



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

GEF ID:	9599		
Country/Region:	Djibouti		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Water Resources, Rangelands and Agro-pastoral Perimeters in the Cheikhetti Wadi watershed of Djibouti		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5921 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$98,477	Project Grant:	\$3,215,068
Co-financing:	\$13,520,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,735,068
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Cyrille Barnerias	Agency Contact Person:	Yves de Soye

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>August 4th, 2016</p> <p>Yes the project is aligned with GEF 6 programming directions LD 1.1 especially by improving sustainable pastoralism, regulating livestock grazing pressure through rotational grazing systems and strengthening community based agricultural management; and LD 1.2 by mitigating impacts of climate change</p>	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		by improving water management practices.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>August 4th 2016</p> <p>yes it is consistent with Vision Djibouti 2035 that insist on sustainable water management (P101-102) and desertification limitation (p102). Please send the SCAPE to the GEF Sec.</p> <p>October 24th 2016 Thank you very much for the documents sent.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>August 4th 2016</p> <p>- Yes drivers of environmental degradation are indicated: climate stress, deforestation, overgrazing, agricultural practices, water and wind erosion. Please confirm that IAS are not a major environmental issue.</p> <p>- Please detail the scaling up part. Maybe other watersheds representatives could be invited to some meetings or demonstrations.</p> <p>- regarding the sustainability, please confirm that budget will be provided after the project for water extraction</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>studies (as well as availability monitoring), watershed governance animation if needed</p> <p>October 24th 2016 Thank you for having provided complete answers.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>August 4th 2016</p> <p>Yes with a few comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the project zone doesn't seem to correspond to the hydrological watershed. Is it on purpose? if yes, please provide explanations. - please provide a map with terrain elevation, hydrological watersheds and project outline. - Please indicate what is the level of current data availability on the aquifer(s) serving of Cheikhetti wadi watershed (area, depth, level, quality ...). - if herders cross watershed boundaries, please make sure to avoid negatives impacts on neighboring watersheds due to changes related to the project. Inter-watersheds relationships should also be taken into account in the model to prepare for a future scaling up. 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- the project will normally participate in the aquifer replenishment. Do you think that it could also be an opportunity to work on water quality by implementing basic water quality monitoring as well as simple measure to improve water quality?</p> <p>- If relevant, could the plantation of trees also be extended to hillsides and ridges to slow water, decrease erosion and increase the tree resources (wood and grazing)?</p> <p>- Please include IAS safeguards for the seed bank and plantation.</p> <p>October 24th 2016 Addressed</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>August 4th 2016</p> <p>yes with the following comments:</p> <p>- it is very good to propose indicators and targets.</p> <p>- regarding the "Proportion of herders complying with community rangeland management agreements that reinstate rotational pasture use and water and soil conservation measures across rangeland within the Cheikhetti Wadi watershed", do herders have similar</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>numbers of animals? If not, it could be more representative of the grazing pressure to use the number of animals impacted by management measures.</p> <p>- "Groundwater/piezometric level measured in selected permanent wells across the Cheikhetti Wadi watershed, based on monthly monitoring": could you provide an estimated target of the number of measure points that could be implemented?</p> <p>- Could this also be used to provide an indicator (with a target) to evaluate the aquifer replenishment (in comparison with older references if they exist for example or to the initial state that will be measured)?</p> <p>October 24th 2016 Addressed</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>August 4th 2016</p> <p>- Yes Gender Elements are included in the PIF and could be precised during the PPG phase.</p> <p>- No, Indigenous people involvement is not presented clearly enough.</p> <p>- Please provide a minimal list of CSO that will be involved.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		October 24th 2016 Addressed	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>August 4th 2016</p> <p>No, the total proposed Grant is \$3,630,000. It is \$801,668 above the STAR allocation, knowing that Djibouti has already over-utilized \$1,200,000 on the BD Star allocation, but nothing from the CC Star allocation (\$3m). Fee in Finance Breakdown record(s) higher than 9.5% of amount</p> <p>October 31th 2016 The STAR allocation for LD is not \$2,830,000 but \$2,828,332. While it is possible to shift \$800,000 from the Climate Change Star Allocation, that would not be sufficient to cover the project costs+ project fees + PPG + PPG fees. Please adapt the project budget.</p> <p>November 7th 2016 Addressed</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>August 5th 2016</p> <p>No, please address the comments above.</p> <p>October 30th 2016</p> <p>Yes, the project is technically cleared, recommended for clearance and PPG. Thank you for your precise and complete answers.</p> <p>Please at CEO endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - develop a Monitoring and Assessment plan to measure the changes - provide baseline data for monitoring - disaggregate data related to benefits by gender - confirm co-financing (while securing co-financing in cash) - confirm the breakdown of resources per component and if possible increase the part for activities on the ground and scaling-up measures while reducing the part for governance - confirm the establishment of partnerships with universities and 	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		CSOs for actions on the ground	
Review Date	Review	August 05, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 31, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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

CEO endorsement Review

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

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation			
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		