

Climate security and sustainable management of natural resources in the central regions of Mali for peacebuilding

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10687

Countries

Mali

Project Name

Climate security and sustainable management of natural resources in the central regions of Mali for peacebuilding

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/10/2021

Review completed by PM

2/24/2022

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response
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
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

We welcome the co-financing of \$10 million from UNDP with the Liptako-Gourma project. Please, confirm there is no duplication of use of this co-financing, for instance, with the GEFID 9661 project ?Mali-Community-based Natural Resource Management that Resolves Conflict, Improves Livelihoods and Restores Ecosystems throughout the Elephant Range?.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2022 - OK noted.

GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Please indicate why all the co-financing is listed as investment mobilized? Some of the co-financing letters clearly indicate that the amounts are being provided in cash -- for instance the \$1.5 million amount provided by UNDP. In addition, the type of co-financing (i.e. grant, cash ,etc.) must be clearly articulated in the letters. Please review these entries and make the adequate adjustments to prevent delays in the clearance of the CER.

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - OK.

Agency Response

UNDP, 1/11/2022:

Confirmation was received from the project coordinator of the Liptako-Gourma project that there is no duplication of funding for either the Elephant project or any other project.

UNDP 2/14/2022

The UNDP cash co-financing was changed to ?in-kind ? investment mobilized?. The type of co-financing was clarified in the Table 2 ?baseline projects with co-financing? in Section II - 1a Project Description (see Green highlight).

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

A) We note with concern the reduction in the number of beneficiaries, as well as the more modest reduction in the number of people trained, from LDCF finance. Please clarify why this occurred and consider opportunities to increase both expected ambition levels to the number approved at the PIF stage and explain the need for any change, if any.

B) We note the CER includes the following LD targets: 14,000 ha under 3.3 (restoration of grasslands and shrublands) and 7,000 ha under 3.4 (restoration of wetlands), 15,000 ha under 4.3 (SLM), and 27,000 beneficiaries, including 16,200 women and 10,800 men. Please confirm these targets.

C) Additionally, with regards to the core indicator 6 on carbon: 900,000 tons of carbon were mentioned at PIF level. An EXACT table is available, highlighting potential gains of 2.648 million of tons of eCO2. Please justify the assumptions made and the reasoning. Please fill in the targets under the core indicator 6 at CEO endorsement.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2022 -

A) Unclear what the explanation is here -- please clarify regarding impact for LDCF beneficiaries. Did it turn out that the population was lower than estimated at PIF stage or why exactly? \$180/per beneficiary, which is what the LDCF portion is calculating to be seems a bit high for these types of activities.

B) OK

C) I cannot locate the footnote. Pls confirm if the footnote indicates that this tool was used: <https://ndepartnership.org/toolbox/global-climate-change-institutional-capacity-assessment-tool> because it seems as if the figures have been updated in line with the EXACT estimates.

GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Cleared. Thank you for the clarifications.

Agency Response

UNDP, 1/11/2022:

1. A) Based on census data of the 15 target communes, the number of direct beneficiaries from climate resilient physical and natural assets has been revised to cover approximately 20% of local community members, as well as 10% benefiting from improved climate services which was previously unaccounted for.
1. B) The targets are, as per GEF Core Indicator worksheet: Indicator 3.1: 10,000ha, Indicator 3.2: 5,000ha, Indicator 3.3: 15,000ha, Indicator 3.4: 6,000ha, Indicator 4.3: 225,000ha Indicator 11 increased to 142,592 (of which 69,165 men and 73,427 women)
1. C) A footnote has been added to clarify assumptions.

UNDP, 1/28/2022:

A) No considerable reduction of a number of beneficiaries has occurred compared to PIF estimates. During PPG phase, the scope of influence remained unchanged the number was specified based on census data. In the last resubmission, the number of direct beneficiaries was increased to 142,592 (a 5% decrease from the 150,000 at PIF

stage). This increase can be explained by the inclusion of beneficiaries from climate resilient physical and natural assets (expected to cover 20% of the 15 target communities) and climate services (expected to cover an additional 10% of the 15 target communities), using the last census data.

B) NA

C) The added footnote that provides an explanation indicates the following ?The EX-ACT tool was used to produce this estimate, using a total accounting period of 20 years. This tool is widely used for this purposes and no existing guidance suggests otherwise. According to the assessment 10,000ha of degraded land will be restored for cropland and use improved agronomic practices, as well as nutrient and water management. In addition, it assumes that the degradation of 5,000ha of forest land without the project would be large, but will be low with the project. Finally, 15,000ha of degraded land will be restored to grassland.? As mentioned in the footnotes, the EX-ACT tool was used, instead of the Global Climate Change Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool. The footnote is available in the word version of the CEO ER..

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

We note with appreciation additions and sharpening of several of the outputs, as well as clearly laying out the changes to budget allocation by Outcome, and differences in the co-finance. This is good practice and we would welcome it in other CERs.

A) The number of beneficiaries in this section is indicated as approximately 1000,000 (direct and indirect). Please maintain consistency with the expected impact numbers in the GEF TF and LDCF/SCCF indicators data.

B) Regarding output 1.3, please clarify the instrument/process built in for the vulnerability assessments and maps to be updated periodically.

C) Importantly, in table 1 or elsewhere in this section, please clarify the risks of anticipated impacts for hazards or "climate parameters" (as referred to in this section) according to at least 2 scenarios (optimistic and pessimistic) on livelihoods and wellbeing of the target geography and population. This is touched on for temperature. Please expand on this. Please also indicate how the proposed project interventions will

effectively address these impacts. Ideally, climate impacts based on the scenarios could be linked more explicitly to the 6 "drivers and climate vulnerability" aspects discussed later in this section.

D) Also regarding table 1, please widen the left column so the content can be read easier.

E) The changes in comparison with the PIF are welcome, as a better anchorage in the national LDN framework was expected, as well as a fine tuning of local stakeholders. In this regard, we welcome the Output 1.1 on a "National LDN committee revitalized and capacitated for better coordination of cross-sectoral decision-making for LDN", as well as the Output 3.3 "Training, technical support and equipment provided to climate-smart cooperative enterprises involving women, youth and displaced persons". The learning strategy has also been reformulated.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2022 -

A) OK

B) OK

C) OK

D) Noted

Agency Response

1. UNDP, 1/11/2022:
2. A) Numbers were revised to ensure consistency across the documents. The number of beneficiaries is 142,592 as per the explanation in the previous comment.
 1. B) This was clarified under the description of output 1.3. In particular, the involvement of the DGPC and the DRPSIAP was highlighted for the sustainability of the output: "Ultimately, the project will work on capacitating the DRPSIAP to ensure the long-term sustainability of this intervention, and ensure that data required by IGM to update vulnerability assessments and maps is collected on a regular basis?"
 1. C) Information on climate parameters was provided (more details are available in annexes) and data was updated from CMIP6.

To clarify how project interventions will address these impacts, a paragraph has been added to the ToC narrative "In terms of climate resilience, the project will seek to stabilize crop yields affected by increasing evapotranspiration (associated with higher temperatures) and erratic rainfall patterns by focusing on adaptation measures that provide reliable supplies of water, promote improved access to drought-resistant and otherwise climate resilient seed varieties, and capacitate farmers on

integrated pest management. Moreover, it will capacitate communities to undertake works that rehabilitate ecosystems including grasslands and wetlands, so they are more resilient to climate change, including measures to reduce siltation associated with increasing water erosion; stabilize dunes and reduce sand encroachment; and reduce the impact of recurring extreme flooding events. The project under Component 3 will also focus on supporting climate-smart cooperative enterprises in the provision of essential adaptation service, which will both diversify incomes and enable adaptation activities under Component 2. Finally, the text under "climate change projections" and "drivers and climate vulnerability" has been restructured to make the link between climate impacts clearer to the 6 drivers and climate vulnerability aspects.

1. D) The table has been removed in response to new data presented, and clarification of impacts by key sector impacted by the project.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Please expand in this section on climate adaptation benefits from this project to the livelihoods and wellbeing of target populations.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

1/11/2022:

Text has been added in this section: *The project is also expected to generate several adaptation benefits. Amongst those, it is anticipated that the project will increase the knowledge on climate change vulnerability and impacts at national and local levels, which will contribute to enabling stakeholders to make evidence-based adaptation decisions. This knowledge will continue to be improved over time through regular updating of vulnerability assessments and maps. Adaptation will be mainstreamed into local planning, ensuring adaptation options are effectively selected, adopted, and implemented for long-term resilient planning. The resilience of the key ecosystems local communities depend on for their livelihoods will also be enhanced, through a range of interventions aimed at restoration, as well as sustainable management, which will secure valuable ecosystem services and generate numerous socio-economic benefits. These benefits include, but are not limited to: i) increased financial security through diversified livelihoods; ii) increased food security, associated with adaptation practices, rehabilitated, and restored ecosystem services of economic value; iii) enhanced local NRM governance; iv) enhance climate security; and v) women and youth empowerment.*

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

N/A

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

A) Please include a report on stakeholders engaged during the design/project preparation phase.

B) We concur with the importance of working with local producer organizations, including women organizations. However, if we see the effort to involve local

communities, local governance entities, deconcentrated technical services, and private sector actors (through Components 2 and 3), we would like to be sure that sufficient resources will be used to empower these organizations. It is not obvious in the current budget. Please, clarify and confirm.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

1. 1/11/2022:
2. A) The information has been consolidated in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (see *PIMS 6317 Annex 9 SEP 21Dec21?*) under Table 2, and an additional table 3 was added to present interviews and focus groups held, consolidating data from individual consultant reports. Further information can be found in these individual reports.
1. B) This is confirmed. The budget includes several items under Components 2 and 3, to ensure sufficient engagement of these key stakeholders. These elements are scattered through the detailed description under the GEF budget tab in the document *PIMS 6317 Annex 1_GEF Budget Template_21Dec21?*. In terms of local communities, the project has budgeted for instance for a number of community forums to foster exchanges between traditional leaders, elected officials, and community members at large; deconcentrated technical services such as DREF and others will be engaged through MoUs/LOAs to implement several activities including setting up FFS and implement climate-smart practices; agricultural research institutions will support seed production networks through MoUs/LOAs; other private sector actors, in particular incubators, will be brought in through MoUs/LOAs as well. To ensure that these organizations are able to deliver on their mandates, the project has budgeted for expert consultants to provide capacity-building where necessary. Training of trainers for extension services, for instance, is explicitly budgeted for in each of the communes, different workshops at local level are being planned, etc. Where possible, the project is also leveraging the institutions which have been recently capacitated to conduct similar tasks through other projects (e.g. DREF for training of nursery staff). Moreover, on Component 3, the Component is structure to build capacity of local entrepreneurs at different levels. Indeed, Output 3.3 has been specifically added to strengthen the training aspects of private sector actors (i.e. local entrepreneurs) and trainings budgeted for over 300 enterprises and cooperatives.

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Please provide brief narrative explanation of how the includes gender responsive measures to address gender gaps or promotes gender equality and women empowerment.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

1/11/2022:

A paragraph was added and reference is made to the gender analysis and action plan. Both reports are in French but the results are informing the project design and reflected along the documents. *A gender analysis and gender action plan were developed during the PPG phase. The results of the analysis were taken into consideration into the design of the project, and inform the strategy taken to tackle closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; improving women's participation and decision making; and generating socio-economic benefits or services for women. As such, the project will seek to increase women participation in mechanisms to prevent conflicts associated with natural resources (Component 2), as well as have a renewed focus on supporting women-owned businesses while taking into account not only the technical barriers (e.g. lack of access to credit, equipment, business know-how) but also the socio-cultural barriers that limit involvement of women in business activities or may increase the risk of GBV when women gain greater financial independence (Component 3).*

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Please briefly expand on the narrative on private sector engagement in the project, including how this project will empower and support private sector action for climate adaptation and resilience, recognizing that smallholder farmers and MSMEs are important components of private sector.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

1/11/2022:

The strategy on the engagement of the Private Sector was expanded with the following text: *As stated earlier, the project works on building climate-resilient livelihoods by*

promoting opportunities in Component 3 for local youth and women entrepreneurs (MSMEs) from target communities to receive entrepreneurship training in existing incubator programmes in Mopti and Ségou (Donilab) in agri-processing and climate-smart technologies; and supporting them to access micro-finance and loan guarantees. The project will work on the development of human capital for enhanced adaptive capacity? creating scholarships for local youth to be trained e.g. in maintenance of solar PV systems (supporting adaptation activities)? see Output 3.2. Such training, in addressing long-term operation and maintenance, also promotes sustainability and mitigates the risk of high-tech equipment becoming defunct after the project ends. In addition, recognizing that smallholder farmers are key actors of the private sector, Component 2 of the project will work to capacitate and empower them to widely adopt climate-smart agriculture and increase the resilience of production systems in the face of climate change. It will use an FFS approach and a training of trainers approach to scale up impact and ensure the long-term sustainability of the interventions.?

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

The risk analysis has improved in comparison with the PIF, with the inclusion of the COVID situation, climate risks, and security issues.

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

A) To avoid any potential for confusion, in the GEF CER document, please use GEF terminology for "implementing" and "executing partners", whereby the Implementing Agency is UNDP and the "Executing partner" is AEDD for this project.

B) We note that it seems the coordination with existing projects has been taken seriously, notably with GIZ/Germany. We hope that the same level of coordination and common actions will happen with other GEF and LDCF projects, notably about the

institutionalization of governance mechanisms (multiple stakeholder platforms) and the scaling up of good SLM, restoration, and climate adaptation and resilience practices. Please confirm and explain as relevant.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2022 - Clarification requested. The information is well noted. While the GCF co-financing makes coordination with the GCF a given, please clarify that this project has also done the requisite due diligence to coordinate with other ongoing GCF Projects so as to maximize synergies.

GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Noted and cleared.

Agency Response

1/11/2022:

The text was adjusted to reflect the GEF terminology. The text was maintained as per UNDP terminology in the Project Document.

- B) Yes, the project will in particular work closely with the Community-based Natural Resource Management that Resolves Conflict, Improves Livelihoods and Restores Ecosystems throughout the Elephant Range GEF/UNDP project. Being the Implementing Agency on both projects, UNDP will ensure that coordination will be done and duplication avoided. Extensive consultations conducted during the PPG phase have enabled the clear definition of activities and prioritization of intervention areas to avoid duplication. Moreover, lessons learnt from prior projects were considered and where possible the results built upon and new capacity built leveraged for this project (e.g. PACV-MT Adaptation Fund project).

UNDP 1/29/2022:

As indicated through the provision of the co-financing letter, the project will ensure synergies with the Hydromet project. While the other 8 GCF projects intervening in Mali have been taken into consideration, no particular potential for synergies or areas of complementarities were identified with these projects, mainly due to distinct thematic and / or geographic scope.

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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response
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
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response
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
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response
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

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Please briefly explain how this project will contribute to green and climate resilient recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2022 - Cleared

Agency Response

1/11/2022:

Text has been added, based on the text provided in the PIF: *Strategy and action framework for response to the COVID-19 pandemic:*

The project will contribute to the Government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic, supported by the United Nations (UN) and other financial and technical partners.

According to a rapid analysis by the UN Country Team of the socio-economic impacts of COVID-19 in Mali, the indirect socio-economic impacts were anticipated to likely be even more devastating than the direct health effects. Indeed, the World Bank in 2021 found that the health crisis was estimated to have pushed an additional 900,000 people into poverty, reversing much of the poverty reduction progress achieved in Mali over the last decade.

The project strategy is to contribute in two ways to assisting the Government of Mali with a 'green recovery' from the pandemic, building on UNDP's support to Government, and on the Government's commitment of new resources for social protection, corresponding to 1.3% of GDP. This strategy responds to the guidance document 'GEF's Response to COVID-19', and has a dual action framework including for alignment of the project goals with the response and recovery strategies:

1. Actions to support COVID-19 response in the short-term: The proposed project has been designed to maximize opportunities for job creation and training, local economic development, and productivity improvements, as follows:

Job creation through small business development: In Component 3 of the project, youth-led climate-smart agribusinesses, technologies and services are developed. This includes work to: (i) provide opportunities for local youth from target communities to receive entrepreneurship training in existing incubator programmes in Mopti city; (ii) promote access to loan finance and loan guarantees for youth with solid business plans and family/community backing in agri-processing and climate-smart technologies. In Output 2.3, training is provided in 15 target communes in Mopti to develop farmers' capacity for Assisted Natural Regeneration and other Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) techniques, building on traditional knowledge and local preferences.

Productivity improvements: In Output 2.3 of the project, technical and financial support are provided to farming households (including women headed households) to adapt farming practices to climate change, and restore farm productivity. This includes work to: (i) form agro-ecological farmer's groups / Farmer Field Schools, including women farmers, and establish demonstration plots for train-the-trainer activities; (ii) provide heads of households (male and female) with regeneration incentive package (e.g. shears, pickaxe, wheelbarrow, boots and gloves); and (iii) promote climate-smart agriculture including new drought-resistant local crops/varieties, improved pest

management, fodder and fruit trees, and dry season gardening schemes, providing training and equipment, (e.g. seeds, seedlings, polyethylene bags, watering cans and spades).

2. Actions to support COVID-19 response in the long-term: The proposed project has been designed to maximize opportunities for strengthening supply chains, consistent with long-term decarbonization targets, and increasing natural and economic resilience and adaptive capacity, as follows:

Strengthening supply chains: In Output 3.1 of the project, new value chains for climate-resilient crops and processed products are identified and catalyzed. This includes work to: (i) empower entrepreneurs with climate-smart business and leadership training; (ii) support / establish women producer associations and cooperatives of youth and displaced people., conducting value chain analysis and market studies with them; and (iii) support set-up and first two years of operation of cooperative climate-smart businesses ? including partnerships for land and infrastructure, technical training and business planning, market access and savings groups/micro-credit..

Supporting long-term decarbonization targets: Output 3.3 of the project involves creating scholarships for local youth to be trained in supply and maintenance of solar PV technology for adaptation activities (water pumps and agri-processing for adaptation). Solar power also support low-emissions development strategies and decarbonization targets as part of the post-COVID green recovery.

Increasing natural and economic resilience and adaptive capacity: In Output 2.5 of the project, land and water resources (outside of family farms) are restored through communal restoration works for ecosystem-based adaptation. This includes work to: (i) train community resource management committees and community members, including youth and displaced persons, to analyze adaptation needs, and to plan, carry out and monitor rehabilitation efforts; (ii) equip commune / village-level committees and carry out plantings for rehabilitation of pastureland and protection of villages from sand encroachment; (iii) equip committees to develop and sustainably restore watercourses (channels, rivers, ponds, pools) and carry out rehabilitation works; and (iv) equip committees to construct/rehabilitate communal earth dams, and wells with solar PV-powered pumps, to increase household water supply and irrigation.?

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

- The audit template submitted with this endorsement request has been reviewed and cleared from a technical and programmatic perspective. The financial, operational, and policy due diligence may reveal issues that may still need to be addressed by UNDP. -

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 14Dec2021 - Please address the set of comments. In doing so, please attach a tracked changes or highlighted version of the CER document.

GEFSEC, 3/8/2022 - Please address the following and resubmit for further clearance:

1. Totals per focal area in Table A (CCA= \$6,552,831 LD= \$959,726) don't match the totals per focal area in Table D (CCA= \$4,872,831 LD= \$2,639,726) ? please amend
2. On Table B: Table B has been incorrectly filled out. Multiple lines have been provided with different amounts, for the same component within the same trust fund. For component 3 there is the missing project financing amount. Please harmonize and regroup the component lines (for same trust fund) and add the total of the project financing in one line.
- 3.
4. On Proportionality of the PMC: There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$64,887,683 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$3,244,384 instead of \$1,709,600 (which is 2.6%). 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 amend.
5. On co-financing: a) All but the UNDP co-financing letters have been provided in French only. Please provide English translations, as previously requested. b). The co-financing from the "Embassy of Netherlands" will not be provided in the form of a grant but rather as in-kind since it is linked with activities related to the financing of another project ? please amend.
6. On the co-financing from "Fonds Climat Mali": Again this co-financing will be provided through different projects so please correct to "in-kind" as this will not be a cash co-financing. It looks like Fonds Climat Mali depends on the Ministry of Environment, if this is the case then please correct the type of co-financier to "Recipient Country Government"?

7. On the co-financing from ?LoCAL?: by reading the co-financing letter it does not look like this has anything to do with the UN Capital Development Fund reason why it should be corrected to Ministry of Environment and Recipient Country Government and not Donor Agency. Also the type is in-kind and not grant.
8. On the co-financing from ?WB ? PRGIP?: the letter provided is from the Ministry of Environment so this can't be considered financing from the WB. If so, please request the WB to provide a co-financing letter. This seems to be a similar case to the previous ones where the ministry of environment is providing in-kind co-financing from parallel projects.
9. On the co-financing from ?AER-Modern Energy?: this co-financing will be in-kind as it looks like the Ministry will be providing solar panels. Please correct the name of co-financer to ?Ministry of Mines, Energy and Water?. Also in the first section it stipulates that the amount provided in co-financing will be 33 Billion CFCA but at the bottom of the letters it stipulates 3 billion CFCA. Please confirm the final amount and the currency exchanged utilized
10. On the co-financing from ?GCF/ Hydromet-MALI?: The letter comes from the Ministry of Security and Civil protection from Mali. This cannot be accepted as GCF co-financing. If not it should also include IDA co-financing and letters from both institutions should be provided. Similarly to above cases this is the Government providing in-kind co-financing from other projects being developed with funding from other international organizations.
11. On the co-financing from UNDP: it seems like the 1,500,000 in cash is missing in the portal. The other co-financing should be considered in-kind. The first line where it says only UNDP, it should include ? ?youth to peace? so its clear the project that it refers to.
12. In-kind co-financing should be categorized (in most cases) as Recurrent expenditures. If any Investment Mobilized is included (like the cash contribution from UNDP) then an details should be provided in the paragraph below Table C on how it was identified.
13. On Core Indicatorsv(i) Annex A ?Project Results Framework? ? the targets for GEF sub-indicators 3 (Area of land restored) should also be reflected in the Results Framework in Annex A. (ii) Annex A ?Project Results Framework? ? the target for GEF Core indicator 4 (Area of landscapes under improved practices) does not align with target in Portal?s core indicator table. Please revise. (iii) Core Indicator Table - Can you please un-click the GEF Core Indicator 4 (Marine protected area). (iv) Annex A ?Project Results Framework? ? the target for GEF Indicator 11 (Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender) in annex A (73,427 are women and 69,165 are men) is different with the target found in Core Indicator Table (62,162 are women and 73,427 are men). Please make sure the same is reflected on the core indicator table.
14. On the Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG): this section in Portal demands ?detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing

status?. However, there is no detailed information per activities as shown in the table below ? please amend.

GEFSEC 8April2022 - Technically cleared, pending any further comments from PPO.

Agency Response

GEFSEC, 3/8/2022 - Please address the following and resubmit for further clearance:

1. Totals per focal area in Table A (CCA= \$6,552,831 LD= \$959,726) don?t match the totals per focal area in Table D (CCA= \$4,872,831 LD= \$2,639,726) ? please amend

UNDP ? The totals in table A now match the totals in table D. CCA-2 was mistakenly selected in the GEF Portal, instead of LD-1.1. Under table A, CCA-1 is now budgeted for a total of \$4,872,831 while LD1-1, 1-4 and 2-5 now total \$2,639,726.

2. On Table B: Table B has been incorrectly filled out. Multiple lines have been provided with different amounts, for the same component within the same trust fund. For component 3 there is the missing project financing amount. Please harmonize and regroup the component lines (for same trust fund) and add the total of the project financing in one line.

UNDP - For each outcome, the outputs funded by each trust fund were regrouped.

3. On Proportionality of the PMC: There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$64,887,683 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$3,244,384 instead of \$1,709,600 (which is 2.6%). 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 amend.

UNDP - The PMC cofinancing was increased to \$ 3,409,600, with an increase of \$1,700,000 from the Liptako Gourma Stabilization Facility under PMC. This represents the support from the project in facilitating/creating a safer environment for field monitoring and evaluation by the PMU.

4. On co-financing: a) All but the UNDP co-financing letters have been provided in French only. Please provide English translations, as previously requested. b). The co-financing from the ?Embassy of Netherlands? will not be provided in the form of a grant but rather as in-kind since it is linked with activities related to the financing of another project ? please amend.

UNDP - a) The translations for all the co-financing letters are now available; b) the type co-financing from the ?Embassy of Netherlands ? PASARC II? was changed to ?in-kind?, ?recurrent expenditures?

5. On the co-financing from ?Fonds Climat Mali?: Again this co-financing will be provided through different projects so please correct to ?in-kind? as this will not be a cash co-financing. It looks like Fonds Climat Mali depends on the Ministry of

Environment, if this is the case then please correct the type of co-financier to ?Recipient Country Government?

UNDP - The co-financing was changed to ?in-kind? and the source of co-financing to ?Recipient Country Government?, with the name of co-financier changed to ?Ministry of Environment?. Fonds Climat Mali is the donor agency for this project, but the letter was signed by the Ministry of Environment as Executing agency.

6. On the co-financing from ?LoCAL?: by reading the co-financing letter it does not look like this has anything to do with the UN Capital Development Fund reason why it should be corrected to Ministry of Environment and Recipient Country Government and not Donor Agency. Also the type is in-kind and not grant.

UNDP - The co-financing was changed to ?in-kind? and the source of co-financing to ?Recipient Country Government?, with the name of co-financier changed to ?Ministry of Environment ? LoCAL?. UNCDF is the donor agency for this project, but the letter was signed by the Ministry of Environment as Executing agency.

7. On the co-financing from ?WB ? PRGIP?: the letter provided is from the Ministry of Environment so this can't be considered financing from the WB. If so, please request the WB to provide a co-financing letter. This seems to be a similar case to the previous ones where the ministry of environment is providing in-kind co-financing from parallel projects.

UNDP - The co-financing was changed to ?in-kind?, ?recurrent expenditures?. The World Bank is the donor agency for this project, but the letter was signed by the Ministry of Environment as Executing agency.

8. On the co-financing from ?AER-Modern Energy?: this co-financing will be in-kind as it looks like the Ministry will be providing solar panels. Please correct the name of co-financier to ?Ministry of Mines, Energy and Water?. Also in the first section it stipulates that the amount provided in co-financing will be 33 Billion CFCA but at the bottom of the letters it stipulates 3 billion CFCA. Please confirm the final amount and the currency exchanged utilized

UNDP - The type of co-financing was changed to ?in-kind?. The AER (Agency of Renewable Energies in Mali) is indeed under the Ministry of Mines, Energy and Water, but the letter is issued by the AER. In the letter, the first section stipulates the total amount of the project (XAF 33 billion) while the last paragraph provides the co-financing amount (XAF 3 billion) ? this can be better understood in the translated letters. The exchange rate used is US\$ 1 = XAF 564.5.

9. On the co-financing from ?GCF/ Hydromet-MALI?: The letter comes from the Ministry of Security and Civil protection from Mali. This cannot be accepted as GCF co-financing. If not it should also include IDA co-financing and letters from both institutions should be provided. Similarly to above cases this is the Government providing in-kind co-financing from other projects being developed with funding from other international organizations.

UNDP - The type of co-financing was changed to ?in-kind?, ?recurrent expenditure? and the source of co-financing to ?Recipient Country Government?, with the co-financier ?Ministry of Security and Civil protection / HYDROMET-MALI?. The GCF is the donor, but the letter was signed by the Ministry of Security and Civil protection as Executing agency.

10. On the co-financing from UNDP: it seems like the 1,500,000 in cash is missing in the portal. The other co-financing should be considered in-kind. The first line where it says only UNDP, it should include "youth to peace" so its clear the project that it refers to.

UNDP - The co-financing that is not included is instead the UNDP "youth to peace" project. This project was withdrawn as the project will end in September 2022. The US\$1,500,000 cash co-financing from UNDP is now referred to as "UNDP TRAC" and tagged as "grant" investment mobilized?.

11. In-kind co-financing should be categorized (in most cases) as Recurrent expenditures. If any Investment Mobilized is included (like the cash contribution from UNDP) then a details should be provided in the paragraph below Table C on how it was identified.

UNDP - All co-financings except for UNDP cash co-financing (grant, investment mobilized) were changed to "Recurrent Expenditures?".

12. On Core Indicators (i) Annex A "Project Results Framework" the targets for GEF sub-indicators 3 (Area of land restored) should also be reflected in the Results Framework in Annex A. (ii) Annex A "Project Results Framework" the target for GEF Core indicator 4 (Area of landscapes under improved practices) does not align with target in Portal's core indicator table. Please revise. (iii) Core Indicator Table - Can you please un-click the GEF Core Indicator 4 (Marine protected area). (iv) Annex A "Project Results Framework" the target for GEF Indicator 11 (Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender) in annex A (73,427 are women and 69,165 are men) is different with the target found in Core Indicator Table (62,162 are women and 73,427 are men). Please make sure the same is reflected on the core indicator table.

UNDP -

(i) Sub-indicators for the Core indicator 3 "Area of land restored" are now provided in Annex A, in alignment with the GEF Core indicators (Core Indicator 3, sub-indicators 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4) as well as the LDCF Core Indicator (Core Indicator 2, output 1.1.1). (ii) This was revised (iii) We believe the GEF refers to Indicator 5 "Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (excluding protected areas)". Indeed this indicator does not apply, but the system does not seem to allow to un-click, (iv) The Core Indicator table was revised.

13. On the Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG): this section in Portal demands "detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status". However, there is no detailed information per activities as shown in the table below please amend.

UNDP - The table was revised and now provides more details on expenditure.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes. We appreciate how the stakeholder comments and responses to each have been clearly laid out in Annex B. This is good practice, and we encourage with this all projects.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 1/25/2022 - Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

N/A

Agency Response

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 N/A

Agency Response

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 14Dec2021:

Not yet. Pending addressing comments.

GEFSEC, 1/26/2022 - Not yet. Please address the comments on the core indicators and coordination and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Please refer to the comment and clarification on co-financing and resubmit.

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - Yes, this project is being recommended for technical clearance.

GEFSEC 4/8/2022 - Further policy comments responded to, and this is recommended for technical clearance again.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/2/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/24/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/8/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations