



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

GEF ID:	9537		
Country/Region:	Morocco		
Project Title:	Revitalising Oasis Agro-ecosystems through a Sustainable, Integrated and Landscape Approach in the DraË-Tafilalet Region (OASIL)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-3 Program 7; LD-1 Program 1; CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,631,050
Co-financing:	\$41,270,000	Total Project Cost:	\$49,901,050
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 03, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Michael Hage (Mr.),

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	Potentially, Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. We recommend at CEO endorsement to connect the LDN framework, the NDC, and the Aichi Targets. Maybe the LDN framework will not be ready at CEO endorsement, but it will be strategic to maintain a certain	

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
		flexibility to ensure that this project will be aligned with the future LDN framework. The proposal is aligned with GEF strategy as well as Moroccan INDC.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>July 9, 2016 No. Please elaborate on the Baseline projects in support of: Community gene-banks, value chains for species other than dates (i.e. aromatic and medicinal plants, local goat cheese, dried meat, dried vegetables..) and agro-ecotourism. Then, provide the incremental reasoning for the proposed GRF investments.</p> <p>All the co-financing is expected in cash. Can you confirm the level of dialogue with these different institutions. Are they aware they are listed in this PIF with the associated co-financing \$ figures?</p> <p>August 18, 2016 - Thanks for the detailed responses (23 pages). We will appreciate to better understand how the responses</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>will impact the project document and the result framework, as the PIF has not significantly been modified. Thanks to mention the pages or sections which are modified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, provide a list of species, varieties, and crop wild relatives which are targeted by this project under the BD2 Program7 (see possible FAO work). - Cofinancing: Comment addressed. Please, check and confirm the breakdown of cofinancing in the table B: the sum up does not match with the total which is mentioned. - Please, provide the full EXACT analysis, and not only the last page. - Can you please provide more information on the new land practices (in support of the table p27). <p>August 29, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>July 9, 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formulation of outputs: please, refer to the OECD guidelines to better formulate the outputs which should be specific, quantifiable, reflect the results of the project activities and illustrate the value for money (1.1.1, 1.2.1, 2.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.2.1...). 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- The current component 1 and 2 do not cover low-carbon activities, and it will be difficult to understand if the mitigation technologies to be introduced in component 3 will be adequate and cost-efficient. It is expected that Component 1 will mainstream low-carbon development in oasis development policies, and component 2 will investigate GHG emission profile and prioritize effective low-carbon activities. Please, clarify.</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>How can "The capacity of the government and other national stakeholders to promote the sustainable management of oasis agro-ecosystems (Outcome 1) be achieved using only awareness raising, a "multi-sector platform/information system" and a declaration?</p> <p>What does a "multi-sector platform/information system" actually mean?</p> <p>Output 1.1.2 What are the productive sectors that will be subject to mainstreaming BD best practices?</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>How are the capacities of the National Extension Agency going to be enhanced to incorporate BD approaches? What does this mean in reality?</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p> <p>What does it mean to "mainstream BD approaches into future regional plans?</p> <p>Many outputs are basic or baseline activities (2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5) and should be financed by the government or the cofinancing (\$12 million). Can you explain what the cofinancing will finance?</p> <p>From the point of view of the BD Focal Area, an investment of \$1.6 million for this component is not justifiable when considering the proposed outputs (i.e. databases, catalogues, reinforcement of information systems, oasis typology and mapping).</p> <p>Who is the owner and curator of the information systems to be reinforced?</p> <p>Not clear how these investments render any measurable and tangible GEBs. The status of the Biodiversity assets in the region will be unaffected</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>with or without this component.</p> <p>Is the project going to develop the agro-ecosystem plans only, or is it going to implement them too? Plans only are unlikely to deliver any GEBs and most likely left unused after the completion of the project.</p> <p>COMPONENT 3</p> <p>Suggest doing planning and implementation in only pilot oases ecosystems.</p> <p>Output 3.1.1. Is very vague. Need to elaborate because "local capacities are enhanced", can mean anything.</p> <p>Output 3.1.5. Please elaborate on the exact nature of the proposed in-situ conservation of agro-biodiversity measures.</p> <p>Output 3.2.2. Reads as an afterthought. Only mentioned once in the Results Framework.</p> <p>COMPONENT 4</p> <p>Budget appears very high. Difficult to justify M&E for \$4,450,000, including GEF \$450K.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources		Who is going to maintain the website once completed? August 18, 2016 Addressed.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes.	
	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>The project is using LD and BD resources: - LD: 4,256,164 (project) +404,336 (fees) + 100,000 (PPG) + 9,500 (fees) = \$4,770,000 - BD: \$4,374,886 + 415,614 (fees) + 100,000 (PPG) + 9,500 (fees) = \$4,900,000</p> <p>NB: in the project grant, \$1,826,484 are transferred from BD to CCM, applying the marginal adjustment (\$2,000,000 in total, with \$173,516 of fees).</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	No set aside.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>July 9, 2016 No. Please address issues under items 4 and 5.</p> <p>August 18, 2016 Thanks for the revised package. Please, complete the responses under the item 4.</p> <p>August 29, 2009 All points under the item 4 have been addressed: the PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	July 09, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 29, 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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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 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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.