

Resilient, productive and sustainable landscapes in Mali's Kayes Region

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10362

Countries

Mali

Project Name

Resilient, productive and sustainable landscapes in Mali's Kayes Region

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/9/2021

Review completed by PM

11/28/2022

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 14, 2021

Addressed.

July 8, 2021

Rio Marker for CCM should be 0. Please, revise.

Agency Response Rio marker for CCM amended.
Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
November 17, 2022

Addressed.

November 14, 2022

- The table B and the annexes with the result framework are not readable. We cannot check the changes. Please, correct the formatting.

- The comments made on October 14 will be checked at the next submission, with a readable information.

- Please, further strengthen the consistency and clarity of the climate adaptation rationale for the LDCF finance in this project, including the risks of climate impacts that this project is supporting adaptation to, particularly with regards to changing precipitation patterns and anticipated drought. For example:

- o With regards to para 47, we note the indications regarding anticipated temperature increased. Please clarify what RCP is being referred to.

- o With regards to para 48, we note the indication that there is uncertainty as to the direction of change, with some models indicating increases in the duration of the dry spells while others suggest decreases. As yet, there are thus no univocal precipitation change projections for Mali under a future climate. While we appreciate there is uncertainty, we also note the LDCF funding is targeted on addressing the risks of drought, as is explained in para 73. At the same time, we note the indication in para 52 that droughts have been particularly studied in the Malian context. Please expand and clarify on what different sources of climate information indicate about the anticipated risks of precipitation patterns and drought in the project area.

- o With regards to para 49, please reference where these figures are coming from. These seem to suggest more conclusive information is present on the likelihood of increased drought than is stated in para 48. Please clarify.

- Component 2, outcome 2:

- o Please strengthen articulation of how current and anticipated impacts of key climate hazards (temperature increases, rainfall change) will be systematically included and addressed in the sustainable landscape management plans.

- o para 162 refers to modules. Please clarify what modules are being referred to.

? - Component 3, Outcome 3:

- o While we appreciate that income diversification, particularly of women and youth, can be a relevant climate adaptation strategy, this outcome would be strengthened with greater specificity and correlation with the current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards, and therefore it is unclear if the LDCF funding for this outcome will be money well spent. For example,

- Please clarify what the basket of goods is or will be that will be supported by this outcome.

- Table 12 on income generation activities has formatting problems and its relevance is therefore hard to assess.

- How will this project ensure that the new income activities people are supported to be engaged in will be relevant to losses of income from current activities the same people are engaged in now or have been in the past?
- How will the barrier of access to affordable capital be addressed for those who will transition livelihood activities to the new income activities?

October 14, 2021

Some comments expressed in other items may have been too broad and were not properly addressed. We are completing the review with the following items, aligned with previous comments, to improve the incremental reasoning, the climate adaptation rationale, with potential changes in the result framework. The project interventions should be responses to current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards, with generation of GEBs, and adaptation benefits.

- To what extent will outcomes 1 and 2 both directly consider and focus land use planning on anticipated climate impacts, rather than what the current state? Please ensure sufficient attention and budget is included in this outcome to understand and address specific climate impacts looking forwards.
- For example, please elaborate on how output 2.1 will ensure location of agrosylvopastoral food systems and intensification of production systems will be sustainable given changing climate impacts, and adjust the output as needed.
- About the component 3, we understand and agree on the development of livelihoods. However, we have not seen a focus on livelihoods adapted to climate change and a priority given to value chains also creating agroecological benefits. It is a GEF and LDCF project: we expect GEBs, adaptation benefits, and GEF and LDCF resources should be additional to generate these benefits. We have not seen such demonstration for the proposed value chains related to horticulture, small livestock, and poultry (outcome 3.1). The GEF and LDCF resources should be focused on outputs and activities that contribute to GEBs and adaptation benefits. Other activities related to infrastructures and materials should preferably be financed by cofinancing (see activities 3.1.3 related to seeds and fertilizers, 3.1.4 on a financing plan for collective purchase and operation of transport equipment, 3.1.5 on livestock and poultry, 3.1.6 on small equipment related to chicken coops, 3.1.7 on providing animals and chicken food, 3.1.8 about livestock), 3.1.9 on recycling and waste water - see your response to the item 6, there are still mention of waste water in the work plan; 3.1.11 on small means of transportation).
- Same demonstration is needed for the value chains mentioned in the output 3.2 (neem seed oil, fodder). It seems easier for this value chain. We may wonder however if the

GEF should finance all these activities, including the baseline activities: 3.2.1, 3.2.3, 3.2.4...

July 8, 2021

- See below detailed comments about the result framework, and especially the component 3.

Agency Response

15 November 2022

- Apologies for the formatting issues, which were beyond our control (and which we could not see in the Portal, therefore not address timely). We are addressing the formatting issues with the GEFSEC IT team. Please confirm proper visualisation.
- The minimum and maximum of temperature increases correspond to RCP 2.6 and RCP 8.5, respectively. This has been clarified in the text.
- Most available studies on drought focus on past or current droughts and associated coping mechanisms.

When it comes to anticipated risks, detailed analyses on drought exposure (measured through a drought index based on soil moisture projections) are mostly available at the national level and show heterogeneity of results across models. For example, the Postdam Institute for Climate Impact Research conducted a meta-analysis of four Global Climate Models (IPSL-CM5A-LR, GFDL-ESM2M, MIROC5, HadGEM2-ES) and six Global Hydrological Models (CLM45, H08, LPJmL, MPI-HM, PCR-GLOBWB, WaterGAP2) to assess projections of the area of cropland exposed to at least one drought per year . While, under RCP 6.0, the median of all models indicates that the indicator will remain virtually unchanged in response to global warming by 2060, the variance around the median is substantial across models. Indeed, some models predict a large increase in drought exposure. The range of probability of annual cropland exposure to drought would widen from 0.2-4.5% in 2000 to 0.03-15.0% in 2080. The range of high probability also widens from 0.1-13.6% in 2000 to 0.02-29.4% in 2080. This means that, according to some models, the risk of exposure to drought would increase threefold under an intermediate (RCP 6.0) emission scenario, while other models predict no change at all. This uncertainty at the national level is confirmed by a review of the new generation CIMP6 models.

Zooming in on the project target areas and looking at projections of annual Standardised Precipitation-Evapotranspiration Index (SPEI) through various CIMP6 individual models (under a mid-range scenario SSP2-4.5 and by 2060) indicate that westernmost and northernmost target circles could become more drought-prone than southernmost circles. This is the prediction of models CNRM-ESM2-1 and GFDL-ESM4; conversely,

models FGOALS-G3 and MIROC6, MRI ESM2-0 do not predict a significant difference across target circles (all would be affected by increased droughts).

These additional elements have been added in paragraphs 53 and 54.

- This data is from Institut d'Économie Rurale. 2020. Adaptation de l'Agriculture et de l'Élevage au Changement Climatique au Mali - Résultats et leçons apprises au Sahel. The source has been added in the core text, in addition to the footnote (#33). As for the uncertainty: In spite of the uncertainties mentioned above, it should be noted that: i) no model anticipate a decrease in drought exposure in any of the target circle; ii) there is a probability that western and northernmost circles could be relatively more exposed to droughts; and iii) the consequences of past droughts are particularly present in northern circles. The proposed interventions under Component 2 take this risk analysis into consideration; for example, land restoration through the Vallerani system will be focused on northern circles. Likewise, best water management practices will be particularly disseminated in APFSs in these circles.

Component 2, outcome 2:

- Prior to the development and/or revision of sustainable landscape management plans, PDSECs and pastoral conventions, site-specific Climate Risk Assessment will be produced. The process will involve the following steps: i) context-specific climate projections; ii) first-order biophysical impact assessments; and iii) second-order socio-economic assessments. Based on the risk assessments, tailored land management practices will be suggested as the plans are collectively elaborated. For example, cropland predicted to be affected by increasing temperatures and decreasing precipitation could benefit from interventions to foster tree cover in mixed agro-forestry systems, as these have been documented to limit evapotranspiration and generally improve land and water efficiency in semi-arid areas. Likewise, projected decrease in water and fodder availability in certain areas would lead to plan for changes in some transhumance tracks, establishment of fodder plantations and changes in the management of water points for cattle.

- These are Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral Farmer Field School learning modules (this has been clarified in the core text, now para 168). Examples include integrated pest management, manure cycle, water conservation etc. However, new modules could be developed based on communities' demand and the results of the site-specific Climate Risk Assessments mentioned earlier.

Component 3, outcome 3:

- The baskets of goods approach fits within the broader territorial approach to development, with which the proposed project is aligned. In the mid-1990s, the territorial development perspective incorporated notions of multi-actor networks and inter-cooperation to better understand the reality of empirical experiences. It is in this

context that the 'Basket of Territorial Goods and Services' (BTGS) was presented. Faced with the crisis of intensive agricultural systems and new reconfigurations of rural spaces, this approach analyzes local actors who articulate market and non-market spaces to create a homogenous product supply, coherent with territorial characteristics, which value, among other aspects, local know-how, culture and natural environments. Within this context, the role of social actors - public, private or those related to associations - determines the unfolding of development projects that deviate from conventional or purely economic initiatives.

Under Outcome 3, but in close relation with Outcome 2 (esp. APFS activities), selected income-generating activities that have the potential of bringing benefits for the territory, or productive landscape scale, will be supported. The proposed IGAs are thus selected based on their climate adaptation potential, benefits in terms of sustainable natural resource management, economic potential, gender inclusiveness potential, etc.

This additional language was added between paras 184 and 185 in the core text.

- We are addressing the formatting issues with GEFSEC IT colleagues.

- Project activities and IGAs have been proposed targeting specifically different farm typologies. These discrete farm typologies resulted from the extensive TAPE assessments carried out during the PPG. Different farm typologies face different challenges in their agroecological transition, and therefore would benefit from different IGAs in order to maximize CCA/BD/LD benefits from the agroecological transition. The project targets the most vulnerable, and proposes income diversification (poultry, horticulture, dairy) that deliver multiple results against several of the 10 elements of agroecology (nutrition, soil health, water security, lower cost for agricultural inputs, etc.). Furthermore, as these proposed IGAs are more often practiced by women - structurally more vulnerable to climate change - the project adopts a solid gender sensitive approach to programming.

Training will be open to a broader audience, the provision of small material, small tools and cattle will be on a case-by-case basis, based on the demonstrated economic vulnerability of applicants. Particular attention will also be given to interest shown by youth (in the context of the Junior Farmer Field and Life School, see 3.4).

Other IGAs have been proposed that help maximize adaptation / BD/ LD benefits, such as:

- a. Neem seed oil to fight fall armyworm that is predicted to become more prevalent with climate change: the selection of beneficiaries will be based on existing baseline investments (existing press in Kita) and vulnerability of target population in two other circles (esp. women and disabled people)

b. Compost production: this is anticipated to mostly be a side activity that all interested farmers among target communities can take part in.

- The access to affordable capital barrier will be addressed under Output 3.2, which foresees to tap into existing, innovative micro-finance mechanisms to upscale them in the target areas (Caisse de R?silience approach).

October 2022

Outcomes 1 and 2 will focus on current and anticipated climate impacts. All land-use plans and development planning will be based on the climate risk assessment to be conducted, that will feature impact assessments for different RCPs and various time horizons. As mentioned, the SCAT will be informed by the Climate Risk Assessment to ensure that any decision on natural resource allocation (incl. land-use planning) reflects the risks and opportunities associated with anticipated climate change. This has been further emphasized in the description of Outcome 2.

Please see extensive modifications brought to Component 3 in response to above and below comments. A number of activities has been deleted (recycling, financing of means of transportation, market infrastructures ? except for toilet facilities, which would directly benefit women and facilitate their access to territorial markets seen as key outlets for agroecological products) and the climate rationale & GEB underpinning income-generating activities in revised Output 3.1 has been further outlined (added Table 12). The description of barriers has also been revised to better explain the focus of Outcomes 1 and 2 (see also additional paragraph 52).

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 17, 2022

Addressed.

November 14, 2022

Addressed.

However, the changes with the PIF should be explained: why this change? and in which measure this change impact the project: The changes of cofinancing from Islamic Development Bank, CPEAP, and ATI by mainly cofinancing from the government with irrigation related projects is not neutral. We are less seeing the catalytic effects of GEF and LDCF resources. Please, justify.

October 14, 2021

An unofficial translation is available.

- In future submissions, please, provide together the original letter and the unofficial translation as proofs of evidence in the table C on cofinancing. It is not convenient to load the letters in the table C and the translated letters elsewhere, here in annex of the project document.

July 8, 2021

- Please, include non-official translation of the proofs of cofinancing from the Ministry of Agriculture and the CIRAD.

Agency Response

15 November 2022

Please, do note that during the extended PPG phase, the baseline projects (IDB's IRDPK, CPEAP and FAO's TCP) tabled in the approved PIF were nearing closure, and therefore expired as potential co-financing for the GEF/LDCF investment. A renewed dialogue with project partners was undertaken. From this dialogue, a number of priority investments were identified, and negotiations with co-financiers engaged.

The baseline projects tabled in the PIF delivered on improved income and livelihoods of people in project sites, on water infrastructure, increased agricultural productivity, and infrastructure. These elements remain relevant in all confirmed baseline investments, as illustrated below, and further developed in the project document (p. 58 and 93).

The confirmed partnership with co-financiers in the project document is different, but the relevance of the co-financing is maintained. Together with the GEF/LDCF project, the co-financing embraces the 10 elements of agroecology, and therefore directly contributes to the agri-food system transformation envisioned for this project. They do that in different ways, complementing GEF/LDCF investments, and focusing on:

1. - the development of financial services for smallholders to access, in order to transition towards profitable and sustainable production practices (baseline project **INCLUSIF**);

2. - improved conditions for co-creation of knowledge, securing the involvement of the science-community and opening a dialogue between scientists and practitioners in order to push knowledge generation and learning(baseline project **FAIR Sahel**);
3. - market integration and investments in basic infrastructure in order to improve resiliency (to climate change, conflict, Covid-19) of the most vulnerable rural households (baseline project **SD3C**);
4. - the facilitation of synergies between transhumant pastoralists and agricultural populations, anticipating and managing (in a data-driven way) potential land and water tenure related conflicts, recognising that conflict eventually undermines all investment in sustainable NR management through planning and participatory management (baseline project **Gestion des Conflits**);
5. - water management and irrigation investments, recognising the central role water plays in order to sustainably produce in the Sudano-Sahel climate increasingly challenged by drought and erratic rainfall (baseline project **PAIS**); and
6. - value chain development in support of women livelihoods (baseline project **Project d?Appui aux Femmes**).

(PS The ATI project did not change from PIF to CER, so it is not included in the narrative here above. As the Ministry of Agriculture is the executing partner for the ATI investment, it is featured within the MOA co-financing to the project.)

The catalytic role the GEF/LDCF investment plays, where the co-financing lays the basis for success (resolving conflict, investing in basic infrastructure, investing in conditions for improved knowledge generation and learning, ?), is accelerating the agroecological transition for vulnerable farm typologies in order to deliver on the project?s objective of productive and sustainable landscapes. The agroecological transition is proven to deliver improved soil health (contributing to LD), biodiversity (on farm, but also in the landscape), and climate resilience not the least thanks to diversification and synergy. Furthermore, the approach is poised to deliver a great number of additional benefits, thanks to the integrated nature of the approach. This has been all well captured in the following peer-reviewed scientific article following the baseline assessments of the Mali PPG: [Evidence on the multidimensional performance of agroecology in Mali using TAPE - ScienceDirect](#).

These elements have been added in the project document p. 57, and are the foundation of the incremental and the additional cost reasoning. Details are in the relevant sections of the project document and CER.

Translations have been provided in Annex of the project document.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 8, 2021

See comments on the budget below.

Agency Response See updates in the budget.
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response N/A
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
November 17, 2022

Addressed.

Note: if you are comfortable with the carbon calculations and can provide the evidence, we wonder why you did not report the carbon gains (767,413 metric tCO₂eq) under the core indicator 6 - to be considered after the quality control and/or the inception workshop.

November 14, 2022

- Tables and annexes are not readable. The comment below stay valid so far.

- We do not understand the strategies and interventions to reach 10,000 ha of land restored under the Core Indicator 3 (3.1: 4,000 ha of agricultural lands, 3.2: 2,000 of forested lands, and 3.3: 5,000 ha of grasslands) and 160,000 ha of lands under improved management (4.1: 25,000 ha better management for BD; 4.3: 135,000 ha: SLM)

October 14, 2021

The comment stays valid: it is still difficult to see the logical connection between the proposed result framework, budget, and the associated indicators. Several items seem

out of the reasoning both from a GEF and a LDCF point of view. We tried to rephrase some of the comments to facilitate a response. See also above, item 2 on the result framework.

July 8, 2021

- We take note of the significant increase on each target under the core indicator 4, the number of beneficiaries (core indicator 11), and new values for the core indicator 3 (restoration). However, it is difficult to see the logical connection between the proposed result framework, budget, and the associated indicators. Several items seem out of the reasoning both from a GEF and a LDCF point of view (see comments on the components 2 and 3).

Agency Response

28 November 2022

The direct and indirect carbon benefits have been recalculated using EXACT and inserted in the project document. The reasoning (assumptions) has been clarified in a separate document, uploaded in the Roadmap section.

15 November 2022

Please, see the table below with a detailed narrative on project delivery of GEBs.

TF Core Indicators	
CI 3: 10,000 ha of land restored, including:	
- CI 3.1: 4,000 ha of agricultural land	Through APFSs, selected agroecological practices for cropland will be implemented (incl. soil conservation, water management, nutrient recycling, integrated pest management, limited and no tillage, etc.)
- CI 3.2: 2,000 ha of forested land	The forestry modules of the APFSs will allow to disseminate selected forestry & agroforestry practices on at least 2,000 ha. This will include intercropping, multi-use tree species, afforestation, fodder plantation etc.

- CI 3.3: 4,000 ha of
grassland

Activity 2.3.8: 4,000 ha will be restored through zai implemented mechanically with the Vallerani system, with a focus on northern landscapes (circles of Kayes and Y?liman?). Areas managed through mechanised zai may be used to demonstrate further SLM techniques and other agroecological practices during APFS training sessions. Climate-adapted, diverse and indigenous shrub and grass species will be used to restore degraded grassland.

CI4: 160,000 ha of land under improved management (incl. 25,000 ha to benefit BD ? CI 4.1)

Climate adaptation, land management and BD conservation will be mainstreamed (2.1) into:

- 22 Sustainable Land Management Plans
- 17 Economic, Social and Cultural Development Programmes
- 22 intercommunal and six inter-circle pastoral conventions.

The basis for integration will be delivered through capacity-building of local, regional and national stakeholders (1.1, 1.3, 1.4) and dedicated assessments (site-specific climate risk assessment and Biodiversity Integrated Assessment and Computation Tool B-INTACT).

These plans will embed the actions at the plot level into the wider landscape, shed light on tensions between different (and sometimes conflicting) land uses, particularly addressing the interactions between natural and production land. It will steer agroecological field activities through APFSs under 2.3 (and implementation of revised pastoral conventions under 2.1.3) that will aim to promote soil conservation, water management, nutrient recycling, integrated pest management, integration of agro-sylvo-pastoral productive systems etc., all with the purpose of meeting the LD, BD & CCA-related targets set forth in the revised plans mentioned above. Some of these activities will be conducted in the buffer zones of Key Biodiversity Areas (Bafing chimpanzee sanctuary and Boucle du Baoul?) that support globally significant BD ? for an estimated total of 25,000 ha.

The total surface of communes that will be targeted for the mainstreaming of LD, BD and CCA into their land management is 1,664,000 ha. Through APFSs, it is estimated that agroecological practices will be disseminated and eventually practiced on approx. 160,000 ha (roughly 10% of the area).

As a result, specific Global Environmental Benefits expected from the project interventions include:

- ? the mainstreaming of biodiversity concerns into landscape management plans, contributing to limit the fragmentation of natural habitats;
- ? the promotion of genetically-diverse cultivars, including local and traditional species;
- ? the restoration of grasslands through enrichment planting of shrubs and trees and seeding of local grasses;
- ? the preservation of naturally-occurring trees and shrubs in grasslands and forests through the promotion of fodder culture;
- ? a limitation of human pressure on forests for fuelwood harvesting; and
- ? reduced degradation of aquatic habitat through limited siltation from soil erosion.

LDCF Core Indicator	
CI2: 135,00 ha of land managed for climate resilience	Cf. rationale for TF CI 4 above. Only the 135,000 ha corresponding to TF CI 4.3 have been counted towards the LDCF CI.

Please see response to Comment 6 below

October 2022

Tables have been inserted in Annex A, showing the connections between GEF and LDCF Core Indicators, project outputs and project budget. Please note that a small correction has been made to the target for GEF Core Indicator 11, for the sake of consistency.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response N/A

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response N/A

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
November 17, 2022

Addressed.

November 14, 2022

Comments still valid.

October 14, 2021

Comments still valid.

July 8, 2021

- See comments on the result framework, the component 2, and especially the outputs and activities under the component 3. Some adjustments may be needed.

Agency Response

15 November 2022

We understand that review was impeded because of formatting issues in the Portal. Please, see responses, extensive amendments in the ProDoc and updated tables and annexes, addressing previous concerns and observations. All amendments have been highlighted in yellow for ease of reference.

October 2022

Please see responses provided below.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response N/A

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 17, 2022

Addressed.

November 14, 2022

- ? Project justification: Please further strengthen the consistency and clarity of the climate adaptation rationale for the LDCF finance in this project, including the risks of climate impacts that this project is supporting adaptation to, particularly with regards to changing precipitation patterns and anticipated drought. For example:
- o With regards to para 47, we note the indications regarding anticipated temperature increased. Please clarify what RCP is being referred to.
 - o With regards to para 48, we note the indication that "is uncertainty as to the direction of change, with some models indicating increases in the duration of the dry spells while others suggest decreases. As yet, there are thus no univocal precipitation change projections for Mali under a future climate." While we appreciate there is uncertainty, we also note the LDCF funding is targeted on addressing the risks of drought, as is explained in para 73. At the same time, we note the indication in para 52 that "droughts have been particularly studied in the Malian context". Please expand and clarify on what different sources of climate information indicate about the anticipated risks of precipitation patterns and drought in the project area.
 - o With regards to para 49, please reference where these figures are coming from. These seem to suggest more conclusive information is present on the likelihood of increased drought than is stated in para 48. Please clarify.
- The fact that several tables and annexes are not readable to not help to understand the progresses on the incremental and the adaptation reasoning.

October 14, 2021

The incremental and adaptation reasoning is not still acceptable. Please consider the following elements:

- We note some of the barriers indicated are rather general and high level, and as such could be strengthened with considerations of why these barriers exist and what the project can do to address the constraints creating the barriers. In particular, we suggest to elaborate on the barriers of "mainstreaming climate change adaptation into existing land-use plans" (iv) "insufficient availability and adoption of climate resilient crops", and consider if the current outputs and associated activities can more directly address those constraints to the barriers.
- Please consider the extent to which access to capital is a barrier for transition to climate smart agricultural production, storage and distribution, and incorporate this into the barriers section as appropriate, as well as ensure project outputs and activities sufficiently directly address this barrier as relevant.

- As written in the section 68 of the project document, we would like to see a project strategy addressing the following problem: "The degradation of soil ? acidification, salinisation ? is caused by both natural processes (such as wind and water erosion) and inappropriate agricultural practices, including misuse of chemical fertilisers, monoculture and overgrazing. The impacts of anticipated climate changes ? e.g. increase in potential evapotranspiration? will compound the adverse effects of unsustainable resource management, exacerbate land degradation processes and decrease the yields of most major crops". The project should be a response to these problems focusing the GEF resources on additional activities to generate agroecological benefits to combat land degradation, notably through SLM. We suggest narrowing the proposed activities to better reflect the added value of GEF resources in generating GEB and the LDCF resources in generating adaptation benefits. Several baseline activities, not generating GEB and adaptation benefits should be financed by the cofinancing or removed from the result framework. There is a risk of dispersion in too many activities with a disputable value for money in terms of GEB and adaptation benefits.

July 8, 2021

- Additional cost: the additional vs incremental cost isn't clear for component 2, particularly pertaining to the specific additionality of the LDCF investment. Please, explain.

Agency Response

15 November 2022

- The minimum and maximum of temperature increases correspond to RCP 2.6 and RCP 8.5, respectively. This has been clarified in the text.
- Most available studies on drought focus on past or current droughts and associated coping mechanisms.

When it comes to anticipated risks, detailed analyses on drought exposure (measured through a drought index based on soil moisture projections) are mostly available at the national level and show heterogeneity of results across models. For example, the Postdam Institute for Climate Impact Research conducted a meta-analysis of four Global Climate Models (IPSL-CM5A-LR, GFDL-ESM2M, MIROC5, HadGEM2-ES) and six Global Hydrological Models (CLM45, H08, LPJmL, MPI-HM, PCR-GLOBWB, WaterGAP2) to assess projections of the area of cropland exposed to at least one drought per year . While, under RCP 6.0, the median of all models indicates that the indicator will remain virtually unchanged in response to global warming by 2060, the variance around the median is substantial across models. Indeed, some models predict a large increase in drought exposure. The range of probability of annual cropland exposure to drought would widen from 0.2-4.5% in 2000 to 0.03-15.0% in 2080. The range of high probability also widens from 0.1-13.6% in 2000 to 0.02-29.4% in 2080.

This means that, according to some models, the risk of exposure to drought would increase threefold under an intermediate (RCP 6.0) emission scenario, while other models predict no change at all. This uncertainty at the national level is confirmed by a review of the new generation CIMP6 models.

Zooming in on the project target areas and looking at projections of annual Standardised Precipitation-Evapotranspiration Index (SPEI) through various CIMP6 individual models (under a mid-range scenario SSP2-4.5 and by 2060) indicate that westernmost and northernmost target circles could become more drought-prone than southernmost circles. This is the prediction of models CNRM-ESM2-1 and GFDL-ESM4; conversely, models FGOALS-G3 and MIROC6, MRI ESM2-0 do not predict a significant difference across target circles (all would be affected by increased droughts).

These additional elements have been added in paragraphs 53 and 54.

- This data is from Institut d'Économie Rurale. 2020. Adaptation de l'Agriculture et de l'Élevage au Changement Climatique au Mali - Résultats et leçons apprises au Sahel. The source has been added in the core text, in addition to the footnote (#33). As for the uncertainty: In spite of the uncertainties mentioned above, it should be noted that: i) no model anticipate a decrease in drought exposure in any of the target circle; ii) there is a probability that western and northernmost circles could be relatively more exposed to droughts; and iii) the consequences of past droughts are particularly present in northern circles. The proposed interventions under Component 2 take this risk analysis into consideration; for example, land restoration through the Vallerani system will be focused on northern circles. Likewise, best water management practices will be particularly disseminated in APFSs in these circles.

October 2022

The Barriers section (from paragraph 74) has been complemented as suggested. Please consider that the limited mainstreaming of CCA, SLM and BD into land-use planning was quite extensively analysed as Barrier 3, including through the detailed analysis of 9 PDSECs during the PPG phase. Similarly, access to capital was recognised as an important barrier (Barrier 7); its link with the underdevelopment of climate-smart agriculture has been made explicit and will be addressed accordingly under Output 3.2. The insufficient availability and adoption of climate resilient crops has been explicitly mentioned under Barrier 5, and the provision of and training on the use of climate-resilient crops has been added under Activity 2.3.5 as suggested.

SLM is at the core of the APFS activities under Output 2.3, which will specifically aim at disseminating best practices to fight the degradation phenomena described in the Threat section. The APFS curricula will be further tailored to the specific conditions of each site, but a sample has been developed during the PPG phase and is presented in Annex O. The connection between SLM and the APFS has been made more explicit in the description of Output 2.3 and its activities.

As suggested, a number of activities have been deleted under Component 3 (some of the IGA-related activities, all market infrastructure activities except for toilet facilities as they will mostly benefit women etc.).

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
November 17, 2022

Addressed.

November 14, 2022

- To check when the tables and annexes will be readable.
- However, it seems that the activities are not significantly changed or be adjusted and, if we are seeing the potential benefits for local communities, we are not seeing how these activities can generate global environment benefits and somehow adaptation benefits.
- There are definitely a diversity of income generating activities that would find a place in a classical agriculture project, eventually in the cofinancing. But so far, the incremental reasoning and the added value of the use of GEF and LDCF resources is not demonstrated. The changes in cofinancing may be one explanation.
- It seems that the comments have not been seriously tackled since the first review almost 15 months ago and the precedent review 12 months ago. This lack of responsiveness is now seriously threatening this project: if the project is not recommended by December 3, 2022. The project will be automatically cancelled.

October 14, 2021

Not addressed. We are sorry if our comments were not well understood, potentially being too broad, but the explanations and the current framework for GEFB and adaptation benefits is not satisfactory:

- Still, there is only limited generalized references to how specified climate hazards are expected to change over time and the implications for project design. We suggest deepening these considerations in the Request for CEO endorsement. More specifically, please deepen consideration of how the impacts of drought and other climate hazards on agricultural production in the future (preferably with a timeline of 2030 and 2050). This is important, to ensure the project interventions will strengthen climate change adaptation and resilience impacts to current climate as well as anticipated impacts.

- In its currently iteration, the project recognizes the impacts of climate hazards are expected to generally increase in the future, but there is little indication of by how much and in what ways. Therefore, there is no way of knowing whether the project outcomes and outputs are designed to address anticipated climate changes in the future. In strengthening these considerations of climate change adaptation rationale, if possible, it would be ideal to refer to the anticipated impacts of climate hazards under both an optimistic and pessimistic scenario, in order to design for a future state in between. These aspects of Climate Rationale were the focus of a technical dialogue in April 2021 on strengthening climate change adaptation impacts through the LDCF, with involvement of several adaptation specialists from GEF Agencies.
- For example, the "Global environmental and adaptation problems, root causes and barriers" section (d) refers to climate induced challenges such as increased incidence and intensity of crop pest infestations, heat stress on crops, and loss of water quality and quantity. However, there is no indication of how these climate impacts are anticipated to change in the future. Therefore, it is not clear what this project is aiming to help the target populations of Mali adapt to through ecosystem-based approaches.
- Further, examples in this sub section appear to be referring to non-climate drivers to biodiversity loss. Please more explicitly explain how climate hazards are driving current and anticipated impacts on ecosystem health, and based on this more directly link the proposed interventions to address these current and anticipated climate impacts.
- We take note of your responses below, but they are not all fully reflected in the revised project document. See the activities related to waste water for instance.
- The proposed reasoning about poultry and small livestock is still not convincing in terms for GEB and adaptation benefits. We suggest increasing the role of cofinancing to cover these activities, and concentrate the use of GEF resources for activities generating GEB and adaptation benefits.
- The demonstration is potentially interesting for women oriented activities. We take note of the potential adaptation benefits from horticulture (please, note that the proposed definition of GEB in your response is not acceptable in a GEF context; diversity of species is not enough; only the benefits to global important biodiversity can be covered by GEF resources. to be revised.

July 8, 2021

- Please provide the definition of resilience you use throughout all the document - more income generating activities may increase the "resilience" of communities vis-a-vis external shocks, but most of these activities are not all eligible under the LDCF.
- More details would be appreciated regarding the adaptation benefits and exactly how the activities result in increased resilience of the target communities to specific climate induced threats and hazards.

Agency Response

15 November 2022

Apologies for the formatting of tables and annexes, which did not show when uploading in the Portal. We are working with GEF IT team to resolve the issues in the Portal.

In response to the incremental and additional cost reasoning, allow us to summarise the approach. Together with the GEF/LDCF project, the co-financing embraces the 10 elements of agroecology, and therefore directly contributes to the agri-food system transformation envisioned for this project. They do that in different ways, complementing GEF/LDCF investments, and focusing on:

- the development of financial services for smallholders to access, in order to transition towards profitable and sustainable production practices (baseline project INCLUSIF);
- improved conditions for co-creation of knowledge, securing the involvement of the science-community and opening a dialogue between scientists and practitioners in order to push knowledge generation and learning (baseline project FAIR Sahel);
- market integration and investments in basic infrastructure in order to improve resiliency (to climate change, conflict, Covid-19) of the most vulnerable rural households (baseline project SD3C);
- the facilitation of synergies between transhumant pastoralists and agricultural populations, anticipating and managing (in a data-driven way) potential land and water tenure related conflicts, recognising that conflict eventually undermines all investment in sustainable NR management through planning and participatory management (baseline project Gestion des Conflits);
- water management and irrigation investments, recognising the central role water plays in order to sustainably produce in the Sudano-Sahel climate increasingly challenged by drought and erratic rainfall (baseline project PAIS); and
- value chain development in support of women's livelihoods (baseline project Project d'Appui aux Femmes).

The catalytic role the GEF/LDCF investment plays, where the co-financing lays the basis for success (resolving conflict, investing in basic infrastructure, investing in conditions for improved knowledge generation and learning, ?), is accelerating the agroecological transition for vulnerable farm typologies in order to deliver on the project's objective of productive and sustainable landscapes. The agroecological transition is proven to deliver improved soil health (contributing to LD), biodiversity (on farm, but also in the landscape), and climate resilience not the least thanks to diversification and synergy. Furthermore, the approach is poised to deliver a great number of additional benefits, thanks to the integrated nature of the approach. This has been all well captured in the following peer reviewed scientific article which develops the tools adopted during the PPG: *Evidence on the multidimensional performance of agroecology in Mali using TAPE* - ScienceDirect.

Finally, please do note the different actions the PPG team undertook in order to fully integrate GEFSEC inputs into the finalised project document and CEO Endorsement Request:

- After a first review, in consultation with project partners, the PPG team provided further justifications for the approach adopted. This approach had been approved at PIF stage by all parties, including national partners, FAO technical experts, STAP, GEFSEC program managers, and Council. Instead of substantially altering the project intervention strategy and actions, a further development of key approaches was provided.
- After a second review, when some comments persisted and more work appeared to be needed to deliver on GEFSEC Program Managers' concerns, a great number of changes were made in order to accommodate these concerns and observations. All these amendments are highlighted in yellow in the project document, and had repercussions

throughout the document, including on the results matrix, the component description, and the budget. We regret most of these amendments could not be appreciated due to formatting issues and are confident this has now been overcome.

- In parallel, FAO finalised its due diligence with respect to the operational modality of the project. This exercise took much longer than anticipated. Now, operational partner agreement and contracts are ready for signature, and project partners ready to move smoothly into project execution. The finalisation of operational modality was holding back the resubmission to GEFSEC.

Older submission:

The definition of resilience that has been used to guide the elaboration of the project strategy is the one cited by UNFCCC from the IPCC Assessment Report 4 (2007), namely *the ability of a social or ecological system to absorb disturbances while retaining the same basic structure and ways of functioning, the capacity for self-organization and the capacity to adapt to stress and change?*.

The PPG team is aware of eligibility criteria for investments under the LDCF, and the various income-generating activities proposed for support under Component 3 contribute to the adaptation option (2nd priority) reported in Mali's NAPA (Table 6 page 44): diversifying income sources. This adaptation strategy is compatible with the definition of resilience adopted for the project.

The target agro-sylvo-pastoral population being all threatened by the risk of decreasing agro-sylvo-pastoral yields because of the detrimental impacts of climate change described in the project document (to be further substantiated with the Climate Risk Assessment at project inception), diversifying their income sources away from a few staple ASP products is believed to increase the adaptive capacity and resilience of these populations. In addition, the project support will specifically target some of the most vulnerable categories of the populations (namely, women and youths) who are even more likely to see their livelihoods negatively impacted by climate change as they have more limited adaptive capacity (including less access to natural resources, land, finance, ...).

Additional information on the proposed Income Generating Activities (IGAs) ? including expected GEBs ? is provided below and has been clarified in the project document.

- Horticulture: this is a remarkable source of income diversification as the beneficiaries will be encouraged to cultivate a diversity of climate-resilient species. Also, a more diverse production will facilitate access to a diversified diet and improve food and nutrition security. GEB: diversification of species (in particular local, indigenous species, contributes to a production system that is more resilient to pest outbreaks (integrated pest management is promoted) and less dependent on chemical inputs. Only those practices, technologies and IGA investments will be supported that fully embrace the agroecological principles of agrobiodiversity and soil health in particular.

- Small livestock and poultry: only local, indigenous and climate-adapted species will be promoted. This IGA will be a source of income diversification and improve food security. GEB: Integrated (agro-sylvo-pastoral) food systems are aligned with the agroecological transition approach, and have the potential to significantly contribute to the improvement on a number of biophysical and other AE dimensions.

- Waste treatment: This value chain has been eliminated from the project document and investments into the other value chains increased. Nevertheless, recycling and waste treatment support the development of income generating activities (climate change adaptation diversification strategy), and generate GEB by: i) reducing pollution through the collection and reuse of organic and non-organic waste, in particular in and around territorial markets; and ii) facilitate the production of biological compost that will then be used as a natural fertilizer. This dimension significantly contributes the agroecology element of circular economy.

- Neem seed oil production: this IGA will benefit women and youths, and strengthen their income sources, again in a spirit of income diversification as adaptation strategy. GEB: neem seed oil is used as a bio-pesticide against armyworm. Developing this value chain was also a recommendation from the terminal evaluation of LDCF-FAO #4822.

- Dairy: the development of a climate-resilient dairy value chain will provide a regular income stream to smallholders (one or two cows per household) that will complement their main income. Dairy products can contribute to diet diversification and food and nutrition security. Only climate-resilient species will be promoted.

Finally, the proposed project adopts a landscape/territorial approach, and hopes to accelerate the agroecological transition within the selected landscapes. Territorial markets are documented to play a catalytic role in such a transition. The development of territorial markets is seen as a powerful way to strengthen food and nutrition security in the face of climate change (one of the key adaptation priorities set forth by Mali in its NAPA and NDC), and to strengthen the resilience of local populations. A case study from Mali has been documented in OECD/FAO/UNCDF (2016), *Adopting a Territorial Approach to Food Security and Nutrition Policy*, OECD Publishing, Paris. By benefitting from an improved access to territorial markets, local producers will be less dependent upon intermediaries to sell their products on markets. This will cut costs and allow more value added to be recaptured by the producers themselves, thereby allowing them to increase their revenue, make savings and ultimately invest in their development, contributing to resilience. In addition, the Mapping of Territorial Markets exercise conducted during the PPG phase has shown that the diversity of products sold on territorial markets is higher than on regional markets. Supporting the development of territorial markets will therefore encourage production diversification (and risk management on the producers' side). However, please note that the budget for market infrastructure has been further decreased.

All the elements above have been included in the project document.

October 2022

- Please see added paragraph 52 as well Table 12, and other edits throughout the project document.

- Please see revised Component 3, including Table 12. The observation of climate-related pest outbreaks will also be included in the APFS curricula.

- Please see changes in the threats section, barrier section as well as in the description of Component 2 (e.g. paragraph 163).

- Sorry for some oversight, mentions to treatment of waste water have now been deleted throughout.

- Please see revised list of activities under Component 3; in particular, the provision of equipment for poultry (e.g. chicken coops) will be covered by cofinancing.

- Please see revision of Component 3 as well as amendments made throughout the project document. The focus on women has been emphasized where relevant. In particular, we suggest retaining the activity on construction of toilet facilities in territorial markets (Act. 3.1.16), as this will be particularly beneficial for women. Indeed, the absence of toilet facilities is a barrier that constrains women's access to such markets, although these are crucial to support the agroecological transition.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 14, 2021

Addressed.

July 8, 2021

The sections on innovations, sustainability, and scaling up are not complete:

- The notion of sustainability should be better defined - the project activities should be better anchored in existing systems and institutions (notably related to the decentralization) to have a better chance to last once the project will have closed.

- As discussed during the PIF review, we would like to see the notion of "multi-stakeholder platform" promoted into the existing legal and regulatory framework for sustainability and scaling up. We were potentially expecting some lessons or best practices from other GEF and LDCF projects on this aspect. Please, revise.

- The relatively high level of resources for international and national consultants also contribute to a question about the sustainability of the proposed approach. Could it be possible to attach some of these contracts to permanent entities on the ground - national and local agencies, extension services, NGOs, etc?

Agency Response

- The governance-related interventions are deeply rooted in the institutional decentralisation context, specifically to enhance their sustainability and acceptance. This decentralization context is detailed in the "National framework for the management of productive landscapes / at the decentralized level" section, and, first and foremost, has been explored during the PPG phase through a series of interviews with key informants and stakeholder groups in the field (see Annex I2). The choice of local governance interventions has been directly informed by this analysis of the decentralization context, as well as by lessons learned from other projects (e.g. GIZ-supported PADRE project, which has been supporting the Diéma CLOCSAD). This aspect has been further explained in the "sustainability" section for improved clarity.
- This is well noted, and an activity has been added to promote the mainstreaming of these platforms into the national legal and regulatory framework. Language has been added in the "sustainability" and "potential for scaling up" sections as well.
- Indeed, some of the budget lines referred to as "consultants" will be invested with permanent, on-the-ground entities. This is notably the case for Outputs 2.3 (extension officers and NGO members will form the bulk of APFS trainers), 3.3 (with CAMIDE) and 3.4 (with AMSD). It is explicitly the intention of the project developers and the Government of Mali to optimize the sustainability of the project results by resorting to permanent human resources ? this is also the rationale behind Outputs 1.3 and 1.4.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response N/A

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response N/A

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender
differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so,
does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators
and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response N/A

Private Sector Engagement

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier
and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 17, 2022

Addressed.

November 4, 2022

- To be checked in a readable document.

- We did not find the responses in the comment 6 above.

October 14, 2021

To be checked in the next submission.

July 8, 2021

- Yes, the private sector will be involved in the microfinance and the certification of value chains (if the demonstration of adaptation benefits and GEBs is made).
- However, the mention of the private sector in the component 3 stays blurred by the fact that we are not convinced by the proposed reasoning and activities - most of the proposed interventions should be covered by the baseline and cofinancing as far as we are clearly seeing the benefits for adaptation and the global environment.

Agency Response

15 November 2022

Formatting issues are being addressed with GEFSEC IT team.

With respect to the private sector engagement, please do note that indeed the cofinancing does address a number of barriers for further private sector engagement, and the GEF/LDCF project adds value/complements by facilitating access to loans for agripreneurs to develop sustainable businesses (component 3), as well as the establishment of a platform to bring actors together to encourage the transition to sustainable business practices (component 1).

Please see response to Comment 6 above.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 14, 2021

Addressed.

July 8, 2021

- COVID Risk and Opportunity Assessment missing. Please, complete (if needed, check <https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>).

Agency Response Please see the Epidemic Contingency Plan in Annex M that elaborates on the project risks and opportunities linked with the Covid-19 epidemic, fully aligned with the referenced guidance document.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 14, 2021

Addressed.

July 8, 2021

Project arrangements

- We take note of the FAO responsibilities as GEF Agency and the use of fees (line 285 and 286, prodoc), however, we are not clearly seeing the difference with the tasks proposed for the OPA manager (see excel budget, line 5, \$35,000) and the use of GEF funds for a project position based in the FAO's office. Without further explanation, please, remove this budget.

Coordination

- As requested at PIF level, were you able during the PPG to take lessons from past and on-going GEF and LDCF projects? The text in the section 12 says that this work of collating and synthesizing the lessons from the portfolio should have been done during PPG. Please, clarify. There is indeed an interesting GEF SLM portfolio in Mali (#9961, 9293, 5746, 5270, 3370, 1431) as well as four closed LDCF projects in Mali that could provide lessons. Is a synthesis of lessons and best practices available? This point was also requested by Canada at the moment of the Work Program ("Is capitalizing on previous GEF funded projects in Mali as the GEF6 project developed by AfDB on the regions of Kayes, Koulikoro and Segou?) and Germany who extended the request to other donors and partners.

- There are GEF and LDCF projects under preparation. Is FAO coordinating with IFAD (LDCF) and AfDB (GEF)?

- While the submission notes that the AEDD is well placed to identify synergies and prevent duplication with GCF projects, of which 4 readiness proposals are mentioned. There are several other projects in the pipeline ? please confirm whether AEDD is aware of these.

Agency Response

Project arrangements

- Please, note that the paragraphs (now 291 and 292) in the project document reference the use of GEF fees, which include the oversight roles and responsibilities of the FAO Representative in Mali as project Budget Holder (BH). The BH is accountable for the project and the use of the GEF/LDCF grant, and therefore oversees the Operational Partner and service providers. A portion of the fees covers time of the FAO-Representative for oversight of procurement and financial management, clearance of financial reports for disbursement of funds, and covers the cost of supervision missions of the FAO-Representative, and more. (Note that fees also cover technical support to the project, oversight and support from the GEF Coordination Unit, in addition to this financial oversight secured by the BH.) On the other hand, the OPA Manager mentioned in Line 5 of the project budget references the specialist dedicated to the day-to-day management of the Operational Partnership Agreement (OPA) with the Operational Partner (i.e. the Executing Partner of the project). This includes the daily exchanges with the OP to ensure delivery of activities and outputs according to an established workplan and budget, the preparation of financial progress reports for review and clearance by the BH, the contracting of the service provider for audits and spot checks, and more. OPA manager has an important role in building OP's capacity to deliver in line with its risk mitigation plan and with FAO's and GEF fiduciary standards. Please, note the OPA Manager is only part-time dedicated to the FAO-GEF project and is largely co-funded by FAO's own resources).

Coordination with ongoing projects & lessons learned from past projects

- Lessons learned from the GEF and non-GEF portfolio of relevant initiatives in Mali have informed the project design. This is reflected throughout the project document and is presented in Section 8: Knowledge Management. Additional tables that explicitly identify these lessons learned from the evaluations of closed projects have been added in Section 8 (see also responses to Germany's comments in Annex B).

Coordination with projects under preparation

- FAO is aware that IFAD is formulating a project entitled "Strengthening integrated approaches to build the climate resilience of vulnerable rural communities and agricultural production systems in the central regions of Segou in the Republic of Mali." This LDCF project (PIF to be approved), to be executed by AEDD, will aim to reduce the vulnerability of communities in the central regions of Segou to the risks posed by climate change through the adoption of climate smart agro-sylvo-pastoral and fish

farming practices. Lessons learned will be shared, in particular on APFS (Output 2.3 of the IFAD project) and development of land-use plans (Output 1.2). All relevant information and knowledge generated by the FAO-GEF-LDCF project will be made available IFAD and AEDD during the PPG phase of the IFAD-LDCF project. This has been reflected in Section 6b.

- o FAO is aware that a West African Development Bank-GEF6 project will be implemented starting in 2022. This regional project (?Impact Investment and Capacity Building in Support of Sustainable Waste Management to Reduce Emissions of Unintentional POPs (UPOPs) and Mercury in West Africa?) will focus on waste management, with limited potential for synergies with the proposed project.
- o FAO is also aware of the ongoing development of a UNDP-GEF project ?Climate security and sustainable management of natural resources in the central regions of Mali for peacebuilding?. Although the intervention areas and agro-climatic zones of the two projects will not overlap, coordination will be sought with UNDP and AEDD to maximise synergies between national-level expected outputs, especially LDN-related capacity building (Output 1.1 of UNDP-GEF project) and capacity building to conduct climate change vulnerability and environmental impact assessments at the landscape level as well monitoring of climate change resilience, land and biodiversity use and conservation (Outputs 1.3 & 1.4 of FAO-GEF project). This has been reflected in Section 6.b.
- o In addition, a new programme focusing on agroecology is under formulation and was identified recently. This ?Programme for the promotion of agroecological cropping systems and soil protection in Mali? to be funded by the German Cooperation and executed by DNA will work in the Kayes region. Given the evident opportunities for synergy between these two initiatives, specific coordination will be sought in the inception phase of the proposed project, with a view to inform the final formulation of the German cooperation-DNA project. This has been reflected in Section 6b.
- o AEDD is fully aware of the status of project development and of the pipeline of projects generally. AEDD has been fully engaged throughout the PPG phase (cf. Annex I2), and confirmed coordination with ongoing and pipeline GEF portfolio as laid out above.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 14, 2021

Addressed.

July 8, 2021

- This project should significantly contribute to the NAPA/NAP (adaptation) and the NAP under UNCCD, as well as the recently endorsed LDN targets. We would have expected a better analysis LDN targets and more information about how this project will contribute. Please, complete.

- As requested by Germany at PIF level, please, elaborate in more details the link between the NDC/NAP process and the project components, outcomes, and indicators.

Agency Response Additional information on the contribution of the project to Mali's NDC and LDN targets has been added (Section 7).

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response N/A

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response N/A

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response N/A

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 14, 2021

The project will generate socio-economic benefits. However, these benefits should be additional to GEB and adaptation benefits and cannot be considered alone. This is why we repeated comments above on the incremental reasoning and the result framework to better focus the project results and activities to generate GEBs and adaptation benefits.

July 8, 2021

- We will review this question when the result framework will have been revised, especially the component 3 and the associated outputs.

Agency Response

Noted with thanks.

October 2022

Please see extensive revision to project interventions to refocus them on CCA & GEB generation, as well as responses to comments above.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
November 17, 2022

Addressed.

November 14, 2022

- Formatting issues: Several tables and annexes, to not say all, are either out of the margins or with a superposition of texts: these tables and annexes are then impossible to read: See table B (result framework), tables 1 to 24, several boxes (mapping of territorial markets, agroecological approaches, lessons learned, B-INTACT, Note on Delfino), see annexes A, B, budget, 12 (stakeholders), gender action plan...

- We are not in measure to review the changes in the result framework, the components, outcomes, and outputs.

October 14, 2021

- We take note of the rationale for the two 4x4 vehicles and find it acceptable. Same for the 3 motorbikes and operating costs.

- All the Office running costs should be assigned to pmc. Please, remove \$3,000 for office running costs assigned to C2 and C3.

July 8, 2021

No.

Annex C: Point taken about the difficulty to include the full budget, but please insert 1) a summary of the budget and 2) a budget per component (and not per outcomes/outputs).

Budget:

- The level of consultants both international and national is significant in this project. It may raise a sustainability issue. Would it be possible to propose a strategy to engage/empower national and local institutions, extension services or NGOs to do these tasks?

- International consultants: will these recruitments be open to global experts? Or are these experts already identified, notably from FAO?

- We take note of the budgets requested for the 4x4 vehicles (one taken by the LDCF, one taken by the GEF) and motorbikes:

1) Could you please provide the number of vehicles financed or made available by the cofinancing,

2) please justify the need for two 4x4 vehicles;

3) the budget includes the purchase of 3 motorbikes and associated operating costs. However, in the text, under the activity 1.1.4, the need for small equipments for the 22 COFOS is mentioned. Please clarify the number of 2 wheel-vehicles needed for this project. Can you provide the number of motorcycles made available from the cofinancing?

- The USA highlighted the high costs of the Delfino plowing techniques: please justify this investment from the GEF (\$360,000), the operating costs from the LDCF (\$20,000), and you anticipate the post-project situation.

- Staff: Several positions should be covered by pmc:
- Please, justify why the project coordinator, with mainly coordination tasks is budgeted under the components 1, 2, 3, and pmc (\$29,800 under pmc) from the GEF and \$20,00 from the LDCF under the component 2.
- Financial & Administrative Officer: the budget should be covered by pmc, and not the components 2 and 3 and the LDCF (component 2).
- Please justify the breakdown of the Technical assistant budget between the components 1, 2, 3, 4, and the pmc.
- The budget for two drivers is assigned to the component 2 from the GEF and the components 2, 3, and pmc from the LDCF.. They should be budgeted under the pmc.
- Please clarify the needs and the budgets to cover three local project officers.
- Please, justify the needs for \$422,420 of travels (line 5021) with \$253,876 from the GEF and \$168,544 from the LDCF.
- See the comments on the result framework - several budget items should be modified (construction of market infrastructure, expenses related to value chains...).

Agency Response

15 November 2022

Formatting issues are being addressed with GEFSEC IT team.

Earlier responses

Annex C

The budget has been inserted in the Portal as requested.

Budget

- Please, see response provided under question 7 above.
- Vehicles:
 - 1) The OP has 2 vehicles that will be made available to the OP, partners and project staff for project-related field missions. These cars are available to support other investments in the Kayes region, and are not exclusively available to serve the GEF project.
 - 2) Nevertheless, the project management unit needs to be able to visit project sites in the 2 selected landscapes at any given time, considering the importance of the direct investments in demonstration work in and with communities and producers. Lessons from previous projects and programmes in Mali and the region show that the absence of a vehicle available to the project management unit and project experts, represents a handicap and negatively impacts efficiency and effectiveness of project delivery.

3) The motor bikes are intended to be made available to the Local Project Officers in Di?ma, Kita and Kayes. It is a cheaper (in terms of purchase and maintenance) solution compared to cars, and meets the needs, i.e. covering short distances throughout the year. A great number of motor bikes will be made available by the project partners, as these are the means of transportation of the 150 APFS Facilitators and the 20 Animators of the Dimitra Community Listeners Clubs (CLCs), for instance. The reference to motor bikes in the description of activity 1.1.4 has been eliminated as it was incorrect. The intention of the project is by no means to buy 22 motor bikes for the COFOs.

- With respect to the cost of deploying the Delfino plow, elements of response are provided in Annex B, responding to USA questions.
- Part of the time of the decentralized Local Project Officers has been budgeted under PMC. Other national and international consultants will provide exclusively technical inputs to the project and provide limited M&E related services. These are not budgeted for under PMC.
- The Project Coordinator-Chief Technical Advisor (full title) is a technical expert, and will be strongly engaged in the delivery of the technical components. Only a portion of her/his time will be dedicated to management activities. The TORs are joined in Annex U of the Project Document. Furthermore, the NPC-CTA will be supported by a number of other project management unit members in her/his management tasks, and these members are budgeted under the PMC.
- The cost of the Financial and Administrative Officer has been included in PMC entirely, and includes a contribution from LDCF and GEFTF.
- Please, consider the TORs for the Technical Assistant in Annex U, as these reference the support to training and learning under components 1, 2, 3 and 4. Nevertheless, the technical assistant also provides support to overall management of the project, and therefore partially featured under the PMC.
- The drivers have been budgeted under PMC.
- Di?ma (covering Di?ma and Nioro), Kita (covering Kita) and Kayes (covering Bafoulab?, Kayes and Y?liman?) are strategically located to easily, promptly and safely reach the 6 project areas of both landscapes of the Kayes region, while they also represent the locations where a number of project partners are duty stationed. The choice to have full time decentralized officers in 3 locations is one motivated by cost-efficiency, while securing continuous field presence and interactions with project stakeholders at the local level. Indeed, the road infrastructure, availability and conditions of vehicles of project partners at central (and even decentralised) level, and security concerns, are among the reasons that could jeopardize the smooth execution of field work with a PMU in Bamako or Kayes (city) only.
- Travelling in Mali is expensive, as considerable security costs need to be budgeted for. However, the cost for travel has been brought down, particularly the cost of international travel.
- Please, see answer to comment 6 above. However, the budget for the suggested infrastructure was reduced.

October 2022

Office running costs have been removed from C2 and C3 and assigned to PMC.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 17, 2022

Addressed.

November 14, 2022

- To be checked when the submission will be readable.

October 14, 2021

See the comments above, notably item I) 2. There are still pending questions mainly related to components 2 and 3 (the Adaptation Specialist also made a comment on the component 1). Some outputs and activities should be financed by cofinancing or other partners, or simply removed, when the GEBs and adaptation benefits are not clear. The responses below are not convincing.

July 8, 2021

Most of the questions on the result framework are related to the component 3 ?improved finance for and investments into climate change adapted livelihoods and sources of income of vulnerable agro-sylvo-pastoral communities?: The way the outputs and activities are written under the alternative scenario is confusing and difficult to determine the GEF vs the LDCF-financed activities. The components are separated by trust-fund in Table B, but it is difficult to see the full coherence with the actual description of the projects.

All proposed outputs and activities should be aligned with the adaptation and/or the incremental reasoning to justify additional activities to produce adaptation and/or global environment benefits. Activities under component 3 need to be further elaborated and redefined. The majority of these activities are too vague for this stage of project development and not adaptation activities.

- Output 3.1: why a reference to circular economy? ? it is not eligible under the LDCF (and should not appear in the result framework), and if you do not make the demonstration of generating GEB, notably in areas under SLM, for instance, we are not seeing either the interest of this reference to the activities financed by the GEF.

- About the notion of value chains to support, you also need to make the demonstration on how these value chains will contribute to adaptation and/or global environment benefits ? poultry, small livestock, horticulture? do not respond to this request. These activities should be covered by the cofinancing or parallel projects.

- Activities related to recycling and waste treatment are also questionable. We understand the interest for communities, but these should also be covered by cofinancing or parallel projects. We are not seeing adaptation or global environment benefits. All activities from 3.1.9 to 3.1.12 are concerned by this comment (business plans for waste water and recycling, training, small means of transportation (?), small equipment), as well as the associated budgets.
- Output 3.2: again the support to value chains should be connected to adaptation and global environment benefits: about the neem seed oil, any activity or purchase should be connected to the improvement of neem agroforestry parklands for better resilience, SLM, or landscape restoration. Without this demonstration and the quantification of benefits, we understand that communities may be interested by a specific press and dedicated equipment, but it should not be covered by GEF or LDCF resources. Provide the demonstration needed, or remove these activities and the associated budgets.
- Same comment for the dairy products: the diversification of incomes is not a sufficient reason to justify these activities ? the notion of ?resilience? is not used a proper way vis-?-vis an eligibility under the LDCF ? the LDCF finances activities for adaptation against climate change.
- Same comment for the production of fresh fruit and vegetables and the development of horticulture: explain the adaptation benefits and the global environment benefits related to SLM or land restoration. If it is not possible, it means that these activities should be financed by cofinancing,
- Output 3.3: innovative financial mechanisms are potentially welcome if you can make the connection with agro-sylvo-pastoral sectoral activities associated to adaptation benefits and/or GEB. Please, complete.?
- Output 3.4: certification systems: OK. We understand that these systems aim to facilitate the market to access to farmers engaged in agroecological and organic production ? these aspects are transformable into adaptation benefits and GEB (core indicators. 4.1, 4.3 for instance).
- Output 3.5: Junior Farmer Field and Life School approach: here again, such approach towards the youth is welcome if the nature of agriculture promoted can generate adaptation benefits and/or GEBs. Restoring the attractiveness of the agricultural sector is not sufficient. Please, clarify.
- Output 3.6: At least four territorial markets equipped with essential infrastructures to support the resilience and development of income-generating activities, in coordination with the platforms to be established under Output 1.2.? Please, define your meaning of resilience in this output. More income generating activities is surely welcome to the local communities, but eligible under a LDCF and GEF project only with adaptation benefits and GEBs. Either you can make the demonstration, or please, remove these activities and the consequent associated budget.
- We have difficulties to understand the logics of activities under this output and the eligibility under a GEF/LDCF project ? market infrastructure, public toilets, water

access, warehouse?. These activities should be covered by cofinancing or a parallel project, but we are not seeing the generation of GEB of adaptation benefits (Activities 3.6.1 to 3.6.5).

Agency Response

15 November 2022

Formatting issues are being addressed with GEFSEC IT team.

Please, note that the Portal requires separate entries per trust fund GEFTF and LDCF. Nevertheless, the project is integrated in its approach, its scope and its logic. As argued throughout the project document, the agroecological transition translates the vision of the project. It is a comprehensive sustainable food and agriculture approach that is rooted in the 10 elements of agroecology, including biophysical (BD, LD and CCA included) elements, but also socio-economic and enabling environment elements. Therefore, with the promotion of an agroecological transition in the Kayes region, delivering GEBs and adaptation benefits are given a central place, while also elements that sustain and further accelerate the GEB and adaptation benefits delivery including gender equality, co-creation of knowledge, youth employment and much more. The approach minimises trade-offs, but rather offers holistic solutions to identified shortcomings/barriers to an agroecological transition. Please, do consider the section in the project document that develops the project intervention strategy.

Please also see response to Comment 6 above; additional explanations have been included in the Additional Cost Reasoning section.

Furthermore, note that the interventions under Component 3 are aligned with the LDCF Programming Directions, which states (Objective 2) that the LDCF may invest in ?Climate-resilient smallholder food systems that generate climate mitigation, sustainable land management and biodiversity benefits while addressing the root causes of degradation and vulnerability?. This is exactly the reasoning behind this integrated GEF TF-LDCF project which focuses on disseminating agroecological principles and supporting the strengthening of the resilience of local livelihoods.

- Output 3.1 ? Circular economy is part and partial of the agroecological transition. The proposed value chains to further strengthen with support of this project have been selected to support the agroecological transition, responding to gaps and barriers. Response to comment 6 above specifies the contributions to GEBs and CCA. Activities related to recycling and waste treatment have been eliminated. The team will invest efforts to secure co-financing during implementation to cover costs of activities that are considered ineligible for GEF/LDCF.
- Output 3.2 ? The output has been amended to emphasise the potential contribution of the strengthened value chains to the agroecological transition.

- Output 3.3 ? The output has been amended to explicitly mention the nature of investments supported.
- Output 3.5 - Also here, some additional text in the output. Note that the JFFLS and financing mechanisms (Outputs 3.3 & 3.5) will work as incubators to catalyse innovations that will specifically enhance the resilience of target populations ? in line with the LDCF Programming Directions: ?LDCF support may be provided for the operation of incubators and accelerators at multiple scales; for raising capacity of local private actors.? The fact that the activities under Component 3 will specifically be implemented to enhance the resilience of local livelihoods ? and not function as ?business-as-usual? development, has been clarified in the project document.

October 2022

Please see proposed revisions throughout the project document ? in particular on Component 3.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 14, 2021

Addressed.

July 8, 2021

Not fully.

At PIF level, we highlighted several aspects to be checked at CEO endorsement:

- Is a specific study on drought finally included in the PPG?
- Are the lessons from past and on-going projects taken and highlighted to design the project?
- Is the risk analysis completed and comprehensive (including climate risks and COVID-19 risks for instance)?

Agency Response

- A specific study on drought was not able to be conducted during the PPG phase. However, drought will be assessed as part of the detailed Climate Risk Assessment to be conducted at the inception phase of project implementation.

- These lessons learned have been incorporated and highlighted throughout Section 1a as well as in Section 6b (especially Table 19).

- The risk analysis has been revised and augmented and a specific assessment of Covid-19 related risks conducted (please see Section 5a and Annex M).

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 14, 2021

Addressed.

July 8, 2021

- Comments from the USA, Canada, and Germany were expressed after the work program. Please, include a table of responses.

Agency Response Responses to comments from Canada, Germany and USA have been added in Annex B.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response N/A

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 14, 2021

Addressed.

July 8, 2021

Yes.

- Could you provide a list of studies, assessments, reports developed during the PPG, please?

Agency Response

The following studies, assessments and reports have been developed during the PPG phase:

- APFS training strategy (Annex O)
- Report from the implementation of the Characterization of the Agroecology Transition tool (Annex P)
- Report from the implementation of the Mapping of Territorial Market tool (Annex P)
- Sample output from the B-INTACT tool, assessing the impact of project investments on BD (Annex Q)
- Report from consultation missions conducted from 15 to 19 and 20 to 28 March 2021 (not annexed to the prodoc because of file size, but can be shared separately upon demand)
- Epidemic contingency plan (Annex M)

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response N/A

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

N/A

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

N/A

Response to PPO comments Dec 1st

1. Projects dates have been corrected. Thank you for the comment.

2. Re the NPC ?
 - His TORs were provided in annex U. However, we have now copied the full set of tasks in the core text of the project document to avoid misunderstandings. Please, do see the amended text in the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination section of the CER. The text that was provided only reported the PMC related tasks, as the section only relates to project management. The full list of roles, responsibilities and tasks for the Project Coordinator is reported in the detailed TORs in Annex U. .

 - Effectively, the NCP is a technical expert, delivering a great number of technical tasks. The cost of these technical tasks is therefore charged on the technical components of the project.

 - The NPC, however, also has project management tasks, and the full cost of these tasks is charged to PMC and to co-financing coming from Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Élevage et de la Pêche (MAEP) .

 - Please, note that the co-financing to PMC is proportional as per PPC guidelines. The co-financing to PMC covers negotiated costs of carpark, drivers, OPA manager,

administrative support, etc. provided by MAEP and FAO. Therefore, the PMC co-financing is fully subscribed and can no longer absorb further costs of the NPC.

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
December 1st, 2022

Thanks for the corrections and clarifications. Upon clearance from the Control Quality, the project will be recommended for CEO endorsement.

November 30, 2022

Thanks for the responses to most of the comments. However, please, respond to the following remaining items;

1- The elapsed time between the new dates is 48 months instead of 60 months ? please ask the Agency to extend the Expected Completion date till 3/31/2028 *or* to reduce the duration to 48 months.

Submission Date	Expected Implementation Start	Expected Completion Date
9/30/2019	4/1/2023	3/31/2027
Duration ⓘ		Agency Fee(\$)
60 In Months		649,036.00

2- While the Agency presents in their responses that the National Project Coordinator will perform ?technical tasks? (which would correspond to 62% of the salary charged to project components), the TORs included in the ProDoc (see below) do not make justice to this distribution: the nature of the tasks are mainly managerial in nature, so it is difficult to justify proportion charged to project components.

292. The National Project Coordinator (NPC) will be in charge of daily implementation, management, administration and technical supervision of the project, on behalf of the Operational partner and within the framework delineated by the PSC. S/he will be responsible, among others, for:
- i) coordination with relevant initiatives;
 - ii) ensuring a high level of collaboration among participating institutions and organizations at the national and local levels;
 - iii) ensuring compliance with all OPA provisions during the implementation, including on timely reporting and financial management;
 - iv) coordination and close monitoring of the implementation of project activities;
 - v) tracking the project's progress and ensuring timely delivery of inputs and outputs;
 - vi) providing technical support and assessing the outputs of the project national consultants hired with GEF funds, as well as the products generated in the implementation of the project;
 - vii) approve and manage requests for provision of financial resources using provided format in OPA annexes;
 - viii) monitoring financial resources and accounting to ensure accuracy and reliability of financial reports;
 - ix) ensuring timely preparation and submission of requests for funds, financial and progress reports to FAO as per OPA reporting requirements;
 - x) maintaining documentation and evidence that describes the proper and prudent use of project resources as per OPA provisions, including making available this supporting documentation to FAO and designated auditors when requested;
 - xi) implementing and managing the project's monitoring and communications plans;
 - xii) organizing project workshops and meetings to monitor progress and preparing the Annual Budget and Work Plan;
 - xiii) submitting the six-monthly Project Progress Reports (PPRs) with the AWP/B to the PSC and FAO;
 - xiv) preparing the first draft of the Project Implementation Review (PIR);
 - xv) supporting the organization of the mid-term and final evaluations in close coordination with the FAO Budget Holder and the FAO Independent Office of Evaluation (OED);
 - xvi) submitting the OP six-monthly technical and financial reports to FAO and facilitate the information exchange between the OP and FAO, if needed;
 - xvii) inform the PSC and FAO of any delays and difficulties as they arise during the implementation to ensure timely corrective measure and support.

3- From what we see, the co-financing allocated to PMC (1.3 million and all co-financing is represented in grants ? actually FAO contributes with a grant of 3.7 million) could cover the 85 k for the National Project Coordinator that is now charged to the project components. Please ask the Agency to re-consider.

November 28, 2022

All points addressed, subject to the review from the Quality Control.

Please, find below the comments from the Quality control. Please, be aware that the extended cancellation deadline is next Saturday December 3th, 2022.r

1. On project information: please request the agency to change the expected implementation start to a future date and adapt the duration of the project accordingly.

Submission Date 9/30/2019	Expected Implementation Start 1/1/2022	Expected Completion Date 12/31/2026
Duration 60 in Months		Agency Fee(\$) 649,036.00

2. On the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 7.5% (whose approval was not found in the Review Sheet neither in the comments section in Portal), for a co-financing of \$26,544,302 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,990,822 instead of \$1,331,398 (which is 5.0%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

Hence, there are two issues to address:

Provide the approval on the increase of PMC from 5.0% to 7.5%

If approved, increase the co-financing contribution to PMC ? if not approved, reduce the GEF portion to PMC.

	Sub Total (\$)	6,351,769.00	26,544,302.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	304,095.00	878,722.00
	LDCF	176,100.00	452,676.00
	Sub Total(\$)	480,195.00	1,331,398.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	6,831,964.00	27,875,700.00


3. On co-financing (comment provided by Seo-Jeong):

? Under ?Investment mobilized description? section, please provide a summary of all 3 grant investment reported.

? CIRAD: change ?Donor agency? to ?Other?

4. Project Coordinator and Technical Assistants are being charged to a component. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The co-financing allocated to PMC is 1.3 million (that could increase up to 1.9 million ? see point 2. Above), and all co-financing is represented in grants, please request the agency to review so the project staff can be appropriately charged to toe PMC (GEF and co-financing portion).

5. On the prodoc: while this option will be further assessed, when looking for the Terms of Reference for staff positions charged to the componentst we noticed that a section of the updated prodoc is only provided in French (page 255 onwards). Please request the agency to have all the prodoc translate to English and make sure the terms of reference for the staff positions charged to the components to detail the activities undertaken under each component.

Document Title	Category	Prefix	Classification	Modified Date	Published
Updated ProDo c 15Nov2022	Project Document	Agency pr oject docu ment	Official Use Only	11/16/2022 5:46 AM	

Annex O. APFS training strategy

Introduction

L'objectif du projet est de promouvoir les innovations en matière de gouvernance, de production et de financement afin de réduire la vulnérabilité des systèmes alimentaires et des moyens de subsistance agro-sylvo-pastoraux des petits exploitants, en inversant la dégradation des sols et en mettant fin à la perte de biodiversité d'importance mondiale dans les paysages fragiles de la région de Kayes.

Pour atteindre cet objectif, un des produits est de former au moins 15 000 producteurs agro-sylvo-pastoraux à travers des écoles de terrain agropastorales (CEAP) organisées pour hiérarchiser, démontrer, co-créer et diffuser des pratiques de production innovantes. Les écoles de terrain agro-sylvo-pastorales (CEAP) qui ont prouvé leur efficacité au Mali constituent des outils privilégiés pour diffuser l'approche agro-écologique dans la gestion de paysages résilients, productifs et durables afin de maintenir ensemble les différentes dimensions et interactions notamment les relations entre les plantes, les animaux, les sols, l'eau, les humains et l'environnement au sein des systèmes agricoles.

6. On the design: there are a number of tables and maps that do not fit within the portal margins. Please request the agency to try as best as possible to fit everything within the margins.

Position	Unit	Quantity	Rate	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount
Project Coordinator	Months	60	2750	28,400	28,400	28,400	0	0	79,800	165,000	165,000		165,000
APFS Master Trainer	Months	60	1800	0	108,000	0	0	0	0	108,000	108,000		108,000
M&E Officer	Months	60	1800	0	0	0	0	108,000	0	108,000	108,000		108,000
Communication Officer	Months	30	1800	10,800	12,600	12,600	18,000	0	0	54,000	54,000		54,000
Gender & Participatory territorial diagnostic Officer	Months	60	1800	0	54,000	54,000	0	0	0	108,000	108,000		108,000
Financial & Administrative Officer	Months	60	1800	0	0	0	0	0	108,000	108,000	108,000		108,000
Project Technical Assistant	Months	60	750	9,000	10,500	9,000	9,000	0	7,500	45,000	45,000		45,000
Drivers (two)	Months	220	275	0	0	0	0	0	60,500	60,500	60,500		60,500
Local project Officers (three)	Months	180	1800	0	142,000	142,000	0	0	40,000	324,000	324,000		324,000
Sub-total national Consultants				105,785	435,395	316,955	27,000	108,000	295,800	1,288,915	1,211,050	0	77,865

2. Response to **comments** from STAP at PIF stage

Comment	Response
1 Please, see the STAP comments in the ProDoc (the Portal does not seem to enable insertion of pictures in this section).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "Barriers and "Alternative scenarios" sections have been significantly updated and expanded to detail the reasoning behind the design of outputs, outcomes and impacts, as well as causal relationships behind them. A preliminary climate impact analysis has been included and supports the intervention rationale. A detailed Climate Risk Assessment will be conducted during the inception stage of project implementation to further substantiate and, a

November 17, 2022

The project is recommended for technical clearance. Waiting for the quality control.

November 14, 2022

Most of the revised tables and annexes are not readable: most of the responses could not be checked. However, it seems that the project has not deeply changed and many comments are still valid. Basically, the demonstration of incremental and adaptation reasoning is still weak. If we can understand the socio-economic benefits from the proposed activities in the agricultural sector, we are still not seeing how the interventions will generate GEBs and adaptation benefits. It is a serious issue at the third submission 15 months and 12 months after the first and second review (also noting that this submission was roughly not readable). This lack of responsiveness is now seriously threatening this project: if the project is not recommended by December 3, 2022. The project will be automatically cancelled.

October 14, 2021

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above. Some changes are needed, not only justification. Please, make information coherent between the portal and the project document.

July 8, 2021

No, the project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above from LDCF and GEF reviewers. Thanks.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/8/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/14/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/17/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/28/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations