

Scaling up a Multiple Benefits Approach to Enhance Resilience in Agro- and Forest Landscapes of Mali's Sahel Regions (Kayes, Koulikoro and Ségou)

[Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement](#)

Basic project information

GEF ID

9293

Countries

Mali

Project Name

Scaling up a Multiple Benefits Approach to Enhance Resilience in Agro- and Forest Landscapes of Mali's Sahel Regions (Kayes, Koulikoro and Ségou)

Agencies

AfDB

Date received by PM

11/24/2018

Review completed by PM

12/10/2019

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Yes, the project has slightly changed since the PIF. Changes are explained and justified:

- The project duration was adjusted from 60 to 35 months to fit the life expectancy of the main cofinancing project.
- Another change is the adjustment between the different components to emphasize the impacts on the ground of the component 2.
- The result framework was simplified: shortened formulation, merging.- The result framework was simplified: shortened formulation, merging, also responding to some STAP comments.

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

- At PIF level, we appreciated the participatory process at different jurisdictional levels: a number of platforms and participatory process are still included in the result framework (see outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3). However, we are not clearly seeing the future of these platforms once the project will have closed. Is there a plan to make these platforms sustainable (through the decentralization process for instance?), or will disappear at the end of the project? This project was considered by the STAP as a possible model and a good source of practices and lessons about integration. It would be important to strengthen all these integration related aspects.
- Please, can you be more specific and tell us what kind of POPs pesticides will be targeted for elimination?
- Is it possible to give a ballpark figure about the quantity of avoided UPOPS when applying the BAT/BEP measures for waste management (vis-a-vis the open burning of agricultural waste and municipal solid waste?).

August 30, 2019

Questions are still pending on CW (see below).

Response to Secretariat comments

The decentralization process is important to support the holistic INRM approach and to help facilitate the necessary cross-sector interfacing for INRM. To ensure the sustainability of the platforms beyond the project, the roles and responsibility for the platforms and its facilitation will be determined early on at project inception. This is reflected in Activity 1.1.1 which was added under Output 1.1 of Component 1. The comment on strengthening integration is very well noted and will be

considered at project inception stage. Knowledge management activities of the proposed project have been elaborated in section A.8 on "Knowledge Management" to contribute and strengthen the knowledge on integrated approaches for enhancing food security along with other multiple environmental benefits using the landscape approach.

Regarding POPs pesticides, the project will consult the implementation team of the Enabling Activities for the NIP Update and Review project on new POPs for updated inventory figures and findings on (i) old and new POPs pesticides and (ii) old and new unintentionally produced POPs (u-POPs), as the last POPs inventory for Mali was submitted in 2006. The proposed project will further undertake an inventory of open burning practices and uPOP releases in the project region using the UN Environment Standardized Toolkit for Identification and Quantification of Dioxins and Furans and Other Unintentional POPs under Article 5 of the Stockholm Convention, as well as, utilize information already gathered from the NIP Update and Review activities.

The proposed project first needs to establish the inventory on open burning practices and uPOP releases in the project region by estimating the amount of general waste burnt in the region over a year. Then, by estimating the amount of waste diverted from open burning towards BAT/BEP practices, the project will be able to establish the estimated quantity of avoided uPOPS when applying the BAT/BEP measures for waste management (vis-a-vis the open burning of agricultural waste and municipal solid waste). As specified however, the proposed project will target 2 g TEQ/a.

Additional information was added in the baseline section regarding the need to update the inventory of POPs pesticides. As a result, the following activity was added to Component 2, Output 2.11:

- Activity 2.11.1: Undertake an inventory on open burning practices and uPOPs releases in the project region.

The POPs pesticides targeted under this project are those identified in the NIP of Mali, namely, Dieldrin and DDT. Due to New POPs, the proposed project needs to further consult and collaborate with the NIP Review and Update activities to include newly listed POPs pesticides in the POPs elimination activities for this proposed project (for a total of an estimated 100 tons).

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

There is an acceptable risk analysis with mitigation measures. It is surprising that there are only low and medium rated risks. Please, confirm there are no high risks in this project (capacity, security, ...).

August 30, 2019

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments The risk analysis exercise was reviewed and as a result, adjustments were made on the level of risks faced by the project along with their corresponding mitigation measures in section A.5 "Risks" of the CEO Endorsement. Risks pertaining to the capacity and security amongst others, were also considered.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

A number of evidences is available to confirm cofinancing. However, we have difficulties to match these evidences with the different cofinancing sources:

- Please, confirm the grant and loan from AfDB (respectively \$27,212,548 and \$25,589,812). We found a document mentioning 18,195,000 UC.
- Confirm the cofinancing amount from the government (\$5,777,503).
- OK for the cofinancing from La Voute Nubienne,
- There is no justification and amount for the in-kind cofinancing from Elephant Vert.

August 30, 2019

Thanks for the effort. However, evidences are needed for all cofinancing, including in-kind contributions. We understand the difficulty to obtain a letter from communes, but we suggest AfBD to emit a letter if a pertinent partner cannot be contacted in a reasonable time ("association des communes", for instance). The alternative is to remove this in-kind cofinancing.

Response to Secretariat comments The ADF grant corresponds to an amount of UC 18,195,000 whereas the ADF loan corresponds to an amount of UC 18,195,000. The cofinancing amount from the government corresponds to USD 7,035,879 (ADB June 2019 exchange rate). Concerning the cofinancing from Elephant Vert, they will be contributing an amount in-kind of USD 802,639 (ADB June 2019 exchange rate). With regards to the co-financing from the "association des communes", given the low amount and the difficulty it will take to obtain the co-financing letter, it was decided to remove this reference from the co-financing table.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

The component was severely reduced, but there is a KM plan. We let the Agency fix the level of resources with their national and local counterparts. Please, confirm.

August 30, 2019

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

This is to confirm the amount of GEF financing for Component 3 for a total of USD214,515 which will complement the AfDB's cofinancing amount of USD 7,243,770.

Agency Responses**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:****GEFSEC****Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

At PIF level, a number of questions were actually pending: lack of quantification of GEB and indicators, lack of accuracy on SLM and CSA activities, weak data on gender, and stakeholders).

The Agency did a serious job to address these points (see Annex B, and relevant sections). Thanks.

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments**STAP**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

The comments from Canada are somehow included (with additional data on vulnerable groups, including the Youth, and women, as well as an annex and additions on the security situation). However, we recommend to AfBD to formally include responses to the two following Canada's comments in a table of response (as done for STAP and GEFSEC's comments).

"The proposed project aims to promote resource planning and management that address socio-economic and climatic priorities. In doing so, it aligns with Mali's national priorities in the agriculture sector and supports the Mali government's current policies of increasing agricultural productivity.

1. Conflict dynamics in the central regions of Mali (Ségou, Mopti) are not overtly considered in this project. There has been a rise of multilayered community-based conflicts involving different ethnic groups over land issues (sharing, access, ownership, rights, etc.) in the region. Further, farmers, pastors and herders are competing over the lands in the central regions. We suggest that the project consider hiring a conflict analysis and resolution focal expert who could assist with any conflicts that might arise during project implementation.

2. Youth constitutes one of the most underemployed and marginalized groups in the central regions of Mali. Does the project proponent have plans to incorporate activities that will focus on this vulnerable population?

August 30, 2019

Please include the responses from Canada's comments in a table in the portal, as you did for STAP and GEF comments.

Response to Secretariat comments

1. The NGO that will be executing the Programme to develop the agricultural value chain and to strengthen the nutrition of benefitting communities of the P2RS Baseline project in Mali has already mobilized a Conflict resolution expert. His remuneration will be covered by the GEF financing.

2. Most of the baseline project's activities will target the women and the youth (amongst the vulnerable communities). Nearly all capacity building activities from the baseline project will benefit young men and women, including for waste management activities.

The responses to Canada's comments have been added in table in the portal as requested.

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

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

August 30, 2019

Some comments have not fully been addressed. And please address the comments below from the CW coordinator and the CCM co-reviewer:

- The Core indicators for chemicals, in particular core indicator 9, need to include the type of chemical being addressed such as PCB, DDT etc. In the portal there is a drop-down list to select all relevant chemicals. Please address this.
- In addition, the calculations and assumptions to arrive at the core indicators also needs to be provided at the end of the core indicator table in the portal. Please address.
- The core indicator for GHG reduction needs to be checked and revised:

o First, in the CEO RE document, please justify that the GHG accounting methodology used for the project is consistent with the GEF proposed methodology (<https://www.thegef.org/topics/greenhouse-gas-ghg-accounting>);

o Second, it seems that the GHG emission reduction amount shown in the core indicator is part of the total calculated amount that is shown in the CEO RE document. Please double check the number and revise it.

November 27, 11

All points have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement

January 8, 2020

Please address the following comments made by PPO:

1- On Co-financing: Needs evidence for ‘beneficiaries’.

Additionally, some co-financing letters that are in French should have an accompanying English translation (the Agency can translate).

Particularly for AfDB’s grant and loan documents (considering that they have identical amounts), a simple 1-pager translation for each highlighting the co-financing amounts should be sufficient for our understanding. However, please be aware that the date of these AfDB operations are November 2014 and December 2014, so please ask the Agency to adjust the co-financing amounts commensurate with the project’s lifetime.

2- On M&E: Audit is an ineligible expense for GEF financing under M&E;

3- On Agency Certification: please ask the Agency to delete the two highlighted attachments as they do not belong to this section.

4- On Council Comments: only Canada’s comments were addressed in Portal - The PMIS contains record of U.S. upstream comments. These comments do not appear in the Joint Summary of Chairs. (If you are sure that Agency has adequately responded to this previously, please dismiss this comment and the next one on Germany’s comments – if not, please ask the Agency to address these comments). Similarly German Council comments have not been responded to. Response should be reflected in Annex B in the Portal.

5- The Project Document submitted is in French. There should have been an English Version since the official language of GEF is English. A detailed assessment of the project including its annexes and budget will follow once the English version is received.

Response to Secretariat comments

The type of POPs pesticides being addressed (100 tonnes of POP Pesticides, of which 15 tonnes are Endrin, 30 tonnes are Heptachlor and 55 tonnes are Endosulfan) have been added to the core indicators. This information is based on data collected during the preparation of Mali's NIP Update (which is still ongoing).

Calculations and assumptions for the UPOPs emissions mitigated are as follows: Mali's NIP indicates that open burning contributed 3.4 g TEQ/a of UPOP releases. It is envisioned that the proposed measures that are being proposed under this project will lead to the reduction of open burning practice through BAT/BEP and awareness raising and capacity building initiatives, significantly reducing the formation and emissions of UPOPs. When fully implemented, the project will lead to the avoidance of 50 - 60% of open burning practices, which translate to approximately 2g TEQ/a.

The GHG reductions through afforestation and reforestation measures under the project were recalculated using FAO's EX-ACT tool (Enhanced carbon stock through SFM, reforestation, etc. (on a **total 9,500 ha**) with a cumulative avoided GHG emissions of **132,693 tCO₂eq / year** and **2,653,852 tCO₂eq** over the 20-year duration of accounting (in the language used for the EX-ACT Tool, this corresponds to 5 years for the implementation phase and 15 years for the duration of the accounting phase).

Various sections of the CEO Endorsement document were updated to reflect this, and an additional activity was added to component 3 to operationalise a land-use Carbon MRV system, to be supported by institutional arrangements to ensure the permanence of the afforestation and reforestation interventions of the project.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

