



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.



**FINAL REPORT**

**of the**

**Terminal Evaluation of the Niger COGERAT project**

**PIMS 2294**

**Sustainable Co-Management of the Natural Resources of the**  
**Air-Ténéré Complex**

*Co- gestion des Ressources de l'Air et du Ténéré*

***Evaluation Team:***

***Juliette BIAO KOUDENOUKPO, Team Leader, International Consultant***

***Pierre NIGNON, National Consultant***

**Draft Completed in July 2013**

Original in FR + EN Translation reviewed and 'UNDP-GEF-streamlined' on 16 Dec 2014

## STREAMLINING

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Sustainable Co-Management of the Natural Resources of the Air-Ténéré Complex (COGERAT)<sup>1</sup></b>
----------------------	---

GEF Project ID PIMS #	2380		Concept Paper/PDF B proposal (PIF-equivalent)	13-Nov-2003
UNDP-GEF PIMS #	2294		CEO Endorsement Date	14-Jun-2006
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID:	NER10 / 00044111 / 00051709		PRODOC Signature Date	22-Aug-2006
Country(ies):	Niger		Date project manager hired:	No info.
Region:	Africa		Inception Workshop date:	No info.
Focal Area:	Land Degradation / Multiple		Planned planed closing date:	Aug-2012
Trust Fund [indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]	GEF Trust Fund		If revised, proposed op. closing date:	Aug-2013
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective	OP15 (Land Degradation / Sustainable Land Management – of GEF3)		Actual operational closing date ( <i>given TE harmonisation and mgt response finalisation</i> )	31-Dec-2014

Exec. Agent / Implementing Partner:	Ministry in charge of the environment portfolio <sup>2</sup>
Other Partners:	Decentralised authorities, particularly Communes and local communities, users of the Reserve, occupational groups and NGOs, Land Commissions, traditional chiefs, other opinion leaders, the Regional Governorate and decentralised technical services. In addition, there is the Ministry for Water and the Environment (MH/E) (providing the institutional basis of the project), UNDP as the Implementing Agency for the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the Technical and Financial partners, the Steering Committee, the Partners' Forum, the management unit and operational units of COGERAT, the office of the Air and Ténéré Nature Reserve, and the Scientific Committee.

<b>Project financing</b>	<u>at CEO endorsement stage (Million US\$)</u>	<u>at project end (Million US\$)*</u>
[1] GEF financing (FSP + PDFB/PPG): <sup>3</sup>	4.232	4.232
[2] UNDP contribution:	0.060	0.956
[3] Government:	0.500	0.727
[4] Other partners:	4.808	2.156
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3+ 4]:	5.368	3.839
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5]	9.600	8.071

<sup>1</sup> At pipeline entry stage, the title was " Co-Management of Resources in the Air and Ténéré National Nature Reserve and adjacent areas (COGERAT)". In French, the title is "Co- gestion des Ressources de l'Air et du Ténéré". In the process of streamlining the report, we added the correct title in English.

<sup>2</sup> Currently (2014): Ministère de l'Environnement, de la Salubrité Urbaine et du Développement Durable. In July 2013: Ministère de l'Hydraulique et l'Environnement (MHE).

<sup>3</sup> PDF/PPG \$232,000 ; GEF Grant \$4,000,000 ; Total Grant (=PDF/PPG + GEF Grant) \$4,232,000.

<b>1 Suivi et évaluation</b>	<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>Notation / Rating</b>
Conception du suivi et de l'évaluation à l'approbation initiale	M&E design at pipeline entry	MU
Mise en œuvre du plan de suivi et d'évaluation	M&E Plan Implementation	MS
Qualité globale du suivi et de l'évaluation	Overall quality of M&E	MS
<b>2 Agence FEM et partenaire de mis en oeuvre</b>	<b>2. GEF Agency and Implementing Partner (IP)</b>	<b>Notation / Rating</b>
Qualité de la supervision du PNUD	Quality of UNDP oversight	N/A*
Qualité de l'exécution par le partenaire de mis en oeuvre	Quality of implementation by the (IP)	N/A*
Qualité globale de la supervision et mise en œuvre	Overall quality of oversight and implementation	HS*
<b>3 Évaluation des résultats</b>	<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<b>Notation / Rating</b>
Pertinence	Relevance	R
Efficacité	Effectiveness	S
Efficience	Efficiency	MS
Note globale de la réalisation du projet	Overall Project Outcome Rating	S*
<b>4 Durabilité</b>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<b>Notation / Rating</b>
Ressources financières :	Financial resources:	L
Socioéconomique:	Socio-economic:	U
Cadre institutionnel et gouvernance :	Institutional framework and governance:	L
Environnemental :	Environmental :	MU
Probabilité globale de la durabilité :	Overall likelihood of sustainability:	ML

\* Note: TE is somewhat ambiguous in its ratings. We believe it is a translation problem. In the summary it says "Overall quality of implementation/execution of the project = 6/6", which would be a HS rating, but right above it says "Activities by the executive and implementing agencies : S (Satisfactory)". The same applies to the overall assessment of outcomes. It says "Overall quality of project outcomes = 4/6", meaning MS, but right above it says "Outcomes : S (Satisfactory)". We retain the latter in light of the positive aspects highlighted for other ratings.

<b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</b>	<b>Sustainability ratings:</b>	<b>Relevance ratings</b>
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
		<b>Impact Ratings:</b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

## Table of Contents

<b>STREAMLINING.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PREAMBLE.....</b>	<b>6</b>
i. Introduction.....	6
ii. Summary.....	7
iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations .....	16
<b>MAIN REPORT .....</b>	<b>18</b>
1. Introduction.....	19
1.1 Objectives of the final evaluation .....	19
1.2 Scope and methodology .....	19
2. Description and development context of project .....	20
2.1 Project start and duration of project.....	20
2.2 Problems that the project sought to address .....	20
2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project.....	21
2.4 Baseline indicators established at the design stage and during implementation .....	22
2.5 Main stakeholders .....	22
2.6 Expected Outcomes.....	22
3. Findings.....	23
3.1 Project Design/Formulation .....	23
3.1.1 Analysis of Logframe/Results Framework (Project logic/strategy; Indicators).....	23
3.1.2 Assumptions and risks .....	24
3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. in the same focal area) incorporated into project design .....	24
3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation .....	24
3.1.5 Approach to Replication .....	27
3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage .....	28
3.1.7 Linkages between the project and other interventions in the sector .....	28

3.1.8 Management Arrangements .....	29
3.2 Project implementation .....	29
3.2.1 Adaptive management (changes made in the design and outcomes of the project during its implementation) .....	29
3.2.2 Partnership agreements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/Region) .....	30
3.2.3 Feedback from the monitoring and evaluation activities used for adaptive management .....	30
3.2.4 Project Finance (in USD) .....	31
3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation .....	33
3.3 Project Results .....	34
4. Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons .....	41
4.1 Recommendations .....	41
4.2 Corrective action for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project .....	42
4.3 Action to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project .....	42
4.4 Proposals for future directions underlining the main objectives .....	42
4.5 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success .....	43
4.6 Lessons learned .....	43
<b>ANNEXES .....</b>	<b>45</b>
Annex 1: Terms of reference for the final evaluation of COGERAT .....	46
Annex 2: Itinerary of COGERAT final evaluation mission .....	58
Annex 3: List of people met .....	59
Annex 4: Summary of field visit .....	63
Annex 5: List of documents consulted .....	64
Annex 6: Matrix of Evaluation Questions .....	65
Annex 7: Questionnaire used and results .....	67
Annex 8: Agreement Form .....	69
Annex 9: Operationalising the intervention logic of COGERAT-II: 08/02/2007 .....	70

# PREAMBLE

## i. Introduction

The project on ‘Co- Management of Natural Resources of Aïr and Ténéré – COGERAT’ is part of the Accelerated Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (ADPRS), in its focus on environment and sustainable development. This project relates in particular to the sections dealing with the fight against land degradation and the promotion of sustainable management of biodiversity, contained in programme 3 on country support. A key priority is capacity building in terms of environmental protection, sustainable management of natural resources and food security.

By committing themselves to the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), developing countries such as Niger have undertaken to ‘maintain a sound economy, tackle their own development and meet the human and social needs of their people’. Niger faces a major challenge in achieving the Millennium Development Goals, particularly in relation to MDG7 on the environment, given the extreme degradation of its natural resources (deforestation, desert encroachment)<sup>4</sup>. Controlling, or even reversing, the process of degradation of natural resources is central to ensuring the survival of the people of Niger, given that their growth rate was put at 3.3% in the same report on Sustainable Human Development. It is, therefore, very opportune that the Government of Niger should give priority to development of the rural sector as a means of promoting vigorous economic growth, food security and increased personal income.

The decision by the Government of Niger to make environmental management one of its major priorities led to the mobilisation of funding through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), under the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to implement the Project for the Co-Management of the Natural Resources of Aïr-Ténéré (COGERAT), following the signing of agreements on 22 August 2006. This funding comes under the GEF Operational Programme on ‘Sustainable Land Management’. The project should help reverse the process of degradation of natural resources and in particular restore the biodiversity of the Aïr Ténéré National Nature Reserve, by making local inhabitants feel responsible. More specifically the ultimate aim of the project is ownership and sustainability of achievements, rehabilitation of degraded land and responsible partnership between Communes and the State to allow for sustainable management of natural resources in the Aïr-Ténéré nature reserve.

The COGERAT PIMS 2294 project was launched in August 2006 and was planned to last six (6) years. It is now coming to an end and, in its current phase, must undergo a final evaluation, as required by the donor and in accordance with the principles of participatory democracy and aid effectiveness, and the need for transparency and responsibility. This final evaluation offers the opportunity to assess the achievement of the project objectives and stimulates ideas for new initiatives to be pursued with a view to consolidating and making the most of the achievements and acting on lessons learned.

The period set for the final evaluation of the project is 12 July to 6 August 2013, when the final report is to be submitted to UNDP.

---

<sup>4</sup> United Nations (2004). Fifth National Report on Human Development in Niger.

## ii. Summary

The COGERAT project is centred on the Agadez Region and covers the land in the Air-Ténéré complex which makes up the Air and Ténéré National Nature Reserve (ATNNR) and its adjacent areas (the Municipalities of Iférouane, Gougaram, Tabelot and Timia). This is an area of 20,000,000 hectares farmed by 10,000 permanent inhabitants, 4,000 agri-pastoralists and 18,000 transhumant herders. The project is part of the GEF Operational/Strategic programme, specifically i) Sustainable Land Management, Capacity Building, and ii) Operational Programme 15 (OP 15- Sustainable Land Management).

The project is implemented by a range of different stakeholders whose level of responsibility varies from that of central administration down to community level. The main stakeholders are the local communities at the project sites: Timia (Zomo, Etagay, Egalagh, Ajirou, Tewat, Naballow, Mari, Tchiromosquée, Tassalwat, Essalel), Iférouane (Egagar Faoudet, Ibdéram Tadeck, Afes, Tefes), Gougaram (Teznet, Tchinmazele), Tabelot (Egagar Aghatir, Atakaki, Abardak). These communities are supported by the decentralised regional and municipal authorities, chiefly the Directorate for Research and Programming (DEP/MHE), the Directorate for Fauna, Hunting and Protected Areas (DFC/AP/MHE), the Directorate for Forest Management, Reforestation and Land Restoration (DAF/R/RT/MHE), the Regional Directorate for the Environment in Agadez, the Regional Directorate for Agriculture in Agadez, the Regional Directorate for Livestock in Agadez, the Regional Directorate for the Plan, the Directorate for Rural Development, the Directorate for Land Management and Community Development in Agadez, the Departmental Land Commissions (COFODEP) of Arlit and Tchirozérine, the Commune Land Commissions (COFOCOM) of Gougaram, Iférouane, Tabelot and Timia and the Niger National Institute for Agronomic Research (INRAN). At the central level, the Ministry for Water and the Environment is in charge of implementation of the project whilst Governmental coordination is in the hands of the Ministry for Planning, Land Management and Community Development.

The team responsible for this final project evaluation is made up of two Consultants (one International Consultant, the Team Leader, and one National Consultant).

## Acknowledgements

The Team of Consultants would like to express their sincere thanks to all those who in one way or another have helped ensure that this mission to produce a final evaluation of COGERAT was conducted effectively and efficiently. Special thanks go to the Resident Representative of the United Nations Development Programme - Niger, the in-country Coordinator for the United Nations and his team who spared no effort to ensure the final evaluation went smoothly. We should also like to extend our gratitude to the Director General for the Environment, Water and Forests, and his team at Central, Regional and Departmental levels for their unfailing support for our work. We are grateful to all the Agadez Region political, administrative and technical agencies, particularly the Governor of the Region, the Prefect for Iférouane and the Mayors of the Communes of Gougaram, Iférouane, Tabelot and Timia. Thanks also go to the inhabitants of the places visited, in particular those of the Commune of Iférouane, for their hospitality and ready availability. Finally, we would like to record our deep gratitude to the COGERAT management team and their Technical and Financial partners for the outstanding part they played in organising the field visit.

## Summary project table: Forecasts

<p><b>Programme period:</b> 2004-2007</p> <p><b>Programme Component :</b> Energy and Environment</p> <p><b>Project title :</b> Co-management of the Natural Resources of Air-Ténéré (COGERAT)</p> <p><b>Project ID :</b> PIMS 2294</p> <p><b>Duration of project :</b> Six (6) years</p> <p><b>Arrangements for Implementation :</b> National Government</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="2">FUNDING (USD)</th></tr> <tr> <th colspan="2">GEF FUNDING</th></tr> <tr> <td>Budget Total</td><td>9,367,734 USD</td></tr> <tr> <td><i>Planned resources</i></td><td>9,367,734 USD</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> </td></tr> <tr> <td>GEF</td><td>4,000,000 USD</td></tr> <tr> <td>Government</td><td>500,000 US \$</td></tr> <tr> <td>Bilateral</td><td>1,706,000 USD</td></tr> <tr> <td>UNDP</td><td>60,000 USD</td></tr> <tr> <td>Communes/Region</td><td>1,641,734 USD</td></tr> <tr> <td>NGOs</td><td>1,460,000 USD</td></tr> </table> <p><small>*For details on co-financing refer to finance section of project document</small></p>	FUNDING (USD)		GEF FUNDING		Budget Total	9,367,734 USD	<i>Planned resources</i>	9,367,734 USD			GEF	4,000,000 USD	Government	500,000 US \$	Bilateral	1,706,000 USD	UNDP	60,000 USD	Communes/Region	1,641,734 USD	NGOs	1,460,000 USD
FUNDING (USD)																							
GEF FUNDING																							
Budget Total	9,367,734 USD																						
<i>Planned resources</i>	9,367,734 USD																						
GEF	4,000,000 USD																						
Government	500,000 US \$																						
Bilateral	1,706,000 USD																						
UNDP	60,000 USD																						
Communes/Region	1,641,734 USD																						
NGOs	1,460,000 USD																						

## Project Description

As its name indicates, the COGERAT project involves participatory management of the natural resources of Air Ténéré. The underlying idea is to achieve sustainable management and conservation of biodiversity in the reserve by providing for viable economic alternatives and sustainable social impacts for local inhabitants. Development strategies which are compatible with the biodiversity conservation objectives of the reserve should considerably reduce pressure on the protected area. While the precursors of COGERAT, namely the Air Ténéré project and the Project to Support the Management of Natural Resources (PAGRANAT), shared the same objectives, COGERAT works within the very specific context of decentralisation and involves empowerment and clear institutional capacity to ensure effective and sustainable joint management of the resources of the reserve to the benefit of local people. It must be added that the implementation of COGERAT has been affected by periods of insecurity as a result of the armed uprising in 2007-2009, which had a grave impact on the performance of the project and also posed a challenge to the smooth management of the Air – Ténéré reserve.

- Each aspect of the evaluation of project performance was categorised according to the key evaluation criteria in the directives on final project evaluations of GEF funded projects supported by UNDP (monitoring and evaluation, implementation by the agency responsible, outcomes, sustainability and impact). The mission then analysed and commented on these aspects and, following both the GEF ToR and the guidelines for evaluation, proposed the following qualitative ratings of performance :



**Table showing Ratings (See P.53 of the ToR)**

<b>Rating of project performance</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<b>1. Monitoring and evaluation S (Satisfactory)</b>		
Overall quality of monitoring and evaluation	4/6	<p>Notable progress recorded in the implementation of the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the project in terms of monitoring and evaluation. This refers in particular to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Specifying and integrating missing data in the project logframe and other reference documents</li> <li>- Adaptation of indicators</li> <li>- Decentralisation of collection of piezometric and climatic data.</li> </ul> <p>However, more work needs to be done in terms of defining specific, objectively verifiable indicators relating to the sustainable management of the environment.</p>
Implementation of monitoring and evaluation at start of project	3/6	Further work was needed to operationalise the monitoring and evaluation plan, already in existence when the project was launched, and adapt it more closely to current circumstances.
Implementation of the monitoring-evaluation plan	4/6	Considerable efforts were made after the Mid-Term Evaluation of the project. Further work is needed to make more of and upgrade the information generated by the system in place
<b>Activities by the executive and implementing agencies : S (Satisfactory)</b>		
Overall quality of implementation/execution of the project	6/6	All stakeholders met by the mission agreed on the high quality of activities undertaken by COGERAT
Execution by the management agency	N/A	
Execution by the executing agency	N/A	
<b>Outcomes : S (Satisfactory)</b>		

Criteria	Rating	Remarks
Overall quality of project outcomes	4/6	Good outcomes were achieved in terms of rural eco-development, capacity building in areas adjacent to the Air – Ténéré nature reserve and implementation of tools for the decentralised management of natural resources. However, much remains to be done in terms of the protection and conservation of the ATNNR, the basic <i>raison d'être</i> for COGERAT. No impact evaluation has been carried out of the few minor activities undertaken in terms of ATNNR protection. In addition, there is no data for assessing the degree to which pressure has been reduced on the ATNNR as a result of action taken to protect and restore land in the areas adjacent to the reserve.
Relevance : relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	2/2	All the activities undertaken are targeted directly at the achievement of the results expected in the areas adjacent to the ATNNR.
Effectiveness	5/6	Immediate results were achieved through the construction of specific preventive works and projects to restore land. For example, in some places infiltration weirs have led to a rise in the water table in pastoral and productive wells. The building of protective dykes has reduced the undermining of kori banks and has protected houses and cultivated plots.
Efficiency	4/ 6	External factors, specifically the armed uprising and subsequent insecurity, caused a delay and considerable extra expense (car hire) in the implementation of the project.
<b>Sustainability : P (Probable)</b>		

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Overall probability of the risks to sustainability	<b>3/4</b>	In terms of risks, financial resources pose a major challenge in comparison with other potential risks, which are deemed minor.
Financial resources	<b>4/4</b>	This is one of the major risks to sustainability of activities implemented under COGERAT.
Socio-economic	<b>1/4</b>	This is a minor risk in the sense that the project has adopted an overall approach which takes into account the improvement in living conditions of local inhabitants.
Institutional framework and governance	<b>4/4</b>	Lack of financial resources and weak institutional and governance capacity are among the major risks affecting the sustainability of activities implemented under COGERAT
Environmental	<b>2/4</b>	Achievement of the expected results will no doubt have a positive impact on the condition of natural resources in the ATNNR. Conversely, if the anticipated results are not achieved, the situation would worsen and could even become irreversible in terms of the degradation of ATNNR resources.
<b>Impact : M (Minimal)</b>		
Improvement in the state of the environment	<b>2/3</b>	The structures set up by the project have worked well and produced effects in the valleys in terms of plant cover. Monitoring missions were undertaken with the support of the project but were not sufficient because the agencies in charge of monitoring did not have the necessary resources and the ATNNR area is so large. The impact of the action taken on the condition of the resources in the ATNNR is hard to discern, which has made it not only necessary but indispensable to step up action

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
		to protect, upgrade and conserve ATNNR resources if impact is to be more significant.
Reduction of stress on the environment	<b>1/3</b>	Protective action in the ATNNR is still on too small a scale to make an effective contribution to the smooth management of natural resources
Progress towards stress/status change	<b>1/3</b>	Progress is being made in the conservation of natural resources but this is still on a very modest scale.
Overall results of project	<b>2/4</b>	Better results could have been achieved if stakeholders had been more environmentally aware.

### **Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons**

COGERAT is a model of joint, inclusive and decentralised management of natural resources in partnership with the communities and local inhabitants in the ATNNR. Within the framework of the implementation of the co-management agreement signed between the State and the Communes, each of the parties has made significant efforts to respect the commitments undertaken (bearing in mind the means available), in spite of the insecurity caused by the uprising. The committee set up to steer and monitor the implementation of the agreement on the joint management of ATNNR resources has been able to function. The level of participation in cash and kind on the part of the Communes was unprecedented in comparison with past attempts at joint management of natural resources in West Africa. During the first three years of the project, the Communes contributed 108,825 \$ US, that is about 54,000,000 CFA francs in cash, to which should be added several contributions in kind and services such as rental of vehicles at favourable rates, granted exclusively to COGERAT by agencies and business operators (25,000 CFA francs/day as opposed to 40 to 50,000 for other projects and programmes). Every year the Communes include a line for the co-financing of COGERAT activities in their budget after deliberation of their governing bodies. Once the AWP of the project has been approved by the Steering Committee, discussions are opened with each Commune with a view to setting up operational agreements on each activity requiring its financial contribution. This contribution is paid directly to UNDP which then pays it into the project account. The procedure is deemed fully transparent by stakeholders. A charter for eco-tourism within the ATNNR has been drawn up and signed. This charter is now influencing the ongoing process of drawing up a code on eco-tourism in Niger.

In addition, COGERAT has played a key, catalytic role in the search for synergy between stakeholders (projects, programmes, technical services), in attempts to draw up and implement local development plans in a coherent way and improve coordination between different interventions at the Regional level. Furthermore, the process of co-management has given rise to the innovative idea of implementing a joint structure for the Communes to manage natural resources in the ATNNR. This admirable idea will make it possible to share thoughts on the future of the ATNNR and on possible workable strategies for conservation and development; at the same time these inter-Commune arrangements will make it possible to pool the efforts of the 4 Communes to mobilise the essential funds needed for the substantial investment required.

The Regional Council, which was set up after COGERAT II was launched, is a relevant agency in terms of strengthening inter-Commune arrangements. This Regional Council will play a key role in i) advocating for the mobilisation of resources, particularly the transfer of funds from the State to the Communes (as Regional councils will receive licence fees from now on), ii) coordination and development of synergies, iii) drawing up and implementation of land management schemes (an indispensable tool for clarifying the status of different resources, as the edges of the reserve are threatened by the expansion of cultivated plots and this could serve to bolster its conservation status and protect it from these external risks).

Significant results have been achieved in terms of food supply for both humans and livestock. Cereal banks set up in the different localities sell sacks of millet at between 13 and 25,000 CFA francs when it costs 30-32,000 CFA francs on the market, thus protecting the essentially pastoral people from losing the capital value of their source of income (livestock) because of food needs. This constitutes an indirect source of income for cooperatives. However, **we have yet to see the impact of the establishment of these banks on food security for the most vulnerable segments of the population.** Likewise, the impact of protective works and soil restoration on the pressure on the ATNNR remains to be seen.

The operation to erect stone barriers through ‘food for work’ has led to a drop in sales of animals on local markets by beneficiary groups and this has reduced the number of households who sell their livestock and thereby their capital to buy food, and has helped secure their source of income.

In terms of income-generating activities, COGERAT has created opportunities through:

- ✓ Intensive Use of Manual Labour to restore land, paid for by cash for work
- ✓ Intensive Use of Manual Labour to create firebreaks, paid for by cash for work
- ✓ Intensive Use of Manual Labour to restore land, paid for by food for work
- ✓ Creation of cereal banks and banks for cattle feed which allowed access to cereals
- ✓ Implementation of works to recharge the water table

These activities have enabled local communities to stay put through the creation of temporary jobs (reducing rural out-migration), made the terms of the cattle-cereal and cattle-cattle feed trade favourable to agri-pastoralists through sales at moderate prices, improved pastoral production (through the restoration and re seeding of marginal land which has increased fodder production), improved agricultural output by recharging the water table and introducing local self-management (implemented by the different partners). These activities to protect and restore land are estimated to produce medium and long term environmental impacts which are worth assessing.

By way of illustration, land restoration activities have created employment for about **350 young people every year for a period of 6 months, at a cost of about 60,000 CFA francs per month. This has made it possible to make a real dent in rural out-migration and contribute to social stability and the reduction of juvenile delinquency.** Impact studies could provide more specific data on this.

At the technical level, there is an effective transfer of the skills involved in protecting and restoring land and all stakeholders demonstrate ownership of project activities. Although these activities, which are relevant in an area which is primarily devoted to livestock and other farming, make an effective difference to the wellbeing of the people, the environmental awareness of stakeholders, especially local inhabitants, is not sufficient for them to make a connection with conservation of the ATNNR, which remains the end aim of COGERAT. Indeed, this lack of environmental awareness has led to modest initiatives to develop ATNNR to the benefit of local people. It then becomes a considerable challenge – and one that must be tackled within

a very short time frame- to make people understand the importance of protecting, conserving and improving the ATNNR. It is not only environmental awareness but the **visibility of UNDP and GEF which have to be built up in the field. UNDP support has not covered any of the communication activities about COGERAT, despite this being a beacon project which should place UNDP in a good position as a leader in the fight against desertification.**

**At the financial level,** the mobilisation of co-finance by the Government and UNDP was exceptional, with respective rates of mobilisation of 145.41% and 1592.89%. Real progress has been made in the mobilisation of co-financing in relation to the situation portrayed in the Mid-Term Evaluation. The level of mobilisation of co-finance in comparison with forecasts in the project document is 71.52%. It should also be noted that co-finance in kind represents about 50 % of the total co-finance mobilised, due to the fact that the project built up a relationship with partners involved in the field of food security, particularly WFP and ICRC. In addition, after 2010 the philosophy of food for work was again accepted by the Government.

In terms of preventing conflict over the management of natural resources, work remains to be done to activate the Land Commissions, which were set up to strengthen the smooth management of the ATNNR. In addition, greater attention to the gender dimension would make it possible to reduce inequalities and promote the involvement of women in decision-making bodies in a cultural context which is favourable to the emergence of women.

**The need to consolidate the advances listed above and the admirable but still fragile initiatives to build up co-management and collaboration between Communes necessitates a third phase of COGERAT, to last 5 years.** During this 5 year period, it will be important to:

- Clearly separate the protection and conservation dimension in the ATNNR from the rural eco-development dimension, and on this basis develop a coherent strategy for improving the ATNNR. There must be coherence between the two dimensions. In addition, apart from the emphasis on biological diversity, this strategy must also take into account the immense archaeological, prehistoric, historical and cultural wealth of the ATNNR;
- Introduce wide-ranging measures to ensure steps taken to manage banks and water are effective;
- Plan a separate component entirely devoted to the Information - Education - Communication of the wider public, particularly schoolchildren. **Publicity campaigns should be programmed to take place as early as possible so that the UNDP Office of Communications can showcase the advances made by COGERAT. This Office should highlight the wealth of COGERAT documentation on the UNDP website.**
- Give greater priority to gender issues, in the first place by recruiting female staff to support the project management team at the Commune level. An appropriate strategy must be drawn up;
- Accelerate the process now under way to transfer the ATNNR conservation unit to within the ATNNR;
- Boost the mobilisation of financial resources by promoting advocacy to the State, the international community and mining companies to ensure they are fully involved in Commune investment plans. **Here too, the UNDP Office of Communications should lend its voice to strengthen advocacy for a third phase of COGERAT.**

- Build up the capacity of the emerging inter-Commune structure by providing a mechanism and the bodies needed to implement the joint project to conserve the ATNNR in a manner which is effective, transparent and fair. Stakeholders should perceive this project as necessarily freeing up positive externalities for all Commune institutions, with its focus on sharing costs, finance, risks and benefits.

**Until this 3rd phase is fully launched, practical measures should be taken to set up a one (1) year transition period with a scaled-down team from the management unit overseeing day to day management of the project while helping prepare the new phase. COGERAT III could be prepared for, amongst other things, by carrying out impact studies and vulnerability surveys. The aim of this transition is both to ensure we maintain the knowledge base necessary for a smooth launch of COGERAT III and to restore the confidence of potential donors in terms of security. To achieve this, the Government of Niger and UNDP must jointly commit to provide the substantial budgetary allocations as soon as possible in order to allow for this transition.**

The main lessons learned from the implementation of COGERAT are as follows:

- Participatory management of the natural resources of the ATNNR is a long term project which calls for ongoing and repeated dialogue and major financial resources on the part of all involved.
- Given the background of post uprising recovery and the number of young people and amount of poverty in the Communes involved, the latter cannot be expected to make a major financial contribution, bearing in mind they already face a series of requests to meet the countless other emergencies experienced by local people. This means there is an urgent need to keep on the project team who will have the job of finalising the project document for phase III and mobilising resources from partners such as WFP and ICIR to continue activities in the field.
- Addressing the gender dimension means dealing with the question of inequality between men and women, acknowledging this and seeking to reduce it by taking strategic action while meeting the specific needs of men and women. Involving women and young people in the activities of the COGERAT project does not automatically tackle the gender issue. They have to be given greater opportunities to take part in the decision- making process.
- Raising environmental awareness does not happen overnight. But it is an essential process if we are to ensure sustainable management of the ATNNR resources.
- Promoting action to protect the environment presents a major challenge in contexts where the local people are as poor and vulnerable as they are in this region. In this scenario there is a strong temptation to prioritise steps to promote development.
- Interests, roles and responsibilities must be clarified before there can be real coordination of and synergy between the activities of partners.

### iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

APR	Annual Project Report
ATNNR	Aïr and Ténéré National Nature Reserve
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BAB	Cattle feed bank
BC	Cereal Bank
CDP	Community Development Plan
CERK	Cooperative of Users of the Natural Resources of Koutous
CES/DRS	Conservation of Ground Water,/Protection and Restoration of Land
COFO	Land Commission
COFOCOM	Commune Land Commission
COFODEP	Departmental Land Commission
COGERAT	Co- Management of the Aïr – Ténéré Reserve
CPD	Country Programme Document
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DAP/R/RT	Directorate for Forest Management, Reforestation and Land Restoration
DBMS	Data Base Management System
DEP	Directorate for Research and Programming
DFC/AP	Directorate for Fauna, Hunting and Protected Areas
DRE	Regional Directorate for the Environment
DRT	Regional Directorate for Tourism
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HCCT	High Commission for Territorial Collectivities
HCME	High Commission for the Modernisation of the State
I 3N	Programme Initiative 3 N
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IEC	Information – Education - Communication
INRAN	Niger National Institute for Agronomic Research
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
LM	Land Management
LUCOP	Poverty Reduction Programme
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MHE/LCD	Ministry for Water, the Environment and Desertification Control
MI/D	Ministry of the Interior and Decentralisation



NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
OP 15	Operational Programme 15 Land Degradation
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PADLAZ	Programme of Support for Decentralisation and Local Development in Agadez
PAGRANAT	Project to Support the Management of the Natural Resources of Aïr–Ténéré
PDES	Economic and Social Development Plan
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
RN	Natural Resources
ROSELT	Network of Long-term Ecological Monitoring Observatories in the Sahel and Sahara
SNCC	Nigerien Company for Coal Marketing
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
WFP	World Food Programme
WWF	World Wide Fund For Nature

# MAIN REPORT

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Objectives of the final evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are to assess the project outcomes and draw lessons to improve the sustainability of the achievements of this project and promote overall improvement of UNDP programmes (see Annex 1). More specifically, it is intended to:

- Evaluate the relevance, performance and success of the project in terms of achieving its aim.
- Identify first signs of possible impact and the sustainability of results, including the contribution made towards developing the capacity of local beneficiary organisations and the achievement of overall environmental objectives.
- Identify/document lessons learned and formulate recommendations which might improve the design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.
- Increase organisational learning by emphasising a developmental approach
- Draw up recommendations allowing for informed decision making and improving the development and implementation of policies in the host country.
- Notification according to GEF criteria.

## 1.2 Scope and methodology

Bearing in mind the nature and aims of COGERAT, two main themes were reviewed during this final evaluation. These were essentially i) co-management, and ii) restoration and conservation of natural resources in the Aïr and Ténéré reserve.

The methodology used in the final evaluation consisted of reviewing the relevant sources of information, such as the project description, reports on the project such as the AWR/PIR and other reports, project budget revisions, Mid-Term Review, progress reports, GEF focal area monitoring tools, project dossiers, strategic and legal national documents and any other documents deemed useful for this evaluation. A list of the documents consulted is set out in Annex 5 of this report.

The mission was launched with a briefing session with UNDP officials. This was followed by introductory meetings with the project management team and then sessions with the Technical and Financial partner and the Secretary General of the Governorate in Agadez. Discussions in the field then took place with a comprehensive evaluation in the commune of Iférouane, located at the entrance to the ATNNR. This examined all aspects of co-management and included visits to projects in the field, followed by discussions with the Mayors of the Communes of Gougaram, Tabelot and Timia in Iférouane (see mission itinerary in Annexes 2 and 4).

Evaluation criteria were reviewed and noted in the light of an evaluation questionnaire (see Annex 6) completed with approximately one hundred people (see list of people met in Annex 3), drawn up by the Team of Consultants. Feedback sessions were held in the field with all stakeholders involved as well as at the Regional and Central level, which served to validate and enrich the evaluation report.

## 2. Description and development context of project

### 2.1 Project start and duration of project

Although it was programmed for January 2006, the COGERAT project was actually launched in August 2006, for an effective duration of 7 years and 2 months. The project was intended to end in July 2012 and therefore last 6 years. There has been a long history of technical assistance for the management of natural resources in Aïr and Ténéré, dating back to the 1980s (DANIDA, UNEP, WWF, IUCN). In response to a request from Niger, the Global Environment Facility approved a sum of four million (4,000,000) USD, to finance the Project on the Co-Management of the Resources of Aïr and Ténéré: Phase II (COGERAT II), covering the period 2006 - 2011. The convention was officially signed on 22 August 2006, between the Government of the Republic of Niger, represented by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Integration and the Resident UNDP Representative in the presence of the Minister of State, the Minister for Water, the Environment and Desertification Control. (MHE/LCD). Activities were launched with an initial workshop on 9 September 2006 and the Steering Committee first met on 10 September 2006 in Agadez.

### 2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

The main problems COGERAT faces are : (i) absence of a favourable climate for collaborative joint activities (platform for Communes to collaborate with each other) ; (ii) lack of shared objectives in terms of management and ownership between the State and local communities (co-management agreement); (iii) poverty of Regional and local communities (improvement of land productivity and water conservation ) ; (iv) lack of community capacity and State services to adopt methodologies and techniques of sustainable land management (training) ; (v) lack of the information on trends and potential of land and natural resources needed for decisions and management options (scientific and local knowledge based on monitoring and adaptive management). Below are further details on the problems listed above:

- **Land degradation: a major phenomenon affecting the Saharan and mountainous ecosystem of Aïr :**
  - ✓ Average rate of specific degradation in Aïr is estimated at 3.5 tonnes/ha/year, that is about 18 million tonnes/year for the entire ATNNR reserve and its adjacent areas;
  - ✓ Significant erosion of kori banks (for example, more than 100 metres over about 400 metres in Amerig (Timia) in 20 years, 31.5 m in 18 years in the village of Afassas (Tabelot)), and a drastic reduction in river beds.
- **Growing pressure on woody and herbaceous plants due, amongst other things, to :**
  - ✓ Creation of dead hedges round the expanding cultivated plots;
  - ✓ Exploitation of approximately 97,000 tonnes of wood energy per year;
  - ✓ Exploitation/export of hay to neighbouring towns and countries;
  - ✓ Frequent bushfires in sparsely populated areas;
  - ✓ Recurrent droughts.
- **Drastic reduction in number of fauna due to :**
  - ✓ Poaching;

- ✓ Disturbance of habitats (mining, expansion of cultivated plots etc.)
- ✓ Lack of monitoring:
  - Some species apparently not observed since the eighties (e.g. Oryx, Warthog, Addax, Striped Hyena, Cheetah)
  - Other species viewed as endangered (Dama gazelle, red-necked ostrich);
- **Degradation of archaeological and cultural heritage due, amongst other things, to :**
  - ✓ Tourism with scant regard for the environment;
  - ✓ Systematic pillaging of archaeological and paleontological objects;
  - ✓ Inadequate monitoring.
- **Change in pattern of land use through :**
  - ✓ Extension of cultivated land into pastoral areas;
  - ✓ Extension of cultivated land into forested areas.
- **Potential environmental challenges of mining boom:**
  - ✓ Issuing of several exploration and exploitation permits in the Region;
  - ✓ Inadequate capacity of local communities to monitor and follow up environmental impact of mining.
- **Absence of a favourable environment for joint activities which would create synergies :**
  - ✓ No inter-Commune platform with shared objectives on management and ownership for the State and local communities;
  - ✓ Lack of information on trends and options for sustainable management.

## 2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

The action taken within the framework of COGERAT Phase II is designed to tackle the basic causes of land degradation and reduction of biodiversity in the ATNNR and its adjacent areas, which are chiefly the poverty of local people and the growth of inappropriate and uncontrolled forms of exploitation of natural resources.

**The long term goal of the project is stated as follows:** *To contribute to combatting land degradation and sustainable management of the Saharan ecosystems by integrating the process of local development and decentralisation.*

**Project Development Objective (2006 – 2013) :** *to contribute to setting up a decentralised community system of land and natural resource management in the ATNNR and adjacent areas which will reverse trends towards environmental degradation and improve livelihoods of resident populations.*

## **2.4 Baseline indicators established at the design stage and during implementation**

COGERAT-II has a logframe whose intervention logic is limited by the wording of the indicators (global terminology) and the large number of these. In its original form, the project includes one objective and 23 outcomes. The objective is to be measured by 3 OVI's whilst the 23 outcomes actually include 24, all expressed rather vaguely and imprecisely.

Knowing that aggregate indicators are hard to measure, those supporting implementation of the monitoring plan suggested it would be useful to operationalise this logic and the number of indicators was increased from 27 to 76.

The indicators set out below were established when the project was designed:

## **2.5 Main stakeholders**

The process has mobilised public stakeholders (administrative authorities, technical Government services), local communities, grassroots communities and Technical and Financial partners.

The main project stakeholders are decentralised authorities, particularly Communes and local communities, users of the Reserve, occupational groups and NGOs, Land Commissions, traditional chiefs, other opinion leaders, the Regional Governorate and decentralised technical services. In addition, there is the Ministry for Water and the Environment (MH/E) (providing the institutional basis of the project), UNDP as the Implementing Agency for the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the Technical and Financial partners, the Steering Committee, the Partners' Forum, the management unit and operational units of COGERAT, the office of the Air and Ténéré Nature Reserve, and the Scientific Committee.

## **2.6 Expected Outcomes**

The main outcomes and impacts of the intervention of COGERAT in the ecosystem of the ATNNR and its adjacent areas are expected to be as follows:

- Establishment of a joint management agreement involving the State, communities and users ; this agreement allows discussion and improved coordination of issues arising from shared management of the ecosystem as a whole, joint measures to manage the space and access to natural resources as well as communities' priorities relating to LM and NRM action and biodiversity conservation.
- Restoration of 55,000 ha of degraded land used for pastoral activities and plot cultivation, by using techniques to improve the collection and conservation of surface water;
- Management of a further 100,000 ha by Communes and other users through conservation measures and measures to restore land, applying the principle of decentralisation and the decentralised approach to resource management;

- 50% reduction in illegal exploitation of natural resources (wood, fodder, wild fauna etc.) in the reserve and adjacent areas ;
- 18% reduction in wood consumption in urban areas; this will help reverse the trend towards destruction of plant cover in the reserve area;
- Restoration of fauna and its habitat, through collaboration between the State, rural communities and the tourism industry;
- Establishment of 7 Land Commissions (Commune and Departmental), which form a framework to prevent and manage conflict and ensure the safety of rural producers.

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1 Project Design/Formulation

##### 3.1.1 Analysis of Logframe/Results Framework (Project logic/strategy; Indicators)

There were some gaps in the logical framework drawn up when COGERAT was designed, particularly in the formulation of some of the indicators which were found to be too aggregated, imprecise, and difficult to measure. At the beginning, the PMU team applied these indicators. When the project was launched, three indicators had been defined for the achievement of the project objective *to set up a decentralised community system of land and natural resource management in the ATNNR and adjacent areas which will reverse trends towards environmental degradation and improve livelihoods of resident populations.*

The indicators were as follows:

1. A joint management agreement for the ATNNR and its adjacent areas involving the State, the Communes and users;
2. Improvement of livelihoods of local people linked to availability of and access to essential natural resources (land, water, pasture, vegetation);
3. Amount of land and natural resources being used appropriately.

To put the intervention logic into operation it was necessary to extract those elements which would make it possible to define indicators linked to the different stages of the logframe and then set parameters for them.

The table in Annex 9 sets out the indicators which emerged from this exercise to make them operational. After the review by the Mid-Term Evaluation team and in order to reflect their recommendations on the logframe, the PMU team focused on indicators of impact connected with the major outcomes, such as co-management, land reclamation, reduction of wood used for energy etc. This exercise to define impact indicators could be further refined, particularly as regards sustainable environmental management.

### 3.1.2 Assumptions and risks

The risks which might affect the effective implementation of the project were financial, operational and political:

**Financial risks:** Mobilisation of co-finance remains a determining factor in the achievement of the objectives of the project. The project could have been severely affected had the PMU not been pro-active in managing this type of risk. In the end, it was only possible to mobilise 44% of the funds needed. Some of the financial partners which had been identified from the outset were unable to honour their commitments because they had left Niger following the uprising. Thanks to the dynamism of the PMU team, new financial partners were able to make a significant contribution, bringing the level of co-financing to 71%, most of which was in kind (cereal banks, cattle feed banks and food for work). These partners were ICRC, WFP, PADLAZ and decentralised aid from the French Department Côtes-d'Armor and the Department of Tchirozérine.

**Operational risks:** Climate shocks (drought and floods) also represent risks to the effective implementation of the project. Faced with a natural catastrophe such as that which occurred for the first time in 30 years in the Agadez Region, the team would have had no other choice but to give priority to humanitarian action and emergency relief to the detriment of work to protect and conserve the ATNNR.

**Political risks:** Policy change is also a major risk. To illustrate this, before 2010, policy on preventive works, and land restoration (only filter strips), as well as the approach to compensation for the opportunity cost of labour inputs (cash for work) could have had a negative effect on the success of the project and participation by local people. Fortunately, this policy changed, leaving more options open in terms of preventive works and land restoration, depending on the nature of the problems identified.

### 3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. in the same focal area) incorporated into project design

The Aïr-Ténéré, PAGRANAT and LUCOP projects which preceded COGERAT, served as a source of inspiration for initiatives which boosted the effectiveness of the project. For example, the specific record cards used by COGERAT in monitoring the ATNNR and in ecological follow up are upgraded spinoffs of the Aïr-Ténéré project. The LUCOP project set an example for advisory support for producers, through the medium of field-schools, in planting bush hedges and undertaking better forms of clearance.

### 3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

#### Main stakeholders

- Stakeholders and partners in co-management at the local level
- Stakeholders and partners at the Regional level
- Stakeholders and partners at the national level
- Technical and Financial partners at the national and international level



### Stakeholders and partners in co-management at the local level.

Category of Stakeholder	Role	Representative	Participation
Communes (decentralised communities )	Management of land and natural resources in the ATNNR and adjacent areas, mobilisation of resources and co-financing of action Drawing up Commune development plans which integrate local ecosystem management initiatives	Mayors and Municipal Councillors Framework for consultation between Communes	Main stakeholder in the context of COGERAT and the co-management of the ATNNR and adjacent areas. Mayors chair Commune based Land Commissions. Negotiation and implementation of co-management agreement with the State.
Users, occupational groups (herdsmen, farmers, wood and hay traders, artisans, tourist guides)	Key spokesmen for the project and the Communes	Local co-management bodies Community organisations, co-operatives, groups	Key partners of COGERAT and the Communes in terms of developing procedures for co-management and implementation of LM, NRM and monitoring activities.
Land Commissions	Conflict prevention; securing land rights, overseeing development, supervising land management and shared heritage issues.	Local stakeholders	Essential role in drawing up the co-management agreement ; supervising development, resource inventory ; Management and maintenance of works.
Traditional chiefs and other opinion leaders, especially religious leaders	Key spokesmen for project and Communes.	Local stakeholders	Members of Commune Land Commissions and stakeholders in the development of procedures for co-management and conflict management.
ATNNR management body	Key spokesperson for the project and the Communes.	ATNNR Conservator	Key partner of COGERAT and the Communes in the development of procedures for co-management and the implementation of monitoring and follow up in the ATNNR.
Forestry posts in Iférouane, Timia, Tabelot and Gougaram	Resource protection at the Commune level.	Heads of Forestry Posts	Commune partners in NRM, monitoring and supervision of use of natural resources. Members of Commune COFOS.
Local NGOs	NGOs from the communities in the	NGO staff	Participating in efforts at social mobilisation,

Category of Stakeholder	Role	Representative	Participation
	ATNNR and adjacent areas, active in local development and NRM		consciousness raising and implementation of LM/NRM activities.

### Stakeholders and partners at the Regional level

Category/Unit	Function	Representative	Participation
Regional Directorate for the Environment Agadez	Key COGERAT partner	Regional Environmental Director	Key partner of project Coordinator; supervision of ATNNR Conservator; co-ordination of activities of Forestry Posts; Participation in Agadez stakeholder forum.
Governorate, Prefectures	Territorial administration	Governors, Prefects	Participation in Agadez stakeholder forum.
Travel agencies and Regional Tourism Directorate	Key partners within the framework of co-management of the ATNNR and adjacent areas	Travel agencies and Regional Tourism Directorate	Participation in drawing up the strategy for tourism within the ATNNR and its adjacent areas and the co-management agreement.
Directorates for technical water services, animal resources, education and training, local development and rural development	Support for local development ; implementation of national policies	Technical services staff	Technical support, advice, provision of services to Communes ; Participation in Agadez stakeholder forum.
Existing projects and programmes in the Region	Mobilisation of resources and co-funding	Project staff	Technical partners: collaboration and sharing of lessons learned, financial partners: co-financing of activities.

### Stakeholders and partners at the national level

Category/Unit	Function	Representative	Participation
Ministry for the Environment and Desertification Control	GEF partner Chair of Steering Committee Implementing Agency	Secretary-General of ME-LCD; DGE/EF.	Meetings of Steering Committee Management and general guidelines of project Monitoring and assessment
UNDP Niger	ME/LCD partner Member of Steering Committee	Staff UNDP Niger	Meetings of Steering Committee; Management and general

Category/Unit	Function	Representative	Participation
			orientation of project. Monitoring and evaluation
Permanent Secretariat for the Rural Code (SPCR)	Supervision and support for introduction of COFOs	SPCR personnel	Support and advice in drawing up and defining the priorities of COFOs.
Ministry of the Interior and Decentralisation and the other institutions in charge of local community issues (HCCT, HCME)	Creating conditions favourable to the practical establishment and running of Communes.	MI/D, HCCT and HCME personnel.	Support and advice on start-up in the Communes; budget support.

### Technical and Financial partners at the national and international level

Category/Unit	Function	Representative	Participation
UNDP-GEF	ME-LCD partner Participation in Steering Committee	UNDP GEF personnel	Learning, monitoring and evaluation; Financing.
ROSELT	Long term ecological observation.	ROSELT - Niger	Technical support for introduction of monitoring system.
Other Technical and Financial partners potentially interested in the Region, the ATNNR and its adjacent areas.	Mobilisation of resources and co-financing.	Offices in Niamey, Agadez and abroad.	Technical partners: collaboration and sharing of lessons learned; Financial partners: co-financing of activities.

### 3.1.5 Approach to Replication

Having adopted the view that the project would close at the end of phase II, the PMU team took the initiative to prepare a project exit strategy, involving all stakeholders. The main aim of this strategy is to ensure beneficiaries take ownership of the technical and financial aspects of project activities, which is a necessary and integral condition for ensuring the achievements of the project become permanent. This exit strategy has three closely connected components:

- Capitalising on and consolidating progress made since 2006 by continuing technical activities and promoting these achievements through the dissemination of information.
- Organisation of a meeting to share lessons learned, achievements and success factors ;
- Arrangements for handover to ensure activities are continued after the project ends through:
  - ✓ Introduction of a partnership approach between the communities and the technical services of the Ministry for Water and the Environment, through the co-management agreement.
  - ✓ Introduction of a Steering and Monitoring Committee to oversee the implementation of the agreement between the State and the Communes on co-management of the resources in the Air and Ténéré National Nature Reserve;

- ✓ Introduction of an Intercommunal Management Association for the Sustainable Management of Natural Resources,
- ✓ Monitored introduction of capacity building for village committees set up to monitor and maintain community works designed as part of the sustainable management of land and natural resources ;
- ✓ Introduction and capacity building of community teams set up to monitor resources in the ATNNR;
- ✓ Establishment of a grassroots committee for co-management and local bodies for co-management of natural resources ;
- ✓ Inclusion of sustainable land management issues, biodiversity and climate change in Commune Development Plans (CDP) and local planning ;
- ✓ Building capacity of village leaders in different aspects of the management of natural resources and socio-economic activities in the reference sites, in order to maintain the momentum.

### **3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage**

The close involvement of UNDP during the programming process and the monitoring of the implementation of COGERAT, as well as its presence on the Steering Committee, represents a comparative advantage for the organisation as the implementing agency for the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). In addition, UNDP is one of the Government of Niger's partners in the development of policy and strategy on environmental issues and desertification control, where it is the lead partner. COGERAT is therefore a very useful vehicle for UNDP, enabling it to play a full supporting role to the Government, particularly in terms of ensuring the coherence of action taken to promote sustainable development.

### **3.1.7 Linkages between the project and other interventions in the sector**

The project activities are part of national programmes and policies, the PDES, which is the model for all interventions, as well as the 3N Initiative 'Nigeriens are fed by Nigeriens' (*'les Nigériens Nourrissent les Nigériens'*) in addition to the Commune Development Plans.

COGERAT supported the drawing up and conclusion of an agreement between the State and the Communes to co-manage the resources of the Air and Ténéré National Nature Reserve (ATNNR) which enabled local communities to be fully involved in management of the ATNNR but also led to the generation of resources to finance the management of the ATNNR.

COGERAT enabled local inhabitants of the ATNNR to form an intercommunal association for the sustainable management of natural resources, letting them share efforts to manage natural resources. The co-management agreement and inter-Commune platform are thought provoking innovations in the context of decentralisation and, particularly, the transfer of skills to local communities.

COGERAT initiated and/or belongs to a number of stakeholder fora. These are:

- Regional Forum for Consultation and Collaboration;
- Regional Forum for monitoring the Strategy for Accelerated Development and Reduction of Poverty (SDRP);
- Fora for partner consultation at the level of the Department or Commune;
- Food security cluster.

### **3.1.8 Management Arrangements**

COGERAT is implemented in accordance with the relevant national arrangements. At the national level, the COGERAT project is implemented under an agreement between the Ministry for Water and the Environment (MH/E) of the Republic of Niger and the United Nations Development Programme. The General Directorate for the Environment, Water and Forests (DGE/EF), is responsible on behalf of MH/E for technical oversight of the project. A Steering Committee was set up to ensure supervision of the implementation of the project.

To grant proper recognition to GEF for its funding, the GEF logo appears on all project publications, vehicles, offices and equipment bought with GEF funds. This applies to any quote in publications involving GEF projects, ensuring GEF receives the necessary recognition. The UNDP logo is given priority and is separated from the GEF logo where possible, as the United Nations must be made visible for reasons of security.

At the Regional level, the project is coordinated and implemented by a Project Management Unit. This Project Management Unit is run by a National Coordinator, supported by an Expert in social mobilisation and local development, an Expert in natural resource management, an Expert in monitoring and evaluation, an administrative and financial officer and an accountant.

The project collaborates closely with technical services, NGOs, projects and service providers which provide support and advice as well as technical supervision in the implementation of COGERAT.

## **3.2 Project implementation**

### **3.2.1 Adaptive management (changes made in the design and outcomes of the project during its implementation)**

Within the framework of adaptive management some adjustments were made to project outcomes.

Operational results relating to management: ‘Management of a further 100,000 ha by Communes and other users through conservation measures and measures to restore land, applying the principle of decentralisation and the decentralised approach to resource management’ and ‘50% reduction in illegal exploitation of natural resources (wood, fodder, wild fauna etc.) in the reserve and adjacent areas’ were removed on the recommendation of the Mid-Term Evaluation.

The Communes are short of financial resources and already participate in co-financing the restoration of the 55,000 ha which leaves them very little margin for manoeuvre in terms of restoring a further 100,000 ha of degraded land.

It was impossible to establish the baseline situation either when the project was designed or during the period of armed uprising, which means the progress achieved in reducing the illegal exploitation of natural resources cannot be measured.

In terms of additions to the operational results, it is worth noting that 2009 saw a new cycle of cooperation between Niger and the UN system in general and UNDP in particular. Within the framework of this

programme of co-operation, COGERAT is in a position to contribute two CPAP results, namely ‘Establishment of a lasting system for co-management between the State and Communes of the natural resources of the Aïr–Ténéré Nature Reserve and its adjacent areas’ and ‘A local vision for sustainable management of natural resources is developed and activities to protect and restore the environment are implemented in the ATNNR and its adjacent areas’.

### 3.2.2 Partnership agreements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/Region)

**It is worth noting that at the time the project was designed, the partners had been identified and letters of commitment had been signed to mobilise co-financing. Unfortunately, since February 2007 the project area has been negatively affected by an armed uprising.**

**This situation made it harder to achieve the results set for the project and led the project team to seek out new partners to mobilise co-financing, both in cash and kind. Around 60 operational and partnership agreements were negotiated and signed in fields varying from local planning and development, to security of land rights, restoration of land, carrying out of community works, avoidance and management of natural crises and catastrophes and recovery from these events.**

Partners	Number of partnership or co-financing conventions or agreements signed with COGERAT	Purpose
Poverty Reduction Programme (LUCOP) German financial support	2	Securing land rights : establishment of Land Commission Local planning and development (drawing up and/or evaluation of CDP implementation).
Programme of Support for Decentralisation and Local Development (PADLAZ)-financed by European Union	3	Local planning and development (drawing up and/or evaluation of CDP implementation) Building water management structures and protection of banks.
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)	8	Food security, prevention and management of crises and recovery; restoration of degraded land.
World Food Programme (WFP)	5	Food security (creation of BCs and Food for Assets), restoration of degraded land.
Decentralised aid : French Department Côtes- d’Armor and Department of Tchirozérine	2	Local planning and development (drawing up and/or evaluation of CDP implementation).
Communes where there is intervention	37 (several operational conventions signed)	Implementation of annual project activity programmes.
Areva mining company	1	Creation of an infiltration weir
NGO GAGE-Zoo of Malhouse-Cooperative of Users of the Natural Resources of Koutous (CERK)	1	Conservation of fauna (ostriches).

### 3.2.3 Feedback from the monitoring and evaluation activities used for adaptive management

[n/a]

### 3.2.4 Project Finance (in USD)

#### 3.2.4.1 GEF Funds

Within the framework of the financing of the current phase of the project, 4 million dollars were allocated under the heading of GEF funds, divided as follows; Outcome 1 (15%), outcome 2 (25%), outcome 3 (15%), outcome 4 (10%) and outcome 5 (35%). As shown in the table below, the funds allocated were used up entirely in 2012 which meant that AWP 2013 was financed by the Government, UNDP and local partners. It is important to note that dollar fluctuation during the period of project implementation caused some losses.

HEADING	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL	FORECAST	SOLDE
OUTCOME 1	101,855.81	90,574.44	140,761.79	145,207.50	58,271.66	59,960.30	31,841.25	628,472.75	600,000	- 28 472,75
OUTCOME 2	91,946.38	322,540.31	239,986.39	216,554.22	153,738.34	122,186.80	14,721.00	1,161,673.44	1,000,000	- 161 673,44
OUTCOME 3	59,368.55	56,534.28	139,224.21	99,815.89	56,317.76	57,619.36	9,478.74	478,358.79	600,000	121 641,21
OUTCOME 4	2,994.15	43,456.38	41,528.79	32,588.97	38,300.03	25,037.77	4,554.19	188,460.28	400,000	211 539,72
OUTCOME 5	372,080.79	466,787.78	423,463.29	155,195.87	111,663.98	45,865.29	3,948.35	1,579,005.35	1,400,000	- 179 005,35
GAIN/LOSS	- 18,684.97	- 19,273.72	8,707.40	- 8,627.44	- 4,853.04	6,725.51	- 2,082.31	- 38,088.57	-	38 088,57
TOTAL	609,560.71	960,619.47	993,671.87	640,735.01	413,438.73	317,395.03	62,461.22	3,997,882.04	4,000,000	2 117,96

### 3.2.4.2 Co-Finance Situation 2006 - 2012

Co-finance (type/source)	Own finance UNDP (in US dollars )*		Government (in US dollars )		Partner agencies (in US dollars )		Total (in US dollars)	
	Planned	actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Subsidies	60,000	955,739	500,000	577,085	4,807,734	387,770	5,367,734	1,920,594
Loans/Concessions								
Support in kind				150,000		1,768,553		1,918,553
Other								
<b>Totals</b>	<b>60,000</b>	<b>955,739</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>727,085</b>	<b>4,807,734</b>	<b>2,156,323</b>	<b>5,367,734</b>	<b>3,839,147</b>

Overall, real progress has been made in the mobilisation of co-financing in relation to the situation portrayed by the Mid-Term Evaluation. The level of mobilisation of co-finance in comparison with forecasts in the project document is 71.52%. The mobilisation of co-finance by the Government and UNDP was exceptional, with respective rates of mobilisation of 145.41% and 1592.89%.

It should also be noted that co-finance in kind represents about 50% of the total co-finance mobilised, due to the fact that the project built up a relationship with partners involved in the field of food security, particularly WFP and ICRC. In addition, after 2010 the philosophy of food for work was again accepted by the Government.

Analysis of the sources of co-finance mobilised shows that, at the level of the partner agencies, the project developed partnerships with agencies which had not been identified during the drawing up of the project.



### 3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation

Overall, the quality of monitoring and evaluation was deemed satisfactory. Substantial progress was noted in the implementation of the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the project as regards monitoring and evaluation. This relates particularly to:

- The drawing up and integration of missing data in the project logframe and other reference documents ;
- Adaptation of indicators ;
- Decentralisation of the collection of piezometric and climatic data.

However, more remains to be done in terms of defining specific, objectively verifiable indicators relating to the sustainable management of the environment. It is worth noting that after the establishment of monitoring and evaluation at the time when the project was launched, further work was needed to operationalise this, and adapt it more closely to current circumstances. In addition, the implementation of the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation contributed significantly to improving the system. However, further work is needed to make more of and upgrade the information generated by the system in place.

### 3.2.6- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation/execution (\*) coordination and operational issues

*Co-ordination of implementation took place essentially at two levels, firstly planning of work programmes and annual budgets, and secondly, monitoring-evaluation.*

#### 3.2.6.1 Process followed for the planning and evaluation of activities

This is a participatory process which involves all key stakeholders at every stage:

- Initiation of activities during Commune workshops for self-evaluation and programming ;
- Adjusting programmed activities to the logframe and outcomes expected from the CPAP ( Project Management Unit) ;
- Submitting the draft Annual Work Programme (AWP) to the General Directorate for the Environment, Water and Forests (DGEEF) to check it is consistent with national policies in natural resource management and amendment of AWP ;
- Submitting the amended AWP to UNDP for budgetary allocation and checking it is consistent with the CPAP outcomes ;
- Signing of AWP by the technical implementing partner (Ministry for Water and the Environment), Governmental coordinating agency (Ministry for Planning, Land Management and Community Development) ;
- Meeting of project Steering Committee (bringing together grassroots stakeholders, technical implementing partner and UNDP ;
- Joint mission to supervise activities ;
- Holding a Mid-Term Review of AWP.

#### **3.2.6.2- Formal framework for co-ordinating activities**

- Project Steering Committee ;
- Project AWP Review meetings (bringing together the Technical implementing partner, the Governmental coordinating agency, UNDP and others) ;
- Joint project activity supervision missions (bringing together the Technical implementing partner, the Governmental coordinating agency, UNDP and others);
- Self-evaluation workshops for the Communes on implementation of AWPs (bringing together stakeholders in the Communes and representatives of the beneficiaries of project activities)

### **3.3 Project Results**

#### **3.3.1- Overall results (attainment of objectives)**

Overall, the outcomes achieved through implementation of the COGERAT project contribute towards the attainment of the project objectives... However, much work remains to be done to increase the environmental awareness of local inhabitants, in order to have a more significant impact on protecting and conserving the resources of the ATNNR.

#### **3.3.2- Relevance**

The action undertaken is deemed relevant to the extent that it is tailored to the problems originally identified and meets the expectations of the project, particularly in the adjacent areas. Amongst the activities undertaken are the creation of infiltration weirs to improve the level of the water table, as well as cereal banks and animal feed banks. All these activities justify the need for an overall approach to the protection and conservation of the ATNNR but also call for a form of adaptive management which incorporates adjustments and reflects concerns on the part of stakeholders, as to implementation and climate change and its corollary (drought and food insecurity). These activities have strengthened the intervention framework of the project and the dialogue between stakeholders. The latter are periodically under stress due to an emergency which has no direct impact on the initial results (later improved). The activities were supported by co-financing. However, the impact of these steps to protect and restore land on the condition of the ATNNR resources still needs to be evaluated before we can assess the relevance of these activities to the underlying aim of the project, the conservation of the ATNNR.

#### **3.3.3- Effectiveness and efficiency**

The effectiveness of COGERAT has been acknowledged by both local populations and the Technical and Financial partners.

### Personal statements on the effectiveness of COGERAT

*'The COGERAT team is very accessible and always ready to listen to local people. The team is always there when you need it and in all its interventions it has invariably prioritised local people as its main stakeholders.'* Amadou TidjanI, Rural Development Agent -Agadez.

*'Most of the cooperatives which run the cereal banks set up with the help of COGERAT have bank accounts, some amounting to 10,000,000 CFA francs'* Mamadou Adamou, Regional Agriculture Director, Agadez.

*'We would like to express our admiration to COGERAT for making its interventions so visible. Like the conductor of an orchestra, it brought all stakeholders together in its search for synergy between the different activities. PACII and COGERAT were always at the forefront of CDP interventions'* Assane Abdouramane, Co-ordinator PACII-Agadez.

*'This is the first time in the history of Iférouane that a project has been able to work with local people without excluding anyone; men, women, young and old, took part in all the COGERAT activities and have been able to benefit'* Assalama Lahou, representative of a women's group in Iférouane.

*'COGERAT's key strength has been to prioritise grassroots communities. Decisions were taken at the community level with the technical services. Even when it came to issues relating to protection of the ATNNR, it was the local people who chose the eco-rangers. We participated in identifying, planning implementing and monitoring most of COGERAT's activities. We would consult each other regularly to adjust and correct anything that was not working. Although the consultations were often long they bore fruit.'* Mohamed Houma, Mayor of Iférouane.

Despite the Touareg uprising during the implementation of COGERAT (2007-2009), the project achieved results which were significant, both qualitatively and quantitatively. These results were as follows:

#### ● **Conclusion of an agreement between the State and the Communes to co-manage the resources of the nature reserve**

- An action plan for the implementation of the State-Communes agreement on the co-management of the ATNNR resources was drawn up and adopted ;
- A committee to steer and monitor implementation of the agreement to co-manage ATNNR resources was set up ;
- A charter for eco-tourism within the ATNNR was drawn up and signed;
- An inter-Commune association for the sustainable management of the ATNNR resources was established;
- A Regional framework for consultation and collaboration was established;
- Sixty (60) grassroots committees were established to manage and protect the environment ;

- Fourteen (14) local bodies were established to co-manage natural resources;
- Fourteen (14) community teams were set up to monitor the nature reserve and a decree was signed giving them the status of eco-rangers;
- Twenty four (24) joint missions were carried out to monitor the resources of the ATNNR ;
- Natural resource management was integrated into Commune Development Plans (CDP).

**● *Arrangement to prevent and resolve conflict over access to and use of natural resources***

- 7 Land Commissions established
- Four (4) Commune based Land Commissions set up (Timia, Tabelot, Iférouane and Gougaram) ;
- Two (2) Departmental Land Commissions established (Arlit and Bilma);
- One (1) Permanent Regional Secretariat for the Rural Code set up ;
- Members of Land Commissions trained ;

**● *Operational arrangement for food security***

- 57 Cereal Banks (BC) with a total of 1697 tonnes are in operation ;
- 49 Animal Feed Banks (BAB), representing 455 tonnes, are in operation and 2300 mineral licks are available;
- Work to restore land paid for under food for work, 499 tonnes completed ;
- Increase in crop and or pastoral production of the order of 1 to 2 % where work is being carried out to recharge the water table ;

**● *Contribution towards reversing the trend towards degradation of land and other natural resources (32,470 ha reclaimed)***

- 4 infiltration and/or water-spreading weirs built;
- 3 protective dykes for kori banks made out of gabions (393 ml);
- 12 kori bank protection groynes built using gabions (820ml);
- 15,470 ha of degraded land reclaimed and seeded in small tubs ;
- 6.25 ha of mobile sand dunes stabilised and fixed;

- 216, 330 ml of stone barriers built;
- 45 ha of block planting carried out (sites where land has been reclaimed and some school sites );
- 7,000 naturally regenerated young woody shoots (75 ha) identified and protected;
- 1,600 ml biological protection of banks carried out;
- 8,500 ml of living hedging planted around market gardens;
- 840 km of firebreaks created;

**● *Reduction in consumption of fuelwood and illegal exploitation of forest resources (fuelwood consumption cut by about 15%)***

- Implementation of an information and awareness-raising campaign on usage for major consumers ;
- Organisation of joint monitoring missions in the ATNNR;
- Bringing the forestry posts around the reserve into operation;
- Dissemination of information about coal through a partnership with SNCC;
  - ✓ 5 sales points for coal and a stock of 32 tonnes set up in partnership with SNCC;
  - ✓ 405 multi-pot stoves, F30 stoves, F20 stoves and F8 stoves with drawers made available;

**● *Local capacity building in environmental restoration and joint methods of management and organisation, leading to local ownership of activities to preserve the integrity of the ecosystem***

- 7,755 producers, local representatives, technical services and project agents trained in LM/NRM techniques, land rights and decentralisation;
- 260 producers trained in composting techniques ;
- 672 stakeholders trained in use of coal and equipment ;
- 115 stakeholders trained to respond to climate change ;
- 4 workshops organised on publicising legislative and regulatory texts on NRM and environmental protection;
- 15 members of community teams trained in the national legal and regulatory framework for the management of natural resources and environmental protection;
- 642 women trained in techniques of lighting coal ;

- 15 tinsmiths and 15 members of women's groups and female organisers trained in methods of spreading information about use of coal and stoves

● ***Greater understanding of the ecological and socio-economic environment of the arid and Saharan ecosystem (approximately thirty studies carried out)***

- Environmental impact study;
- Methodology for creating and setting up an inter-Commune consultation framework for the sustainable management of natural resources ;
- Economic evaluation of the value of goods and services provided by the arid ecosystems of Aïr Ténéré;
- Establishment of baseline on perception and behaviour of users of the areas and resources of the ATNNR and its adjacent areas, as regards issues of sustainable management of natural resources;
- Design and establishment of a COGERAT II database;
- Ecological and socio-economic conditions of the Aïr-Ténéré National Nature Reserve and its adjacent areas ;
- Investigation of knowledge about the hay sector in the ATNNR and adjacent areas;
- Environmental Impact Study;
- Methodology for creating and introducing an inter-Commune consultation framework for the sustainable management of natural resources ;
- Economic evaluation of the goods and services provided by the arid ecosystems of Aïr Ténéré;
- Establishment of baseline on perception and behaviour of users of the area and resources of the ATNNR and its adjacent areas, as regards issues of sustainable management of natural resources;
- Design and establishment of a COGERAT II database;
- Ecological and socio-economic conditions of the Aïr-Ténéré National Nature Reserve and its adjacent areas ;
- Investigation of knowledge about the hay sector in ATNNR and adjacent areas;
- Study of the fuelwood and construction wood sectors, and of alternative technologies in the ATNNR and adjacent areas;
- Study on the mechanism for financing local development initiatives to restore and manage/conserv natural resources in the ATNNR and its adjacent areas.
- Study of the impact of the common jackal (*canis aures*) on socio-economic activities;

- Study of the impact of using dead hedges on the dynamics of woody resources in Aïr : case of the Commune of Tabelot and Timia;
- Study of the impact of the proliferation of *Prosopis juliflora* on socio – economic activities and biodiversity in the COGERAT intervention area: case of the rural commune of Timia;
- Plan to train stakeholders in sustainable management of natural resources ;
- Plan to monitor and evaluate the COGERAT project;
- Baseline of ecological and socio-economic trends ;
- ATNNR inventory of fauna and flora
- Strategy and Development Plan for Eco-tourism in the Aïr and Ténéré National Nature Reserve and its adjacent areas;
- Strategy for control of invasive species;
- Strategy and action plan for livestock rearing and reintroduction of endangered species in the ATNNR;
- Study of the impact of the common jackal (*canis aures*) on socio-economic activities;
- Study of the impact of using dead hedges on the dynamics of woody resources in Aïr : case of the Commune of Tabelot and Timia;
- Study of the impact of the proliferation of *Prosopis juliflora* on socio – economic activities and biodiversity in the COGERAT intervention area: case of the rural Commune of Timia;
- Plan to train stakeholders in sustainable management of natural resources ;
- Plan to anticipate and manage emergencies linked to climatic and environmental factors ;
- Plan to monitor and evaluate the COGERAT project;
- Baseline of ecological and socio-economic trends ;
- ATNNR inventory of fauna and flora
- Strategy and Development Plan for Eco-tourism in the Aïr and Ténéré National Nature Reserve and its adjacent areas;
- Strategy for control of invasive species;
- Strategy and action plan for livestock rearing and reintroduction of endangered species in the ATNNR;

### ● ***Improvement of institutional and regulatory framework for management of ATNNR***

- Co-management agreement leading to fuller involvement in ATNNR management;
- Fuller involvement of eco-rangers following the decree on their status and role;
- Conclusion of the charter on eco-tourism within the ATNNR;
- Revision and harmonisation of texts on the management of natural resources in Niger ;
- Establishment of Land Commissions ;
- Creation of the Inter-Commune Association for the Sustainable Management of Natural Resources (AINRM) ;
- Drawing up an inventory of fauna and flora in the ATNNR.

Most of the activities produced immediate effects, particularly the construction of preventive works and restoration of land. For example, the creation of infiltration weirs has led to productive pastoralists' wells in some places, thanks to the rise in the water table.

In terms of co-management, the municipal councils have developed a good understanding of the issues and advantages involved in this and working with other Communes, as well as the need to make local people more environmentally aware in their approach to the challenges of conserving and protecting the reserve.

The effectiveness of the project can best be appreciated by its huge capacity to mobilise people which has made it more visible throughout the project intervention area. In addition, the project has played the role of leader and key advocate in co-ordinating stakeholders and particularly in developing synergy in the drawing up and implementation of the Commune Development Plan (CDP) and mobilisation of further resources.

In terms of efficiency, there is a manual on administrative and financial procedures, project accounts are subject to annual certified audits and annual programmes of activities are regularly drawn up. However, external factors, specifically the Touareg uprising and subsequent insecurity, caused delays and considerable further expense (car hire) in the implementation of the project.

### **3.3.4- Country ownership**

The COGERAT outcomes now feature in national policies and strategies:

- Implementation of the co-management agreement is now included in national policies, particularly initiative 3N (cf output 2 of PIP 7) and PDES (cf programme for conservation of biodiversity). The co-management approach inspired by the COGERAT outcomes will be extended to other protected areas;
- The ATNNR eco-tourism charter has been taken into account in the process of drawing up a code of conduct for the newly emerging tourist activities. The charter was presented by the delegation of Niger at the first Pan African conference on sustainable management of tourism in protected areas



and national parks of Africa. MHE plans to extend the example of the eco-tourism charter to other protected areas of Niger (cf output 1 of the non woody forest products component) ;

- The ecological, piezometric, climatic and socio-economic data collected within the framework of project implementation have permitted improvement of the routine reporting on the state of conservation of the reserve as well as providing the basis for assessing the results of the agro-sylvo-pastoral campaign.

### **3.3.5- Sustainability**

The effective implementation of the agreement augurs well for the sustainability of project activities as the interests of local people have been taken into account and they have been fully involved throughout the process of project implementation, starting from the identification and planning of activities, through to implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Co-management at the Commune level has been reinforced with the innovative initiative on building up relations between Communes, which will help ensure natural resource management is more effective. However, although technical ownership is an asset in terms of specific protection and land restoration measures, financial ownership by the Communes is a key factor in sustainability. The Communes will have to compensate for the opportunity costs involved in the creation of stone barriers by poor people and make a more substantial financial contribution towards the large scale investment needed for the management and protection of the ATNNR. The key to success lies in the capacity of the Communes to make the most of the ATNNR to expand their tax base while ensuring local people benefit in terms of income generating activities and job creation. Advocacy to Government agencies will strengthen the sovereign authority of the State in terms of conservation of the ATNNR. Extra financial resources could be mobilised following a successful appeal to the international community and mining companies active in the Region.

## **4. Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons**

### **4.1 Recommendations**

**The need to consolidate the progress of COGERAT II and the admirable but still fragile initiatives in co-management and collaboration between Communes, necessitates a third phase of COGERAT to last 5 years. Until this 3rd phase is fully launched, practical measures should be taken to ensure a one (1) year transition period with a scaled-down team from the management unit to oversee day to day management of the project while helping prepare the new phase. COGERAT III could be prepared for, amongst other things, by carrying out impact studies and vulnerability surveys. The aim of this transition is to ensure we maintain the knowledge base necessary for a smooth launch of COGERAT III but also to restore the confidence of potential sponsors in terms of security. To achieve this, the Government of Niger and UNDP must together commit to make substantial budgetary allocations available as soon as possible to allow this transition.**

## **4.2 Corrective action for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project**

To obtain significant results in the restoration and conservation of the ATNNR, the rural eco-development component has to be separate from the component dealing with land management and upgrading of the ATNNR, and have a clear strategy and definition of the roles and responsibilities of the State and communities. The two components must fit together. Measures to improve the ATNNR must be thought through in such a way as to ensure not only that restoration of the ATNNR pays for itself but also that the process provides a credible source of income and jobs for local people. To strengthen protection of the ATNNR, the process of relocating Arlit Region conservation unit inside the ATNNR must be stepped up.

Greater emphasis should be given to the gender dimension by involving more female staff in the Project Management Unit. Female personnel could support the branch chief in each of the four Communes in facilitating project activities.

The Information-Education-Communication component should be seen as an integral part, supporting the two other components of rural eco-development and restoration/upgrading of the ATNNR. This dimension will help build up awareness by local people of the aims of biodiversity conservation in the ATNNR

## **4.3 Action to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project**

The COFO, COFOCOM and related consultation frameworks for stakeholders must be revitalised. Advocacy should be reinforced at several levels to boost the mobilisation of finance. This will put the Communes in a position to fully meet both the opportunity costs of people involved in protecting and restoring land and the investments needed for protection, improvement and conservation of the ATNNR, while benefitting from the support of the State as sovereign authority.

## **4.4 Proposals for future directions underlining the main objectives**

- Interventions in the adjacent areas should prioritise activities relating to the life of local people, such as the management of banks and water but also productive action (market gardens, livestock farming), which generates revenue. Wide-ranging action should be taken as part of a valley management approach, to ensure work carried out is effective. In terms of co-management, it would be a good idea to build up the capacity of the emerging inter-Commune structure by providing an inter-Commune mechanism and the institutions needed to implement the joint project to conserve the ATNNR in a manner which is effective, transparent and fair. Stakeholders should perceive this project as necessarily freeing up positive externalities for all Commune institutions, with its focus on sharing costs, funding, risks and benefits.

#### **4.5 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success**

When the questionnaire on relevance, performance and success was analysed it revealed best practices in terms of approach to project implementation. The key to success, which turns out to be fundamental in terms of ownership of the project, is involvement of the main stakeholders in all stages of implementation of the project from identification of problems and solutions to planning of action to be taken, co-financing of works and participatory monitoring and evaluation. In contrast to earlier projects in this sector, the degree of participation by stakeholders in implementation of COGERAT is satisfactory. However, this could be further improved with greater involvement of women in decision making bodies. Another practice singled out for praise from the point of view of the potential for replication and sustainability of the action is the carrying out of simple works with local materials. Amongst these works are:

- ✓ Constructions to combat gully erosion (lines of stones)- very accessible to local people – available material
- ✓ Protection of natural regeneration ;
- ✓ Sowing of perennial herbaceous plants and direct seeding of woody plants ;
- ✓ Bush hedges.

The worst practices were the transplantation of plants grown in nurseries in pastoral areas despite severe climatic conditions. When these practices failed, the PMU team decided to give priority to sowing and direct seeding.

#### **4.6 Lessons learned**

The main lessons learned from the implementation of COGERAT are as follows:

- Participatory management of the natural resources of the ATNNR is a long term project which calls for ongoing and repeated dialogue and major financial resources on the part of all involved.
- Given the background of post uprising recovery and in the light of the number of young people and amount of poverty in the Communes involved the latter cannot be expected to make a major financial contribution bearing in mind they already face a series of requests to meet the countless other emergencies experienced by local people . This means there is an urgent need to keep on the project team who will have the job of finalising the project document for phase III and mobilising resources from partners such as WFP and ICIR, to continue activities in the field.
- Addressing the gender dimension means dealing with the question of inequality between men and women, acknowledging this and seeking to reduce it by taking strategic action while meeting the specific needs of men and women. Involving women and young people in the activities of the COGERAT project does not automatically tackle the gender issue. They have to be given greater opportunities to take part in the decision- making process.

- Raising environmental awareness does not happen overnight. But it is an essential process if we are to ensure sustainable management of the ATNNR resources.
- Promoting action to protect the environment presents a major challenge in contexts where the local people are as poor and vulnerable as they are in this region. In this scenario there is a strong temptation to prioritise steps to promote development.
- Interests, roles and responsibilities must be clarified before there can be real coordination of and synergy between the activities of partners.

# ANNEXES

## Annex 1: Terms of reference for the final evaluation of COGERAT

### FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT ON CO-MANAGEMENT OF THE RESOURCES OF Aïr and Ténéré (COGERAT)

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE – [included in French as in the original]

#### EVALUATION FINALE DU PROJET DE CO-GESTION DES RESSOURCES DE l'Aïr et du Ténéré (COGERAT)

#### TERMES DE REFERENCE

#### INTRODUCTION

Conformément aux politiques et procédures de suivi et d'évaluation du PNUD et du FEM, tous les projets de moyenne ou grande envergure soutenus par le PNUD et financés par le FEM doivent faire l'objet d'une évaluation finale à la fin de la mise en œuvre. Les présents termes de référence énoncent les attentes associées à l'évaluation finale du projet de **Co-gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré (PIMS 2294)**.

Les éléments essentiels du projet à évaluer sont les suivants :

#### TABLEAU RECAPITULATIF DU PROJET

Titre du projet: Cogestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré (COGERAT)				
ID de projet du FEM :	2380		<u>at endorsement (Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion (Million US\$)</u>
ID de projet du PNUD :	2294	Financement du FEM :	4	4
Pays :	Niger	Financement de l'agence d'exécution/agence de réalisation :	0,06	0,842
Région:	Agadez	Gouvernement :	0,50	0,608
Domaine focal :	Dégradation des Terres	Autres:	4,808	1,292
Programme opérationnel :	OP 15	Cofinancement total :	5,368	2,742
Agent d'exécution :	PNUD	Coût total du projet :	9,368	6,742
Autres partenaires participant au projet :	MHE	Signature du DP (Date de début du projet) :		22 Août 2006
		Date de clôture (opérationnelle) :	Proposé : Août 2012	Réel : Août 2013

## OBJECTIFS ET PORTEE

---

Les **bénéfices nationaux attendus**, comprennent la réduction de la pauvreté, l'amélioration de la gestion des ressources naturelles, l'inversion de la tendance à la dégradation des terres, l'identification des approches et des méthodologies appropriées de gestion durable des terres qui répondent aux besoins sociaux, la réduction de conflits et un environnement plus propice pour régénérer de revenus à partir de l'éco-tourisme.

Les principaux **bénéfices globaux** seront réalisés sous la forme de la réhabilitation des sols dégradés et du couvert végétal, la préservation d'habitats de faune d'importance internationale, le contrôle de l'érosion, meilleure gestion des ressources pastorales, et la gestion concertée d'un écosystème aride relevant du Patrimoine Mondial. Par ailleurs, le COGERAT permettra une meilleure compréhension de l'évolution et le fonctionnement d'écosystèmes arides, une meilleure compréhension des formes de co-gestion, viables dans des milieux caractérisés par la pauvreté et le manque de moyens ainsi qu'une meilleure compréhension des modes de production permettant à la fois d'exploiter les ressources des zones arides et de contribuer au maintien des paysages et des services fournis par l'écosystème.

**Le but à long terme** du projet est de contribuer à la lutte contre la dégradation des terres et à la conservation des écosystèmes sahariens du Nord Niger, en intégrant les processus de développement local et de la décentralisation. **L'objectif** du COGERAT est de contribuer à la "mise en place d'un système décentralisé de gestion des sols et des ressources naturelles de la Réserve Naturelle Nationale de l'Aïr et du Ténéré (RNNAT) et ses zones connexes, permettant de renverser les tendances à la dégradation du milieu et d'améliorer les conditions de vie des populations résidentes ". Les **principaux résultats attendus** du projet sont les suivants:

- La co-gestion de Vingt (20) millions d'hectares par l'Etat et les autorités municipales sur la base d'un accord de co-gestion entre les quatre (4) communes et l'Etat,
- La restauration de 55,000 ha de terres dégradées à vocation agropastorale en utilisant des techniques qui amélioreront la collecte et la conservation des eaux de surfaces ;
- La Gestion de 100 000 ha additionnels par les communes et des autres usagers à travers des mesures de conservation et restauration des sols conformément à l'esprit de la décentralisation ;
- La mise en place de 7 Commissions Foncières départementales et/ou communales (COFOCOM) pour servir de cadre de prévention et de gestion de conflits et de sécurisation des producteurs ruraux.
- La diminution à 50% de l'exploitation illégale des ressources naturelles (bois, fourrages, faune sauvage, ...) dans la réserve et de les zones connexes ;
- La réduction de 15% de la consommation de bois dans les zones urbaines, ce qui contribuera à inverser la tendance à la destruction du couvert végétal ;
- La restauration de la faune d'importance internationale et de son habitat à travers la collaboration entre l'Etat, les communautés rurales et les entreprises/industries touristiques.

En résumé, les résultats obtenus par le projet sont les suivants :

- (i) **Conclusion d'un accord Etat-communes riveraines de cogestion des ressources de la réserve naturelle;**
  - Un plan d'action de mise en œuvre de l'accord Etat-communes de cogestion des ressources de la RNNAT élaboré et adopté;
  - Un comité de pilotage et de suivi de la mise en œuvre de l'accord de cogestion des ressources de la RNNAT mis en place ;
  - Une charte de l'écotourisme dans l'espace de la RNNAT élaboré;
  - Une Association Intercommunale pour la gestion durable des ressources de la RNNAT mise en place;
  - Un cadre régional de concertation et de synergie mis en place;
  - Soixante (60) comités de base de gestion et de protection de l'environnement ;
  - Quatorze (14 ) structures locales de cogestion des ressources naturelles mise en place;
  - Quatorze (14 ) brigades communautaires de surveillance de la réserve naturelle mis en place et signature d'un arrêté portant statut des éco gardes;
  - Vingt Quatre (24) missions conjointes de surveillance des ressources de la RNNAT réalisées;
  - Intégration de la gestion des ressources naturelles dans la planification du développement local (PDC).
- (ii) **Une inversion des tendances à la dégradation des terres et des autres ressources naturelles**

- 31 720 ha de terres dégradées récupérés etensemencés ;
- 6,25 ha de dunes vives stabilisés et fixées;
- 5 785 ml de cordons pierreux réalisés;
- 4 seuils d'infiltration et ou d'épandage réalisés;
- 3 digues de protection des berges de koris en gabions réalisés (393 ml);
- 12 épis de protection des berges de koris en gabions réalisés (820ml);
- 45 ha de plantation en bloc réalisés (sites de récupération des terres et de certaines écoles);
- 7 000 jeunes pousses de ligneux (75 ha) en régénération naturelle repérés et protégés;
- 1 600 ml protection biologique des berges réalisés;
- 8 500 ml de haies vives autour des exploitations maraîchères;
- 690 km de bandes pare feux réalisés;
- 5 points de vente de charbon minéral et un stock de 26 tonnes de charbon minéral mis en place en partenariat avec la SNCC;
- 405 foyers multi marmites, foyers F30, foyers F20 et foyers F8 à tiroirs

**(iii) Un dispositif de prévention et de gestion des conflits liés à l'accès et à l'utilisation des ressources naturelles opérationnels**

- 7 commissions foncières mises en place
- Quatre (4) commissions foncières communales mises en place (Timia, Tabelot, Iférouane et Gougaram) ;
- Deux (2) commissions foncières départementales mises en place (Arlit et Bilma);
- Un (1) secrétariat permanent Régional du Code Rural mis en place
- Formation
- Un dispositif de sécurité alimentaire opérationnel
- 48 Banques Céréalières (BC) totalisant 1278 tonnes
- 31 Banques Aliment Bétail (BAB) totalisant de 230 tonnes et 2300 pierres à lécher;
- Augmentation des productions agricoles et ou pastorales de l'ordre de 1 à 2 % au niveau des sites de réalisation des ouvrages de recharge de la nappe.

**(iv) Des capacités locales renforcées en matière de restauration du milieu, de modes de gestion partagés et d'organisation pour la prise en charge locale des actions de préservation de l'intégrité de l'écosystème;**

- 7 755 producteurs, élus locaux, services techniques et agents de projet formés en techniques GDT/GRN, Foncier et décentralisation;
- 260 producteurs formés en techniques de compostage ;
- 672 acteurs formés à l'utilisation du charbon minéral et des équipements.
- 115 acteurs formés en gestion en changement climatique;
- 4 ateliers de vulgarisation des textes législatifs et réglementaires sur la GRN et protection de l'environnement
- 15 membres des brigades communautaires formées sur la connaissance du cadre juridique et réglementaire national en matière de gestion des ressources naturelles et protection de l'environnement;
- 642 femmes formées en techniques d'allumage du charbon minéral, 15 ferblantiers et 15 membres de groupements féminins et animatrices formées en techniques de vulgarisation de charbon minéral et foyers

L'évaluation finale sera menée conformément aux directives, règles et procédures établies par le PNUD et le FEM comme l'indiquent les directives d'évaluation du PNUD pour les projets financés par le FEM.

Les objectifs de l'évaluation consistent à apprécier la réalisation des objectifs du projet et à tirer des enseignements qui peuvent améliorer la durabilité des avantages de ce projet et favoriser l'amélioration globale des programmes du PNUD.

## APPROCHE ET METHODE D'EVALUATION

---

Une approche et une méthode globales pour la réalisation des évaluations finales de projets soutenus par le PNUD et financés par le FEM se sont développées au fil du temps. L'évaluateur doit articuler les efforts d'évaluation autour des critères de pertinence,



d'efficacité, d'efficience, de durabilité et d'impact, comme défini et expliqué dans les directives du PNUD pour la réalisation des évaluations finales des projets soutenus par le PNUD et financés par le FEM. Une série de questions couvrant chacun de ces critères ont été rédigées et sont incluses dans ces termes de référence (**voir annexe C des termes de référence**).

L'évaluateur doit modifier, remplir et soumettre ce tableau dans le cadre d'un rapport initial d'évaluation et le joindre au rapport final en annexe.

L'évaluation doit fournir des informations factuelles qui sont crédibles, fiables et utiles. L'évaluateur doit adopter une approche participative et consultative garantissant une collaboration étroite avec les homologues du gouvernement, en particulier avec le point focal opérationnel du FEM, le bureau de pays du PNUD, l'équipe chargée du projet, le conseiller technique du PNUD-FEM basé dans la région et les principales parties prenantes. L'évaluateur doit effectuer une mission sur le terrain à terrain (**Région d'Agadez**), y compris les sites du projet (**communes rurales de Gougaram, Iférouane, Tabelot et Timia**). Les entretiens auront lieu au minimum avec les organisations et les particuliers suivants :

- Les communautés locales de base (agriculteurs, éleveurs, brodeuses, artisanes, guides touristiques...) et leurs formes d'organisation (brigades communautaires de surveillance, structures locales de cogestion, association intercommunale de gestion durable des ressources naturelles, coopératives, comités de gestion des banques céréalières et banques aliments bétail, groupements...);
- Les plates-formes régionales de planification et de résolution des litiges dans la zone d'intervention (COFOCOM, COFODEP, SPRCR...);
- L'administration locale (commune dans les zones d'appui et spécifiquement des sites de référence);
- Le PNUD: Représentant résident, Le RRA/programme, le Chargé de programme Environnement Energie du bureau du PNUD Niger, la Conseillère Technique Régionale du PNUD/FEM pour la gestion durable des terres et des autres ressources naturelles en Afrique, basée à Pretoria;
- Le Ministère de l'Hydraulique et l'Environnement : Secrétariat Général du Ministère de l'Hydraulique et de l'Environnement (SG/MH/E), Direction Générale de l'Environnement et des Eaux et Forêts (DGE/EF), Direction de la Faune, de la Chasse et des Aires Protégées (DFC/AP), Direction des Aménagements Forestiers, du Reboisement et de la Restauration des Terres (DAF/R/RT), Direction des Etudes et de la Programmation (DEP);
- Les Directeurs régionaux de l'Environnement, de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage, du Tourisme, du Génie Rural, du Plan et de l'Aménagement du Territoire;
- Les Directeurs départementaux de l'Environnement, de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage, du Tourisme, du Génie Rural, du Plan et de l'Aménagement du Territoire;
- Les partenaires financiers du projet dans la zone d'intervention : Programme d'Actions Communautaires (PAC), Projet d'Appui à la Décentralisation et au Développement Local dans la Région d'Agadez (PADDLaz), Projet Lutte Contre la Pauvreté (LUCOP), Coopération décentralisée Côte d'Armor.

L'évaluateur passera en revue toutes les sources pertinentes d'information, telles que le descriptif de projet, les rapports de projet, notamment le RAP/RMP et les autres rapports, les révisions budgétaires du projet, l'examen à mi-parcours, les rapports sur l'état d'avancement, les outils de suivi du domaine focal du FEM, les dossiers du projet, les documents stratégiques et juridiques nationaux et tous les autres documents que l'évaluateur juge utiles pour cette évaluation fondée sur les faits. Une liste des documents que l'équipe chargée du projet fournira à l'évaluateur aux fins d'examen est jointe à **l'annexe B** des présents termes de référence.

## CRITERES D'EVALUATION ET DE NOTATION

Une évaluation de la performance du projet, basée sur les attentes énoncées dans le cadre logique/cadre de résultats du projet (**voir annexe A**) et qui offre des indicateurs de performance et d'impact dans le cadre de la mise en oeuvre du projet ainsi que les moyens de vérification correspondants, sera réalisée. L'évaluation portera au moins sur les critères de pertinence, d'efficacité, d'efficience, de durabilité et d'impact. Des notations doivent être fournies par rapport aux critères de performance suivants. Le tableau rempli doit être joint au résumé d'évaluation. Vous trouverez les échelles de notation obligatoires à **l'annexe D** des termes de référence.

*Vous trouverez ci-après un tableau utile à inclure dans le rapport d'évaluation.*

Notation de la performance des projets		
Critères	Note	Commentaires
1. Suivi et Evaluation: Très satisfaisant (TS), Satisfaisant (S), Moyennement satisfaisant (MS), Moyennement, insatisfaisant (MI), Insatisfaisant (I), Très insatisfaisant (TI) Qualité globale du suivi et de l'évaluation		

Critères	Note	Commentaires
Qualité globale du suivi et de l'évaluation	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	
Mise en place du suivi et de l'évaluation au démarrage du projet	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	
Mise en oeuvre du plan de suivi et d'évaluation	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	
<b>Exécution par l'organisme d'exécution et l'organisme de mise en oeuvre :</b> Très satisfaisant (TS), Satisfaisant (S), Moyennement satisfaisant (MS), Moyennement insatisfaisant (MI), Insatisfaisant (I), Très insatisfaisant (TI)		
Qualité globale de la mise en oeuvre/l'exécution du projet	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	
Exécution par l'agence de réalisation	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	
Exécution par l'agent d'exécution	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	
<b>Résultats :</b> Très satisfaisant (TS), Satisfaisant (S), Moyennement satisfaisant (MS), Moyennement insatisfaisant (MI), Insatisfaisant (I), Très insatisfaisant (TI)		
Qualité globale des résultats des projets	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	
Pertinence : pertinent (P) ou pas pertinent (PP)	(sur une échelle de 1 à 2)	
Efficacité	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	
Efficiences	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	
<b>Durabilité :</b> Probable (P) ; Moyennement probable (MP) ; Moyennement improbable (MI) ; Improbable (I)		
Probabilité globale des risques qui pèsent sur la durabilité	(sur une échelle de 1 à 4)	
Ressources financières	(sur une échelle de 1 à 4)	
Socio-économique	(sur une échelle de 1 à 4)	
Cadre institutionnel et gouvernance	(sur une échelle de 1 à 4)	
Environnemental	(sur une échelle de 1 à 4)	
<b>Impact :</b> Important (I), Minime (M), Négligeable (N)		
Amélioration de l'état de l'environnement	(sur une échelle de 1 à 3)	
Réduction de la tension sur l'environnement	(sur une échelle de 1 à 3)	
Progression vers la modification de la tension/de l'état	(sur une échelle de 1 à 3)	
Résultats globaux du projet	(sur une échelle de 1 à 6)	

## FINANCEMENT / COFINANCEMENTS DU PROJET

L'évaluation portera sur les principaux aspects financiers du projet, notamment la part de cofinancement prévue et réalisée. Les données sur les coûts et le financement du projet seront nécessaires, y compris les dépenses annuelles. Les écarts entre les dépenses prévues et réelles devront être évalués et expliqués. Les résultats des audits financiers récents disponibles doivent être pris en compte. Les évaluateurs bénéficieront de l'intervention du bureau de pays (BP) et de l'équipe de projet dans leur quête de données financières pour compléter le tableau de cofinancement ci-dessous, qui sera inclus dans le rapport d'évaluation finale.

Cofinancement (type/source)	Propre financement PNUD (en millions de dollars américains)		Gouvernement (en millions de dollars américains)		Organismes partenaires (en millions de dollars américains)		Total (en millions de dollars américains)	
	Prévu	Réel	Prévu	Réel	Prévu	Réel	Prévu	Réel
Subventions								
Prêts/Concessions								
Soutien en nature								
Autres								
<b>Totaux</b>								

## INTEGRATION

Les projets financés par le FEM et soutenus par le PNUD sont des éléments clés du programme de pays du PNUD, ainsi que des programmes régionaux et mondiaux. L'évaluation portera sur la mesure dans laquelle le projet a été intégré avec succès dans les priorités du PNUD, y compris l'atténuation de la pauvreté, l'amélioration de la gouvernance, la prévention des catastrophes naturelles et le relèvement après celles-ci et la problématique hommes-femmes. En outre, l'évaluation sera incluse dans le plan d'évaluation des bureaux de pays.

## IMPACT

Les évaluateurs apprécieront dans quelle mesure le projet atteint des impacts ou progresse vers la réalisation de ceux-ci. Les principales conclusions qui doivent être mises en évidence dans les évaluations comprennent la question de savoir si le projet a connu : a) des améliorations vérifiables au niveau de l'état écologique ; b) des réductions vérifiables au niveau de la tension sur les systèmes écologiques ; ou c) des progrès qui démontrent que le projet est en bonne voie vers la réalisation de ces impacts.

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMANDATIONS & LEÇONS APPRISSES

Le rapport d'évaluation doit inclure un chapitre proposant un ensemble de conclusions, de recommandations et d'enseignements.

## MODALITES DE MISE EN OEUVRE

La responsabilité principale de la gestion de cette évaluation revient au bureau de pays du PNUD **au Niger**. Le bureau de pays du PNUD contactera les évaluateurs en vue de garantir le versement en temps opportun des indemnités journalières à l'équipe d'évaluation et de finaliser les modalités de voyage de celle-ci dans le pays. L'équipe de projet sera chargée d'assurer la liaison avec l'équipe d'évaluateurs afin d'organiser des entretiens avec les parties prenantes et des visites sur le terrain, ainsi que la coordination avec le gouvernement, etc.

## CALENDRIER DE LA MISSION D'EVALUATION

Le mois de **Mars 2013** sera consacré l'évaluation finale du projet. L'évaluation durera au total **26 jours** selon le plan suivant :

<i>Activité</i>	<i>Nombre de jours</i>	<i>Date d'achèvement</i>
<b>Préparation de la mission</b>	<i>4 jours</i>	<i>16 Juillet 2013</i>
<b>Mission d'évaluation</b>	<i>15 jours</i>	<i>24 Juillet 2013</i>
<b>Projet de rapport d'évaluation</b>	<i>5 jours</i>	<i>29 Juillet 2013</i>
<b>Rapport final</b>	<i>2 Jours</i>	<i>2 Août 2013</i>

## PRODUITS DE L'EVALUATION

Il est attendu de l'équipe d'évaluation les résultats suivants:

<b>Produits livrables</b>	<b>Contenu</b>	<b>durée</b>	<b>Responsabilités</b>
<b>Rapport initial</b>	L'évaluateur apporte des précisions sur le calendrier et la méthode	Au plus tard deux semaines avant la mission d'évaluation.	L'évaluateur envoie au bureau du PNUD- Niger
<b>Présentation</b>	Conclusions initiales	Fin de la mission d'évaluation	A l'Unité de Gestion du Projet et Bureau PNUD-Niger

<b>Projet de rapport final</b>	Rapport complet (selon le modèle joint) avec les annexes	Dans un délai de trois semaines suivant la mission d'évaluation	Envoyé au bureau du PNUD- Niger, examiné par le CTR, le service de coordination du programme et les PFO du FEM
<b>Rapport final</b>	Rapport révisé	Dans un délai d'une semaine suivant la réception des commentaires du PNUD sur le projet	Envoyé au BP aux fins de téléchargement sur le site du CGELE du PNUD..

\* Lors de la présentation du rapport final d'évaluation, l'évaluateur est également tenu de fournir une « piste d'audit », expliquant en détail la façon dont les commentaires reçus ont (et n'ont pas) été traités dans ledit rapport.

## COMPOSITION DE L'EQUIPE D'EVALUATION

L'équipe d'évaluation sera composée d'un **consultant international** et d'un **consultant national** (un Nigérien). Les consultants doivent disposer d'une expérience antérieure dans l'évaluation de projets similaires. Une expérience des projets financés par le FEM est un avantage. (Si l'équipe comprend plus d'un évaluateur, celui-ci sera désigné comme chef d'équipe et sera chargé de finaliser le rapport). Les évaluateurs sélectionnés ne doivent pas avoir participé à la préparation ou à la mise en oeuvre du projet et ne doivent pas avoir de conflit d'intérêts avec les activités liées au projet. Les membres de l'équipe doivent posséder les qualifications suivantes :

- Un minimum de 10 ans d'expérience professionnelle pertinente ;
- Une connaissance du PNUD et du FEM ;
- Une expérience antérieure avec les méthodologies de suivi et d'évaluation axées sur les résultats ;
- Des connaissances techniques dans les domaines focaux ciblés.

En cas de sélection d'évaluateurs individuels (plutôt que des équipes complètes de terrain proposées par un cabinet d'études), **le consultant international sera le Chef d'équipe**. Ce dernier aura la totale responsabilité de livraison des produits de l'évaluation.

## CODE DE DEONTOLOGIE DE L'EVALUATEUR

Les consultants en évaluation sont tenus de respecter les normes éthiques les plus élevées et doivent signer un code de conduite (**Annexe E**) à l'acceptation de la mission. Les évaluations du PNUD sont réalisées en conformité avec les principes énoncés dans les « Directives éthiques pour l'évaluation » du GENU (UNEG).

## MODALITES DE PAYEMENT

Les tranches de paiement ci-dessous sont indicatives et seront adaptées au besoin par le PNUD-Niger ou le conseiller technique du PNUD/FEM aux procédures standard en vigueur.

%	Etape
10%	A la signature du contrat
40%	Suite à la présentation et l'approbation (par le BP et le CTR du PNUD) du rapport d'évaluation finale définitif
50%	Suite à la présentation et l'approbation (par le BP et le CTR du PNUD) du rapport d'évaluation finale définitif

## DEPÔT DE CANDIDATURE

Les candidats sont invités à postuler en ligne [registry.ne@undp.org](mailto:registry.ne@undp.org) au plus tard le 21 Janvier 2013. Les consultants individuels sont invités à envoyer leur candidature, ainsi que leur curriculum vitae pour ces postes. La candidature doit comprendre un curriculum vitae à jour et complet en français, ainsi que l'adresse électronique et le numéro de téléphone du candidat. Les candidats

présélectionnés seront invités à présenter une offre indiquant le coût total de la mission (y compris les frais quotidiens, les indemnités quotidiennes et les frais de déplacement).

Le PNUD applique un processus de sélection équitable et transparent qui tient compte des compétences et des aptitudes des candidats, ainsi que de leurs propositions financières. Les femmes qualifiées et les membres des minorités sociales sont invités à postuler.

## ANNEXE A [des TdR]: CADRE LOGIQUE DU PROJET

Outcomes	Outputs
<b>SUB-COMPONENT 2.2</b>	
<u>Résultat 1</u> : Un cadre dynamique et opérationnel pour les acteurs en vue de mettre en œuvre la gestion partagée des ressources naturelles au niveau des écosystèmes est mis en place	1.1- Les 4 Communes de la RNNAT et ses zones connexes mettent en place un Cadre de concertation intercommunal visant la gestion durable de l'écosystème saharien
	1.2- Un mécanisme de financement appuyant les initiatives locales de GDS et GRN est fonctionnel.
	1.3- Les utilisateurs et les gestionnaires des ressources naturelles sont formés aux techniques de GDS et GRN
	1.4- Les utilisateurs directs et indirects des ressources naturelles de la RNNAT et ses zones connexes, sont sensibilisés aux enjeux de la GDS et GRN
	1.5- Un système de prévision et de gestion de crises (sécheresses, invasions de criquets, inondations), est fonctionnel pour la Région d'Agadez
	1.6- Un réseau de surveillance conjoint Etat-Communes des prélèvements des ressources naturelles et patrimoniales de la RNNAT et ses zones connexes est fonctionnel
<u>Résultat 2</u> : Les conditions de vie, ainsi que l'intégrité de l'écosystème sont améliorées grâce à la mise en œuvre de méthodologies et technologies appropriées pour la gestion durable des sols et des ressources naturelles	2.1- Réalisation de seuils d'épandage et digues dans les zones de culture et protection physique et biologique
	2.2- Restauration des terres de parcours affectées par l'érosion hydrique et éolienne et protection mécanique et biologique
	2.3- les sols affectés par dépôts éoliens sont stabilisés.
	2.4- - Les systèmes de production pastoraux sont améliorés
	2.5- L'utilisation du bois pour la construction et le bois feu diminue dans la Région d'Agadez
	2.6- L'impact d'espèces envahissantes sur les activités économiques est réduit
<u>Résultat 3</u> : L'utilisation efficace d'outils et de méthodes de co-gestion favorise la conservation et la restauration des sols, l'utilisation durable des ressources naturelles et l'amélioration des conditions de vie	3.1- Préparation et adoption d'une stratégie de développement du tourisme dans la RNNAT et ses zones connexes
	3.2- Réintroductions raisonnées d'espèces en voie de disparition (autruche à cou rouge et gazelle dama) apportent des bénéfices aux populations locales
	3.3- Les Commissions Foncières de la Région d'Agadez sont fonctionnelles
<u>Résultat 4</u> : Un système de suivi basé sur les connaissances scientifiques et locales concernant l'évolution de la situation socio-économique et écologique fonctionnel	4.1- Réseau d'Observatoires est fonctionnel
	4.2 Base des données fonctionnelle
<u>Résultat 5</u> : Apprentissage, évaluation et gestion adaptative améliorés	5.1- Gestion efficace du projet par une gestion adaptative
	5.2- Suivi-évaluation
	5.3- Un Comité Scientifique appui efficacement l'Unité de Gestion du projet et le Comité de Pilotage
	5.4- Préparation d'un diagnostic annuel participatif de l'état des lieux écologique et socio-économique
	5.5- Les financements sont utilisés de manière efficace et les affectations sont transparentes (audit annuel)

## ANNEXE B [des TdR]:: LISTE DES DOCUMENTS A EXAMINER PAR LES EVALUATEURS

Aussi bien le consultant national qu'international devront se familiariser entièrement avec le projet par le biais d'un examen de tous les documents pertinents avant le voyage dans un pays donné/ l'initiation de la mission. Parmi ces documents, figurent:

- Document de Projet ;
- Plans de travail et budgets du projet ;
- Rapport de lancement ;
- Rapports Annuels d'Exécution technique et financière du Projet ;
- Rapport des missions d'audits annuelles ;
- Rapport de la mission indépendante d'évaluation à mi-parcours en Décembre 2009;
- Compte-rendu de toutes les réunions du Comité de Pilotage ;
- Rapport des missions conjointes MHE/PNUD et/ou de supervision PNUD.

Les documents ci-dessus référencés seront mis à la disposition des évaluateurs en prélude à la mission, et en format électronique, dans la mesure du possible. Tout autre rapport produit et jugé pertinent pour l'évaluation en relation avec le projet (y compris ceux de la Phase PDF - le site Web, les publications, la correspondance, etc.) peut être utilisé par l'équipe d'évaluation du projet après son arrivée à l'Unité de de Gestion du Projet à **Agadez, Niger**.

## ANNEXE C [des TdR]: QUESTIONS D'EVALUATION

Critères d'évaluation	Question	Indicateurs	Sources
Pertinence : comment le projet se rapporte-t-il aux principaux objectifs du domaine focal du FEM et aux priorités en matière d'environnement et de développement au niveau local, régional et national ?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Efficacité : dans quelle mesure les résultats escomptés et les objectifs du projet ont-ils été atteints ?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Efficience : le projet a-t-il été mis en oeuvre de façon efficiente, conformément aux normes et standards nationaux et internationaux ?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Durabilité : dans quelle mesure existe-t-il des risques financiers, institutionnels, socio-économiques ou environnementaux au maintien des résultats du projet à long terme ?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact : existe-t-il des indications à l'effet que le projet a contribué au (ou a permis le) progrès en matière de réduction de la tension sur l'environnement, ou à l'amélioration de l'état écologique ?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## ANNEXE D: NOTATION

Echelle de notation		
Notations pour les résultats, l'efficacité, l'efficience, le suivi et l'évaluation et les enquêtes	Notations de durabilité :	Notations de la pertinence

<p><b>6. Très satisfaisant (TS) :</b> le projet ne comporte aucune lacune quant à la réalisation de ses objectifs en termes de pertinence, d'efficacité ou d'efficience</p> <p><b>5. Satisfaisant (S) :</b> Seules quelques lacunes mineures ont été décelées</p> <p><b>4. Moyennement satisfaisant (MS) :</b> des lacunes modérées ont été décelées</p> <p><b>3. Moyennement insatisfaisant (MI) :</b> le projet comporte d'importantes lacunes</p> <p><b>2. Insatisfaisant (I) :</b> le projet comporte d'importantes lacunes au niveau de la réalisation de ses objectifs en termes de pertinence, d'efficacité ou d'efficience</p> <p><b>1. Très insatisfaisant (TI) :</b> le projet comporte de graves lacunes</p>	<p><b>4. Probable (P) :</b> risques négligeables à la durabilité</p> <p><b>3. Moyennement probable (MP) :</b> risques modérés</p> <p><b>2. Moyennement improbable (MI) :</b> risques importants</p> <p><b>1. Improbable (I) :</b> risques graves</p>	<p><b>2. Pertinent (P)</b></p> <p><b>1. Pas pertinent (PP)</b> Notations de l'impact :</p> <p><b>3. Important (I)</b></p> <p><b>2. Minime (M)</b></p> <p><b>1. Négligeable (N)</b></p>
<p>Notations supplémentaires le cas échéant : Sans objet (S.O.) Évaluation impossible (E.I.)</p>		

## ANNEXE E [des TdR]: FORMULAIRE D'ACCEPTATION DE CODE DE CONDUITE DU CONSULTANT EN EVALUATION

### Les évaluateurs:

1. Doivent présenter des informations complètes et équitables dans leur évaluation des forces et des faiblesses afin que les décisions ou les mesures prises soient bien fondées.
2. Doivent divulguer l'ensemble des conclusions d'évaluation, ainsi que les informations sur leurs limites et les mettre à disposition de tous ceux concernés par l'évaluation et qui sont légalement habilités à recevoir les résultats.
3. Doivent protéger l'anonymat et la confidentialité à laquelle ont droit les personnes qui leur communiquent des informations. Les évaluateurs doivent accorder un délai suffisant, réduire au maximum les pertes de temps et respecter le droit des personnes à la vie privée. Les évaluateurs doivent respecter le droit des personnes à fournir des renseignements en toute confidentialité et s'assurer que les informations dites sensibles ne permettent pas de remonter jusqu'à leur source. Les évaluateurs n'ont pas à évaluer les individus et doivent maintenir un équilibre entre l'évaluation des fonctions de gestion et ce principe général.
4. Découvrent parfois des éléments de preuve faisant état d'actes répréhensibles pendant qu'ils mènent des évaluations. Ces cas doivent être signalés de manière confidentielle aux autorités compétentes chargées d'enquêter sur la question. Ils doivent consulter d'autres entités compétentes en matière de supervision lorsqu'il y a le moindre doute à savoir s'il y a lieu de signaler des questions, et comment le faire.
5. Doivent être attentifs aux croyances, aux us et coutumes et faire preuve d'intégrité et d'honnêteté dans leurs relations avec toutes les parties prenantes. Conformément à la Déclaration universelle des droits de l'homme, les évaluateurs doivent être attentifs aux problèmes de discrimination ainsi que de disparité entre les sexes, et s'en préoccuper. Les évaluateurs doivent éviter tout ce qui pourrait offenser la dignité ou le respect de soi-même des personnes avec lesquelles ils entrent en contact durant une évaluation. Sachant qu'une évaluation peut avoir des répercussions négatives sur les intérêts de certaines parties prenantes, les évaluateurs doivent réaliser l'évaluation et en faire connaître l'objet et les résultats d'une façon qui respecte absolument la dignité et le sentiment de respect de soi-même des parties prenantes.
6. Sont responsables de leur performance et de ce qui en découle. Les évaluateurs doivent savoir présenter par écrit ou oralement, de manière claire, précise et honnête, l'évaluation, les limites de celle-ci, les constatations et les recommandations.
7. Doivent respecter des procédures comptables reconnues et faire preuve de prudence dans l'utilisation des ressources de l'évaluation.

### Formulaire d'acceptation du consultant en évaluation

**Engagement à respecter le Code de conduite pour l'évaluation dans le système des Nations Unies**

Nom du Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Nom de l'organisation du consultant (le cas échéant): \_\_\_\_\_

**Je confirme que j'ai reçu et compris et le Code de conduite des Nations Unies pour l'évaluation et m'engage à le respecter.**

Signé à lieu le date

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**ANNEXE F [des TdR]: AVANT PROJET DE RAPPORT D'EVALUATION<sup>5</sup>**

- i. Page d'introduction
  - Titre du projet financé par le FEM et soutenu par le PNUD
  - N° d'identification des projets du PNUD et du FEM
  - Calendrier de l'évaluation et date du rapport d'évaluation
  - Région et pays inclus dans le projet
  - Programme opérationnel/stratégique du FEM
  - Partenaire de mise en oeuvre et autres partenaires de projet
  - Membres de l'équipe d'évaluation
  - Remerciements
- ii. Résumé
  - Tableau de résumé du projet
  - Description du projet (brève)
  - Tableau de notations d'évaluation
  - Résumé des conclusions, des recommandations et des enseignements
- iii. Acronymes et Abréviations  
(Voir Manuel de rédaction du PNUD<sup>6</sup>)
1. Introduction
  - Objectif de l'évaluation
  - Champ d'application et méthodologie
  - Structure du rapport d'évaluation
2. Objectifs et contexte de Développement du projet
  - Démarrage et durée du projet
  - Problèmes que le projet visait à régler
  - Objectifs immédiats et de développement du projet
  - Indicateurs de base mis en place
  - Principales parties prenantes
  - Résultats escomptés
3. Conclusions  
(Outre une appréciation descriptive, tous les critères marqués d'un (\*) doivent être notés)
- 3.1 Conception / Formulation du projet
  - Analyse ACL/du cadre des résultats (Logique/stratégie du projet ; indicateurs)
  - Hypothèses et risques
  - Enseignements tirés des autres projets pertinents (par exemple, dans le même domaine focal) incorporés dans la conception du projet
  - Participation prévue des parties prenantes
  - Approche de réplique
  - Avantage comparatif du PNUD
  - Les liens entre le projet et d'autres interventions au sein du secteur

<sup>5</sup>The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>6</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008



- Modalités de gestion
- 3.2 Mise en oeuvre du projet
  - Gestion adaptative (modifications apportées à la conception du projet et résultats du projet lors de la mise en oeuvre)
  - Accords de partenariat (avec les parties prenantes pertinentes impliquées dans le pays/la région)
  - Commentaires provenant des activités de suivi et d'évaluation utilisés dans le cadre de la gestion adaptative
  - Financement du projet
  - Suivi et évaluation : conception à l'entrée et mise en oeuvre (\*)
  - Coordination au niveau de la mise en oeuvre et de l'exécution avec le PNUD et le partenaire de mise en oeuvre (\*) et questions opérationnelles
- 3.3 Résultats du projet
  - Résultats globaux (réalisation des objectifs) (\*)
  - Pertinence(\*)
  - Efficacité et efficience (\*)
  - Appropriation par le pays
  - Intégration
  - Durabilité (\*)
  - Impact
- 4. Conclusions, Recommandations et enseignements
  - Mesures correctives pour la conception, la mise en oeuvre, le suivi et l'évaluation du projet
  - Mesures visant à assurer le suivi ou à renforcer les avantages initiaux du projet
  - Propositions relatives aux orientations futures favorisant les principaux objectifs
  - Les meilleures et les pires pratiques lors du traitement des questions concernant la pertinence, la performance et la réussite
- 5. Annexes
  - TDR
  - Itinéraire
  - Liste des personnes interrogées
  - Résumé des visites sur le terrain
  - Liste des documents examinés
  - Tableau des questions d'évaluation
  - Questionnaire utilisé et résumé des résultats
  - Formulaire d'acceptation du consultant en évaluation

## ANNEXE G [des TdR]: FORMULAIRE D'AUTORISATION DE RAPPORT D'EVALUATION

( à remplir par le BP et le conseiller technique du PNUD-FEM affecté dans la région et à inclure dans le document final)

### Rapport d'évaluation examiné et approuvé par Bureau de pays du PNUD

Nom: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

CTR du PNUD-FEM

Nom: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Annex 2: Itinerary of COGERAT final evaluation mission

Date	Activities	Place	Stakeholders
<b>Thursday 11 July 2013</b>	Arrival of International Consultant	Niamey	
<b>Friday 12 July</b>	Briefing for Team of Consultants	UNDP/ Niamey	UNDP Programme Team and Consultants
<b>Monday 15/07/2013</b>	Arrival of Team of Consultants in Agadez	Governorate  UNDP office /Agadez COGERAT	UN agency security service /Agadez  Regional directors for projects and programme and partner NGOs
	Visit to Governor Security Clearance (meeting with LSA) Meeting with Technical and Financial partners		
<b>Tuesday 16/07/2013 To Wednesday 17/07/2013</b>	Discussion with Project Management Unit Roundup of discussion with Project Management Unit	COGERAT	Co-ordinator SMLD Expert NRM Expert M/E Expert Administrative Assistant
<b>Thursday 18/07/2013</b>	➤ <b>Depart Agadez for Iférouane</b>	Commune of Iférouane (Iférouane)	Prefect of Iférouane Mayor of Iférouane
	Visit to Departmental Prefect and Mayor Settling in of mission		
<b>Friday 19/07/2013</b>	➤ <b>Iférouane</b>	Commune of Iférouane	Women's group Youth groups Municipal Council
	Interview with various groups of stakeholders in Iférouane (focus group) and Municipal Council		
<b>Saturday 20/07/2013</b>	➤ <b>Depart Iférouane for sites in Tin-Tellous-Afes-Faoudet</b>	Commune of Iférouane (Tin-Tellous-Afis-Faoudet)	Mayor of Iférouane Beneficiaries and their various committees
	Visit developments in the field (stone barriers and BC in Tin-Tellous, weir in Afes, filter strips and stone barriers in Faoudet)		
<b>Sunday 21/07/2013</b>	➤ <b>Iférouane</b>	Commune of Iférouane (Iférouane)	Mayor of Iférouane Mayor of Gougaram Mayor of Tabelot Mayor of Timia  Prefect and DTS
	<b>Working meeting</b> with the 4 Mayors Interview with Departmental Prefect and technical services (Planning, Environment, Agriculture and Livestock Farming)		
<b>Monday 22/07/2013</b>	➤ <b>Depart Iférouane for Agadez</b>		
<b>Tuesday 23/07/2013</b>	Roundup of field investigations  Feedback session on field investigations and preliminary conclusions	COGERAT	Team of Consultants  Team of Consultants Authorities (Governorate, Regional Council, Sultanate) Technical and Financial partners COGERAT PMU
<b>Wednesday 24/07/2013</b>	<b>Return to Niamey</b>		Consultants

**NB:** SMLD : Social Mobilisation and Local Development  
NRM : Natural Resource Management  
M/E : Monitoring and Evaluation  
DTS : Decentralised Technical Services  
PMU : Project Management Unit  
COGES : Management committee

### Annex 3: List of people met

Order of meeting	Surname and First name	Position	Institution/organisation	Location
<b>UNDP Niamey</b>				
1	Fodé NDIAYE	UNDP Resident Representative	UNDP	Niamey
2	Victor Womitso	Deputy Resident Representative /Programme	UNDP	Niamey
3	Laoualy Ada	Assistant to the Resident Representative Programme	UNDP	Niamey
4	Mansour NDIAYE	Economist	UNDP	Niamey
5	Elhadji Mahamane M. Lawali,	Programme Head for Environment /Environment	UNDP	Niamey
6	Bassirou Hassane,	Environment Unit UNDP	UNDP	Niamey
7	Keita Maria Iboune	Head of Performance, UNDP Office	UNDP	Niamey
8	Boubacar Souley	Communication/s consultant	UNDP	Niamey
9	Aly Adamou	Head of Communications	UNDP	Niamey
<b>Directorate for the Environment, Water and Forests</b>				
10	Mamadou Hamadou	Director General for the Environment, Water and Forests	DGEF	Niamey
11	Issa Mariama Ali Omar	Representative of the Directorate for Fauna, Hunting and Protected Areas	UNDP	Niamey
<b>Governorate AGADEZ</b>				
12				
13	Zoukhaneini Maiga	Secretary General of the Governorate	Governorate	AGADEZ
<b>UN office</b>				
14	Captain Moctar Salley	Security Council- Local Security Council-LSA	United Nations Office	AGADEZ
<b>Project Management Unit (PMU)</b>				
15	Yacouba Seydou	Project co-ordinator	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
16	Toukour Maidagi	Expert in Social Mobilisation and Local Development	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
17	Adamou Lazoumar	Expert in Sustainable Land Management/ Natural Resource Management	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
18	Salek Amoumoune	Expert in methods of monitoring and evaluation	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
19	Baba Sékou	Assistant Secretary	PMU COGERAT	AGADEZ
<b>Technical and Financial partners</b>				
20	Abachi Idi	Regional Director for the Environment	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
21	Ghissa Alhassane	Permanent Secretary, Economic Interest Group TAGATT	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
22	Nouh Kanta	Regional Director for Planning	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
23	Assane Abdouramane	Community Action Programme II	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
24	Bouba Abdou	Project for the Promotion of Productive Agriculture	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
25	Marsadou Soumaila	Regional Director for Tourism	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
26	Mamadou Adamou	Regional Director for Agriculture	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
27	Seïdi Houmoudan	Treasurer, NGO Man and Development Tamat	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
28	Ahmadou Tidjani	Rural Development Agent	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ

Order of meeting	Surname and First name	Position	Institution/organisation	Location
29	Hamza Tchémogo	Technical Assistant, Instrument for Stability (short term) -IFS/CT/EU	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
30	Kiari Boukari	UNDP Field Co-ordinator	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
31	Aliza Zahadi Hassan	Project for the Development of Agricultural Exports	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
32	Moukeila Souley	Assistant FAO/World Food Programme	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
33	Mohamed Agalher	International Committee of the Red Cross ICRC	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
34	Sadeh Emichitou	Organisation for Nature- ONAT	PMU-COGERAT	AGADEZ
<b>IFEROUANE</b>				
<b>Representatives of women's groups and associations</b>				
35	Ghaïchita Haïdo		Iférouane Town Council	Iférouane
36	Assalama Lahou		Iférouane Town Council	
37	Tazori Ahé		Iférouane Town Council	
38	Touma Bikki		Iférouane Town Council	
39	Assalama Attaher		Iférouane Town Council	
40	Hadiza Aboucha		Iférouane Town Council	
41	Kolana Annoussa		Iférouane Town Council	
42	Ghaïchita Ousmane		Iférouane Town Council	
43	Oumounana Ghouman		Iférouane Town Council	
44	Kouwoula Katifa		Iférouane Town Council	
45	Tinna Mohamed		Iférouane Town Council	
46	Ranalhère Attawel		Iférouane Town Council	
<b>Youth Representatives</b>				
47	Ahmed Mohamed Aittek	Youth Group for Sustainable Development- GJDLD « Ochichite »	Iférouane Town Council	
48	Ghousman Aghali	AFA Youth Group	Iférouane Town Council	
49	Alhassane Moussa	Youth President, Central Quarter	Iférouane Town Council	
50	Alhadji Ilias	Vice-president, Northern Quarter	Iférouane Town Council	
51	Mahamane Ahmed	Youth President, Northern Quarter	Iférouane Town Council	
52	Abdou Alhadji	Youth Treasurer, Northern Quarter	Iférouane Town Council	
53	Mohamed ISMAHIL	Youth President, Toudou Quarter	Iférouane Town Council	
54	Aghali Akalor	Youth Vice-president, Toudou Quarter	Iférouane Town Council	
55	Mohamed Moumounta	Member Youth Committee	Iférouane Town Council	
56	Mohamed Attaher	Vice-President, National Association for the Defence of Human Rights	Iférouane Town Council	
<b>Commune Council of Iférouane</b>				
57	Mohamed Houma	Mayor	Iférouane Commune Council	
58	Mouhamed Abakawa	CRI Councillor	Iférouane Commune Council	
59	Tanaldhère Attawel	CRI Councillor	Iférouane Commune Council	
60	Ahnut Hannan	Deputy Mayor	Iférouane Commune Council	
61	Hamédé Yahouya	Elected Councillor	Iférouane Commune Council	
62	Djibrilla Moussa	Elected Councillor	Iférouane Commune Council	
<b>Representatives of local Tchintoulous communities (Air Ténéré Reserve)</b>				
63	Moha Saidou	Representative, Advisory Committee ( <i>Comité des sages</i> )	<b>Tchintoulous</b>	
64	Allassane Gada	Representative of Village Committee	<b>Tchintoulous</b>	
65	Ghabdoulla Houma	Outreach worker	<b>Tchintoulous</b>	
66	Hamid Emoud	Draughtsman	<b>Tchintoulous</b>	
67	Tapha Moussa	Draughtsman	<b>Tchintoulous</b>	

Order of meeting	Surname and First name	Position	Institution/organisation	Location
<b>Meeting with Mayors of the rural Communes in the areas adjacent to the ATNNR</b>				
68	Mohamed Houma	Mayor	Iférouane Town Council	Iférouane
69	Adam Efangol	Mayor of Tabelot	Iférouane Town Council	
70	Moussa Matachi	Mayor of Gougaram	Iférouane Town Council	
71	Siliman Ilatou	Mayor of Timia	Iférouane Town Council	
<b>Meeting with Prefect and the Decentralised Technical Services</b>				
72	LTN Hassane Anoutab	Prefect of Iférouane	Prefect's residence	Iférouane
73	Badjo Yacoubou	Secretary General /Prefecture	Prefect's residence	
74	Rhissa Haidara	Departmental Director for Planning	Prefect's residence	
75	Adamou Ouadé	Departmental Director for Livestock Farming	Prefect's residence	
76	LTN Abdou Nassirou	Departmental Director for the Environment	Prefect's residence	
77	Dr Noufou Abdoul Aziz	Chief Doctor, Health Centre	Prefect's residence	
78	Salifou Kitchira	Head of Pedagogical Department	Prefect's residence	
<b>Feedback session with technical services and Regional authorities in Agadez</b>				
79	Cl. Mj Garba Maikido	Governor	Governorate Agadez	Agadez
80	Zourkaneini Maiga	Secretary General, Governorate		
81	Abdramane Moussa	Deputy Secretary General, Governorate		
82	Housseini Houma	Governorate		
83	Mohamed M. Souley	Head of Personnel, Governorate		
84	Bouba Abdou	Technical Assistant, Sector development, PromAP/GTZ		
85	Ghisse Alhassane	Permanent Secretary, TAGATZ Economic Interest Group		
86	Mohamed Agalher	Executive Director, NGO ONAT		
87	Alassane Abdouramane	Coordinator, Commune Support Project PAC II		
88	Sadeh Emichitou	Elotec Assistant, ICRC		
89	Habbou Hamidou	SCE/AZ		
90	Issifou Moussa	CBRPN Regional Environment Director		
91	Aboubacar Abdoukarim	Regional Environment Director		
92	Baba Seikou	COGERAT Administrative Assistant		
93	Adamou LAZOUMAR	COGERAT Natural Resources Expert		
94	Amadou Harouna	SCE/AZ		
95	Chaibou Aboubacar	Departmental Head, Regional Environment Office		
96	Hamzatou Karznoun	SCE/AZ		
97	Fassouma Idrissa	Communications Officer/Regional Directorate for Agriculture		
98	Laouali Mahamane Gani	Director/Regional Directorate		
99	Mohamed Madou	Director ORTN/AZ		
100	Yahaya M. Bassirou	Financial Assistant, UNDP		
101	Ahmed Annour	Head of Service, SCE/AZ		
102	Hamza Tchémogo	Technical Assistant, IDS/CT3AL		

<b>Order of meeting</b>	<b>Surname and First name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Institution/organisation</b>	<b>Location</b>
103	Mamadou Soumaila	Tourism Director		
104	Hamidou Iro	Director, DRP/AT/DC		
105	Abarchi Idi	Director, Regional Environment		
106	Cl Yacoubou Seybou	Co-ordinator, COGERAT		
107	Seidi Houmoudan	Co-ordinator, NGO Man and the Environment		
108	Dr Salek Amoumene	Monitoring and Evaluation Expert, COGERAT		
109	Ali Koraou	Director General, Rural Development		
110	Nouri Kanta	Deputy DRP/AT/DC/A		
111	Moukaila Souley	Assistant, World Food Programme		

## Annex 4: Summary of field visit

The field visit took place from 15 to 24 July 2013. There were five main stages:

1. *Document review*: the document review, which had begun in the UNDP Office in Niamey, was continued in the Project Management Unit in Agadez. A variety of documents were consulted, ranging from project design documents to annual activity reports, annual planning documents on project activities, reports on annual audits, reports on specific studies, agreement documents on partnerships etc. A total of ... documents were reviewed in the course of the mission.
2. *Meeting with Technical and Financial partners*: Discussions were set up in Agadez with about twenty Technical and Financial partners to obtain a better understanding of their perceptions as to the quality of implementation of the project and the prospects for ownership by local communities. Particular emphasis was given to the partnership agreements and the synergy between activities undertaken within the framework of implementation of the Commune Development Plan. Overall, implementation of the project was deemed satisfactory. The Technical and Financial partners were unanimous about the effectiveness of COGERAT, particularly in its role as a leader seeking synergies between activities but also as a catalyst of initiatives involving other projects and technical partners.
3. *Meeting with team of the Project Management Unit*: This meeting provided further details on the extent to which outcomes had been achieved and made it possible to identify the additional data which needed to be investigated in the field.
4. *Discussions with local people*: Bearing in mind the size of the area of implementation of COGERAT, the Team of Consultants, with the agreement of the PMU, made two decisions. The first was to focus on one of the four Communes, Iférouane, where it would carry out a comprehensive analysis, including discussions with target groups and visits to projects in the field and the second to organise discussions in the selected Commune with the Mayors of the four Communes in order to reflect the concerns of those Communes not visited. In addition, the Team of Consultants held talks with the Technical and Financial partners and the political and administrative authorities of the Commune of Iférouane. The deliberate choice of the commune of Iférouane makes sense partly because of its prime position in relation to the ATNNR and partly because this Commune was not visited during the COGERAT Mid-Term Review.
5. *Presentation on the interim progress of the evaluation*: Feedback on the work being undertaken was given to the Technical and Financial partners as well as the political and administrative authorities under the chairmanship of the Governor of the Region of Agadez.

## Annex 5: List of documents consulted

In order of consultation	Titre	Author and Year of publication	Type of Document
1	Projet de Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	République du Niger, PNUD et FEM, 2005	Project document
2	Evaluation à mi-parcours du Projet de Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	HALLE, B., Chef NIGNON, P., & AMADOU, S.	Project evaluation report
3	Rapport Annuel d'Activités du Projet de Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	Equipe de Gestion du Projet, 2010	Annual activity report
4	Rapport Annuel d'Activités du Projet de Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	Equipe de Gestion du Projet, 2011	Annual activity report
5	Rapport Annuel d'Activités du Projet de Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	Equipe de Gestion du Projet, 2012	Annual activity report
6	Plan de Travail Annuel du Projet de Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	Ministère de l'Eau, de l'Environnement et de Lutte Contre la Désertification, PNUD, FEM, 2011	Annual work plan
7	Plan de Travail Annuel du Projet de Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	2012	Annual work plan
8	Rapport Technique et Financier d'Exécution du Projet de Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	République du Niger, PNUD, FEM, Coopération Suisse, 2006	Report
9	Manuel de procédures administratives, financières et comptable	Cabinet PRESCOA- 2007	Report
10	Rapport d'audit des comptes du Projet de Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré- Exercice 2006	Cabinet Africain de Gestion Informatique et Comptable (CGIC-Afrique)- 2007	Report
11	Audit Comptable et financier du projet Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	Rapport définitif-Exercice clos le 31 /12/2007- Mai 2008	Report
12	Audit 00051709 du projet Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré	Rapport définitif-Exercice clos le 31 /12/2007-Mai 2009	Report
13	Audit des Programmes et Projets Financés par le PNUD exécutés selon la modalité d'exécution nationale-Exercice 2009-	Rapport d'audit et Plan d'action pour la mise en œuvre des Recommandations. 2010	Report
14	Audit des Programmes et Projets Financés par le PNUD exécutés selon la modalité d'exécution nationale-Exercice 2011-	Rapport d'audit et Plan d'action pour la mise en œuvre des Recommandations. 2011	Report
15	Audit Comptable et financier du projet Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré- Rapport d'audit financier	BEC Sarl- 2012- Cotonou	Report
16	Audit financier projet Co-Gestion des Ressources de l'Aïr et du Ténéré- Rapport final financier- Avril 2012	BEC Sarl- 2012- Cotonou	Report



## Annex 6: Matrix of Evaluation Questions

<p><b>1. Relevance</b></p> <p>1.1 Which are the problems that you hope the COGERAT project will solve?</p> <p>1.2 What solutions did COGERAT propose to you? And which solutions did you select (features preferred by women and men in improving a given resource)?</p> <p>1.3 To what extent do the chosen solutions answer your problems?</p>
<p><b>2 Effectiveness</b></p> <p>2.1 Co-management</p> <p>2.1.1 Can you tell us about the main principles of the commitments made through the co-management agreement between MME/LCD and the four Communes?</p> <p>2.1.2 What mechanisms were put in place to facilitate the implementation of commitments? To what extent were the commitments respected?</p> <p>2.1.3 How would you evaluate the level of participation by local communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 1 : Information Sharing</li> <li>• Level 2 : Consultation</li> <li>• Level 3 : Decision-making</li> <li>• Level 4 : Project implementation</li> </ul> <p>2.1.4 Who does what? Who decides? How? Who wins? Who loses? Which women are involved? Which men are involved?</p> <p>2.1.5 In your opinion does the current level of participation enable people to continue the implementation of activities? What are the indicators of this?</p> <p>2.2 Restoration, Conservation and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources</p> <p>2.2.1 Which activities involving Natural Resource Restoration, Conservation and Sustainable Management has COGERAT carried out? Which activities have men participated in? Which activities have women participated in? What are the motivations behind the options chosen by women and men?</p> <p>2.2.2 To what extent did men and women have access to land?</p> <p>2.2.3 Are the options of Restoration, Conservation and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources effective? Give examples.</p>
<p><b>3. Efficiency</b></p>
<p><b>4. Replication/Sustainability</b></p> <p>To what extent can the activities carried out be continued without the help of COGERAT?</p> <p>What solutions has COGERAT supplied for men and women which were not foreseen in the aims and outcomes of the project?</p>
<p><b>5. Impacts of activities undertaken in the areas adjacent to the ATNNR</b></p> <p>5.1. To what extent have the activities undertaken by COGERAT made changes in the livelihoods of men and women?</p> <p>5.2. To what extent can the changes introduced be maintained in the long run and benefit future generations? What potential risks do you see?</p> <p>5.3. Tell us about the condition of the ATNNR before COGERAT was launched</p> <p>5.4. To what extent have the activities undertaken in the Communes involved made positive changes to the condition of the ATNNR?</p>

5.5. To what extent will men and women be able to contribute towards improving the status of ATNNR resources without the support of COGERAT?

5.6. What options would you suggest for the future?

## Annex 7: Questionnaire used and results

<p><b>6. Relevance</b></p> <p>6.1. Which are the problems that you hope the COGERAT project will solve?</p> <p>6.2. What solutions did COGERAT propose to you? And which solutions did you select (features preferred by women and men in improving a given resource)?</p> <p>6.3. To what extent do the chosen solutions answer your problems?</p>
<p><b>7. Effectiveness</b></p> <p>2.1 Co-management</p> <p>2.1.1 Can you tell us about the main principles of the commitments made through the co-management agreement between MME/LCD and the four Communes?</p> <p>2.1.2 What mechanisms were put in place to facilitate the implementation of commitments? To what extent were the commitments respected?</p> <p>2.1.3 How would you evaluate the level of participation by local communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 1 : Information Sharing</li> <li>• Level 2 : Consultation</li> <li>• Level 3 : Decision-making</li> <li>• Level 4 : Project implementation</li> </ul> <p>2.1.4 Who does what? Who decides? How? Who wins? Who loses? Which women are involved? Which men are involved?</p> <p>2.1.5 In your opinion, does the current level of participation enable people to continue the implementation of activities? What are the indicators of this?</p> <p>2.2 Restoration, Conservation and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources</p> <p>2.2.1 Which activities involving Natural Resource Restoration, Conservation and Sustainable Management has COGERAT carried out? Which activities have men participated in? Which activities have women participated in? What are the motivations behind the options chosen by women and men?</p> <p>2.2.2 To what extent did men and women have access to land?</p> <p>2.2.3 Are the options of Restoration, Conservation and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources effective? Give examples.</p>
<p><b>8. Efficiency</b></p>
<p><b>9. Replication/ sustainability</b></p> <p>To what extent can the activities carried out be continued without the help of COGERAT?</p> <p>What solutions has COGERAT supplied for men and women which were not foreseen in the aims and outcomes of the project?</p>
<p><b>10. Impacts of activities undertaken in the areas adjacent to the ATNNR</b></p>

- 10.1. To what extent have the activities undertaken by COGERAT made changes in the livelihoods of men and women?
- 10.2. To what extent can the changes introduced be maintained in the long run and benefit future generations? What potential risks do you see?
- 10.3. Tell us about the condition of the ATNNR before COGERAT was launched.
- 10.4. To what extent have the activities undertaken in the Communes involved made positive changes to the condition of the ATNNR?
- 10.5. To what extent will men and women be able to contribute towards improving the status of ATNNR resources without the support of COGERAT?

What options would you suggest for the future?

## Annex 8: Agreement Form

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

#### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organisation (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *(place)* on *(date)*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

## Annex 9: Operationalising the intervention logic of COGERAT-II: 08/02/2007

INTERVENTION LOGIC		AGGREGATE INDICATOR	OPERATIONAL OVI
Aim of project	Introduce a decentralised system for management of land and the natural resources of the ATNNR and its adjacent areas to make it possible to reverse the trend towards environmental degradation and improve the livelihoods of local people.	1. An agreement to co-manage the ATNNR and its adjacent areas involving the State, the Communes and users	1.1. At project inception, co-management agreement signed by the various partners.
		2. Improvement of the livelihoods of local people linked to the availability of and access to essential natural resources (land, water, pasture, vegetation)	2.1. Rate of out-migration reduced by x% by end of project.
			2.2. Percentage of population whose water needs are met increased by x%.
			2.3. Area reclaimed and rehabilitated reaches 5,000 ha by end of project
			2.4. Naturally regenerated area reaches x ha by end of project.
			2.5. Total production from irrigation improved by x% by end of project.
			2.6. Animal production improved by x% by end of project.
		3. Amount of land and natural resources subject to appropriate usage	3.1. Overexploited area reduced by 25% by end of project.
			3.2. Removal of wood from the ATNNR reduced by 25% by end of project.
			3.3. Removal of fauna reduced by 25% by end of project.
			3.4. Removal of hay from the ATNNR reduced by 25% by end of project.

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome -1	Stakeholders' capacity for and understanding of need to adopt a shared management approach built up.	Outcome 1.1	The 4 Communes of the ATNNR and its adjacent areas set up an inter-Commune consultation framework to provide sustainable management of the Saharan ecosystem	Joint measures to manage the area and access to natural resources.	1.1.1. A framework for inter-Commune consultation and a funding mechanism are in place.	1.1. Capacity building	Establishment of a consultation framework	H/J IS and preparatory mission
								Number of rangelands
								Type and total amount of support given to rangelands
								Number and frequency of consultation workshops
								Number and frequency of meetings of Steering Committee.
								Number of advocacy meetings
							Establishment of a funding mechanism	Partner agreement
								Number of participatory diagnoses of rangelands drawn up.
								Number of schemes for development of rangelands drawn up
								Number of costed local initiative micro projects prepared
								Number of costed local initiative micro projects financed
								Rate of implementation of local initiative micro projects financed
					1.1.2. The Communes and partners (technical SCES,	Technical training of stakeholders in LM and NRM.		Number of people trained by topic and social group.
								Number of LM training workshops held
								Quality of LM pedagogical tools

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGGREGAT E OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATION AL OUTCOME	ACTIVITI ES PLANNE D	SUB- ACTIVITIE S	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS				
					projects, and programmes) participate in LM and NRM within the ATNNR and its adjacent areas.			Number of NRM training workshops held				
					Quality of NRM pedagogical tools							
					Number of study visits							
					Number of topics adopted by social group							
											Workshop to capitalise on achievements	
										Establishme nt of an IEC programme	1 IEC arrangement for a CCC	
											Number and quality of IEC tools	
											Number and quality of bulletins and material published	
											HJ of IEC mission	
										Establishme nt of a system to manage and prevent crises.	Quality of tools and of means of prevention and management of crises.	
											Number of responses to emergencies	
											Number and quality of diagnoses carried out.	
											Number of crises definitively solved.	
											Number of women supported and quality of support	
											Number of vulnerable groups supported and quality of support.	
											Number of women involved in local decision-making bodies	
											Number of young people involved in decision-making bodies	
										Establishme nt of a joint State- Communes monitoring system.	Quality and performance of system of monitoring and protection introduced	
											Number of participants per Commune in the system of monitoring and protection.	
											Performance of joint Services-Communes monitoring network	
											HJ monitoring mission	
											Quality of information gathered	
											Number and quality of bi-annual diagnoses carried out	

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome-1	Stakeholders' capacity for and understanding of need to adopt a shared management approach built up.	Outcome.1.2	A funding mechanism to support local LM and NRM initiatives is in operation	Sustainable funding mechanism common to the 4 Communes in the project area	Operational funding mechanism for local initiatives is in place for the 4 Communes.	Capacity building	Establishment of a funding mechanism for local initiatives.	Partner agreement
								Number of participatory diagnoses of rangelands drawn up.
								Number of schemes for developing rangelands drawn up
								Number of local initiative micro projects prepared and costed
								Number of local initiative micro projects financed with costs
								Proportion of financed local initiative micro projects implemented.
								Number of women benefitting from finance mechanism
								Number of young people benefitting from finance mechanism
								Number of men benefitting from finance mechanism
								Number of micro projects and finance allocated to women
								Number of micro projects and finance allocated to young people
								Number of micro projects and finance allocated to men

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--1	Stakeholders' capacity for and understanding of need to adopt a shared management approach built up.	Outcome.1.3	Users and managers of natural resources are trained in LM and NRM techniques	Number of groups of users and managers of the areas and resources of the project area trained in LM and NRM techniques	25% of users of the ATNNR are trained in LM and NRM techniques	Training of ATNNR users in LM techniques	25% of users of the ATNNR are trained in LM techniques
							Rate of adoption of LM techniques broken down by social group
						Training of ATNNR users in NRM techniques	25% of users of the ATNNR are trained in NRM techniques
							Rate of adoption of NRM techniques broken down by social group
				At least one person per decentralised service is trained in LM and NRM techniques	Capacity building	Training of managers in the decentralised services of the State in LM techniques	At least one person per decentralised service is trained in LM and NRM techniques
							Level of understanding of LM techniques
						Training of managers in the decentralised services of the State in NRM techniques	At least one person per decentralised service is trained in LM and NRM techniques
							Level of understanding of NRM techniques



INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome-1	Stakeholders' capacity for and understanding of need to adopt a shared management approach built up.	Outcome-1.4	Direct and indirect users of the natural resources of the ATNNR and its adjacent areas are made aware of LM and NRM issues	Changes in the perceptions and behaviour of users of places within and the natural resources of the ATNNR and its adjacent areas	Capacity building	Establishment of an IEC programme	1 IEC arrangement for a CCC
							Number and quality of IEC tools
							Number and quality of bulletins and material published
							HJ of IEC mission
							Number of direct users expected to be affected, broken down by social category and Commune
							Number of direct users affected, broken down by social category and Commune
							Rate of achievement of IEC objective by direct users.
							Number of direct users expected to be affected, broken down by social category and Commune
							Number of direct users affected broken down by social category and Commune
							Rate of achievement of IEC objective by indirect users

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
outcome-1	Stakeholders' capacity for and understanding of need to adopt a shared management approach built up.	Outcome-1.5	A system to forecast and manage crises (drought, locust invasion, flooding), is in operation in the Agadez Region	A system to forecast and respond to crises is in operation in the Agadez Region	A system to forecast and manage drought is in operation in the Agadez Region	Capacity building	Introduction of a system to avoid drought.	Quality of preventative tools and measures
								Number of responses to emergencies
								Number and quality of diagnoses carried out.
								Cases of crises definitively solved
								Number of women supported and quality of support
								Number of vulnerable groups supported and quality of support.
								Number of women involved in local decision-making bodies
								Number of young people involved in local decision-making bodies
				A system to forecast and manage locust invasions is in operation in the Agadez Region.	Introduction of a system to avoid locust invasions.		Quality of preventative tools and measures	
							Number of responses to emergencies	
							Number and quality of diagnoses carried out.	
							Cases of crises definitively solved.	
							Number of women supported and quality of support	
							Number of vulnerable groups supported and quality of support.	
							Number of women involved in local decision- making bodies	
							Number of young people involved in decision-making bodies	

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
					A system to forecast and manage floods is in operation in the Agadez Region.		Introduction of a system to avoid floods.	Quality of tools and methods of prevention Number of responses to emergencies Number and quality of diagnoses carried out. Cases of crises definitively solved. Number of women supported and quality of support Number of vulnerable groups supported and quality of support. Number of women involved in local decision-making bodies Number of young people involved in local decision-making bodies

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--1	Stakeholders' capacity for and understanding of shared management approach built up.	Outcome-1.6	A joint State-Communes network to monitor the removal of natural and historical resources in the ATNNR and its adjacent areas is in operation.	An operational monitoring network based on the gathering of information by inhabitants and travel agencies collaborates with the police, customs and State security forces	An operational monitoring network, based on the gathering of information by inhabitants and travel agencies collaborates with the police, customs and State security forces	Capacity building	Establishment of a joint State-Communes system of monitoring.	Quality and performance of the system of monitoring and protection introduced
								Number of participants per Commune in the system of monitoring and protection.
								Performance of the joint Services-Communes monitoring network
								HJ monitoring mission
								Types and corroboration of information gathered
								Number of bi-annual diagnoses carried out and quality
								Categories and number of people involved
								Quality and level of participation by inhabitants
								Quality and level of participation by travel agencies
								Quality and rate of participation by forces of law and order

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
outcome-2	Livelihoods and integrity of the ecosystem improved thanks to introduction of appropriate	Outcome-2.1	Building of water-spreading weirs and dykes in areas under cultivation as well as forms of physical and	Work carried out ; number of cultivated plots protected ; improved water availability as measured by depth of water table	35 cultivated plots protected from water erosion	Application of appropriate NRM and LM technologies and methodologies	Creation of water-spreading weirs, dykes and biomechanical protection against water erosion in cultivated areas	Quality of complementary technical study
								Quality of implementation plan
								Number and quality of consultations
								Km of weirs created
								Number of plants planted
								Ha of biological protection
								Ha of mechanical protection
								Number of cultivated areas affected
		Number of sites affected						

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
methodologies and technologies for sustainable management of land and natural resources	biological protection			the cultivated plots			
				Ha of mechanical protection around the cultivated plots			Proportion of sites covered
							Type and quality of work undertaken.
							Number and social group of owners of cultivated plots.

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--2	Livelihoods and integrity of the ecosystem improved thanks to introduction of appropriate methodologies and technologies for sustainable management of land and natural resources	2.2- Rehabilitation of rangeland affected by water and wind erosion and introduction of mechanical and biological forms of protection	Number of pastoral sites covered.	31 pastoral sites protected from water erosion	Application of appropriate NRM and LM technologies and methodologies	Restoration of land, CES/DRS techniques, areas degraded by water erosion, anti-erosion methods, biomechanical protection, rangelands.	Quality of complementary technical study
				Ha of biological protection in pastoral sites			Quality of implementation plan
							Number and quality of consultations
							Km of weirs created
							Number of plants planted
							Ha of biological protection
							Ha of mechanical protection
							Number of rangeland areas affected
							Number of pasture sites affected
							Proportion of sites covered
Type and quality of work undertaken.							

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome-2	Livelihoods and integrity of the ecosystem improved thanks to introduction of appropriate methodologies	Land affected by wind deposited accumulations stabilised	Number of sensitive sites treated by the techniques of sand dune fixation	15 sensitive sites treated by the techniques of sand dune fixation	Application of appropriate NRM and LM technologies and methodologies	Restoration of land, CES/DRS techniques, degraded areas, wind erosion, anti-erosion methods and biomechanical protection	Quality of complementary technical study
							Quality of implementation plan
							Number and quality of consultations
							Km of bush hedging introduced
							Number of plants planted
							Ha of biological protection
							Ha of mechanical protection
							Km of hedging introduced
							Proportion of sites covered

	gies and technologies for sustainable management of land and natural resources						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--2	Livelihoods and integrity of the ecosystem improved thanks to introduction of appropriate methodologies and technologies for sustainable management of land and natural resources	Outcome 2.1	3.1- Preparation and adoption of a development strategy for tourism in the ATNNR and its adjacent areas	A number of activities implemented based on the development strategy for tourism, particularly measures aimed at greater involvement and economic gains for local inhabitants	A development strategy for tourism is prepared and implemented in the ATNNR and adjacent areas  The income raised for local people in the ATNNR through tourism is increased by x% by the end of the project.	Application of appropriate NRM and LM technologies and methodologies	Preparation, adoption and implementation of the development strategy for tourism.	Tourism Charter
								Strategy and Development Plan for Tourism (DPT)
								Document evaluating tourism campaign
								Workshop to approve DPT
								Launch date for implementation of DPT
								Categories of target groups involved in implementation of DPT
								Iférouane Tourist Centre rehabilitated
								Iférouane Tourist Centre upgraded

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--3	Effective use of co-management tools and methods encourages conservation and restoration of land, sustainable use of natural resources and improved livelihoods	Outcome 3.1	Agricultural and pastoral production methods are improved	% growth in yield	Yields of wheat, maize, citrus fruits, grapes, onions, tomatoes, potatoes and garlic increased by X %  Rate of reproduction of animals ( goats, sheep, camel and cattle) increased by x%  Milk production increased by x%.	Use of tools and methods to conserve and manage the natural resources in a sustainable way and improve livelihoods	Improvement of agricultural and pastoral production methods .	Number and area of agricultural farms affected
								Number and area of pastoral farms affected
								Ha of RNA in the fields under cultivation
								Ha reclaimed and rehabilitated for agricultural production
								Ha reclaimed and rehabilitated for pastoral production
								Level of improvement in level of fertility of agricultural and pastoral land
								Number and type of equipment introduced on farms
								Topics/ technologies given publicity
								Level of adoption of technologies given publicity

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome-3	Effective use of co-management tools and methods encourages conservation and restoration of land, sustainable use of natural resources and improved livelihoods	Outcome 3.2	Use of wood for construction and fuelwood is reduced in the Agadez Region	% increase in construction of houses (cases) and wells using ‘wood free’ techniques	Use of construction wood declines by x%	Use of tools and methods to conserve and manage natural resources in a sustainable way and improve livelihoods	Alternative technology, fuelwood, construction wood and others.	Type and number of appropriate technologies made more widely known
					Use of firewood declines by x%.			Number of people affected, broken down by social category
								Number of adopters
				Forest management in the ATNNR and adjacent areas			Forests of the ATNNR and its adjacent areas are managed and protected	Alternative technology, wood free habitat and well construction
					Type and number of appropriate technologies made more widely known			
					Number of people affected, broken down by social category			
								Number of adoptions
								Level of adoption

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--3	Effective use of co-management tools and methods encourages conservation and restoration of land, sustainable use of natural resources and improved livelihoods	Outcome 3.3	Impact of pests on economic activities is reduced.	Propagation of <i>Prosopis juliflora</i> reduced by methods endorsed by the forestry service ; reduction in incidence of predation by jackals on herds	Propagation of <i>Prosopis juliflora</i> is reduced by x% using methods endorsed by the forestry service	Use of tools and methods to conserve and manage natural resources in a sustainable way and improve living conditions	Control of pests and their impact on economic activities	Complementary study on ecology of species
								Pest management plan
								Number of pest species identified
								Nature of damage/impacts
					Types of economic activity affected			
					Rate of reduction of impacts on economic activities			
					Monitoring			
					Quality of participation by beneficiaries			

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome-3	Effective use of co-management tools and methods encourages conservation and restoration	Outcome 3.4	Careful reintroduction of endangered species (red-necked ostrich, dama	Number of individual animals counted and income generated by local people	A minimum of xxx red-necked ostriches introduced	Use of tools and methods to conserve and manage natural resources in a sustainable way and	Activities to reintroduce endangered species (ostrich, dama gazelle) for the benefit of local people.	The selected site for reintroduction set up and managed
					A minimum of xxx dama gazelles introduced.			Number of brood stock acquired per species
								Number of species reintroduced
								Breeding duration

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
	of land, sustainable use of natural resources and improved livelihoods		gazelle ) brings benefits to local people		Incidence of observed cases of poaching reduced by x%.	improve livelihoods	Release period

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS	
Outcome--3	Effective use of co-management tools and methods encourages conservation and restoration of land, sustainable use of natural resources and improved livelihoods		Outcome 3.5	The Land Commissions in the Agadez Region are in operation	Decisions of Land Commissions	The 3 COFO of the Agadez Region are in operation	Use of tools and methods to conserve and manage the natural resources in a sustainable way and improve livelihoods	Establishment of Land Commissions in the Agadez Region	
									HJ preparation and information mission
									Number of COFO set up
									Number of supported COFO
									Number of operational COFO

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS	
Outcome--3	Effective use of co-management tools and methods encourages conservation and restoration of land, sustainable use of natural	Outcome 3.6	The 4 Communes of the COGERAT project area participate effectively in efforts	The inter-Commune consultation framework has identified and dealt in a concerted manner with 5 issues of common interest with an impact on LM (wood,	The CDP of these Communes are revised bearing in mind local people and the concerns of co-management	Use of tools and methods to conserve and manage the natural resources in a sustainable way and improve livelihoods	Support for the active participation of the 4 Communes in co-management of the ATNNR and its adjacent areas.	Quality of the types of support provided for the participatory process involved in the community-based system of management.
								Duration of support
								Number and quality of training workshops
								Number and category of people trained per Commune

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
	resources and improved livelihoods		at co-management	hay, rehabilitation of pastureland, protection of cultivated plots and management of surface water).			

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--4	A system of monitoring based on scientific and local knowledge of the development of the socio-economic and ecological situation is in operation	Outcome 4.1	A network of observatories is in operation.	A scientific network is in operation to measure climate, monitor water tables, analyse soil fertility, follow the development of rill erosion and changes in landscape, review the status and diversity of vegetation, and follow the price of fodder, wood and agricultural and pastoral products.	Establishment of a system of scientific and community monitoring.	Establishment of a network of observatories	A system to monitor ecological development is in place
				A scientific network to monitor water tables is in operation			A maintained scientific network to measure climate
				A scientific network to analyse the fertility of soils is in operation			A maintained scientific network to monitor water tables
				A scientific network on the development of rill erosion and changes in landscape is in operation			A maintained scientific network to analyse soil fertility
				A scientific network on the status and diversity of vegetation is in operation.			A maintained scientific network on the development of rill erosion and changes in landscape
				A scientific network on the price of fodder is in operation			A maintained scientific network on the status and diversity of vegetation
				A scientific network to measure the price of wood is in operation			A maintained scientific network on the price of fodder
				A scientific network to measure the price of agricultural products is in operation			A maintained scientific network to measure the price of wood
				A scientific network to measure the price of pastoral products is in operation			A maintained scientific network to measure the price of agricultural products
							A maintained scientific network to measure the price of pastoral products

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--4	A system of monitoring based on scientific and local knowledge of the development of the socio-economic and ecological situation is in operation	Outcome--4.2	An expandable data bank on local knowledge about the physical, biological and social environment, is in operation	An expandable data bank on local knowledge about the physical, biological and social environment is in operation	Establishment of a system of scientific and community monitoring.	Establishment of a data base, local ecological and socio-economic knowledge.	Local knowledge data bank
							Scientific data bank
							GIS
							Thematic mapping
							Development and management plan

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--5	Learning, evaluation and adaptive management are improved.	Outcome-5.1	Information and analysis on the implementation of the project, its impacts and trends are available to decision-makers and the public.	Regular contractual reports are published on the basis of information drawn from monitoring and evaluation and submitted in the required timeframe.	Learning, evaluation and adaptive management	5.1- Effective supervision of the project through adaptive management	Staff trained
							Quality of staff training
							Effectiveness of staff training
							Quality of management tools
							Capacity of staff to use management tools
							System of monitoring of ecological and socio-economic change
							Other forms of physical and financial monitoring
							Number and frequency of monitoring reports
							Quality of the status of data bases
							Publications (number and quality)
							Utility of information provided by monitoring and evaluation
							Quality of participation by beneficiaries in the monitoring mechanisms

INTERVENTION LOGIC			AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--5	Learning, evaluation and adaptive management	Outcome--5.1	Results of monitoring and evaluation	Data emanating from the M&E system are reliable, verifiable and precise (concrete)	Learning, evaluation	Monitoring and evaluation of project	System of monitoring and evaluation per indicator
							Performance of data base management system (DBMS)



INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
	are improved.		the project is in operation.	are incorporated in COGERAT planning	The M&E status reports are published within the time frame and M&E results are incorporated into COGERAT planning	and adaptive management.		Capacity of managers to use the management software of the data base
								Decision support tool
								EAP Report
								Assessment and planning workshop
								Meetings of Steering Committee (number and frequency)

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--5	Learning, evaluation and adaptive management are improved.	Outcome--5.3	A Scientific Committee provides effective support to the Project Management Unit and the Steering Committee	Scientific information and analyses of trends serve as decision support tools	The Scientific Committee is in operation	Learning, evaluation and adaptive management	Establishment of a Scientific Committee to support the Project Management Unit and the Steering Committee.	Decree setting up the committee
					Scientific information and analyses of trends provided by the committee serve as decision support tools.			Committee meetings (number and frequency )
								Reports of Scientific Committee (number, frequency, and utility).

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB-ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--5	Learning, evaluation and adaptive management are improved.	Outcome--5.4	Preparation of an annual participatory diagnostic ecological and socio-economic	Perceptions of local people and of technicians/scientists on evolving trends	A participatory diagnostic ecological inventory is carried out annually	Learning, evaluation and adaptive management.	Activities involved in the annual participatory diagnostic ecological and socio-economic inventory.	Annual participatory diagnosis
								Communes involved
								Quality of diagnosis
								Quality of participation by beneficiaries
								Data published
								Tools developed

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATOR	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIES PLANNED	SUB- ACTIVITIES	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
			inventory					

INTERVENTION LOGIC				AGREGATE OUTCOME INDICATO R	OVI OF OPERATIONAL OUTCOME	ACTIVITIE S PLANNED	SUB- ACTIVITIE S	PROPOSED ACTIVITY INDICATORS
Outcome--5	Learning, evaluation and adaptive management are improved.	Outcome--5	Finance is used effectiv ely and allocati ons are transpar ent	Co-financing by Communes and the State	100% of expenditure is in line with budgetary forecasts	Learning, evaluation and adaptive management.	Transparent and effective management of the financial resources of the project	Training workshop on financial management
					Management tools			
					Number of errors noted by annual audits			
					Rate of use of project budget			