|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

2013 Annual Project Review (APR)

Project Implementation Review (PIR) OF UNDP Supported GEF Financed Projects

PIMS 3216 - Project Title: PROMES GDT - SIP - Harmonizing support: A national program integrating water harvesting schemes and sustainable land management in Djibouti

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Focal Area | Land Degradation |
| Lead RTA | Lyes Ferroukhi |
| Lead Country(ies) | (DJI) Djibouti |
| Revised Planned Closing Date | 31-Dec-2014 |
| Overall Risk rating | Moderate |
| Overall DO rating | Moderately Satisfactory |
| Overall IP rating | Moderately Satisfactory |
| GEF grant amount disbursed so far | 830,000 |

Project Summary

The proposed project aims to overcome barriers to taking an integrated approach to SLM in Djibouti. It will create innovative approaches for SLM and achievement of NAP objectives by providing the capacity and skills to achieve the mainstreaming of land degradation measures into national development plans and policies, sectoral plans and district-level investment planning,

and New fiscal, regulatory and policy incentives.

UNDP-GEF Technical Advisor’s Comments

Explanation for change to Overall DO Rating or Overall IP Rating:

I changed the DO rating from S to MS; my own rating was MU but I did not want to overrule the in-country opinions to such a degree. I kept the IP Rating at MS, which was also my rating. More detailed comments are forthcoming.

Is this the terminal PIR that will serve as the final project report? No

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here:

UNDP Country Office’s Comments

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was started but not completed this reporting period, please explain how these are progressing and note if any delays are expected:

If the mid-term review (MTR) OR the terminal evaluation (TE) was completed this reporting period, or if this is the final APR/PIR, please address the following points here:

Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period:

January 2013

PROGRESS TOWARD DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2009** | **Level at 30 June 2010** | **Level at 30 June 2011** | **Level at 30 June 2012** | **Level at 30 June 2013** |
| to enhance the livelihoods of pastoral communities by promoting sustainable natural resource management | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | Vegetation cover in rangeland increase to at least natural levels of 30% by end of project\_x000D\_ \_x000D\_ |  |  |  | The methodology for assessing vegetation cover in range lands will be established, and the baseline values determined by October 2012 for the northern project areas and by January 2013 for the project southern areas. The baseline specified in the logical framework was established for Day Forest only in November 2010. | The community has accepted the mise en défens which are traditional practices. Where rain has fallen, the biomass has increased despite the recurrent drought over five years. One the species concerned is Aizon Carinens which has been regenerated. The threats on the JP has been reduced through Soil and Water Conservation activities. However because of climatic conditions during the last years, the planting of trees did not produced the expected result. |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | Target production rate is 5TLU/ha by end of the project |  |  |  | The initial expertise in pastoralism launched in May 2012 showed that many of the grazing lands are leaner than originally specified in the project document and the baseline was overestimated. This expertise will delve more deeply into this issue in October 2012 but already recommended to focus on an alternative indicator: Number of hectares of new routes open to grazing facilitated by adequate facilities for water availability. | Since its inception, the project has currently put at rest 6,000 hectares in different regions of the country. This represents 60% of the target. In day forest 250 hectares has been put to rest. This result produced is affected by the recurrent drought situation |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | Surface water harvesting increases to 500,000m3 by end of project |  |  |  | The amount of surface water mobilized will reach 172,960 m3 in 2012, which corresponds to half of the total quantity of 500,000 m3 of water targeted by the project for the 6,000 beneficiary families. It should be noted that the baseline was overestimated which explains that the value in 2012 is smaller than the baseline value. | The work done to build small dams, bore holes have enable to mobilize 327.000 m3 of water . It is execpted that the project will reach its target by end of 2014. |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | A long-term programme to plant 1,000 trees/yr over 10 yrs is initiated starting 2011 |  |  |  | Juniper regeneration is performed at a rate of 3000 plants / year | The project has been 3000 plants per year. However the reforestation activity is not yielding goods because of lack of sufficient rain fall. For example Between June 2012 and July 2013 only 100 mm of rain have fallen, 56 mm in 2012. |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | Capacity assessment scorecard increase to 37 by 2014 |  |  |  | An ambitious capacity building programme for 2012 is in place, based on the needs identified by the project during the design phase of the project and the inception workshop. The Capacity Assessment Score Card will be repeated during the final evaluation in June 2014. | The project organized trainings for the 200 members of the communities in Water and Soil Conservation Management, pasture management, Forest management) artisanal use of a wood products. Two study tours have been organised in Ethiopa and Turkey. Women benefited from these trainings. |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | At least two lesson-learned are published by end of the project |  |  |  | The lessons and instructions will be produced at the end of the project. | Publications have been limited to articles in news paper discussing the work undertaken by the project with the support of the local communities. |
| to implement measures for surface water harvesting to fill drinking needs of the community and its livestock and to promote a more sustainable use of pastures by increasing the accessibility of pastures | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | Rate of families with no access to water sources in dry season is reduced by half to 25% by end of project |  |  |  | The results of the July 2011 baseline survey are not yet available for the water access census. This survey will be complemented by studies on pastoralism issues in October 2012 and January 2013 to establish accurate baseline databases and monitor the project’s evolution. | 7.000 households have access to water. The objective of 25% reduction has been reached |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | Pressure on pastures carrying capacity is reduced by half to 30% by end of project |  |  |  | The methodology for assessing the carrying capacity of pastures will be established and the baseline values determined by October 2012 for the northern project areas and by January 2013 for the project southern areas. The indicator should be reviewed by contracted experts in pastoralism in October 2012. | Due to land conservation (mise en repos), the pressure on carrying capacity is reduced. New water catchments created by the project have enabled a better access of cattle to richer grazing land and decrease in overgrazed areas. |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | An economically and culturally sustainable model for the protection of the Day Forest is established by end of project |  |  |  | Preparation of the management plan is planned for the 2nd half of 2012. Discussions were held with local communities. | The community of the Day Forest has adopted a management plan and participate actively in its implementation. Focusing recently on income generating activities have greatly helped in better adherence of communities to the plan. |
| to strengthen national institutional, technical and human capacity at central and local levels. | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | . |  |  |  | The PMU led the constitution of 8 Local Steering Committees in 2011 in each targeted range land area, in addition to 21 Management Committees for the management of water points and related pastures | All committees have been created and are functional. Further more members of the different committees have been trained. (Comité de Pilotage, Comité de gestion Eau, Comité de gestion Pâturage). Women are involved in decision making through these committees, they also manage the financial contribution from the communities given for water access. |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | The SAHP as local plans are adopted in 7 priority areas |  |  |  | The PMU with the Local Steering Committees developed Annual Plans for Hydraulic and Pastoral Development. 7 Plans were finalized in 2011 and one in 2012. | All the 7 SAHP have been adopted and becoming important management tool of the communities |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | A GIS system used by decision makers by end of project |  |  |  | The PMU is presently mapping the 8 targeted rangelands in a scale of 1/200,000, and will establish a GIS unit in Dakka and acquire satellite maps for Dorra. | GIS management tool is not used yet, the activities have been limited to a training in ARCGIS |
|  | Threatened Juniperus procera in Day Forest (total area of 1,800ha) regenerated | Currently only 600 trees are still alive in core area of 675ha, and completely disappeared in remaining areas | Regional coordinators are recruited by the Government by the end of the project |  |  |  | Regional coordinator functions will be evaluated during the project | Regional coordinators are not directly part of the programme, however they collaborate with the PMU team, through signed agreements at the decentralized level. |

RATINGS OF PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DO Rating: Please review the Development Objective Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. A DO rating will be generated based on your answers. | |
| 1 Please rate the cumulative progress being made toward achieving the end-of-project targets as reported in the project results framework in the DO page of this APR/PIR | |
| 2 Please rate the likelihood that the project will deliver environmental and social benefits for an extended period after project completion? | |
| 3 Please rate the likelihood that social or political risks may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes | |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator: Is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.** | |
| MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate. | |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum. | |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. |
| 4. | Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| Overall 2009 Rating |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating | Moderately Satisfactory |
| 2013 Rating | Satisfactory |
| Comments | The PROMES-GDT is the first pilot project that allowed the pastoral community to improve the management of natural resources, to better organize itself and learn how to manage and adapt to climate change effects. In terms of water resources e 317,000 m3 of the revised target of 500.00 were mobilized through the construction and rehabilitation of hydraulic structures on the entire territory. The 25% reduction has been reached. More households have access to water. With regard to Sustainable land management, communities are gradually interested in the activities of Water and Soil Conservation as well as reforestation and putting pasture into rest. New practices have been introduced through the different trainings, study tour to promote sustainable land management. In terms of capacity, more community members, people are better organized and through the different training the capacity has been gradually built. One the important result of this project is also the financial resources more 5.000.000 $ from the world bank to implement a similar programme in different regions of the country. A significant risk will determine the success remains climatic hazards |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer: Is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.** | |
| MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects. | |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum. | |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating, for example, if your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. |
| 4. | Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| Overall 2009 Rating |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| Overall 2012 Rating | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| 2013 Rating | (S) Satisfactory |
| Comments | Because of the following achievements the project is rated satisfactory. I) the setting of three nurseries with a capacity of 80.000 plants per year that provides plants. The day forest nursery produced 20.000 plants These nurseries are managed by the communities with the technical support of the project team. (i) organization and capacity building of the communities structures such as the Local Steering Committee (PLC) and the Committees of Forest Management (CGF), Comité de Gestion de Points d\'Eau , Comité de Paturage; These structures are operational. (iii) training of 200 beneficiaries in conservation techniques of water and soil (bunds, gabions, dry stone thresholds, etc..) Forest exploitation in Day and in Turkey Also a study tour on forest conservation and soil and water conservation techniques in Ethiopia. Through these training activities capacity of the communities and national institutions is gradually being build. (iv) an inventory of dead wood, estimated at about 16,000 m3 of timber The availability of wood is an opportunity for the community to easily generate revenue, reduce grazing pressure on the forest and ensure the normal supply and operation of a wood-craft unit that has been created. (v) the implementation of 6000 plants in Day forest zone vi) treatment and planting at an area of 250 ha in Day Foret zone vii)introduction of income income generating activities by setting an artisanal unit at the Day Forest. The artisanal unit has been equipped and operational. Also measures have taken to introduce beekeeping activities. Communities were trained on wood carving and beekeeping. vii I) A technical assistance mission has help in improving the design of the water catchments, dams and bore holes vii) A expert pastoralist has helped in analyze problems related to pasture land and make recommendations for adaptation and behavior change. viii) Communities members in particular women were sensitized for acceptance of planting trees. At this juncture 200 families accepted planting trees and this is a positive evolution. These encouraging results need to be consolidated through capacity building to ensure sustainability and ownership. In 2013, the project has focused on training, capacity building and the introduction of income generating activities which is of great interest to the communities. The risk associated to the project has because reduced regular involvement of stakeholders whose interest to the project activities increased. However environmental risks namely climate and shortage of rain remains a risk that should be monitored. |
| **Project Implementing Partner: Is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).** | |
| RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for projects under implementation in one country and regional projects. | |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum. | |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| **Project Implementing Partner** | |
| Overall 2009 Rating |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating |  |
| 2013 Rating | (S) Satisfactory |
| Comments | Participative management is an innovative approach of this project and determines the success of the whole program. It is the source of passion and ownership by the people of simple technologies and adaptation practices of Soil Conservation which are success. This is an innovative approach. Through different activities implemented have favored ownership, better organization of communities though the different committees and more awareness and introduction of income generating activities. The major risk factor is climate |
| **GEF Operational Focal point: Is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.** | |
| HIGHLY RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects. | |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum. | |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** | |
| Overall 2009 Rating |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating |  |
| 2013 Rating | (S) Satisfactory |
| Comments | The project rating is satisfactory.The fact that environment protection work have been accepted by the communities is a tangible progress. This will pave for similar projects in other regions. It has already been notice that in other areas where water resources have been mobilized, communities are interested in greening that is planting trees, and development small scale gardens. |
| **Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).** | |
| RECOMMENDED but NOT MANDATORY for jointly implemented projects. | |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum. | |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Provide recommendations for next steps. |
| **Other Partners** | |
| Overall 2009 Rating |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating |  |
| 2013 Rating |  |
| Comments |  |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.** | |
| MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for all projects. | |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum. | |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating (do not repeat the project objective). |
| 2. | Note trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the updated indicators provided in the DO sheet. |
| 3. | Fully explain the critical risks that have affected progress. |
| 4. | Outline action plan to address projects with DO rating of HU, U or MU. |
| **UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser** | |
| Overall 2009 Rating |  |
| Overall 2010 Rating |  |
| Overall 2011 Rating |  |
| Overall 2012 Rating | (MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| 2013 Rating | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| Comments |  |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as 'good practice'. |
| Satisfactory (S) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| IP rating: Please review the Implementation Progress page of this APR/PIR and then answer the questions below. An overall IP rating will be generated based on your answers. | |
| 1 Please rate the progress in delivery of outputs. For example, do the annual outputs represent sufficient progress in order to achieve the project outcomes (see DO page of this APR/PIR)? | |
| 2 Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period are budget resources being spent as planned? (i.e. is project delivery on target?) | |
| 3 Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks managed effectively? | |
| 4 Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issue identified in the APR/PIR last year? | |
| 5 Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation | |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator: Is the person managing the day to day operations of the project.** | |
| MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects where appropriate. | |
| Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum. | |
| 1. | Explain why you gave a specific rating. |
| 2. | Summarize annual progress and address timelines of projec output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans. |
| 3. | Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation. |
| **Overall 2009 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2010 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | Delivery is progressing very well. However UNDP should speed up putting the budget in place at the beginning of the year. of the year. The annual progress towards the outputs is satisfactory and progressing very well. For these reasons the rating is satisfactory. when it comes to trend, it is very positive, however more financial resources must be obtained for the forest component. |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer: Is the UNDP programme officer in the UNDP country office who provides oversight and supervision support to the project.** | |
| **MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.** | |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.** | |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the project manager please explain why.** |
| **2.** | **Summarize annual progress and address timeliness of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.** |
| **3.** | **Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.** |
| **Overall 2009 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2010 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | The rating is satisfactor because of the following acheivements. The trend is positive - Advocacy and sensitization through contact with local authorities in project zones. - Awareness workshop, social communication targeting beneficiaries and setting management committees that undertake surveillance on the sites. - Completion of EIA study - Mapping and demarcation of the different sites with GPS - A decision to extent the project to Arta area - A new Law on MPA has been proposed to the Ministry to set demarcation and propose a new regulation - Frequent visits to the protected areas for regular monitoring - Elaboration of TOR for posing signs, buoys Of the 1.000.000 GEF resources about 775.000 have been delivered. The overall financial delivery is progressing well. |
| **Project Implementing Partner: Is the representative of the executing agency (in GEF terminology). This would be Government (for NEX/NIM execution) or NGO (for CSO Execution) or an official from the Executing Agency (for example UNOPS).** | |
| **RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for projects under implementation in one country or regional projects.** | |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.** | |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating.** |
| **2.** | **Note trends, both positive and negative.** |
| **3.** | **Provide recommendations for next steps.** |
| **Overall 2009 Rating** | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Overall 2010 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | Project overall implementation is satisfactory. The work is the field is progressing in terms of water resource management, community organization and capacity building, water and soil conservation. The trend is positive, however more resources must be mobilized of the forest component. A second phase of the project must elaborated to consolidate what has been achieved and maintain the existing momentum amongst the communities. UNDP should be more flexible when it comes to budgetary allocation. The delivery is satisfactory. |
| **GEF Operational Focal point: Is the government representative in the country designed as the GEF operation focal point.** | |
| **MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for projects under implementation in one country. Not necessary for regional or global projects.** | |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.** | |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating.** |
| **2.** | **Note trends, both positive and negative.** |
| **3.** | **Provide recommendations for next steps.** |
| **Overall 2009 Rating** | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Overall 2010 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** | (S) Satisfactory |
| **Comments** | The implementation is satisfactory since the inception of the project. However it is important to mention that GEF submission and approval of this project has registered significant delay. However the trend is positive. |
| **Other Partners: For jointly implemented projects, a representative of the other Agency working with UNDP on project implementation (for example UNEP or the World Bank).** | |
| **RECOMMENDED but NOT mandatory for jointly implemented projects.** | |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. Please keep word count between 200 words minimum and 500 words maximum.** | |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating.** |
| **2.** | **Note trends, both positive and negative.** |
| **3.** | **Provide recommendations for next steps.** |
| **Overall 2009 Rating** | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Overall 2010 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** |  |
| **2013 Rating** | (-) No rating submitted or requested for this year |
| **Comments** |  |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser: Is the UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser.** | |
| **MANDATORY RATING MUST BE PROVIDED for ALL projects.** | |
| **Please justify your rating and address the following points in your comments. The QORs and delivery data in the ERBM portfolio project monitoring report should inform your rating. Please keep word count between 500 words minimum and 1200 words maximum.** | |
| **1.** | **Explain why you gave a specific rating. If your rating differs from the rating provided by the UNDP Country Office Programme Officer and/or the Project Manager please explain why.** |
| **2.** | **Summarize annual progress and address timelines of project output/activity completion in relation to annual workplans.** |
| **3.** | **Outline the general status of project expenditures in relation to annual budgets, the effectiveness of project management units in guiding project implementation, and the responsiveness of the project board in overseeing project implementation.** |
| **UNDP Technical Adviser** | |
| **Overall 2009 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2010 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2011 Rating** |  |
| **Overall 2012 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **2013 Rating** | (MS) Moderately Satisfactory |
| **Comments** |  |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | **Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.** |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | **Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.** |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | **Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.** |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | **Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.** |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | **Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.** |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | **Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.** |

PROGRESS IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 1- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: to implement measures for surface water harvesting to fill drinking needs of the community and its livestock and to promote a more sustainable use of pastures by increasing the accessibility of pastures** |
| 7.000 households have access to water. The objective of 25% reduction has been reached |
| **Outcome 2- Key Outputs this Reporting Period: to strengthen national institutional, technical and human capacity at central and local levels.** |
| All committees involving beneficiaries have been created and are functional. Further more members of the different committees have been trained. (Comité de Pilotage, Comité de gestion de l\'Eau, Comité de gestion Pâturage). Women are involved in decision making through these committees, they also manage the financial contribution from the communities. PMU has been strengthened with technical assistance from the world bank. Income generating activities empowering beneficiaries been introduced. |

Adjustments

Adjustments to Project Milestones, Project Strategy and Risk Management.

Key Project Milestones

Have significant delays occurred in the project start, inception workshop, Mid-term Review, Terminal Evaluation or project duration?

Yes

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

Yes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key project milestone** | **Scope of delay (in months)** | **Briefly describe change or reason for change** | **Briefly describe the implications or consequences this has had on project implementation** |
| Project Start (i.e. project document signature date) | 1 | To confirm the 2012 PIR: Although the GEF component of the project was submitted to GEF in January 2009, several rounds of comments between GEF and UNDP delayed its approval more than two years. GEF financing was eventually approved through CEO Approval in May 2011 and the related PRODOC was signed in July 2011 - rated as 1 month of delay. | The 1-mth delay had no effects - however the previous delay in formulation and approval led to significant disruptions and misalignment with activities funded by other donors. Technical assistance required by the project on the GEF financing could not be mobilized within the time required. Other donors have almost exhausted their resources. Some of the initial activities to be funded with GEF resources were funded with AFD resources, etc. |
| Inception Workshop |  | To confirm the 2012 PIR: An inception workshop was held on 2-3 November 2011 with representatives of national institutions from the central and regional levels working with PROMES-GDT. Four months after PRODOC signature this seems a timely achievement, no delay here. The GEF component of the project then started in November 2011 and included also the regional office of the UNDP / GEF, UNDP office in Djibouti, IFAD and the PMU. But it could not correct the prior cumulated delay. | The start up mission helped harmonise planning and implementation of GEF funding with the ongoing activities of PROMES-GDT. |
| Mid-term Review | 12 | A joint mission comprised of the government and IFAD (the largest donor) undertook a review of the overall project between 14-26 May 2012. UNDP with FFEM and WFP participated in the review and field mission, and contributed to its conclusions. The objective of the review was: (i) to evaluate the operational aspects, such as management PROMES-GDT and implementation of activities and the degree of achievement of development objectives, (ii) propose corrective actions needed to achieve the expected impact. An independent UNDP-GEF MTR was foreseen for the end of 2012 to complement this review. It has now been postponed because suitable consultants were not available until 2014. | The delay in the conduct of the MTR in 2012-2013 represents a missed opportujnity to sort out the misalignment between donor activities/resourcing, seek solutions for the gradual closures of partner projects, and readjust technical shortcomings (Day Forest action); but also for the development of the new World Bank project in the same field. Also the results were expected for the present 2013 PIR, which is not now possible. |
| Terminal Evaluation |  | TE as planned to be concluded by 30 June 2015 | N/A |
| Project Duration (i.e. project extension) |  | Project closure as planned by 31 December 2014 | N/A |

Adjustments to Project Strategy

Has the project made any changes to its strategy (i.e. logframe/results framework) since the Project Document was signed?

No

If yes, were these changes reported in a previous APR/PIR?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Made to** | **Yes/No** | **Briefly describe the change and the reason for that change** |
| Project Objective | No |  |
| Project Outcomes | No | <strong> </strong> |
| Project Outputs/Activities | No |  |

Risk Management

List number of critical risks as noted in the ATLAS risk log and briefly describe actions undertaken this reporting period to address each critical risk.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **# of Critical Risks (type/description)** | **Risk management measures undertaken this reporting period** |
| Environmental | Recurrent drought through the country is a risk that could be an obstacle to the achievement of project objectives. Climate has been monitored for triggering correctives measures to lessen the impact of drought on population. The project has envisaged to store reserves of fodder for livestock during drought. In some instances donors like FAO provided. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Adjustments general comments:

There is a need to monitor the climate situation as the project impact is heavily influenced by rainfalls.

Finance: cumulative from project start to June 30 2013

DISBURSEMENT OF GEF GRANT FUNDS

How much of the total GEF grant as noted in Project Document plus any project preparation grant has been spent so far? (e.g. PPG + MSP or FSP amount. Do not break down by PPG or project budget.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated cumulative total disbursement as of 30 June 2013. (i.e.CDR information up to 20 June 2013) | 830000.00 |
| Add any comments on GEF Grant Funds |  |

DISBURSEMENT OF CO-FINANCING

How much of the total Co-financing as noted in Project Document has been spent so far? Co-financing is the amount committed in the project document for which co-financing letters are available

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated cumulative total co-financing disbursed as of 30 June this year. Please breakdown by donor. | 8583000.00 |
| Add any comments on co-financing including other types and amounts of additional co-financing such as in-kind, private sector, grants, credits and loans. | Agence Française de Développement IFAD ADB World Bank WFP UNDP Government of Djibouti GEF |

ADDITIONAL LEVERAGED RESOURCES

These additional resources can be from the same donors or new donors.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated cumulative leveraged resources as of 30 June 2013 | 8119000.00 |
| Add any comments on Leveraged Resources. | The World Bank through the PRODERMO project has committed $ 5.800.000 to similar project focusing on water resources catchement in other regions. IFAD has almost doubled its contribution through another grant of $ 3.000.000 since the start of the project. |

Other Financial Instruments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Does the project provide funds to other Financial Instruments? | N |
| If yes, please discuss developments that occurred this reporting period only. |  |

Communications and KM

Tell the Story of Your Project and What has been Achieved this Reporting Period

The combination of work on soil conversation , forest management and rain water catchment is genuine response to people needs. By making water available, and providing training on water hygiene, and introducing income generating activities the living conditions of the people get improved. The most important achievements remains the capacity the programme built withing the communities and the introduction of the income generating activities that will be the source of revenues for the population

Adaptive Management this Reporting Period

PMU has been strengthened. It has now the technical staff to carry the activities of the project. Gender dimension has been integrated to the programme now. However there is work to be done to the establishment of an internal monitoring system

Lessons Learned

The issue of income generating activities has paved way for better adherence of the communities to the project objectives. This has created more committed and better acceptance of the population on relaxing pasture land, undertaking water and soil conversation activities and planting. Without the income generating component there would be no sustainability. Experience gained by communities are replicated in other areas. (production de plants en pépinière, eau et sols, et reforestation)

PARTNERSHIPS

Civil Society Organisations/NGOs

The work with the civil society is progressing very well. Lots have gained by the communities through the work of different committees that have been created. Moreover we have a growing interest of the communities to the water and soil conservation activities.

Indigenous Peoples

N/A

Private Sector

N/A

GEF Small Grants Programme

N/A

Other Partners

IFAD and AFD , UNDP

PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY

Has a gender or social needs assessment been carried out?

No

If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what where the findings?

Does this project specifically target women or girls as direct beneficiaries?

No

Have there been any changes in specifically targeting women or girls as direct beneficiaries this reporting period?

No

If yes, please explain:

Please discuss any of the points above further or provide any other information on the project's work on gender equality undertaken this reporting period

Some points to consider: impact of project on daily workload of women, # of jobs created for women, impact of project on time spent by women in household activities, impact of project on primary school enrolment for girls/boys, increase in women's income etc. Be as specific as possible and provide real numbers (e.g. 100 women farmers participating in sustainable livelihoods programme).

.

ENVIRONMENTAL OR SOCIAL GRIEVANCE

What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?

What is the current status of the grievance?

How would you rate the significance of the grievance?

Please describe the on-going or resolved grievance noting who was involved, what action was taken to resolve the grievance, how much time it took, and what you learned from managing the grievance process (maximum 500 words). If more than one grievance was addressed this reporting period, please explain the other grievance (s) here: