



REQUEST FOR: CEO Endorsement

Project Type: Fullsized Project

Type of Trust Fund: LDCF Trust Fund

PART I PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening resilience to climate change through integrated agricultural and pastoral management in the sahelian zone in the framework of the Sustainable Land Management approach.			
Country(ies)	Mali	GEF Project ID	4822
GEF Agency (ies)	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	616182
Other Executing Partners	Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development (AEDD).	Submission Date	October 06, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s)	Climate Change (Adaptation)	Project Duration (Months)	48
Name of Parent Program	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$)	217,273

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-Financing (\$)
CCA-1	Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Output 1.1.1 Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks	LDCF	383,200	4,526,000
CCA-2	Outcome 2.2: Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses	Output 2.2.1: Adaptive capacity of national and regional centres and networks strengthened to respond rapidly to extreme weather events	LDCF	500,000	4,244,301
CCA-3	Outcome 3.1: Successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas	Output 3.1.1: Relevant adaptation technology transferred to targeted groups	LDCF	1,000,000	4,162,223
CCA-3	Outcome 3.2: Enhanced enabling environment to support adaptation-related technology transfer	Output 3.2.1: Skills increased for relevant individuals in transfer of adaptation technology	LDCF	167,027	1,050,000
Sub-Total				2,050,227	13,982,524

Project management cost ¹		122,500	264,735
Total project costs		2,172,727	14,247,259

B. Project Framework

Project Objective: To enhance the capacity of Mali's agropastoral sectors to cope with climate change (CC), by mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) strategies, practices, and technologies adoption into on-going agopastoral and agricultural development initiatives in the framework of the national Sustainable Land Management (SLM) approach and program (CSI-GDT)					
Project Component	Grant type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1. Development of climate change adaptation (CCA) strategies, plans and tools for vulnerable areas characterized by both agricultural and pastoral production systems	TA	<p>Outcome 1.1: The institutional capacities of the AEDD, Ministry of Rural Development's structures (MDR), local governments, herders, farmers and customary organizations are strengthened to minimize the exposure of agro-pastoral and agricultural production systems in vulnerable areas to climate variability and risks.</p> <p><i>Outcome indicator 1.1 (a): (LDCF AMAT Indicator 2.2.1): By PY2, 10 staff from AEDD, 10 staff from MDR, 10 staff from local government, and 15 herders and staff from customary organizations (to be determined) are trained on the APFS approach and climate resilient pastoral practices.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome indicator 1.1 (b): By the end of the project, 70% of the 3,000 agro-pastoralists targeted through the APFS network have access and use of 10-day weather forecasts.</i></p>	<p>Output 1.1.1: APFS concepts and approaches are circulated and popularized amongst the staff of AEDD, MDR's structures, local government, herders, farmers and customary organizations, to contribute to strengthening adaptation capacities of agro-pastoral and agricultural production systems in vulnerable communes of the Koulikoro, Ségou and Kayes regions.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: Climate information and meteorological data related to climate variability and change are made available and used in targeted vulnerable regions, and institutional actors' capacities are strengthened to better analyse and diffuse this data.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: The Charte Pastoral and its statutes are distributed and implemented. Agreements between local agro-pastoralists are put in place to reduce conflicts linked to climate variability and transhumance</p>	500,000	4,244,301

¹GEF will finance management cost that is solely linked to GEF financing of the project.

			paths.		
2. Capacity building and up-scaling of CCA technologies and best practices for small agropastoralists	TA	<p>Outcome 2.1: Agro-pastoralists (of which at least 30% are women) have strengthened capacities to adopt CCA practices and technologies in agro-pastoral systems.</p> <p><i>Outcome indicator 2.1(a): By the end of the project, 3,000 agro-pastoralists have strengthened capacities to adopt CCA practices and technologies due to project activities. 30% are women.</i></p> <p><i>Outcome indicator 2.1(b): (LDCF AMAT Indicator 3.1.) By the end of the project, 70% of beneficiaries (30% women) adopt promoted CCA practices (type and number to be determined during the project) through the 150 APFSs established.</i></p>	<p>Output 2.1.1: At least 200 APFS facilitators are trained (of which at least 30% are women) through agreements with associations of livestock-raisers and agro-pastoralists</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: 150 APFS are put in place and integrate CCA and sustainable land-use principles in their curriculum, with an accent on best practices, ecosystem resilience, and integration of agricultural and pastoral production systems.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3: Adaptation technologies and practices are distributed to the 150 APFS created by the project.</p>	1,095,627	4,860,629
		<p>Outcome 2.2: Livelihoods of targeted agro-pastoralists improved.</p> <p><i>Outcome Indicator 2.2: (AMAT Indicator 1.3.2): By the end of the project, the income of target groups increases by 5% (attributable to the extent possible to adopted CCA measures).</i></p>	<p>Output 2.2.1: At least 2,500 livestock-raisers and farmers (of which at least 30% are women) participate in the implementation of integrated local adaptation strategies.</p>		
		<p>Outcome 2.3: Agricultural/agro-pastoral productivity in pilot CCA investment areas has increased.</p> <p><i>Outcome Indicator 2.3 (AMAT Indicator 1.2.5): By the end of the project the agricultural/agropastoral productivity of target groups increases by 5% (attributable to the extent possible to adopted CCA measures).</i></p>	<p>Output 2.3.1: Four pilot investments in adaptation are supported to improve ecosystem resilience and contribute to strengthening the capacity of agro-pastoralists to adapt to climate change.</p>		
3.Mainstreaming CCA strategies in agricultural and	TA	<p>Outcome 3.1: APFS-based CCA mainstreamed into integrated rural</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1: National cooperation frameworks that use</p>	350,000	4,526,000

animal production development policies and programme frameworks		development and investment policies <i>Outcome Indicator 3.1: (AMAT Indicator 1.1.1.1) By the end of the project, climate change aspects are mainstreamed within the National Plan for Priority Investment in the Agricultural Sector and the Five-Year Pastoral Development Plan.</i>	APFS to better integrate CCA into agricultural/livestock development are strengthened. Output 3.1.2: The Climate Proofing tool is applied at the national and regional levels through the Strategic Framework for Investing in Sustainable Land-use Management (CSI-GDT). Output 3.1.3. The Five-Year Pastoral Land Use Plan (PQAP) is revised to support integration and mainstreaming of CCA in the agro-pastoral sector.		
4. Project monitoring and evaluation	TA	Outcome 4: Project implementation based on results-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated. <i>Outcome Indicator 4.1: Fulfilment of planned M&E activities including establishing baseline values for all project indicators, yearly updating of indicators, a mid-term review and a final project evaluation and dissemination of lessons learned.</i>	Output 4.1.1. Monitoring and Evaluation System put in place, including systematic collection, analysis, compilation, and operational implementation of data. Output 4.1.2. Mid-term review and final evaluation are conducted. Output 4.1.3. Best practices and lessons learned from the project are disseminated.	104,600	351,594
Subtotal				2,050,227	13,982,524
Project Management Costs (PMC)				122,500	264,735
Total Project Costs				2,172,727	14,247,259

C. Sources of Confirmed Cofinancing for the Project by Source and by Name (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount(\$)
Government of Mali	AEDD	Cash	10,915,000
Government of Mali	AEDD	In-kind	400,000
GefAgency	FAO	Cash	2,343,959
Government of Mali	MDR	In-kind	588,300
Total Co-financing			14,247,259

D. Trust fund Resources Requested by agency, Focal Area and country

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country Name/Global	Grant amount (\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b)	Total (\$) (a + b)
FAO	LDCF	Climate Change	Mali	2,172,727	217,273	2,390,000
Total Grant Resources				2,172,727	217,273	2,390,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

E. Consultants working for technical assistance components (\$):

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants	682,000	-	682,000
International consultants	547,000	-	547,000

PART II PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. Describe Any Changes in Alignment With The Project Design Of The Original PIF

1. The project design is overall fully aligned with the PIF. There are some changes to the structure of outcomes and the details of some outputs. Furthermore the PMC has been raised from 5% (PIF) to 6% (ProDoc). These changes are explained in section A.5 below.

A.1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports etc.

1. The PIF provides an accurate description of the Project's alignment to national strategies and plans.
2. More detailed information is provided in the project document in Sections 1.2 and 1.6.

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities

3. The PIF provides an accurate description of the Project's alignment to GEF focal areas and strategies.
4. More detailed information is provided in the Project Document in Section 1.6.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage

5. The PIF provides an accurate description of the FAO's comparative advantage to implement this Project.
6. More detailed information is provided in the Project Document in Section 1.3.

A. 4 The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address

7. The PIF provides a description of the problem to be addressed. This description is valid. However, the Project Document provides a much more detailed description of the problem to be addressed. Notably, Sections 1.1 and 1.2 of the Project Document provide details of the situation with regards to agro-pastoralism in Mali in terms of climate change and climate variability impacts and related threats. Section 1.2 also provides an analysis of the barriers to adapting to climate change and increasing climate resilience.
8. A thorough analysis of baseline projects was undertaken during the PPG phase. This analysis revealed that certain projects mentioned in the PIF have now terminated and others have started. As a result, the following table lists the 4 programmes and projects that form the baseline and provide co-financing to the proposed project.

Table 1 Introduction to related baseline and co-financing projects and programmes implemented in Mali

Title and Project Objective/Description	Lead Agency	Co-financing amount and duration	Co-financing support to project
Integrating Climate Change into development planning (PICP) Identify areas of vulnerability to Climate Change and the most appropriate tools for adaptation in three regions of Mali (Koulikoro, Segou and Kayes). The aim is to integrate CC into PDESC and national policies on development.	GIZ/AEDD through BMU financing	US\$ 4,500,000 2014-2018	The project will support components 1, 2 and 3.
Support Project for the Implementation of the SNCC Implement the SNCC through adaptation investments to: improve ecosystem resilience; enable rural stakeholders to cope with climate change by adopting diversified agricultural activities; and promote community-based adaptation (including CCA/SLM investments in pasture management and water points).	GIZ/UNDP through BMU financing	US\$ 6,815,000 2014-2018	The project will support components 1, 2 and 3.
Support Project for the Preparation of the General Agriculture and Livestock census in Mali (TCP/MLI/3501) Help the Government of Mali prepare the general census for agriculture and livestock in a way that results will contribute to defining more efficient strategies and policies in order to reduce poverty and food insecurity.	FAO/MDR	US\$ 344,000 2014-2015 expected to be extended	The project will support components 1, 2 and 4.
Youth at work: reduction of rural poverty (GCP/MLI/040/MUL) Improve the livelihood of young rural producers from the informal and formal sector within Mali's rural economy; in particular through the implementation of Farmer Field School for child labor.	FAO/MDR	US\$ 1,999,959 2014-2016 expected to be extended	The project will support components 1, 2 and 4.

A. 5 Incremental/Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project

Additional cost-reasoning and co-financing

9. Based on the PPG assessment of the baseline projects and related consultations, the co-financing to the project has been confirmed and will be as follow:
 - AEDD will provide US\$ 11,315,000 (in cash and kind) in parallel co-financing;
 - FAO will provide US\$ 2,343,959 (in cash) in parallel co-financing; and
 - MDR will provide US\$ 588,300 in kind.
10. The total amount of confirmed co-financing (US\$ 14,247,259) is higher than what was estimated in the PIF (US\$ 9,670,000).
11. Based on the detailed analysis undertaken during the PPG, the allocation of co-financing across the components has increased a little for each component, keeping the same proportions overall. The details are provided in the following table.

Table 2: Detailed co-financing per component

Component	PIF indicative Co-financing (US\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (US\$)
Component 1	2,800,000	4,244,301
Component 2	4,500,000	4,860,629
Component 3	1,850,000	4,526,000
Component 4	249,454	351,594
Project Management	270,546	264,735
TOTAL	9,670,000	14,247,259

Logical Framework

12. The PIF provided a description of the outcomes, outputs and strategies to be supported by the project. The thorough problem analysis that was undertaken during the PPG phase validated the overall strategy and approach of the PIF. It also led to a minor restructuring of some of the outcomes and outputs:
 - Outcome 3.1 and 3.2 have been merged since they were targeting a similar objective and would have had to be monitored through the same indicator.
 - Minor wording adjustment have been made to some outcomes and outputs in order to avoid repetition, better reflect the content of each of them, and avoid expressing quantification aspect at outcome level.
13. The detailed outcomes, outputs and activities are provided in the project document in section 2.3 and 2.4, and in Appendix 1 (Results Matrix).

Additional Reasoning

14. In the baseline, the 4 on-going co-financing projects listed in Table 1, the Ministry of Rural Development's co-financing as well as the previous adoption of the Farmer Field School (FFS) approach in Mali, provide entry points for addressing climate change considerations when supporting agro-pastoralist communities. This constitutes a cost-effective opportunity to finance the additional costs of adaptation using the LDCF funds.

15. With the additional financing from the LDCF, the proposed intervention will (i) develop the basic foundations for mainstreaming climate change adaptation across activities in the agro-pastoralists sectors; (ii) develop the tools and capacities for actually delivering in a cost-effective manner climate change support to vulnerable agro-pastoralist communities; (iii) directly deliver support to a sizeable number of agro-pastoralist communities; and (iv) ensure sustainability by integrating CCA into key policy initiatives and ensuring lessons are learnt and disseminated.
16. Section 1.2.3 in the project document explains in more details the additionality and complementarity of each component of the proposed project with regards to baseline projects.

Global environmental and adaptation benefits

17. The LDCF project is expected to increase resilience to climate change in the intervention areas through an integrated ecosystem-wide approach that focuses specifically on the interactions between agricultural and pastoral production systems. The project will generate both direct and indirect adaptation benefits for agro-pastoralists in the project's target areas.
18. Directly, the project will support at least 3,000 agro-pastoralists to develop and implement new approaches, practices and fodder varieties that increase climate resilience. The project will also contribute directly to organizational strengthening in these communities - leading indirectly to improvements in terms of gender, youth, land tenure, and access to and use of agro-meteorological information. As a result 3,000 families, approximately 18,000 people, will benefit from increased resilience to climate change.
19. The project will lay the ground-work for introduction of adaptation measures by building capacities within local entities and creating access to improved information:
 - APFS concepts and approaches are circulated and popularized amongst the staff of AEDD, MDR's structures, local government, herders, farmers and customary organizations, to contribute to strengthening adaptation capacities of agro-pastoral and agricultural production systems in vulnerable communes of the Koulikoro, Ségou and Kaye regions;
 - Climate information and meteorological data related to climate variability and change will be made available and used in targeted vulnerable regions and institutional actors' capacities are strengthened to better analyse and diffuse this data;
 - The Pastoral Charter and its statute will be distributed and implemented; and
 - Agreements between local agro-pastoralists will be put in place to reduce conflicts linked to climate variability and transhumance paths.
20. The project will also directly train local facilitators in APFS approaches:
 - 200 APFS facilitators will be trained (of which at least 30% are women) through agreements with associations of livestock-raisers and agro-pastoralists;
 - 150 APFS will be put in place that integrate CCA and sustainable land-use principles in their curriculum, with an accent on best practices, ecosystem resilience, agroecology and integration of agricultural and pastoral production systems; and
 - Adaptation technologies and practices will be distributed to the 150 APFS created by the project.
21. The project will directly improve the livelihoods of agro-pastoralists in tangible ways:
 - Revenues and benefits of agro-pastoralists will increase by 5% for APFS participants;
 - At least 2,500 livestock-raisers and farmers (of which at least 30% are women) will participate in the implementation of integrated local adaptation strategies;

- There will be a 5% increase in the agricultural/agro-pastoral productivity in pilot CCA investment areas; and
- Four pilot investments in adaptation are supported to improve ecosystem resilience and contribute to strengthening the capacity of agro-pastoralists to adapt to climate change.

22. The project will create sustainable benefits by mainstreaming CAA into policies and plans:

- APFS-based CCA will be mainstreamed into integrated rural development policies in a coordinated manner under the inter-institutional collaborative framework of the Strategic Framework for Investment in Sustainable Land-use Management;
- National cooperation frameworks that use APFS to better integrate CCA into agricultural/livestock development will be strengthened;
- The climate proofing tool will be applied at the national and regional levels through the Strategic Framework for Investing in Sustainable Land-use Management;
- Investment to scale up CCA strategies and practices in agro-pastoral production systems is increased through specific budget allocations identified by AEDD, the MDR and decentralized administrations; and
- The Five-year Pastoral Land Use Plan (PQAP) is revised to support integration and mainstreaming of CCA in the agro-pastoral sector.

Project Management Costs (PMC)

23. The indicative Project Management Costs (PIF) were elaborated on in detail during the project preparation phase. They now reflect the project’s PMC needs based on an analysis of the project’s duration and the current (and anticipated) situation in Mali, in view of activities needed to be carried out. It is expected that the administrative expenditures are higher due to more complex procurement requirements in view of Mali’s infrastructural and institutional set-up as LDC. This should ensure the timely acquisition of all required goods, works and services, avoiding delays in the project’s overall implementation. For these reasons the Management Costs have been raised by 1%, from 5% to 6%.

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

24. The PIF provided an initial risk assessment. The risk analysis was validated during the PPG process. The PIF assessment was considered largely valid; however some clarifications and modifications were recorded. The revised risk assessment is provided in the following table.

Table 3: Risk Matrix

Risk	Risk Level	Mitigation Measure
High-probability of increased occurrence of extreme weather events which may affect crop and livestock cycles and increase food/nutritional insecurity.	H	Mitigated by supporting the implementation of CCA policies and measures to strengthen pro-active and coordinated responses. Developing adaptation plans for rangeland management and by linking up with on-going emergency/post-emergency initiatives and regular animal health support programs that are implemented by the government. Community-level field observation capacities will be fostered to anticipate CC related disruptions. Finally, the project will support the access and use of climate data which allow better planning.
Insecurity and potential lack of adequate social stability in project area	H	The project areas (Kayes, Ségou and Koulikoro regions) are not affected by actual conflicts, are judged to be safe and would allow project development to continue smoothly. In those areas local level conflict resolution between stakeholders can

		continue to be encouraged through traditional channels. Community based participation and land-use planning involving communities and raising awareness of the long-term benefits of development activities would be used to promote sustainable land management activities.
Spread of the Ebola virus to the project areas	L	At PPG stage, the Ebola virus has yet not spread to Mali and project areas.
Farmers / herders conflicts	M	Clear agreements and management arrangements are developed, ensuring that the rights of each stakeholder are preserved, and defining their duties as well; the application of such protocols is duly monitored.
Reluctance to endorse and participate in the project activities by conflicting stakeholders (agriculturalist/herders) and reluctance/ slowness of local institutions to agree on project activities	L	The risk of reluctance of stakeholders to participate in this project is low. Nevertheless it will be addressed by ensuring local participation in project implementation. In particular, existing areas where income has been generated or losses reduced from adaptation activities will be demonstrated to other farmers and replicated where possible. In addition, achievements on the ground that bring benefits to local producers will be demonstrated during the project to overcome skepticism. Regarding local institutions, common objectives will be established by giving emphasis on local ownership of the process as well as capacity.
Risk of management change in local institution	M	A medium risk of ongoing modification within the framework of the local institutional settings is present. The risk will be addressed by strongly involving local institution at all level, and building appropriate programmes for the involvement of relevant officers and institutional sectors.
Seed shortages due to climate variability shock, prolonged droughts, and/or pests and diseases outbreaks with risk of crop/ grassland failure	M	Pest and disease outbreak due to climate variability may cause risk of crop/grassland failure during the project. The project will address this risk by systematically linking the adoption of CCA measures and fostering of community-level field observation capacities to reduce seed multiplication failures, particularly with specialized seed multiplying farmers.
Lack of adequate human and material resources for the implementation of this project could disturb the implementation of the various activities of the project.	L	Government capacity is not likely to represent a high risk for the project because the capacity for climate resilient development exists in the country (but is not systematically geared towards explicit and specific CCA goals). However the risk of lack of capacities will be mitigated by mobilizing and articulating the capacity of different actors, projects, programs and bilateral agencies to work intensively with government and gradually transfer skills to government counterparts.
Local populations do not see the benefit of resilient practices.	L	The project will ensure a high level of ownership from the population through the participative APFS approach. This model encourages farmers and herders to actively get involved in order to try out and adopt CCA practices and technologies, and gain experience through a learning-by-doing process. Trainings are given by local facilitators in order to ensure the continuity and appropriation of the learning process by the local population.

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

25. In line with recent development in the GEF portfolio in Mali and across Africa, the Project Document (Section 4.1) provides a detailed and updated description of the approach to ensure efficient coordination with other initiatives.

26. Notably, appropriate coordination will be assured with the following initiatives in the GEF portfolio:

- Integrating climate resilience into agricultural production for food security in rural areas of Mali (FAO/LDCF under FAO Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP));
- Strengthening the Resilience of Women Producer Groups and Vulnerable Communities in Mali (UNDP/LDCF);

- Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production for Food Security in Vulnerable Rural Areas in Burkina Faso through the Farmer Field School Approach (FAO/LDCF under FAO Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP)); and
- Land Rehabilitation and Rangeland Management in Smallholder's Agro-pastoral Production Systems in Southwestern Angola (FAO/LD under FAO Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP)).

B. Additional information not addressed at PIF Stage

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation:

27. A stakeholder analysis was undertaken as part of the preparation of this project. The findings are presented in the project document (Appendix 6). The analysis looked at governmental (national and local), non-governmental, academic, community and international stakeholders and partners, and it identified potential collaboration activities/mechanisms. The key partners that will be involved in the project are as follows:
28. At national level. The institutions involved in the project's implementation will be:
- The Ministry of Environment, Water and Sanitation (MEEA);
 - The Agency of Environment and Sustainable Development (AEDD);
 - The Ministry of Rural Development (MDR);
 - The National Directory for Agriculture (DNA);
 - The National Directory for Animal Industry and Production (DNPIA);
 - The Institute of Rural Economy (IER); and
 - Mali- Météo
29. AEDD, as part of the MEEA, will be the lead government counterpart and the project implementing partner. FAO will be the GEF implementing agency and will execute the project as requested by the Mali Government in close cooperation with AEDD and the other project partners. AEDD will be responsible for coordinating project activities and undertaking any activity aimed at supporting the implementation or integration of climate change into local or national policies (especially in the Component 3 framework).
30. The IER and Mali-Meteo will play a role of service providers and will provide technical services to the projects. The IER will intervene in activities involving fodder seed varieties while Mali-Météo will provide the necessary agro-meteorological data for the project.
31. At local level. The MDR will contribute to local activities by organizing APFSs through collaboration between the decentralized services of the DNA and the DNPIA. These two directorates will play a role of technical implementation partners and will sign a letter of agreement with FAO. A memorandum of Understanding will be signed between AEDD and DNA and DNPIA, respectively. The DNA and decentralized agricultural services will ensure transfer of FFS best practices and lessons learned, support the capacities of FFS facilitators, and will actively contribute to the development of APFS curricula. The DNPIA and SLPIA will be responsible for the implementation of APFS with technical support provided by the project.
32. The following additional partners will play key roles in the coordination and implementation of the project at local level:
- The Cercle Council will be responsible for supporting/monitoring activities at the cercle level, ensuring integration with the activities of partner projects;
 - The Commune Council will be responsible for coordination and technical support at the commune level;

- Traditional authorities;
 - Local NGOs such as ALPHALOG, AMAPROS, and Stop Sahel will participate in the implementation of activities at local level;
 - Herders' and farmers' professional organizations such as the Coordination Nationale des Organisations Paysannes (CNOP), the Association des Organisations Professionnelles Paysannes (AOPP), Interprofession élevage and Femmes Rurales.
33. The project beneficiaries will be the agro-pastoral communities of the cercles of Banamba (Koulikoro Region), Niono (Segou Region) and Kita (Kayes Region) who face numerous challenges due to climate change. The project will not only benefit the agro-pastoralists directly involved in APFSs, but also the surrounding communities, local government and organizations who will benefit from capacity building, decreased conflicts, increasing ecosystem resilience, improved transhumance paths and water access, improved seed varieties, SLM, etc.
34. The FAO has developed a series of tools to ensure the full participation of vulnerable and indigenous groups and these will be used in the project. Likewise, the full participation of women and the addressing of gender inequality will be core aspects of the Project, for example through the use of socio-economic and gender analysis (SEAGA) tools.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

35. The project will strengthen the capacities of local institutions in terms of adaptation to climate change through the APFS approach. The participatory and didactic approach adopted at the grass-root level in the project will contribute to avoiding elite capture and to minimizing marginalization at the community level.
36. The first component of the project directly aims at making local institutions and communities familiar with resilience to climate change. Local institutions and customary organizations will benefit from the regional workshops presenting the APFS approach. They will also benefit from training on how to use the SHARP tool to take into account the interests of local populations. This will ensure ownership of the APFS approach, which should be taken up even after the end of the project.
37. The project will circulate the already existing *Charte Pastorale* and will support its application to clarify the right and duties of all key actors in the agro-pastoral sector. This will pave the road for a long term sustainable approach since the *Charte Pastorale* will be better known by local stakeholders, it will stay part of Mali's legal framework, and people will be able to refer to it even after the end of the project. Since the project respects and strengthens existing decision-making processes at all levels, it should ensure that, although new approaches and technologies will be introduced, they do not lead to social dysfunction or negative social impacts. On the contrary, the project is designed to strengthen social capital, providing a good basis for social sustainability.
38. The project will also support Participatory and Negotiated Territorial Developments (PNDT) pilots. This participatory approach will ensure the local population rights to use transhumance routes. This will guarantee a high level of ownership from local stakeholders which will contribute to the social sustainability of the project. The development of local agreements to minimize conflicts between farmers and herders will convey a common understanding that will remain beyond the project's lifetime.
39. By training local master trainers on CCA resilient practices for the APFS, the project strengthens local capacities and ensures that knowledge will remain locally available even after the end of the

project. The project will also contribute to gender equality by ensuring that women represent at least 30% of the population involved in the APFS. In addition, the tool Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) will be used to allow a gender sensitive stakeholder priorities' analysis. The analysis is used within the PNTD for plan negotiations and implementation. The SEAGA analysis is based on an approach that places great emphasis on the importance of linkages between economic, environmental, social and institutional patterns that influence the context in which development activities are undertaken.

40. Through a close collaboration with the FAO Youth at Work project, this LDCF project will also contribute to youth empowerment and to building awareness regarding decent child labor, contributing to building social sustainability within local communities.
41. Local institutions and communities, being directly involved in many participatory activities of the project, are likely to take ownership over CCA practices through the APFS approach. The project will help set up a long-term framework which will ensure the sustainability of the project.
42. One of the focuses of the project is economic sustainability for local agro-pastoralist communities living from crops and livestock resources. The project will introduce methods, measures, practices and technologies that contribute to the economic development of the targeted communities. With the support of the project, agro-pastoralists participating in APFSs should benefit from a 5% income increase and a 5% increase in terms of agricultural and pastoral productivity in the pilot investment zones for CCA. In addition, the changes introduced by the project will be developed in a participatory manner and will respect local needs, local resources and local capacity. Hence, the local communities will be able to sustain the economic improvements after the project. This is mostly the focus of outcome 2.2 and 2.3. Moreover, by strengthening the existing extension system and the capacity of technical agencies (both governmental and non-governmental), the project creates an institutional capacity that can continue to support local communities after the project has been completed (mostly through the activities of output 1.1.1).

B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

43. Cost-effectiveness is at the heart of FAO's Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection's strategy for incorporating CCA concerns into its regular institutional support to sustainable agricultural development in LDCs such as Mali. The proposed project design is expected to be highly cost-effective since it builds on: i) existing FFS structure that is already operational in several regions; ii) on-going activities with similar objectives; iii) synergies with existing programs; and iv) avoiding overlap and coordination of interventions with other CCA projects funded by LDCF in the country.
44. Cost-effectiveness will be achieved by a combination of the following basic principles:
45. Building on FFS already in place through FAO-supported projects will allow for a significant reduction in costs for the proposed LDCF project. The proposed project builds directly on previous collaboration between FAO and Mali on FFS. FAO has been supporting FFS in Mali and has created a core capacity of technical expertise and experience. This includes legal and technical capacity in the government as well as the cadre of FFS experts that have worked on previous FAO projects. By building on these past initiatives, the project capitalizes upon previous FAO work. In the preparation of a similar project in Mali², a comparison of costs for FFS and standard training approaches for extension was undertaken. Although not directly transferable to this project, the finding was that "*building upon 400 existing FFS and 233 experienced facilitators (for crops such as rice, cotton and "maraichage") will save 251 540 USD in training costs alone and 220 000 USD in FFS operation over the project cycle*". Although not a solid

² See Project document: *Integrating climate resilience into agricultural production for food security in rural areas of Mali*

economic analysis, this does indicate the cost-effectiveness of the FFS approach.

46. Adopting cost-effective CCA technical options and practices is a central tenet of the project strategy. A number of cultivars and varieties of fodder have been identified by the IER and local farmers as more drought-stress resistant and with shorter vegetative cycle. Testing and piloting those cultivars into various eco-regions and contributing to develop local seed production centers should have a high rate of return, since most of the more capital intensive (but complementary) solutions, including water and soil management, are being implemented by partner institutions and projects.
47. Cost-effectiveness will also be achieved through knowledge management, synergies and complementarities. Precious knowledge on CC threats and mitigation practices and strategies does exist both at grass-roots and institutional levels, but it is poorly systematized, shared and disseminated. A specific line of action has been introduced in Component 4 in order to systematically foster CCA-related knowledge management systems in a cost-effective manner. The project also encompasses specific mechanisms to establish synergies with the on-going GEF-UNDP NAPA-implementation projects, as well as with a series of other externally funded initiatives.
48. Several alternative designs and approaches were considered for cost-effectiveness during project design. These alternatives included focusing on providing more hardware, or on focusing all capacity development efforts on national government agencies, or by FAO directly providing extension services to agro-pastoralists. Ultimately, it was decided that these approaches would not have as much impact per input, hence the selected focus of transforming agriculture and livestock-raising through the FFS approach was selected. This approach underlies Outcome 2.
49. The project also intends to minimize the use of international consultants where national expertise is available. This will reduce the travel costs and the costs of consultancy fees. Notwithstanding, where international expertise is unique or exceptionally credible, it will be utilized. For example, given the innovative nature of the project related to agro-pastoral field schools, expertise on this will be sought from the East Africa and International Project Technical Adviser position established. However, this key position will be shared with a similar FAO/GEF/LDCF project starting up in Burkina Faso, thereby making significant savings to this project's budget.
50. Finally, the project design has excluded very remote areas and others where mobilization and security costs could pose an excessive burden on project resources.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN

1. The project document provides a detailed description of the monitoring, reporting and evaluation to be undertaken during the project (Section 4.5).
2. Full details of indicators, baseline values and targets are presented in Appendix 1 (Results Matrix).
3. Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow the FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. Monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and indicators established in the project Results Matrix presented in Appendix 1 of the project document. The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been budgeted at US\$ 104,600 (see table below). Integrated into all Outcomes, the Project monitoring and evaluation approach will also facilitate learning and mainstreaming of project outcomes and lessons learned into international good practice as well as national and local policies, plans and practices.
4. A summary of the envisaged M&E activities is provided in the following table.

Table 4: Summary of M&E related costs

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Estimate of costs
Inception Workshop (IW)	NCU, supported by the LTO, BH, and GEF Coordination Unit (GCU)	Within two months of project start up	Covered by output 1.1.1
Surveys to determine AMAT baseline values	NCU and service providers	Within three months of project start up	USD 0 - data is collected by the NCU.
Project Inception Report	NCU, cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH, and the GCU	No later than one month post IW.	USD 0 - project inception report is developed by the NCU.
Field based impact monitoring	NCU, AEDD and other relevant agencies – including regional and provincial - to participate.	Periodically - to be determined at inception workshop.	USD 16,600
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	LTU/LTO, other participating units and GCU	Annual or as required	The visits of the LTO and the GCU will be paid by GEF agency fee. The visits of the NPC and CTA will be paid from the project travel budget
Project Progress Reports	NCU, with inputs from AEDD, PSC members and other partners	Semi-annual	USD 0 (as completed by CTA and NCU)
Project Implementation Review report	NCU supported by the LTO and cleared and submitted by the GCU to the GEF Secretariat	Annual	Paid by GEF agency fee
AMAT	NCU supported by the LTO	Project start-up, mid-Term and project end.	USD 0 - data is collected by the NCU.
Co-financing Reports	NCU, FAO Mali	Annual	Completed by NPC and CTA
Technical reports	NCU, LTO & Participating Units	As appropriate	USD 8,000 (Report on best practices and lessons learned)
Mid-term Evaluation	External Consultant, FAO Office for Evaluation in consultation with the project team including the GCU and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 40,000 for independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Final evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team including the GCU and other partners	At the end of project implementation	USD 40,000 for external, independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Terminal Report	NCU, LTO, TCSR Report Unit	At least two months before the end date of the Execution Agreement	0 (as completed by CTA and NPC)
Total Budget			USD 104,600

Part III **APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE(MM/dd/yyyy)
Alamir Sinna TOURE	Chef, Departement Etudes et Planification / Head, Department of Studies and Planning	AGENCE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET DU DEVELOPPEMENT DURABLE	11/24/2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla (00153) Rome, Italy TCI-Director@fao.org		October 06, 2014	Caterina Batello, Team leader AGPME, FAO Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection Rome, ITALY	+3906 5705 3643	Caterina.Batello@fao.org
Jeff Griffin Environment Officer Officer-in-Charge, daily matters GEF Unit Email: Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org Tel: +3906 5705 55680					

Appendices

Appendix A: Project Results Framework

Please see Appendix 1 of the FAO GEF Project Document

Appendix B– Response to Project Reviews.

Response to GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD) / Work Program Inclusion

Comments received from GEF Sec	Action/reference (referenced refer to the project document)
By CEO Endorsement, please present a more detailed sustainability strategy for the proposed project – Project consistency, section10	A sustainability strategy is included in the project document under Section 5. It is based on the data collection work conducted at the local level by national consultants, and on best practices and lessons learned throughout the FFS experiences in Mali and in other countries with climate change adaptation initiatives.
By CEO Endorsement, given that the previously approved LDCF projects in Mali also target NAPA priorities in the agriculture sector, please present a more detailed framework for how the three initiatives will complement each other and address Mali's urgent and immediate adaptation needs in a coordinated manner, especially with respect to national and policy-level activities – Project design, section 19	<p>Among the four LDCF projects that will be under implementation in 2015, the first two will be executed by the National Directorate for Agriculture (UNDP and FAO as implementing agencies) and the last two will be executed by the AEDD (UNDP and FAO as implementing agencies). These national institutions will be expected to ensure a sound collaboration and coordination between the initiatives that they will be executing respectively.</p> <p>Furthermore, a National Climate Change Committee was created in 2011 in Mali. This Committee comprises of several national stakeholders, including the AEDD (which acts as Secretary) and the MDR. This committee therefore plays a key role for coordination among climate change adaptation initiatives in Mali. The current project's objective is to strengthen this committee.</p> <p>In addition to this committee, a national consultation framework on climate change adaptation, including representatives of the AEDD, the DNA, the DNPIA, has been set-up as part of the first FAO/LDCF. This Framework should play a key role for coordination among the four LDCF projects. To conclude, the projects are implemented in similar regions. Regional Government and regional sector officers will also play a key role in ensuring coordination of activities on the ground.</p>

Comments received from US Council Member	Action/reference (referenced refer to the project document)
Given the importance of climate data and forecasts to understanding climate risk, we request that FAO clarify how it plans to engage appropriate national and regional hydrometeorological organizations, including those in Mali and in the region more broadly, like the African Centre of Meteorological Applications for Development (ACMAD). We also request that FAO clarify how it will learn and build from the good practices that Mali has already generated in engaging with	Mali-Meteo will be the service provider for the dissemination of climate and agro-meteorological data. The proposed project will build on the work of ACMAD and AGRYMET on meteorology and on climate modelling, forecasting, and prediction. Mali-Meteo and other national stakeholders will continue collaborating with ACMAD and AGRYMET throughout the project's lifetime in order to facilitate the flow of accurate information. This will improve the quality of agro-meteorological data available to farmers and pastoralists. The agro-meteorological information will be tailored to suit the needs of agro-pastoralists to enable a better understanding of climate variability and climate change in their region, and highlight risk levels, thereby improving their decision-making

<p>users of climate information, such as farmers, to ensure that such information is actionable at the local level.</p>	<p>ability in terms of agricultural risk management.</p> <p>With the support of Mali-Meteo, DNA and DNPIA relevant weather and climate information will be introduced during the APFS learning-by-doing training. The activity will start with the identification of agro-meteorological information needs in APFS. Furthermore, the DGM/DGPV/INERA staff will be trained in order to respond to farmers' needs within the APFS. Finally, under the supervision of facilitators, the APFS will receive agro-meteorological information and determine ways to use the forecast.</p>
<p>We appreciate the recognition of FAO and its Malian partners of the potential for climate change adaptation efforts to contribute to conflict management, with the aim of strengthening resilience and stability. We also recognize the emphasis this project has placed on the importance of participatory processes, as demonstrated by the diverse list of stakeholders in Section B.5. We encourage FAO to facilitate dialogue and cooperation between the adaptation and conflict management communities in implementing this project. We also strongly encourage FAO to engage environmental groups throughout the planning and implementation of this project.</p>	<p>Several consultation meetings have been held at the regional, circle and commune levels to collect baseline data and involve the wide range of local stakeholders in the project design. These meetings are also aimed at collecting data regarding potential conflicts, and identify activities that can reduce/manage these conflicts. Output 1.1.3 under Outcome 1 will focus on local conflict management by ensuring the diffusion of the Pastoral Charter and its statute of application, and support the development of two pilots of Participatory and Negotiated Territorial Development.</p> <p>Environmental and rural development NGOs and associations have been involved throughout the project planning phase through consultations at local, communal, regional and national levels. They also took part in the validation workshop held in Bamako in July 2014. These organizations include; VSF Belgium, Alphalog, Amapros, Stop Sahel, among others. As described in Section 4.2.1 the organizations will be involved in the implementation of project activities at the local level.</p> <p>The APFS is based on a network of local facilitators that will ensure sustainability of climate change adaptation education.</p>
<p>Clarify how it will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.</p>	<p>A communication plan is included in the project document in Section 4.7, based on consultations held during the field missions. This communication plan clarifies the tools that would be used to communicate the results, lessons learned and best practices. A more in-depth communication strategy will be defined under Output 4.1.3 of Component 4 of the project.</p>
<p>Expand on how it will ensure the sustainability of climate change adaptation education. Given the proposal's stated challenges for scalability in the proposed project areas (i.e. low population, very long distances, marginal transport network), peer education might be explored as a tool</p>	<p>The APFS is based on a network of local facilitators that will ensure sustainability of climate change adaptation education.</p> <p>The FFS concept moves away from a traditional top-down approach with regards to agricultural extension services previously conducted in Mali. The FFS recognizes that farmers already have experience in, and knowledge of, agricultural practices. Farmers play a key role in the FFS process. The different activities lead them to develop individual capacities in order to properly identify, analyze and interpret what happens in the field. This approach helps farmers to take appropriate decisions based on their own experimentation. Farmer participation is a key component that is applied in the proposed project to ensure the local ownership and project sustainability in the long term.</p>

<p>Clarify how it has conducted its socioeconomic analysis to explore linkages and identify win-win solutions for local socio-economic and adaptation benefits, including which stakeholders were consulted.</p>	<p>A socio-economic analysis was conducted as part of the PPG phase at circle, regional and national levels. Stakeholders from all three regions of implementation (e.g. Kayes, Koulikoro and Ségou) and from the three targeted circles (e.g. Banamba, in the Koulikoro Region, Niono in the Ségou Region, and Kita in the Kayes Region) were consulted and detailed socio-economic data was collected during the field visits. The results from these consultations, an in-depth description of each of the selected circles is provided in Appendix 8 of the PRODOC, including specific socio-economic conditions.</p> <p>However, a more detailed socio-economic analysis will follow once the APFS have been identified. The participatory utilization of the SHARP tool will allow for the determining of the resilience of current agro-ecological and socio-economical characteristics, and provides the opportunity to identify socially accepted and climate adapted practices to increase local livelihoods in a sustainable manner. The SHARP tool will also make use of a set of information that has recently been published by the African and Latin America Resilience to Climate Change (ARCC) USAID programme. In particular, ARCC produced a series of studies and modelling systems that provide guidance on the selection of win-win practices. Additionally, USAID is financing a Feed the Future Global Climate Change project in the country that has, among others, the objective of defining a method to estimate socio-economic barriers to adoption of climate resilient practices. Results and lessons learned of this project will be taken into consideration to improve the existing APFS baseline assessment.</p>
--	--

Comments received from Japanese Council Member	Action/reference (referenced refer to the project document)
<p>Regarding the Mali project, we have no objections to the proposal but we think that careful consideration to a situation in Mali is necessary at implementation.</p>	<p>The security situation in Mali has been taken into consideration during project preparation, and is clearly stated in the Risk Matrix of the project document (Appendix 4). The areas targeted by the project are not at risk since they have not been affected by past or current conflicts.</p>

Appendix C – Status of Implementation of Project Preparation Activities and the Use of Funds

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NCIF/ Amount (\$) 100,000		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. Local stakeholder analysis and capacity needs assessment for the design of the planning component (component 1)	8,050	8,050	
2. Technical study and assessment of existing activities for the design of the rangeland rehabilitation component (component 2)	15,500	15,500	
3. Detailed baseline analysis for mainstreaming SLM into agricultural and environmental sector policies and programmes (component 3)	12,100	12,100	
4. Stakeholder consultations	11,450	9,321.99	6,853
5. Analysis of execution options and assessment of fiduciary standards	4,875	0	0
6. Detailed design of project components, additional reasoning, expected adaptation benefits, Results Framework, financial plan and detailed budget	48,025	9,096.59	39,078
Total	100,000	54,069	45,931 ³

³ The remaining balance is composed as follows: i) the GEF international consultant still need to complete his activities at the time of this submission ; ii) validation workshop costs reimbursement are still under completion; and iii) the remaining balance of USD 32,763.48 has been committed for the recruitment of consultants. Consultants recruited include: an experienced English/French translator for the FAO project document translation, and an agro-pastoral expert that will support the collection of information necessary to complete the baseline indicators alignment with GEF standards, assist the project task force in the mapping of project sites, support the collection of AMAT baseline indicators and follow up in establishing project partnerships.