

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

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10362

Countries

Mali

Project Name

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

Agenices

FAO

Date received by PM

10/9/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Not clear for BD: The use of BD resources should be reflected with indicators highlighting global environment benefits. The proposed 5,000 ha under improved management for BD are not enough convincing to demonstrate GEB: either you can make the demonstration that the biodiversity on these 5,000 ha present a global interest (we did not find information on the kind of biodiversity that will be improved), or you can also make a demonstration that the proposed activities will benefit to surrounding Key Biodiversity Areas or protected areas with a global importance (Kouroufing and Wang National Parks, Bafing sanctuary, Boucle du Baoule

reserve). For your information, please be aware that activities in the surroundings of the Bafing sanctuary would be positively welcome, as we have other NRM projects on the Guinean side on the Bafing-Faleme landscape.

- Not clear for the LDCF part: Please refer to the rest of the review, which requests that a stronger rationale for the adaptation benefits demonstrated by this project to be articulated throughout this proposal.

October 31, 2019

Partially cleared. The PIF submission does integrate additional consideration for the adaptation element of this proposal, but the project design and adaptation focus need further development.

November 4, 2019

Cleared.

Agency Response

BD: Thank you, modifications have been made to more clearly present expected GEBs from the proposed interventions. In particular, target communes will be prioritized in the buffer zones of protected areas, especially the Key Biodiversity Areas that are the Bafing sanctuary and the Boucle du Baoulé reserve. Therefore, the 5,000 ha indicated as a target are expected to be included in the buffer zone of such protected areas. Globally significant biodiversity to be thus protected has been specified in the PIF.

LDCF: The adaptation rationale has been more clearly presented throughout the proposal.

November 1st:

Language that clarifies the adaptation focus of the project has been strengthened throughout the PIF. Changes have been highlighted in yellow.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

LDCF: More clarification is requested. There do not seem to be outputs and activities related to achieving the adaptation benefits of this project in Table B. Adaptation is mentioned in other sections of the PIF submission, but not at all in Table B or the project description.

Recommended action: Please integrate adaptation language into project activities and outputs that create a clear linkage between the project design and the adaptation benefits it aims to achieve.

GEF:

- There is a confusion in terms of formulation of outputs. Please refer to the OECD Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, of needed (<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf>). Outcomes should express the consequences of a set of results and activities. Outputs should be formulated to reflect the value of money, if possible being “SMART”, and at least concrete, measurable/quantified, reachable (X training courses, Y plans, Z ha under SLM, etc.). Several outputs are formulated as outcomes: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, Please, revise.
- 4 outcomes, 22 outputs: the project proposes a very comprehensive approach including all steps of development and support to value chains: establishment of multi-stakeholder platforms, capacity building, development of management plans, knowledge support on SLWM, land restoration, production, market, financing mechanisms, certification processes. There is a general impression that the project will work as a stand-alone project, and we are not seeing how the GEF grant will be additional to cofinancing.
 - o Please reinforce the justification and the logical sequences of outputs and activities by using evidences and technical guidance on integration and capacity building (STAP LDN guidelines, UNCCD SPI interface paper on LDN, various papers on integration – see the references in the GEF6 project developed by AfDB on the regions of Koulikoro, Kayes, and Segou; the proposals in this PIF were considered as a model by the STAP). More recent papers also exist.
- 3.2 What do you mean by “Improved structure of at least three gender-sensitive value chains through the establishment of cooperatives and connection between producers, transformers and marketers?”
- 3.3 Innovative financing mechanisms set up? Please, clarify by what you mean (expected result? baseline? sustainability).

October 31, 2019

LDCF: Not cleared, while the co-benefit is clear to the activities relating to SLM, value chain development, and food security; the specific intended adaptation benefits do not seem to be clearly linked to the proposed activities, aside from the addition of the term "in the context of climate change" to the components and/or outcomes. Additionally, which specific "adaptation strategies" within the context of the proposed SLM/value chain/food security activities will be implemented to achieve these benefits? Slightly more detail regarding specific adaptation activities or elements of the SLM practices would be appreciated. For examples, please refer

to page 16 of these guidelines http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/23469_LDCF_1.pdf (although this is an outdated manual, it does provide some relevant examples of incorporating climate change considerations into project design).

November 4, 2019

LDCF: Cleared. The agency has revisited the project design and reformulated the outputs, positing adaptation as a core activity and objective of the project.

Agency Response

LDCF comment:

The intervention logic was designed with climate adaptation as a core objective. More explicit reference to adaptation has been added in table B and the project description in order to more comprehensively communicate the importance of climate adaptation. Specific baseline and barrier sections have been added.

GEF comments:

- Output formulation: Based on referenced resource material, the outputs flagged in the comment have been revisited.
- Synergies of the proposed GEF funding with other initiatives are described in the “Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects” (for initiatives listed for co-financing) as well as “Coordination” sections of the PIF. Far from a standalone project, the proposed project is conceived as deeply embedded in a national and local context where numerous efforts (past, current and upcoming) are relevant to the adaptation and biodiversity conservation focuses. Efforts to further strengthen synergies and coordination during the implementation phase will be supported by a dedicated working group chaired by the GEF OFP (see response to the Coordination comment below). The comprehensive approach and intervention logic stem from an analysis of existing barriers in the LD, BD and CCA focus areas, and are summarized in the updated ToC diagram. The core of the reasoning is that for the vicious cycle between landscape degradation, loss of BD and poverty to be broken, a holistic approach from land use planning to climate-resilient agro-ecological practices to transformation to marketing needs to be implemented. For each of these components, the proposed project will build on and coordinate with existing GEF and non-GEF relevant initiatives and build upon the investments made by the baseline projects.
- As suggested, the intervention rationale has been strengthened across the project description, including by quoting the scientific and “grey literature” references used to design the strategy.
- 3.2: Detailed activities to be conducted under this output will be further designed during the PPG phase. However, some level of detail has been added in the description of Component 3.
- 3.3: Similarly, a specific study will be undertaken during the PPG phase to establish the baseline situation and target in terms of financial mechanisms available to rural communities in the beneficiary landscapes. This study will analyze lessons learned from past and current initiatives (e.g. the AFD-supported PASECA micro-finance programme) as a basis for the design of the project’s activities. Relevant references have been added in the project description.

November 1st:

The table B of the PIF has been revisited in order to more prominently feature adaptation benefits and justify the use of LDCF funding.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Recent proposals from FAO showed a strong optimism at PIF level with cofinancing in grant or cash, creating a lot of expectations. However, these expectations were disappointing with a difficulty to confirm cofinancing in cash from partners and a difficulty also to mobilize core funds from FAO. We would like to avoid such situation, be sure that all named partners were contacted, and that there are high probabilities to see the cofinancing confirmed. please, explain the current level of dialogue with IDB, CPEAP, ATI, and inside FAO (number of meetings, minutes, notes, agreements...).

October 31, 2019

OK. to be checked at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

This point is well taken. Estimated co-financing amounts at PPG phase have been exceeded at project closure for the FAO-GEF project GEFID 3979 in Mali, but materialized co-financing is still scarce for the GEFID 4822 project. The reason for this latter is that some large investments identified during PPG concluded before the GEF project started its implementation phase, and it does not witness a lack of interest and/or collaboration from partner institutes and actors in the country. These mixed results have, however, resulted in a more rigorous process to identify and capitalize investments as potential future co-financing during the PIF design phase.

The following steps were undertaken to identify co-financing:

- An initial working group with key partner institutes (Ministry of Agriculture and FAO) was constituted to develop a project concept note to be submitted for consideration during the National Dialogue. Co-financing was a central feature of this project concept note.
- Upon selection of the concept note during the National Dialogue and later by the OFP, MOA and the Ministry of Environment, supported by FAO, prepared a comprehensive list of current and future investments to be mobilized as co-financing during a workshop held in the Spring of 2019.
- Before a joint field mission for PIF design with MOA and MOE during the Summer of 2019, a selection of most relevant investments in the same geography and time-frame as the proposed project was confirmed with partners. Partners were contacted through an official letter (see example attached). The letter requested to

confirm that the identified baseline project could indeed be mobilized as co-financing, requested to share all relevant information pertaining to that baseline project and reminded the partner of the commitment (i.e. the co-financing letter) to the success of the FAO-GEF project as co-financiers.

The investments reported in the PIF result from this long consultation process and have been confirmed by the partners. They stand ready, not only to sign the co-financing letters at the appropriate time during PPG.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. Under the current LDCF policy for GEF-7, Mali is currently eligible to access up to USD \$10 million.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- A \$200,000 PPG is requested, with \$66,494 from the LDCF, the rest from STAR allocations.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

LDCF: Not cleared. Please upload the LDCF Core Indicators and Metadata worksheet onto the roadmap section of the portal.

GEF: See item 1. Please explain the GEB related to the 5,000 ha under 4.1

October 31, 2019

LDCF: **Partially cleared.** The LDCF Core Indicators and Metadata worksheet has been uploaded onto the roadmap. However, as the LDCF is aiming to be at parity with the GCF ambition of benefiting 150m people for every \$1b spent on adaptation, we would appreciate if the agency could revisit its assumptions for the indicative numbers provided in the LDCF Core Indicators spreadsheet.

November 4, 2019

LDCF: **Cleared.** This comment is cleared taking into consideration the integrated nature of the project, the multiple co-benefits, and the larger impact generated in part by GEF TF resources.

Agency Response

LDCF: The Core Indicators and Metadata worksheet has been attached.

GEF: The BD core indicator has been clarified.

November 1st:

Please, consider the increase that had been proposed compared to the first PIF submission. The figures (GEFTF and LDCF are complementary, and not overlapping to avoid double-counting) are based on previous and ongoing FAO-LDCF investments in rural Mali. During PPG the design team will be able to provide more accurate estimates of direct beneficiaries.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

LDCF: Please remove the 2 from the Rio Marker for adaptation. This project is presented to have significant adaptation elements, but it is not the principal objective of the project.

LDCF: Cleared.

Agency Response The Rio Marker has been adjusted as suggested, even though adaptation is a principal objective of this project.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

LDCF: More clarification requested. The PIF submission details the biodiversity and land related issues but does not articulate the adaptation problems, root causes, or barriers which need to be addressed.

October 31, 2019

LDCF: This item is cleared. The agency has indicated the adaptation specific barriers in the PIF submission.

Agency Response As described in the responses to previous comments, the adaptation rationale has been more clearly presented and emphasized throughout the proposal.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Addressed.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Addressed.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

LDCF: The project is aligned with CCA-1, Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation.

GEF: See item 1 about the use of the BD 1.1.

October 31, 2019

OK

Agency Response The BD comment has been addressed earlier and in the PIF.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

LDCF: Not clear, more information requested. The additional cost reasoning for the requested LDCF financing is not clearly articulated. More detail on exactly which adaptation activities are being financed under each component, as well as a brief basis upon which these activities are additional to the baseline, as opposed to making the baseline investment itself more climate resilient.

GEF: Theory of Change: the proposed diagram reflects the result framework, but does not propose a Theory of Change. We would like to see a causal model proposing a pathway of change, explaining the outcomes and assumptions. Please revise

October 31, 2019

Not cleared, the revisions which indicate the additional cost reasoning associated with the LDCF financed activities is still not immediately clear. What exactly is the LDCF financing in addition to the baseline that will deliver a concrete adaptation benefit to the community and/or relevant physical/natural assets? How does the LDCF-financed activities increase the resilience of the of target community in a way that is additional to what the baseline is financing?

November 4, 2019

LDCF: Cleared. The agency has added the appropriate explanations regarding the additional adaptation benefits of this project, and has also updated the theory of change to encapsulate the adaptation dimension(s).

Agency Response

LDCF: Please, see responses to previous comments and associated revisions in the PIF.

GEF: See revised ToC diagram.

November 1st:

Additional language has been provided in the relevant section.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

LDCF: Not clear. Please refer to Item 2 and provide the LDCF Core Indicators and Metadata spreadsheet.

GEF: cf.comment above on the indicator 4.1.

October 31, 2019

LDCF: Not cleared. Please refer to Item 6 under Part 1.

November 4, 2019

LDCF: Cleared. Please see Part 1, Item 6.

Agency Response

Comments addressed above and in the PIF.

November 1st:

Comment addressed above.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. to be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please, include a gender action plan in the PPG to influence the result framework. For the time being, gender issues are not properly mainstreamed, and we are not seeing actions against inequalities between men and women. Disaggregated data for the beneficiaries is not enough.

October 31, 2019

to be checked at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response It is indeed the intention to conduct a gender analysis in the project areas, and have this analysis inform detailed project design. Please, do note that the project is already proposing a number of concrete ways to address gender inequalities, in particular when it comes to access to benefits, and participation in decision making over the use of natural resources, and this through a number of tried and tested approaches that promote gender equality. To name the 2 most prominent ones to be deployed in this project are the Dimitra Clubs, and the Gender-Sensitive Value Chains Development guidelines, both developed by FAO.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

To be checked at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- The risk of drought is just mentioned: we would like to see a more elaborated reasoning on how the project will respond to droughts using GEF and LDCE resources.

- In prevision, please include a specific study on this topic during the PPG.

October 31, 2019

Addressed

Agency Response The proposal to include a study on drought related risks to project execution is well received. The risk log in the PIF includes enhanced language on the climate-related risks and mitigation measures.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEF and LDCF: Mentioning the projects and the partners is a minimum, but we would like to clearly see the establishment of platforms of exchange with similar or related projects, as the #9293 and the #5746, in addition of other FAO implemented projects (LDCF #4822). Implementing the notion of integration may need some institutional changes. It is fundamental to avoid duplication of efforts, exchange knowledge, and develop synergy with other partners, especially other GEF and LDCF projects on similar issues and same regions. Please, confirm.

- #9293: Scaling up a Multiple Benefits Approach to Enhance Resilience in Agro- and Forest Landscapes of Mali's Sahel Regions (Kayes, Koulikoro and Ségou), AfDB;
 - #5746: Scaling up and Replicating Successful Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Agroforestry Practices in the Koulikoro Region of Mali, UNEP;
 - #4822 (LDCF): Strengthening Resilience to Climate Change through Integrated Agricultural and Pastoral Management in the Sahelian zone in the Framework of the Sustainable Land Management Approach, FAO.
- We take note of the comparative advantage of FAO described in the document. However, we are not approving any arrangement at PIF level, and will reserve the right to examine any such arrangements during the PPG phase and at CEO endorsement.

As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an "exceptional" basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for

execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The (eventual) technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

October 31, 2019

to be checked at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

A suggestion has been discussed with the GEF OFP in Mali in order to strengthen collaboration amongst teams of relevant projects and share lessons and progress with the OFP and partners. Please, see section 6 Coordination in the PIF. Please, note that project 4822 will soon conclude. The final evaluation is scheduled for later this year (2019). Lessons are feeding the project design, and the project team is fully engaged in this process.

The GEFSEC policy pertaining implementation and execution roles of GEF Agencies is well understood, and the points made will be fully addressed during PPG. It is the intention to engage DNA as execution partner for this project. Therefore, during PPG, a micro-assessment of the operational capacity will be carried out. If DNA does not meet all fiduciary standards, another partner will be sought and assessed. All activities undertaken during PPG with respect to setting up institutional and management arrangements coherent with GEF policies will be well documented and shared as Annex to the CEO Endorsement Request.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

LDCF: Please indicate if, whether, and how the project will coordinate with the in-country National Adaptation Plan process.

October 31, 2019

Cleared, the Agency has specified that the project will coordinate closely with the AEDD (Ministry of the Environment), which will be on the project's Steering Committee and is directly involved in the NAP process. This coordination will be further articulated during PPG.

Agency Response

The proposed project is being closely connected to the ongoing process thanks to the involvement of the AEDD in the project Steering Committee. The AEDD ensures that the climate change adaptation needs of vulnerable smallholder farmers are being integrated into the NAP process. During PPG, the link with the ongoing NAP process will be enhanced, with the aim to propose concrete activities and outputs that are coherent with the NAP.

The PIF has some additional language in the section Coordination, and expanded the language on GCF support to Mali in order to address adaptation priorities.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- See item on coordination. More is needed to improve KM and synergy with other initiatives, especially from GEF and LDCF.

October 31, 2019

to be checked at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response This comment has been addressed above, and the PIF includes additional language in the Coordination section.

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.

October 31, 2019

Not all comments have been addressed. The project is not recommended. Please address the comments above.

November 4, 2019

All comments have been addressed. The project is recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Several items at PIF review need to be confirmed at CEO endorsement:

- Value of the core indicators and adaptation benefits;
- Selected sites (maps and coordinates);
- Gender Action Plan;
- Stakeholders, especially the private sector;
- Risk analysis;
- Cofinancing from partners and from FAO;
- Implementation arrangements;
- Coordination/synergies with other GEF and LDCF projects;
- KM arrangements.

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		