



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5481		
Country/Region:	Morocco		
Project Title:	Conservation of Biodiversity and Mitigation of Land Degradation Through Adaptive Management of Agricultural Heritage Systems		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-1; LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$771,918
Co-financing:	\$7,850,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,671,918
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Abdelwahab Belloum

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	July 25, 2013 Yes, Morocco is eligible. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	July 25, 2013 Yes, the endorsement letter is on file. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	July 25, 2013	

		programmed under the countries STAR, which is available. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the amounts utilized under for BD (\$310,000) and LD (\$590,000) area available.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>No FA set-aside is being requested.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>The focal area objectives are noted (BD2, LD1 and LD3), but it is not clear how the four project components will specifically contribute to them. Please clarify in the narrative section (B.2), including explicit links to focal area outcomes and the proposed GEBs.</p> <p>For BD, the Aichi Targets for contribution are explicitly mentioned as 1 and 2.</p> <p>October 4, 2013</p> <p>Links with LD1 and LD3 are now clear. However, the clarifications provided for BD2 still do not conform to expected</p>	

		<p>Please refer to the BD focal area strategy and clarify whether the focus on sustainable tourism (agor and eco tourism), product or service certification, etc. as described under component 3 (page 9) will contribute to expected outcomes and outputs for BD2. How many hectares of oases systems will be certified (BD Outcome 2.1) and/or benefit from specific policy and regulatory frameworks (BD outcome 2.2) as a result of the project?</p> <p>October 24, 2013</p> <p>The Global Biodiversity Benefits are still not explicit, and reference to species like durum wheat and amalagou almond are not consistent with BD focal area priorities. Additional information is needed on species that will benefit from adaptative management of the targeted oases (see details in cell #24).</p> <p>December 3, 2013</p> <p>It is agreed that these be addressed in the full proposal to be submitted for CEO approval.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the consistencies have been adequately described.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address. sufficiently described and	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the baseline is sufficiently described for a PIF but needs to be better</p>	

Project Design	assumptions?	<p>submitted for approval. Particular emphasis should be placed on how the MSP will add value to the baseline investments in complementary and synergistic manner to strengthen conservation of the oases.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>No. The framework in Table A is not consistent with description of the components under A.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - under 2.1, it is not clear how sustainable land and water management practices will reduce pressure from competing land uses - under 2.1.1, the potential for 10 practices is not reflected in the components as described - "certification" as an indicator for outcome 3.1 is not justified by the proposed activities under Outcome 3. Please provide a more clear link between the outcomes and outputs in the table and proposed activities as presented for the project components. <p>Component 3 - What does a "market plan" actually mean? Please provide a couple of working examples in Morocco or the region that illustrate what these plans look like and how they work.</p> <p>October 4, 2013</p> <p>Reference to "market plan development" under Component 3 has been clarified to mean "products' labelling," which is much more consistent with the proposed approach. Table B is now clear and</p>	

		<p>components, but please clarify how expected outcomes and outputs for BD2 will be supported by Component 3. as noted in #4 above.</p> <p>October 24, 2013</p> <p>Yes, but additional information is needed for the BD benefits in the targeted oases. Specifically, there must be clear description of the labeling requirements for the local products, and who or what entity will be providing the labelling (see details in cell #24).</p> <p>December 3, 2013</p> <p>It is agreed that these be best addressed in the full proposal to be submitted for CEO approval.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>The incremental reasoning needs to be better linked to barriers identified and proposed components. The GEBs are identified and appropriate, but it is not clear how they will be measured and quantified. Please clarify relevant and measureable indicators for the GEBs based on priorities of the BD and LD focal areas.</p> <p>October 4, 2013</p> <p>The reasoning is now clear, including how the identified barriers will be addressed. The GEBs are now consistent with the focal area priorities.</p>	

	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes, CSOs and traditional communities are identified as key stakeholders for the project. Please ensure a clear articulation of how they will be engaged during project preparation and their subsequent role in implementation.</p> <p>October 4, 2013</p> <p>This has been addressed and noted for further development in the full proposal.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes, potential risks have been identified, but mitigation measures for capacity limitation, stakeholder participation, and economic context for co-financing need to be better assessed during project preparation and better articulated in the proposal to be submitted for CEO approval.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Relevant projects for coordination have been highlighted and briefly described. Please provide a clear description of how the proposed MSP will complement the</p>	

		<p>is also linked to and co-financed from Pillar II of Plan Maroc Vert.</p> <p>Although the new identified sites separate this project from previous GEF funded projects (p.12), it is not clear if the activities [(organic farming, ecotourism and certification (of what))] are appropriate and have a chance to deliver tangible and measurable results. Please cross-check the information of this proposed MSP with the other projects to narrow-down themes and sites, so the justification becomes clear.</p> <p>October 4, 2013</p> <p>Links with ASIMA have been clarified. The themes and sites have been considerably narrowed to emphasize product certification as a means of harnessing the value of oases ecosystems for long-term sustainability.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>The narrative on innovativeness (para before A.2) is unclear, even though the approach described as "holistic" under the proposed alternative scenario (page 7) sounds appropriate for the oases system. Please provide a more succinct explanation of elements of innovation reflected in the design, especially given the Agencies experiences with GIAHS.</p> <p>October 4, 2013</p> <p>The innovativeness and potential for sustainability and upscaling are now</p>	

		Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Even though the co-financing is high, the GEF grant amounts seem inadequate based on the outcomes and outputs planned under each component. The proposed outputs are too ambitious for the funding and time available for this MSP. or example, it is unrealistic to think that this project can deliver organic farming, ecotourism and certification (not clear of what) in the 6 project sites with a total population of more than 200,000 people in 15 communities. Please narrow down the thematic issues and geographic scope of the intervention under component 3.</p> <p>Please seriously reconsider the "economic valuation of the Oases environmental services (e.g. PES and other market-based mechanisms) to later develop a marketing plan to link traditional oases products with the market and private sector". The experience so far at the GEF is that these valuations made without a series of activities properly budgeted and linked to a larger project</p>	

		<p>schemes require the a priori identification of buyers and sellers and significant investments and institutional capacity to make them work. This is very unlikely to happen as a result of this MSP. Please also use the advances in the projects listed on page 12 to narrow down the themes.</p> <p>October 4, 2013</p> <p>The project is now much more focused and streamlined to justify the level of GEF resources requested. Activities such as PES have been scaled back accordingly.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role?</p> <p><u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes, based on the GEF amount requested, the indicative co-financing is adequate and includes contribution from FAO, albeit in-kind. Please ensure that the amounts are confirmed and supported with letters when MSP is submitted for CEO approval.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes, PMC is appropriate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs?</p> <p>At CEO endorsement/ approval.</p>	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes, \$50,000 is requested plus fee, which is in line with norm. However, no justification is provided. Please submit justification for amount requested together with the revised PIF.</p>	

	report on the activities using the PPG fund?	October 4, 2013 The PPG request is now justified, and is line with proposed project design needs. Cleared	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>July 25, 2013</p> <p>No, the PIF is not yet recommended. Please address concerns raised in the review.</p> <p>October 4, 2013</p> <p>No, the PIF is still not ready to be recommended. Please address remaining concerns in #4 and #7 as appropriate.</p> <p>October 28, 2013</p> <p>No, PIF clearance is still not</p>	

		<p>following BD related issues:</p> <p>1. Synthesize the list of species that will benefit from the SLM practices needed to justify labeling of local products. For each of the target areas (Oases), please provide the common and scientific names of at least the following groups: Birds (migratory), Mammals (including endemics as appropriate), and Plants (endemics only). A useful option is to consider species compositions based on Ecoregions, especially the following: Mediterranean forests, dry woodlands and scrubs -Terrestrial Eco-regions 85, 86 and 87), Desert Saharan Steppe (Terrestrial Eco-region 93) and Permanent Maghreb (Freshwater Eco-region 34).</p> <p>2. Provide a clear description of the labeling requirements for the local products. Who will provide this labeling? Is it a local labeling system, or does it have some international recognition? What biodiversity standards will be used for this labeling? That is, how do we know that the labeling has a positive impact on biodiversity conservation?</p> <p>December 3, 2013</p> <p>It is agreed that the above issues will be addressed during project development. The MSP is therefore recommended for CEO approval.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		

	First review*	July 25, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	October 04, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 28, 2013	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.