integrated management of the oases	<b>MU</b>
	Existence of texts on functioning of the multi-sector planning platform	No multi-sector planning platform	3 consultation frameworks supported by the project	A functional planning platform	1 regional framework established	the rest of the implementation of the platforms is linked to the decree signed by the government. This text is a beacon for these integrated oasis management structures. Their implementation will be for this semester when the funds of the project are available	<b>MS</b>
landscape-level strengthening of SLM, SFM and BD conservation measures delivering ecosystem and development benefits has benefited over 60,000 ha (40,000 ha of dryland and arid valley forests, 1,000 ha of forest restoration, 19,000 ha of arable land) in the Massif of Air	Area of degraded production cultivated land restored	0 ha	9.000 ha of land restored	19 000 ha of land restored	19650	18650	<b>MU</b>
	Forest area and forest land restored	0 ha	500 ha Forest area restored	1 000 ha Forest area restored Project progress report	Despite the delay in the disbursement of funds, the project achieved 1342 kilometers of firewall strips are realized 643 hectares of degraded land restored 19 hectares of invasive plants are managed	The project has restored 643 ha, but the restoration activities also concern to combat bush fires and the fight against invasive plants	<b>S</b>
	Landscape areas under improved management for the benefit of biodiversity	0 ha	20 000 ha of arid valley forests	40 000 ha of arid valley forests	643	12643	<b>S</b>
	Female recipients of farm-level technical assistance and economic and organizational advice	0	At least 20% of recipients are women	At least 40% of recipients are women Project progress report	10%	a women's group of 43 members trained and equipped with agricultural inputs (improved seeds, means of pumping irrigation water, training in organic and mineral fertilization techniques), training in accounting and support in fruit plants	<b>MU</b>
	Rate of improvement in average income from farms supervised by Project	0	farm income improved by 7% per year	farm income improved by 7% per year	1169933 USD paid for workers including 278857 USD for IMOE NN (5% paid to women)	278857	<b>MS</b>

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

### 3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)



Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
<b>Under Comp 1</b>					
<b>Output 1.1.</b> Legal framework clarifying oasis and arid valley forest ecosystems management re local governance and management is improved and endorsed	june 2020	75	100%	The Legal framework clarifying oasis and arid valley forest ecosystems management re local governance and management is improved and endorsed. All activities which can contribute to set up are realized. • The study on an exhaustive inventory of the oasis ecosystems of northern Niger is carried out	S
Output 1.2. A national observatory of the Oasis and Arid Valley Forest Ecosystems (ONEO) is created and functional.	December 2020	45	45%	Diagnostic analyses conducted and the base line established for the development of Air Massif observatories. The creation of the national observatory requires the establishment of regional observatories. For each regional observatory, the process of	MU
<b>Output 1.3.</b> A national forum on the management of oasis and arid valley forests ecosystems is established (and operational with the support of ONEO).	june 2020	0	0%	The national forum which brings together all the national actors must be held after the municipal forums. This requires enough financial means et rehabilitation or establishment of community resource management structures. The resources made available to the Project Management Unit were not sufficient to initiate this process	MU
<b>Output 1.4.</b> An integrated national strategy for the conservation and management of oasis and dry valley forests systems in Niger is developed, validated and approved by the Government.	December 2021	65	85%	The project has supported government to have an integrated national strategy for the conservation and management of oasis and dry valley forests systems in Niger. The draft validated by the national and local level is available. It will be submitted to the government for validation after proofreading	S
<b>Output 1.5.</b> An oasis and arid valley forests support fund (FAGEDO) is established and operational.	october 2022	25	25%	A decree was adopted by the Government on the Oasis ecosystem management. The decree made provision for the establishment of the funds. The is waiting for 2023 disbursement fund to progress on this activity.	MU
<b>Under Comp 2</b>					
<b>Output 2.1.</b> Integrated Landscape Management Plans (ILMPs) developed for the all municipalities in which forest complexes are found ensuring optimal allocation of land to generate development benefits and critical environmental benefits in tandem	june 2020	10	60%	The project has supported 4 municipalities on the six to actualize the Communal Development Plans (PDC) to integrate integrated management aspects of oasis ecosystem. The process of integrating of the 2 municipalities in in progress	MS
Output 2.2. A diagnosis report on ecological, socioeconomic (agriculture, pastoralism, etc.) dynamics of oasis and arid valley forests ecosystems of Air Massif	December 2021	65	70%	The diagnostic study on the ecological and socio-economic dynamics (agricultural, pastoral, etc.) of the oasis and forest ecosystems of the arid valleys of the Massif de l'Air, paving the way for the establishment of observatories is available. Discussion is underway with the department in charge of ecological monitoring observatories to agree on the baseline and what should be established.	MS
Output 2.3. A common set of environmental and socioeconomic indicators for monitoring oasis and arid valley forests ecosystems of Air Massif integrated in all the ILMPs.	December 2020	25	50%	The final report of Air Massif area is available including the necessary indicators. 4 municipalities (Ifrouane, Timia, Dabaga and Gougaram) have their IMLPs and the environmental indicators are integrated. There are only 2 municipalities left (Tchirozerine and Tabelot)	MS
Output 2.4. A common set of operational actions (SLM practices, Good Agricultural practices, Water Resources Management, SFM practices) to maintain and improve the oasis and arid valley forests ecosystem services developed and integrated into ILMPs.	December 2023	15	40%	Apart from the training and awareness-raising activities carried out, the project has identified with the regional directorates of agriculture and hydraulics future actions to be taken for water management and promising agro-ecological techniques.	MS
Output 2.5. A multi-sector planning platform comprising institutions with sector responsibilities for the development and conservation of the oasis and arid valley forest ecosystems in the Air Massif, as well as relevant CSOs and committed private partners of local communities, facilitate the development of IMOIE -NN.	December 2023	25	25%	The process is ongoing. A regional consultation framework for actors on the integrated management of oases has already is set up	MS
<b>Under Comp 3</b>					

<b>Output 3.1.</b> Ecological connectivity and integrity established between and within the different forest complexes, by implementing forest landscape management practices identified in the ILMPs. Physical measures include: (1) upgrading of conservation status through designation of classified forests and management of forests covering 40,000 hectares, reducing threats (deforestation, unsustainable wood harvesting); (2) the reforestation of 1,000 hectares of land.	December 2023	12	20%	The ILMPs have just been finalized in 4 municipalities. The process has just started while waiting for the other two municipalities	MS
<b>Output 3.2.</b> 1,000 hectares of reforested land	December 2023	13	15%	All the anti-erosion works made are sown with seeds and many partners are planting	MS
<b>Output 3.2.</b> For production cultivated land (19,000 ha targeted): technologies developed, tested and appropriate infrastructure established to operationalize SLM in line with developed ILMPs, namely2: (i) incorporation of nitrogen-fixing trees into annual monocropping; (ii) improvement of planting methods and use of high yielding varieties; (iii) improved water management; (iv) increase in use of organic fertilizer and (v) integrated pest management.	December 2023	15	30%	132 producers (men and women) are trained and made aware of crop diversification, pesticides and alternative control, composting, organic fertilization and techniques for sowing and planting fruit trees and water-saving techniques. irrigation. They are supported with improved seeds and fruit plants. The producers are made aware to plant tree can favorize azote fixation et improving soil quality	MS
<b>Under Comp 4</b>					
<b>Under Comp 5</b>					

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

## 4 Risk Rating

### 4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the Risk Help Sheet for more details on rating

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-	Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs.
3 Implementation schedule	Substantial: Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable or Measures taken are not always adequate	Substantial: Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable or Measures taken are not always adequate and weak adaptive management.
4 Budget	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
5 Financial Management	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative
6 Reporting	Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress	Moderate: Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues.
7 Capacity to deliver	Low : Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before	Moderate: Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages.

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in Table B below

### 4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

M

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

Risk	Risk affecting:								Risk Rating		Variation respect to last rating	
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	Δ	Justification		
The lack of willingness of the relevant parties to finance the initiative in the region in order to meet their cofinancing commitment in the defined time	All Outcome / outputs	L	M	L	M					↑	Most of projects and NGOs have not respected their commitment since the beginning of IMEO-NN. Some projects are also ended. This lead to a cofinancing risk.	
Inability of the municipalities to play their role in co-management	All Outcome / outputs	L	L	L	L					=	The municipalities are able to fully play their co-management role, especially since they are supported by state executives who are assigned to the chief towns of communes. The municipalities are able to fully play their co-management role, especially since they rely on State executives assigned to the chief towns of the municipalities. The municipalities are also managed by highly educated executives	
Floods, drought, pests, and wind erosion can disrupt the process of project implementation.	All Outcome / outputs	M	L	L	L					=	The partners have built water infiltration weirs to feed groundwater and prevent flooding. These phenomena had no influence on the implementation of the project.	
The residual insecurity was linked to the previous armed conflict in the project area and the flow of refugees from Libya.	All Outcome / outputs	L	L	L	L					=	Insecurity is not a disturbing aspect of project implementation, since the start of the project no threat has affected the project team. Today there is no conflict in the area and the area is covered with military patrols to control the residual insecurity.	
Inadequate commitment of local communities in the natural resource management.	All Outcome / outputs	L	L	L	L					=	Local communities are accustomed to co-management of natural resources since the implementation of the COGERAT project, municipalities and beneficiaries have joined the project	

Institutional instability due mainly to the changes of Government staff in the PMU and Councils following the next general elections.
The lack of the involvement of certain user groups such as cattle breeders can lead to conflicts over the use of resources.
COVID 19 pandemic

All Outcome / outputs	L	L	L	M					↑	The project communes have not experienced any problems during past municipal elections and most of the elected municipal councilors have a good level of education. However, the project coordinator who is nominated by the Government has been replaced putting the project in medium risk.
All Outcome / outputs	M	L	L	L					=	The project responds to the aspirations of all socio-professional groups in the area such as cattle breeders, women, young people and agricultural producers.
All Outcome / outputs		L	M	L					↓	COVID-19 is no longer a constraint for project implementation. In fact, the bans are lifted at the national level and all meetings take place normally

Consolidated project risk

Not Applicable	L	L	M							This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.
----------------	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

### 4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

List here only risks from Table A and B above that have a risk rating of **M or higher** in the current PIR

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
The lack of willingness of the relevant parties to finance the initiative in the region in order to meet their cofinancing commitment in the agreed time line.	Reminder of commitments to partners	signature of implementation contract of the same actions with new partners projects and programs in Agadez and the development of a prodoc with new funder	Partnership search	Immediate	IIMOE NN Management Unit, Regional Council and Ministry
Institutional instability related to changes of staff in the PMU	Close consultations with the Project Director	Regular consultations between the Project Task Manager and Project Director	Continue the close consultation with the Project Director	Immediate	UNEP Task Manager
Low capacity of the M&E function in the PMU	Continuous capacity building	Capacity building of the team during various Task Manager mission in the country and support from UNEP finance Unit	Targetted Capacity building	Immediate	Project Coordinator with support from UNEP Task

**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.  
**Significant 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.  
**Moderate 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.

## Project Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines. Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

### 5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

Minor amendments	Changes	Minor amendments
Results framework	No	The Project in agreement with the UNEP has made adjustments following the budget revision. The budget revision consisted in allocating to other lines of the same component the amounts of the lines not consumed during the previous years. These are lines on consultations, the steering committee, technical meetings and the operation
Components and cost	No	
Institutional and implementation arrangements	No	
Financial management	No	
Implementation schedule	Explain in table B	
Executing Entity	No	
Executing Entity Category	No	
Minor project objective change	No	
Safeguards	No	
Risk analysis	No	
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	No	
Co-financing	No	
Location of project activity	No	
Other		

### 5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Original Legal Instrument					
Amendment 1	Revision				
Extension 1	Extension				

## GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap \(https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79\)](https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79) or [GeoNames\(http://www.geonames.org/\)](http://www.geonames.org/) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here\(https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx\)](https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)

Location Name Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
TISSWELENE	18.53	7.78			LAND RESTORATION
GOUGARAM	18.47	7.78			LAND RESTORATION
Eguefneghawane	17.63	7.91			LAND RESTORATION
Etagass	18.08	8.29			Firewall
Arwa	18.79	9.76			Firewall
Ingalan	18.26	8.59			Firewall
Tchilligan	18.17	8.43			Firewall
Injira	18.14	8.40			Firewall
Gabarat	18.54	8.40			Firewall
Kambo Tazorat	18.84	8.55			Firewall
Agalal	18.71	8.25			Firewall
Ouwoudouban	18.92	8.15			Firewall
DAGAGA	16.9	8.09			LAND RESTORATION

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. \*

[Annex any linked geospatial file]





**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.  
**Significant 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.  
**Moderate 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.

**RISKS: Management structure - Roles and responsibilities:**

	Element 1		Element 2		Element 3: likelihood		Risk Level
Low	Well developed, <b>stable</b> Management Structure	and	Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Well developed, <b>stable</b> Management Structure	and	Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	<b>Unstable</b> Management Structure	or	Individuals understand their own role but are <b>unsure</b> of responsibilities of others.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Unstable Management Structure or Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	<b>Unstable</b> Management Structure	and	<b>Unclear</b> responsibilities or <b>overlapping functions</b> which lead to management problems.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Unstable Management Structure and Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Governance structure - Oversight**

Low	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies <b>meet at least once a year</b>	and	<b>Active</b> membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC <b>provides</b> direction/inputs.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies <b>meet at least once a year</b>	and	<b>Active</b> membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC <b>provides</b> direction/inputs.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies <b>do not convene regularly</b>	or	<b>Limited</b> membership and participation in decision-making processes or SC guidance/input provided to project is <b>inadequate</b> .		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene regularly or Limited membership and participation in decision-making processes or SC guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene <b>regularly</b>	and	Steering Committee does <b>not</b> fulfil its TOR.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene regularly and Steering Committee does not fulfil its TOR. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Implementation schedule**

Low	Project <b>progressing</b> according to original work plan	and	<b>Adaptive management</b> is practiced and regular monitoring.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Project progressing according to original work plan and Adaptive management is practiced and regular monitoring. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Project <b>progressing</b> according to work plan	and	<b>Adaptive management</b> and regular monitoring.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	Some changes in project work plan but <b>without major effect</b> on overall timetable	or	Measures taken are <b>not always adequate</b> and weak adaptive management.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable or Measures taken are not always adequate and weak adaptive management. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	<b>Major delays</b> or changes in work plan or method of implementation	and	No measures taken and no adaptive management.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation and No measures taken and no adaptive management. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Budget**

Low	Activities are <b>progressing</b> within planned budget	and	Balanced budget utilisation including PMC.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Activities are <b>progressing</b> within planned budget	and	Balanced budget utilisation including PMC.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	<b>Minor</b> budget reallocation needed with no changes beyond the margins of 10% across the different components – excluding the PMC.	or	<b>Imbalanced</b> utilisation of budget or exhaustion of PMC before project completion.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Minor budget reallocation needed with no changes beyond the margins of 10% across the different components – excluding the PMC. or Imbalanced utilisation of budget or exhaustion of PMC before project completion. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	<b>Major</b> budget reallocation (>10%) across components or significant changes in budget lines (including any increase >5% from original budget)	and	<b>Poor</b> budget utilisation or exhaustion of PMC before project completion.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Major budget reallocation (>10%) across components or significant changes in budget lines (including any increase >5% from original budget) and Poor budget utilisation or exhaustion of PMC before project completion. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Financial management**

Low	Funds are <b>correctly</b> managed and transparently accounted for	and	Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Funds are <b>correctly</b> managed and transparently accounted for	and	Audit reports provided <b>regularly</b> and confirm <b>correct</b> use of funds.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	Financial reporting <b>slow</b> or deficient	or	Audit reports are not provided or indicate <b>minor</b> issues in the use of funds.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Financial reporting slow or deficient or Audit reports are not provided or indicate minor issues in the use of funds. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	<b>Serious</b> financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds	and	Audit reports are <b>not provided</b> or indicate <b>incorrect</b> use of funds.		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds and Audit reports are not provided or indicate incorrect use of funds. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Reporting**

Low	Substantive reports are presented in a <b>timely</b> manner	and	Reports are <b>complete</b> and <b>accurate</b> with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	Substantive reports are presented in a <b>timely</b> manner	and	Reports are <b>complete</b> and <b>accurate</b> with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Moderate: Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Substantial	Reports are complete and accurate but often <b>delayed</b>	Or	Reports <b>lack critical analysis</b> of progress and implementation issues.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		Substantial: Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or Reports lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.
High	<b>Missing</b> reports or <b>serious</b> concerns about <b>timeliness</b> of project reporting	and	Serious concerns about reports <b>quality</b> .		<b>High</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.		High: Missing reports or serious concerns about timeliness of project reporting and Serious concerns about reports quality. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

**RISKS: Capacity to deliver**

Low	<b>Sound</b> technical and managerial <b>capacity</b> of institutions and other project partners	and	Capacity gaps were <b>addressed</b> before implementation or during early stages.		<b>Low</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.		Low : Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
Moderate	<b>Sound</b> technical and managerial <b>capacity</b> of institutions and other project partners	and	Capacity gaps were <b>addressed</b> before implementation or during early stages.		<b>Moderate</b> likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery		Moderate: Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery
Substantial	<b>Weaknesses</b> persist and have been identified	Or	Capacity gaps require <b>longer time to address</b> and are continuously being addressed.		<b>Significant</b> likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery		Substantial: Weaknesses persist and have been identified or Capacity gaps require longer time to address and are continuously being addressed. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery

High	Capacity is very low at all levels	and	Inability to address capacity gaps or partners require constant support and technical assistance.	High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery	High: Capacity is very low at all levels and Inability to address capacity gaps or partners require constant support and technical assistance. High likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery
------	------------------------------------	-----	---	--	---