

# Strengthening integrated approaches to build climate resilience of vulnerable rural communities and agricultural production systems in the central region of Segou in the Republic of Mali.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10823

**Countries**

Mali

**Project Name**

Strengthening integrated approaches to build climate resilience of vulnerable rural communities and agricultural production systems in the central region of Segou in the Republic of Mali.

**Agencies**

IFAD

**Date received by PM**

7/24/2022

**Review completed by PM**

11/22/2022

**Program Manager**

Jason Spensley

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

**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

22 November 2022:

Cleared

15 November 2022:

The elapsed time from implementation start date to completion date is 47 months ?  
please ask the Agency to amend.

4 August 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

18 November 2022

corrected

**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

11 November 2022:

Cleared. In the future, please ensure to be realistic on impact ambition at the PIF stage, and avoid large scale reductions at CER stage.

3 October 2022:

The reduction in impact ambition in several components and outputs remains a concern. For example, what conditions have changed to merit this reduction in impact ambition?

As a further specific, regarding component 3.ii, the PIF indicated 2,500 "beneficiary households (50% women-headed)", and the CER indicates "2,000 beneficiaries (50% women-headed)". Please clarify the CER to be "Beneficiary households (50% women-headed)" in the relevant sections throughout the CER. We understand households refers to more than one beneficiary.

4 August 2022:

We note changes have been made to several of the outputs from the PIF to the CER. Please clearly outline (ideally in a table format) all the changes made with a brief explanation why each is needed and how it serves to strengthen the project.

Agency Response

**Response 1: October 24, 2022**

The concern regarding reducing the impact ambition is noted and comprehensible. However, as was previously mentioned, Table 1 on page 7 indicates where the changes have been effected and the reasoning behind the reduction. More importantly, the project needs to commit to targets that are realistically achievable given the available

resources for the project. Between the PIF and the CER, consultations have been undertaken, and lessons have been learned from previous interventions in Mali. During consultations, new information emerged that informed the draft of the CER. Particularly, the SAWAP[1] helped to provide realistically achievable estimates for this project. Facts from SAWAP indicate that the benchmark for land rehabilitation in Mali can fall within \$200-\$500 per hectare range. For the actual figures based on sustainable land and water management interventions (under SAWAP) in Mali, the cost was **\$2,700** per hectare (Two Thousand Seven Hundred USD per ha). The SAWAP project in Mali (**\$9.75 million** dedicated to SLWM led to the adoption of sustainable land and water management practices on **3,667 ha**)

Please, note that the Proponent as well as the country would like to raise the impact ambitions just like the GEF Secretariat, however the wish is severely constrained by the financial resources. For this particular project with a financial envelop of \$1,776,484 as total project cost, the amount is considered as sufficiently catalytic to realistically achieve what has been promised as targets.

Regarding component 3 targets, 'beneficiary households' has been added, and the target of 2,500 has been maintained as at PIF stage.

---

[1] Please, refer to fairly recent lessons from World Bank (2021) Sustainable Land Management in the Sahel: Lessons from the Sahel and West Africa Program in Support of the Great Green Wall (SAWAP) [here](#).

23 September 2022

Comment noted with thanks. In response:

Please note that the document has Table 1 on page 7 indicating where changes and differences have been effected. In the same Table, the reasons for each change have been included; and these reasons relate to i) feasibility and ease to track and monitor, and ii) the extent to which the targets are realistically achievable given the available resources for the project (\$1,776,484 as total project cost).

---

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4 August 2022:

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

22 Nov 2022:

Cleared

15 Nov 2022:

Please submit co-financing letters for Beneficiaries, GCF and FAO

5 November 2022:

We continue to await all the co-financing letters.

3 October 2022:

We await the co-financing letters.

4 August 2022:

Please provide a co-financing letter from each source, uploaded in the co-financing section.

Agency Response

18 November 2022

The CEO is submitted only with the beneficiaries and GCF co financing letters removing FAO cofinancing. the FAO co financing might arrive on Monday. in case we will let you know.

October 24, 2022

IFAD co-financing letter uploaded.

Still working on gathering the others

23 September 2022

Working on gathering the cofinancing letters

#### **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

22 November 2022:

Cleared

15 November 2022:

The co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10%, for a co-financing of \$32,000,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$3,200,000 instead of \$1,670,000 (which is 5.2%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

Agency Response

18 November 2022

The comment has been taken into account. The co-financing contribution to PMC has been increased to be at the same level of the GEF contribution portion of the PMC.

#### **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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

The response below is noted. However, table C still indicates that only \$33,500 have been committed, and therefore \$21,250 remains to be committed. Please clarify.

4 August 2022:

Please indicate why \$21,250 has not yet been committed and if this will be returned by the Agency.

##### Agency Response

##### **Response 2: October 24, 2022**

Comment seeking additional clarification is noted with thanks. The table has been redone to clarify the status of financial resources in terms of what has been committed and what has been spent to date. In the Table C, the total amount committed is \$21,250 (to the validation workshop foreseen after CER approval), and a total of \$33,500 has already been spent on the preparation of the CER. The total sum of the amount committed and spent is \$54,750.

23 September 2022

Comment noted with thanks. The \$21,250 has been committed to the validation workshop with key stakeholders, but not yet spent since the workshop has not taken place yet. This workshop will be critical in re-engaging different stakeholders and attract additional political will and support for the project.

## **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 5 November 2022:**

Cleared with reluctance, as a significant reduction in impact from PIF to CER is regrettable for all, including the Agency.

#### **3 October 2022:**

The explanation below is well noted. However, we need to register that we remain concerned about the reduction in impact ambition for core indicator 2 (area of land managed for climate resilience) from 55,000 hectares in the approved PIF to only 3,000 hectares in the CER. We are also confused why 5,100 hectares is indicated in the response below, but 3,000 hectares is indicated in the core indicators table in the CER document. 3,000 or 5,100 hectares is a relatively low ambition level for this scale of GEF finance. The differentiation in the explanation below between "target" and "potential for scale up" is unclear. What is meant by scaling up potential and why is this not considered as impact target? Please further consider opportunity to be closer to the hectares impact level that was indicated as expected in the PIF, and/or provide further explanation of what this reduction in impact has been required since the PIF approval, and what is meant by scale up potential. For example, what does this "potential" depend on? What are the strategies to achieve this potential, vs the greatly small numbers of 3,000 or 5,100? Is the impact ambition 55,000 hectares, 5,100 or 3,000?

#### **4 August 2022:**

We appreciate the increase in the expected results for beneficiaries from PIF to CER (3,000 to 6,000) and number of people trained (800 to 3,800) from PIF to CER. However, we note with concern the very significant reduction in the expected impact on the total number of hectares under climate resilient management from 55,000 to 3,000. This very large scale of reduction from the expected level at PIF approval. Please identify ways to be closer to the level of hectares approved at the PIF stage. After identifying ways to bring this indicator back up, if there is expected to be any reduction in the expected impact level approved at the PIF stage, please explain in detail why this expected reduction in impact is needed and what changed to generate this reduction in results.

Please explain the adjustments in the sectoral coverage from PIF to CER.



Agency Response  
**18 November 2022**

The GEF Secretariat's note is understood and acknowledgement within what was explained in the Response 3: October 24, 2022.

**Response 3: October 24, 2022**

Many thanks for the comment, which we have noted with thanks. We share the reviewer's concern regarding the reduction in targets and overall reduced level of project ambition. However, please refer to the response provided in *Response 1: October 24, 2022* above, which has made reference to the cost of land rehabilitation in Mali as learned from SAWAP.

In the CER document, 'Table of Core Indicators highlighting adaptation benefits' on page 50, section 1a.7. Adaptation benefits (LDCF), where Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha) is 5,100 as Core Indicator 2. This figure is derived from the summation of: 800 ha under climate resilient species, essences and seeds; 2,500 ha under local species with high commercial and medicinal value; and 1,800 ha under concrete agro-ecological measures to address the effects of drought, desertification and climate change.

The allusion to 'potential' is an indication of what can be achieved under an enabling environment that would constitute additional financing, community adoption of sustainable production systems, appropriate institutional arrangement to support extension services, absence of pandemics such as COVID-19, among other factors. The potential scaling up in the scenario of this project is an ambition factor of 10 to 11 times (i.e. 55,000) the impact ambition of 5,100 ha that the project seeks to achieve. A sentence has been added to paragraph 92 of the CER document.

Building on the exhaustive response under *Response 1: October 24, 2022* above, the impact ambition is 5,100 ha.

23 September 2022

The comment and concern raised are acknowledged and appreciated. Due consideration has been given following this comment. We would like to keep the ambition of the project reasonably high without being detached from what is realistically possible to achieve. We have therefore, adjusted upwards several targets and indicators. See table of core indicators in section 1a.7. *Adaptation benefits (LDCF)*. Under core indicator, the target is 5,100 ha of land to be managed for climate resilience. As mentioned in the section under potential for *scaling up*, though the target is 5,100 ha, the potential for scaling up goes up to 55,000 ha of land. This is an appreciable level of scaling up given the level of funding (see also below).

As has been indicated under Project description summary (2), the adjustments reflect the understanding of feasibility and ease to track and monitor, and the extent to which the targets are realistically achievable. It should be noted that the project risks tabulated on page 61 have been factored into the planned project targets and indicators. Finally, the adjustments of targets and indicators have considered the available resources for this project (\$1,776,484).

## **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

4 August 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4 August 2022:

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

4 August 2022:

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

3 October 2022:

Cleared

4 August 2022:

No, it appears there has not been further elaboration from the PIF to the CER on how the project is aligned with the LDCF strategy. Please indicate elaboration advanced during PPG.

Agency Response

23 September 2022

The comment for additional information is noted. In response, additional information has been provided, including information on Mali's adaptation priority options and updating the table showing project alignment with LDCF strategy (see page 46)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4 August 2022:

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

3 October 2022:

Cleared

4 August 2022:

Not really. Please briefly expand the elaboration on the projects adaptation benefits through the outcomes and outputs that will be produced.

Agency Response

23 September 2022

The comment and request for additional information have been taken note of. Additional information has been added to more clearly demonstrate the project's benefits and how they translate to support global environmental benefits and adaptation benefits (see pages 74 - 75). These complement those that have been presented in the section under adaptation benefits (see pages 50 ? 51).

**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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

Please note the comments above on needing clarification of what is meant by "Scale-up potential", and how it will be defined.

4 August 2022:

No. Please provide further elaboration.

Agency Response

**Response 4: October 24, 2022 above**

Further commented is noted. Please, see response above under *Response 3: October 24, 2022*.

23 September 2022

Thanks for this comment. The section on innovation, sustainability and scaling-up has been improved accordingly (see pages 51-52). It should be noted, as has been pointed above, the scaling up potential of the project in terms of bringing land under resilient management practices is 55,000 ha.

**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  
4 August 2022:

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  
4 August 2022:

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

22 November 2022:

Cleared

15 November 2022:

It is well noted that the Project includes information on stakeholder consultations during PPG as well as an overview of the different roles of stakeholders in project implementation. The agency should however provide additional information on the role of civil society partners in project implementation. Table to only list some civil society actors but does not provide any explaining on their respective roles. The ticked boxes indicate that they will be (i) Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body and serve as Executor or co-executor.

4 August 2022

We note with appreciation the detailed stakeholder assessment plan attached as an uploaded document. However, it appears that the same information on stakeholders engaged in the body of the CER document is the same as those engaged at PIF stage. Please update in the CER the stakeholder engagement advanced during the design (project preparation) phase since PIF approval.

Agency Response

18 November 2022

Comment on CSOs is well noted. In response, in the Stakeholder Section, under table 4 (Table 4: Stakeholder Table) a paragraph has been added to explain the roles of CSOs, but also particularly the roles that the identified CSOs will play, specific to outputs 3.1.1 and 4.1.1.

23 September 2022

Paragraphs have been added to confirm that physical mission by the Implementing Agency to facilitate in-country consultation with different stakeholder was not possible due to COVID-19 and socio-political insecurity in Mali. However, virtual consultation meetings were organized, in close collaboration with the OFP. Key points of discussions have been highlighted (page 57).

**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

4 August 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**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

4 August 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**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

4 August 2022:

Yes

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

4 August 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**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

4 August 2022:

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

4 August 2022:

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

4 August 2022:

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

4 August 2022:

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

4 August 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

30 November 2022:

Cleared

22 November 2022:

There are still differences between the figures in Table B and the figures in Budget Table. Specifically:

Component 1 in Budget table: \$255,000                      - Component 1 in Table B:  
\$295,000

•Component 2 in Budget table: \$585,000                      - Component 2 in Table B:  
\$600,000

•Component 4 in Budget table: \$180,000                      - Component 4 in Table B:  
\$210,000

Please align and amend.

14 November 2022:

1. Budget table is off margin. Please amend.
2. The budget table under Annex E and the Portal entry's table B do show some differences between components as following:

•Component 1 in Budget table: \$255,000                      - Component 1 in Table B:  
\$295,000

•Component 2 in Budget table: \$585,000                      - Component 2 in Table B:  
\$600,000

•Component 3 in Budget table: \$550,000                      - Component 3 in Table B:  
\$550,000

•Component 4 in Budget table: \$180,000                      - Component 4 in Table B:  
\$210,000

3 October 2022:

Please note the further comments above on hectares impact.

4 August 2022:

Regarding the budget and the contracts generating hectares impact for land under climate resilient management, please note and response here to the comments above on hectares impact in terms of maximising impact for value from these contracts.

Agency Response

**30 November 2022**

Done and amended. Budget Numbers are now aligned with Table B numbers

**18 November 2022**

1-Budget table has been corrected and amount is now consistent with GEF approved Budget

2- The differences arose from the amount being affected to M&E . 40,000 out of Component 1, 15000 from component 2 and 30,000 from Component 4.

These totalled to the 85,000 which is the amount for the M&E component

**Response 5: October 24, 2022 above**

Further commented is noted. Please, see response above under *Response 3: October 24, 2022*.

23 September 2022

Comment noted and appreciated. As has been noted in our responses to similar comments, we number of hectares for land under climate resilient management has been adjusted upwards.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4 August 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

22 November 2022:

Cleared, pending any further comments on policy alignment elements.

14 November 2022:

Further comments on policy alignment are required to be addressed.

5 November 2022:

Recommended for technical clearance

3 October 2022:

Please address the further set of comments.

4 August 2022:

Please address the set of comments.

Agency Response

**18 November 2022**

Comment noted with thanks. In the current iteration, we have addressed the comments to the extent the comments could be addressed.

**Response 6: October 24, 2022 above**

The Reviewer's final comment is well noted. Given the current information and additional consultation with the country, we have responded to the comments and concerns raised in the current iteration of review.

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4 August 2022:

N/A

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4 August 2022:

N/A

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4 August 2022:

N/A

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4 August 2022:

N/A

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4 August 2022:

N/A

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

Please see further comment above.

4 August 2022:

Please see comment above on use of PPG and uncommitted PPG funds.

Agency Response

**Response 7: October 24, 2022 above**

As above under **Response 2: October 24, 2022**, the Reviewer's final comment is well noted. We have responded to the comment regarding the use of the PPG **Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4 August 2022:

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

4 August 2022:

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

4 August 2022:

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

4 August 2022:

N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

30 Nov 2022:

Recommended for clearance.

28 Nov 2022:

One comment is remaining to be addressed on consistency of budget figures.

5 October 2022:

Recommended for technical clearance

3 October 2022:

Not yet

4 August 2022:

Not yet

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>8/4/2022</b>	<b>9/23/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/3/2022</b>	<b>10/27/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/15/2022</b>	<b>11/18/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/22/2022</b>	<b>11/30/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/28/2022</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**