



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	West Africa
Country (ies):	Mali
Project Title:	Strengthening resilience to Climate Change through integrated agricultural and pastoral management in the Sahelian zone in the framework of the Sustainable Land Management Approach
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/MLI/038/LDF
GEF ID:	4822
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change (Adaptation)
Project Executing Partners:	Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development (AEDD)
Project Duration:	60 months (after extension to December 31, 2019)

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	06/10/2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01/02/2015
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31/12/2018
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	31/12/2019
Actual Implementation End Date³:	n/a

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,172,727	
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	AEDD Integrating Climate Change into Development planning (PICP)	USD 11,315,000 USD 4,500,000 (USD 400,000 in kind and USD 4,100,000 (cash)
	Support programme for the implementation of the climate change national strategy	USD 6,815,000 (in cash)
	FAO Youth at work: reduction of rural poverty	USD 2,343,959

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

	(GCP/MLI/040/MUL/)	USD 1,999,959 (in cash)
	Support project for the preparation of the General Agriculture and Livestock Census in Mali (TCP/MLI/3501)	USD 344,000 (in cash)
	Ministry of Rural Development	USD 588,300 (in kind)
	Subtotal Co-financing:	USD 14,247,259
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	1,924,046	
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	3,421,283	

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	February 20, 2019	
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):		
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	May 15, 2017	
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No	
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes	
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	October-November 2019	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes /Tracking Tools Mali 038 Completed in April 2018	

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S	
Overall implementation progress rating:	S	
Overall risk rating:	Low	

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	4 rd PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Mohamed Soumaré, Project Coordinator	Mohamed.Soumare@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Onyango, Vivian (AGPMD)	Vivian.Onyango@fao.org
Budget Holder	Amadou Allahoury DIALLO, FAOR/Mali	Amadou.Allahoury@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Maude Veyret-Picot, Technical Officer, CBC	Maude.VeyretPicot@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s):						
Outcome 1.1 The institutional capacities of the AEDD, Ministry of Rural Development's structures (MDR), local governments, herders, farmers and customary organizations are strengthened to minimize the exposure of agro-pastoral and agricultural production systems in vulnerable areas to climate variability and risks.	Percentage of 3000 agro-pastoralists across the APFS network, 30% of whom have access and use of decennial meteorological data to support information on crop and animal production cycles and transhumance practices	0	500 agro-pastoralists	70% of 3000 agro-pastoralists throughout the APFS networks including 30% women have access to and use the weather forecast	75.39% of agro-pastoralists, of whom 32.81% of trained women have access to and use decennial meteorological data to support information on crop and livestock production cycles and transhumance practices Surveys were conducted between August and September 2018 in a sample of 31 Farmer Field Schools (10 in Kita, 11 in Banamba and 10 in Niono).	HS
	Negotiated participatory territorial development pilot actions (DTPN) implemented	0	2 pilot actions	5 pilot actions completed (natural resource management agreements are negotiated, developed, signed and disseminated)	166.67% - 1 convention: Kourounikoto, urban commune of Kourounikoto, in Kita,: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ ensure the liberation of animal passages, pastoral areas and spaces to reduce conflicts related to the management of agropastoral resources ✓ ensure the respect of the dates of the ascent and descent of animals and the agricultural calendar by agro-pastoralists and pastoralists in order to reduce conflicts ✓ Build agro-pastoral infrastructure, including pastoral wells, and delineate animal corridors, 	HS

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					<p>✓ promote agriculture and intensive livestock farming for good management of natural resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 conventions: Dogotou and Touba, Municipality of Duguwolowila in Banamba; - 2 Conventions : Moussawèrè and Kolodougoucouira in Niono <p>Technical specifications and bidding documents are prepared, clearances obtained, and the selection of a service provider is underway to delineate four transhumance corridors over a total length of 66 kilometers.</p> <p>Each convention foresees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A communal council meets and agrees the convention (deliberation) and set up a management body and its approval by all the actors involved; - To ensure the liberation of animal's passages, pastoral zones and spaces in order to reduce conflicts linked to the management of agropastoral resources; - Ensure the respect of the comeback and descent dates and the agricole's calendar by agro pastoral's actors and the pastors in order to reduce conflicts, - To build agropastoral's infrastructures, notably pastoral wells, and to demarcate the animal's passageways, - To promote agriculture and intensive cattle breeding for a good management of natural resources - Fight against bush fires. 	
Outcome 2.1: Agro-pastoralists (of which at least 30% are women) have strengthened capacities to adopt CCA practices and technologies in agro-pastoral systems.	Percentage of targeted groups that built their capacities for adopting some technologies and practices of CCA (including 30% women)		50%	70% of the beneficiaries adopted the CCA promoted practices throughout the APFS	83.93% beneficiaries (37.86% women) adopted at least one CCA practice, based on surveys conducted in Kita, Banamba and Niono between August and September 2018.	HS

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
<p>Outcome 2.3:</p> <p>Agricultural/agro-pastoral productivity in pilot CCA investment areas has increased</p>	Total quantity of distributed seeds, agroforestry plants and total seeded surface that allow to increase productivity for beneficiaries.		2,5% increase	5% increase	<p>100%</p> <p>The average productivity rate is 36% in Banamba and 39% in Kita for coarse grains (sorghum, millet, sweetcorn), according to the results of evaluations carried out in Kita and Banamba Farmer-Field Schools in November 2018. The rate is 57.89 % for market gardening in Kita and 31.12% in Banamba (potato).</p> <p>1500 Farmer-Field Schools producers have benefited from species seeds (3000 Kg) involving forage, market gardening, cereals and plants that are drought-resistant including 1000kg of potato seeds and 2000Kg forage and crops species.</p> <p>In agroforestry 14.25 ha of plants were developed (2 ha in Kita, 5 ha in Banamba, 7. 25 ha in Niono with 1,510 plants involving Pterocarpus erinaceus, Acacia seyal and Afzelia africana</p> <p>Some other achievements that have contributed to increased productivity include:</p> <p>12 market gardening-perimeters including 6 in Banamba and 6 in Kita;</p> <p>2 Electric baler twines have been provided to Farmer Field Schools in Niono,</p> <p>2 Electric straw cutters have been provided to Kita and Banamba Farmer-Field Schools.</p> <p>10 incubators with a capacity of 60 eggs have been provided to Farmer Field Schools in Niono.</p>	HS
<p>Outcome 3.1:</p> <p>APFS-based CCA mainstreamed into integrated rural development and investment policies</p>	A five-year Plan for Pastoral Development which supports the mainstreaming and insertion of ACC in the agro-pastoralism sector		1 Five year Pastoral Development Plan prepared (PQAP)	1 Five year Pastoral Development Plan prepared (PQAP)	<p>100%</p> <p>The evaluation of the first phase of the Five-year Pastoral Development Program (2008- 2012) was completed as well as the formulation of the second Five-year Pastoral Development Program in the period 2019- 2023. That second phase benefited from a funding of the Special Investment Budget in its implementation, as a contribution from the government, planned for 2020.</p>	HS

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 4.1: Project implementation based on result-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated	Fulfillment of planned M&E activities including establishing baseline values for all project indicators, yearly updating of indicators, a mid-term evaluation/review and a final project evaluation and dissemination of lessons learned.		1 monitoring - evaluation system put in place	1 monitoring - evaluation system put in place	100% A performance framework focusing on the monitoring of indicators is put in place and updated every year. All the indicators were defined in parallel with their collection frequency. People were designated to ensure completion of the task. Data was collected and processed. Reports (8 REAP and 4 PIR), Minutes of Meetings, Meeting reports and technical notes have been prepared and disseminated. A geographical/topographical Information System is set up to collect data, design and disseminate maps on the Project achievements.	HS
			1 Midterm review	2 evaluations (1 mid-term evaluation and 1 final evaluation)	60% out of which: 50% as the mid-term evaluation is available; and 10% as the Terms of Reference for the final project evaluation has been prepared and are being validated.	S
			0	1 WhatsApp group for information sharing and innovation	The group has used a niche to share field information, innovations and other subjects of common interest between Farmer Field Schools and other resource persons. It has 38 members including 8 women, or 21.05%.	S

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
N/a			

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
PRODUIT 1.1.2 Climate information and meteorological data related to climate variability and change are made available and used in targeted vulnerable regions, and institutional actors' capacities are strengthened to better analyse and diffuse this data.	Q2 Y2	Participatory Climate data collection Process underway;	Equipment Acquisition Process rain gauges, smartphones, broadcasting programs) ongoing	107 peoples trained including 3 women (101 producers and 6 technical supervisors des services techniques) 101 smartphones and 75 peasants rain gauge, bought and furnished to the CEAP	75.39% of agro-pastoralists, 32.81% of whom are women, have access and use decennial meteorological data		107,7%	Surveys were conducted between August and September 2018 involving a sample of 31 Farmer-field schools members (10 Farmer-field school in Kita, 11 in Banamba and 10 in Niono). The surveys enabled to assess the level of access and use of decennial meteorological data to support information on crops and animal production cycles and transhumance practices.
Output 1.1.3: The Charter Pastoral and its statutes are distributed and implemented. Agreements between local agro-pastoralists are put in place to reduce conflicts linked to climate variability and transhumance paths	Q4 Y3	Search for documentation related to the pastoral charter at the	105 booklets of the Pastoral Charter in local languages (Banamankan and Fulfuldé) acquired and	10 pastoral charter diffusion at radio-station level (once per week, debates, discussions, information throughout the local radio	40 radio programs disseminate pastoral charter on community radios; 343 dissemination sessions of the pastoral charter by the facilitators in Farmer		333%	Dissemination and popularization of the charter through the Farmer Field Schools and local radios are carried out. Beyond the dissemination of the pastoral charter, other topics were discussed in the various debates.

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

		National Direction of production and animal Industries Training of APFS facilitators	distributed to APFS facilitators and stakeholders 65 sessions of Pastoral Charter diffusion by facilitators throughout the APFS	KUNADIA FM o Kita on the APFS activities, and pastoral charter are realized) 237 dissemination sessions of the pastoral Charter carried out by the APFS facilitators	Field Schools			
	Q4Y3	-	Current Policy examined Key stakeholders identified	territorial Diagnostic conducted in 12 localities 04 provisional conventions have been developed on agro-pastoral resources	5 Natural resource management agreements are negotiated, drafted, signed and disseminated (pilot actions carried out)		166,67%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 convention: Kourounikoto, uraban commune urbaine of Kourounikoto, in Kita, - 2 conventions: Dogotou and Touba, Commune of Duguwolowila in Banamba; - 2 Conventions: Moussawèrè and Kolodougoucouira in Niono
	Q4Y3	-	-	-	4 corridors of animal passage in progress subsequent to the signature of natural resource management agreements		10%	Technical specifications and bidding documents for the 66-km work have been developed, clearances have been obtained, selection process of a contractor for field work is underway.
Output 2.1.1: At least 200 APFS facilitators are trained (of which at least 30% are women) through agreements with associations of livestock-raisers and agro-pastoralists	Q3 Y4	95 people are trained including 89 facilitators and field supervisors (10, 87% are women)	-	165 facilitators (technical agents) and producers trained in 2018 and received recycling training in 2019 including 9,23 % women in the three project intervention districts (Kita, Niono and Banamba)	86 facilitators including 9 women (10, 46%), underwent capacity building in the management of fall armyworm		177,5%	Management training on Fall Armyworm was an unplanned activity but was carried out upon request of producers during the FAO Representative's supervision mission. The training involved members of Farmer Field School Network and Agriculture Sector Officers (Banamba: 25 people, Kita: 30 people and Niono: 31 people). 260 facilitators and supervisors in total were trained by the project.

Output 2.1.2 (revised) 101 APFS are set up and their program integrates the CCA and sustainable land use principles, with emphasis on good practices, ecosystem resilience and integrated agricultural and pastoral production systems	Q3 Y4	12 communes and 64 villages identified	28 communes and 29 APFS intervention villages 87 CEAP implemented;	14 CEAP put in place;	23 Agro-Pastoral Field-Schools were set up by the project (12 in Banamba, 11 in Kita). 581 agro-pastoralists of whom 47.16% women were trained.	100%	In total 124 Agro-Pastoral Field-Schools were set up by the project (40 in Kita, 46 in Banamba and 38 in Niono). This allowed the project to reach 3829 agro-pastoralists, 46.93% of whom were women, compared to 3000 expected.
	Q3 Y4	-	-	-	60 agro-pastoralists all members of Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLA) received training and put in place.	100%	The 60 agro-pastoralists who benefited from capacity building have set up 30 VSLAs as follows: 10 in Kita, 10 in Banamba and 10 in Niono.
	Q3 Y4	-	-	-	10 Agro-Pastoral Field-Schools networks put in place (3 networks on the level of the three Administrative Divisions and 7 village networks, 1 communal)	100%	10 functional networks set up. An exchange trip of two members from Kita Agro-Pastoral Field Schools network was carried out on February 16, 2019 in Dioïla network. It allowed follow-up on experiences from Dioïla network and its sharing with the other members of Kita network.
	Q2 Y4	-	-	-	485 people including 208 women, or 45.77% participated in 8 open days/exchange visits in the Agro-Pastoral Field-School.	100%	The visit days helped to facilitate communication between Producers Field Schools and Agro-Pastoralists Field Schools, to learn lessons about related activities, and disseminate successes among participants of various localities.
Output 2.2.1 At least 2,500 livestock-raisers and farmers (of which at least 30% are women) participate in the implementation of integrated local adaptation strategies	Q4 Y3		Integrated local adaptation strategies are developed	Integrated local adaptation strategies are developed	3829 agro-pastoralist including 46.93% women partook in the implementation of integrated local adaptation strategies and are currently disseminating them.	100%	Agro-Pastoralists Field-School groups disseminate integrated adaptation strategies to their members and neighbors such as : - market gardening on market gardening field perimeters; - the use of straw cutters and bundle axes that surrounding villages may need, to have food supplements for animals;

								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the sale of eggs in the villages to improve local breeds; and - the duplication of sheep fattening and animal care by Agro-Pastoralists Field School members and the community.
	Q2 Y3	-	-	-	<p>12 secure market perimeters (6 in Banamba and 6 in Kita)</p> <p>04 Market gardening wells are being carried out in Banamba on Agro-Pastoralists Field-Schools own funding (Djenidjie-Bambara, Uleni, Kondo, Dandolo)</p> <p>2 boreholes achieved in partnership with Agro-Pastoralist Field-Schools (Begneni, Kouna)</p> <p>7 official allocation of land parcel titles for market gardening activities are obtained on Agro-pastoralist field schools own fund (4 in Banamba and 3 in Kita).</p>		60%	<p>3 perimeters already secured (2 in Banamba and 1 in Kita). The equipment supply process is underway for another 9 perimeters</p> <p>Works (to deepen wells, fencing, and development of tilling plots) have been carried out by beneficiaries as part of their participation/contribution. They pay for specialized labor and provide unskilled labor.</p>
	Q2 Y3			the process is ongoing	2 electric balers are provided to Niono Agro-Pastoralists Field-Schools		100%	Beneficiaries have been trained in their use (Quinzambougou, Nango Sahel)
	Q2 Y3			the process is ongoing	2 motor straw cutters provided to Agro-Pastoralist Field		100%	Benefited 2 Agro-Pastoralist Field Schools including Béréla Kita and Ouleny Banamba

					Schools			
	Q2 Y3			The process is ongoing	10 electric incubators provided to Pastoralist Field Schools in Niono		100%	The capacity of each incubator is 60 eggs.
Output 2.3.1 Four pilot investments in adaptation are supported to improve ecosystem resilience and contribute to strengthening the capacity of agro-pastoralists to adapt to climate change	Q2 Y3			The purchase process is ongoing for the distribution of seeds to beneficiaries	3000 Kg (1000kg seed potato and 2000 Kg seed forage species, cereals) are distributed.		100%	1500 producers at Pastoralist Field Schools level benefited from seeds involving forage species, market gardening, cereals and plants that were sufficiently drought-tolerant and climatic hazards.
	Q2 Y3			The purchase process is ongoing for the distribution of seeds to beneficiaries	1510 plants are distributed.		100%	14. 25 ha of agroforestry plants were planted (2 ha in Kita, 5 ha in Banamba, 7,25 ha in Niono) Plants are: Pterocarpus erinaceus, Acacia seyal, Afzelia africana.
Output 3.1.3. The Five-Year Pastoral Development Plan (Plan Quinquennal d'Aménagements Pastoraux – PQAP) is revised to support integration and mainstreaming of CCA in the agro-pastoral sector.	Q4 Y3		A LoA signed between FAO and DNPIA to review PQAP	The revision is in progress	1 Five-year plan of Pastoral Improvements (PQAP) is revised. 1 national plan validation workshop is held.		100%	The evaluation of the 1st phase of the Five-Year Pastoral Development Program (2008-2012) was carried out as well as the formulation of FYDP II for the period 2019-2023. The national validation workshop of FYDP organized by the National Directorate of Productions and Animal Industries (DNPIA) was held on January 7, 2019, with the participation of various national and local stakeholders, involving 51 people.
Output 4.1.1. Monitoring and Evaluation System put in place, including systematic collection, analysis, compilation, and operational implementation of data.	Q4 Y4	2 six-monthly progress reports and 1 report PIR prepared	2 six-monthly reports and 1 report PIR prepared	2 six-monthly reports and 1 report PIR prepared	2 six-monthly reports and 1 report PIR prepared		92,31%	The project was officially launched in July 2015. Eight (08) half-year reports (one in 2015, two in 2016, two in 2017, two in 2018 and one in 2019) have been prepared and submitted Four (04) PIR (June 2016, June 2017, June 2018 and June 2019) prepared and submitted.

Output 4.1.2. final evaluations are conducted.	Q4 Y4				A ToR prepared for the development of final project subsequent to validation process		10%	
Output 4.1.3. Best practices and lessons learned from the project are disseminated	Q4 Y1			A WhatsApp group is created	8 new members joined the created WhatsApp group.		100%	The WhatsApp group created on April 25, 2018, has registered 8 new members, making a total of 38 members, 8 of whom are women, or 21.05%, made up of Producers Field School and Agro-Pastoralist Field School facilitators and other person resources. The group serves as niche for the sharing of field information, innovations and other topics of common interest (in the form of course text, video with testimonials, photos ...) or reactions to concerns raised by members.

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

- 3829 agro-pastoralists, 46.93% of whom were women compared with 3000 expected, having improved their resilience skills thanks to adopted agro-pastoral practices;
- The project supported the development of a 5-year national pastoral management plan, for which funding has been made available by the Government to ensure its implementation through its special investment budget.
- 5 conventions on the management of natural resources negotiated, signed, distributed and demarcation works involving 4 animal passage corridors (66km) in progress. 1270 hectares of land are managed under signed agreements.
- increased awareness on climate change through taking it into account in municipalities Social, Economic and Cultural Development Plans (SECDP) planning documents; and

- 35% success rate of artificial bovine insemination in Kita.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

Max 200 words:

- Synergy of action between partners intervening in the same field of activities and localities;
- access to irrigation water for the Agro-Pastoralist Field-School market gardening schemes and reducing burden on women: in fact, the Agro-Pastoralist Field Schools need high amount of money to execute wells digging works reaching sometimes great depths. Unfortunately, in hard rock cases (Djenidié-Bambara), they also encounter rock falls from well walls (village of Ouleni)), what requires them to have reinforced concrete nozzles. Faced with such multiple and varied work constraints requiring in some instances, costs which are beyond the means of populations, they seek external support to reach ground water table and carry out their market gardening activities.
- Lack of women's access to land. In view of the cultural context in Mali, women are not landowners. However, the project lobbying near the local authorities permitted some women organizations to get titles of administrative parcels.
- Lack of equipment (cultivation, transport and transformation)
- The preservation of local animal breeds and plant seeds that are in the process of being abandoned (in favor of imported breeds or varieties) in certain localities due to climate change. The majority of local varieties are no more adapted because of longer vegetative cycle which does not permit them to arrive to maturity with the insufficiencies of rain (either tardy or precocious), nevertheless some local varieties are well adapted even if they remain less productive than improved varieties.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	HS	HS	Project implementation during the reporting period has evolved very satisfactorily. Beneficiaries have adopted agro-pastoral good practices. A change in behavior is noted in terms of livestock management, agro-meteorological information, use of adapted seeds and access to the market; A better organization of Ago-Pastoralists Field School groups and villages achieving self-funding of their initiatives and access to microfinance institutions, testify ownership taking of the project by the beneficiaries; Functional Agro-Pastoralist Field Schools local networks regularly support agro-pastoralists in their various concerns; The field school approach is used by other projects at FAO Mali level as well as at other development partner's levels. The approach is even included in the curriculum of the Faculty of Agronomy and Animal Medicine (FAMA) of Segou.
Budget Holder	HS	HS	FAO provided a management oversight of the project to ensure a successful implementation and support a strong understanding on the CCA strategy through APFS. The project developed the best practices; the trends of lessons learnt could be incorporated into the new programs.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	S	Good progress with the project with satisfactory results such as making use of technology opportunities such as mobile phones for dissemination of lessons and also gender representation and participation has been satisfactory. The project is on track to achieve set objectives.

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<p>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>With the project nearing its closure, a good assessment of its progress towards the achievement of its development objectives can be made. The results matrix includes a number of qualitative indicators that have been largely met or even exceeded. It is a successful project with tangible results in the pilot areas and nationally (e.g. its contribution to the national pastoral management and financing plan). Results that go beyond the results matrix indicators were achieved, and contribute to catalysing a change process that is needed for system re-design (believing that climate adaptation does not reside in simple adoption of climate smart practices). These include the stronger involvement of women in natural resource use and management, land use planning at a scale that goes beyond the plots, etc. The project approach, using FFS and APFS approaches, has been successful in mobilising and further capacitating partners (including extension service providers), extending information (such as agro-meteorological information) and knowledge to agro-pastoralists and scaling CCA practices. It is also an approach that has proven to have good dissemination potentials (from farmer to farmer) and sustains achievements locally.</p> <p>The project delivery and management has been satisfactory as well. The PMU adapts smoothly to challenges, remains very much results focused and is committed to deliver in a timely manner. Mali's team's involvement in a regional network of sister projects (in Burkina Faso, Niger and Senegal) has been instrumental for lessons sharing.</p>
---	-----------------	-----------------	---

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

<p>Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)</p>	<p>Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid¹⁸. If not, what is the new classification and explain.</p>

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE

The following table summarizes risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflects also **any new risks** identified in the course of project implementation. The **Notes** column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant**.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	High probability of occurrence of increasingly frequent climatic events likely to affect crops and animal production cycles and increase food / nutrition insecurity	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sequencing of agro-pastoral production sectors (dry / market gardening / small ruminant breeding / poultry - Transfer of APEC facilitation skills to villagers, - Defensive measures and soil restoration / surface water conservation (DRS / CES), - Provision of agro-pastoralists 	All these measures have improved the production of agro-pastoralists	

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Insecurity and potential lack of social stability required in the project area	Average	Transfer of local skills to Agro-Pastoralists Field-School members, facilitators/supervisors, and networks	Facilitates the implementation of project activities	
3	Conflict between farmers/herders	Average	Dissemination of the pastoral charter, negotiation, signature and dissemination of conventions on the management of natural resources.	Prevention, reduction of conflicts with signing of conventions, ongoing realization of animal corridors	
4	Reluctance of conflicting stakeholders (farmers/herders) to assume responsibilities and participate in project activities and reluctance/slowness of local organizations to agree to project activities	Low	Grants seed varieties of varieties adapted to target groups	Producer access to adapted variety seeds	
5	Risk of management change at local institution levels	Average	Dynamic partnership maintained	Activities rolled out normally	
6	Seed shortage due to climate variability and stress, prolonged droughts and/or pests and disease outbreaks that can affect crops/grasslands	Low	Capacity building of producers Provision of seed varieties, varieties adapted to target groups	Producers have acces to seeds of adapted varieties Agro-pastoralists' capacities are reinforced in the management of the Fall armyworm	
7	Lack of adequate human and material resources to implement this project that could disrupt the achievement of many activities.	Low			
8	Local populations do not perceive the benefits associated with resilience practices.	Low			

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	L	Even if there are identified risks, BH and PMU monitor each of them and adopt strategies according to the nature of risks. They involve stakeholders in risk management and mitigation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on the above, the project stakeholders (the steering committee, beneficiaries and FAO) are aware that the project could not achieve the objectives set for it as at 31 December 2018, have agreed on the need to consolidate and sustain gains generated by up to 31 December 2019
--	--

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

*A gender analysis was conducted where it appears that; 46, 69% of women were reached by the project in the implementation of activities. The analysis showed that 84% of beneficiaries 38% of whom are women, have adopted at least one climate-resilient practice and adaptation technologies to promote food security.

The five best practices most adopted by APEC members were evaluated. It was found that three out of five practices are more adopted by men than by women: i) the production and use of organic manure (52% for men and 48% for women); (ii) the cultivation of adapted early seeds (58% for men and 42% for women) ; and (iii) dry, flat and ridge seedlings (58% for men and 42% for women). In contrast, adoption rates for two other practices are higher for women. These are as follows: the combination of crops (53% for women and 47% for men) and the promotion of short cycle breeding (53% for women and 47% for men).

*The Project has an expert in gender and good practice. Also the project staff received capacity building in gender and development in order to bridge gender gaps in access to and control of natural resources; the project conducted advocacy with the authorities for the granting of seven administrative titles of land parcels to women. Also, women have been involved in negotiated participatory territorial development actions. They account for the majority of APEC activities (46.69%)

Women make a significant contribution to improving household nutritional living conditions, schooling children, meeting their clothing needs, in terms of health care, cohesion and social stability.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

N/A

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

The following stakeholders are involved in the implementation of the project including the Ministry, FAO, project steering committee members, local partners.

- A protocol between FAO and DNA, signed and extended until 31 December 2019 for capacity building activities on dry crops, vegetables, the management of armyworms, establishment of Village Savings Associations and Credit (VSAC), market access, GDTE practice.
- A protocol between FAO and DNPIA allowed the following activities to be carried out: identification of transhumance corridors; the setting of land use rights through participatory negotiations in the three Administrative Divisions (circles); support to coordination in the three circles involved in the implementation of participatory and negotiated territorial development pilot actions; and revision of the Five-Year Pastoral Planning Plan (PQAP)
- A Field supervision organized at national level (by project team and DNA, DNPIA, IER, Mali-METEO) contributed to note the project progress on the field, particular to the visited areas (progress made, results achieved, difficulties, prospects) and to propose solutions to the APFES members difficulties which could affect the expected results;
- A field mission organized at Niono by the FAO Representative from 12 to 13/09 noted the effectiveness of the project implementation with encouraging results in term of ownership of activities by the beneficiaries;
- The 5th steering committee held on February 20, 2019 between the designated ministries, FAO, Focal point of FEM, National structures, Governors, Prefects, cercles Councils and NGOs. The all participants appreciated the progress made towards the implementation of the planned activities as well as the Steering committee meeting approved the 2019 action plan.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

Testimonials from the project key actors :



Photo n°1 : Testimony of Ms Djélika DAO Niaminani, on September 12, 2018 during the FAOML Representative mission

One of the APFS members Mrs. Djelika Dao, President of APFS said: "I learned a lot. I was fattening my cow using my own method. One day I fed my cow with a lot of wheat bran without measuring quantities and my cow died. Now, I know about feed rationing with everything I learned in APFS»



Photo n° 2 : Ceremony of giving to the APFS of Niaminani an electric incubator of 60 eggs by the representative of the FAO Mali, on 12/09/2018 in Niaminani.

The FAO Mali Representative in his speech expressed satisfaction in these terms: "I was able to verify everything that was mentioned in the reports, such as said this: to see once is better than to hear 100 times. Through the various skits presented I was able to realize the effects generated by the project and which are based on the three (3) components of intervention of FAO, namely: (i) eat one's fill (ii) improve incomes and, (iii) strengthen social peace."



Photo 3 : Testimony of Mr Mady F KEITA member of Faraba-Guimba & Niafala APFS in Kita

Climate change is more than a reality and therefore we need a greater awareness of its effects: Mr Mady Famakan Keita said: during our practical work in APFS we realized that, our rivers have been drying up since December 2017, whereas this occurred since February in 2016. Also, we observe the same phenomenon for a well of a village which had never dried up for more than 45 years"



Photo 4 : Using of cowpea fodder in Nango Sahel-Niono, June 2018

A woman member of the APFS of Nango Sahel, said "the breeding is threatened and the animals can no longer feed themselves properly. We are forced to produce fodder or store straw to feed animals that are sources of income for women"

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Representation of FAO	Staff Project support (5%), Operations officer (50%)	FAOR, Operations Coordinator, Ass. Program, Operations Officer, Administrative assistants, Procurement unity, Operations assistant, Drivers	0	\$ 707 210	\$ 260 728	\$ - 707 210
	Youth at Work : reduction of poverty (GCP/MLI/040/MUL)	Water fountain, Chairs, tables, fridge, Printer	\$ 1 999 959	\$ -	\$ 2 624	\$ 1 997 335
	Support project for the preparation of general Agriculture and Livestock census in Mali (TCP/MLIM3501)		\$ 344 000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 344 000
Ministry of Rural Development	Ministry of Rural Development	Conference room (2015; 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019), Offices rent for Project Office and Local Advisors (3 cercles);	\$ 588 300	\$ 1 500 000	\$ 15 300	\$ - 911 700
AEDD	AEDD		\$ 11 315 000	\$ 672 897		\$ 10 642 103

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

					-	
Contribution des bénéficiaires du projet (membres des CEAP)	Bénéficiaires à Kita, Banamba, Niono		\$ 541 176			\$- 541 176
	TOTAL	\$ 14 247 259	\$ 3 421 283	\$ 278 652		\$ 10 823 352

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

The co-financing planned was estimated during the project formulation. Some targeted projects have been closed. The project team used the available resources to achieve the results.

The beneficiaries of the project contributed financially and physically to the implementation of the project; they have:

- financed from their own resources the obtaining of the administrative titles of allocation of the vegetable parcels;
- Contributed to build wells by participating physical and paying from their own funds locally labor (contractors, masons, scrap metal workers);
- Participated on construction of the fences of market gardening perimeters or palisade as well as arrangements for their development;
- transported on their own funds, from the cercles offices to their localities: inputs, materials and equipment (cotton cakes, molasses, field supplies and equipments, cements, etc.)
- Participated on learning activities to build capacity (once a week / CEAP members).

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. DO **Ratings definitions: Highly Satisfactory (HS** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.