



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5192		
Country/Region:	Mali		
Project Title:	Strengthening the resilience of Women producer group's and vulnerable communities in Mali		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4919 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,460,000
Co-financing:	\$16,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,960,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mame Diop

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Mali is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point of Mali and dated October 19, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. UNDP has a comparative advantage in community-based approaches and institutional capacity building for climate change adaptation.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency	NA	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. The proposed project would benefit from UNDP's current and past programming in Mali, particularly in the areas of climate change adaptation and sustainable development. In addition, the project would benefit from a well-staffed country office, including a national climate change specialist.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant (\$6 million, including Agency fee) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is well aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 and, specifically, outcomes 1.3, 2.1 and 3.1. According to the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), \$4.1 million or some 75 per cent of the proposed LDCF	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>grant would be allocated towards CCA-3. Yet, as noted on p. 3 of the PIF, nearly 60 per cent of the grant would contribute towards strengthening and diversifying the livelihoods of rural households. This would correspond better to outcome 1.3 of the LDCF/SCCF strategy.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the distribution of grant and co-financing in Table A reflects the design and structure of the proposed project.</p> <p>11/20/2012 â€™ NOT CLEAR. Table A remains inconsistent with Section II.A.1.1 of the PIF. The Agency has not provided a response to the previous comment and recommendation.</p> <p>12/11/2012 â€™ YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework has been revised as requested.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>YES. The project is consistent with Mali’s NAPA completed in July 2007 and contributes towards 7 of the 19 priorities identified, with a focus on water resources management and the transfer of sustainable and climate-resilient agricultural technologies. In addition, the project is consistent with Mali’s Strategic Framework for Growth and Poverty Reduction and its National Policy on Climate Change.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any,</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would build the capacities of beneficiaries to adopt,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	sustain and scale up the adaptation technologies, practices and approaches introduced.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on the 166 Communes Initiative, which seeks to combat food security in Mali's most vulnerable municipalities; the UN Joint Programme on Improving Child Nutrition and Food Security in the Most Vulnerable Municipalities; and the UNCDF's program on Food and Nutritional Security in Nara and Nioro.</p> <p>With respect to the 166 Communes Initiative and the UN Joint Programme, it is not clear how the initiatives relate to the indicative co-financing figures and sources presented in Table C.</p> <p>For all three baseline initiatives, it is not clear whether they include any activities in Sikasso, one of the targeted areas of the proposed LDCF project. As for the UN Joint Program, implemented in Bandiagara, it does not seem to be active in any of the areas targeted through the proposed project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify how the 166 Communes Initiative and the UN Joint Programme relate to the indicative co-financing figures and sources provided in Table C; and (ii) clarify whether the proposed baseline projects include any activities in Sikasso and whether the UN Joint</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Program has any activities in the three targeted regions.</p> <p>11/20/2012 ‘ YES. The re-submission excludes the 166 Communes Initiatives and the UN Joint Programme among the baseline projects, while noting that the proposed project would contribute towards the implementation of the former.</p> <p>In their place, the re-submission includes the USAID Feed the Future project, which would also target communes in Sikasso region, and the UNDP Support Programme on Management of the Environment and Sustainable Development. In accordance with the changes made to the baseline projects, the indicative co-financing level has been adjusted to \$16.5 million.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>In absence of a clear description of the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build, the additional cost reasoning cannot be adequately assessed.</p> <p>Specifically, with respect to Component</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>1, the PIF notes that strengthened water resources management and access to water have been identified as national priorities. It is not clear, however, what measures have been taken and will be taken to address these priorities under the baseline projects.</p> <p>As for Component 2, the additional cost reasoning, as provided in Section B.2 of the PIF, makes no reference to the baseline initiatives, except for the linkages to be established under Output 2.4.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please strengthen the additional cost reasoning for both components.</p> <p>11/20/2012 ‘ YES. The re-submission clarifies adequately the additional cost reasoning for the proposed adaptation measures. In particular, the revised PIF provides a clear description of the activities carried out and planned under the three baseline initiatives, as well as relevant gaps and vulnerabilities that would be addressed through the proposed LDCF grant.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, kindly clarify the interface between the proposed project and broader investments planned under the 166 Communes Initiative, as the latter could present a vehicle for scaling</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		up successful adaptation measures.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the project framework accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>11/20/2012 â€™ YES. The Project Framework is sound and sufficiently clear.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please ensure that the expected adaptation benefits are described based on sound methodology and assumptions.</p> <p>11/20/2012 â€™ YES. The expected adaptation benefits are adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	YES. The project describes clearly the expected socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are considered throughout the project.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	YES. The PIF considers public participation, including the role of CSOs, women, youth and CBOs.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	YES. Relevant risks, including the potential effects of the insecurity in the North of the country, have been considered and relevant mitigation measures have been identified.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. Coordination with other related initiatives is adequately considered for this stage of project development.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	YES. The proposed project would be coordinated by the national Agency for the Environment and Sustainable Development (AEDD), and it would be executed with support from the ministries of environment and desertification control, animal resources and livestock industries, agricultural development, hydraulics and decentralization.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$260,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 and 2, the LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>11/20/2012 â€™ YES. The grant and co-financing amounts per component are adequate and appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please adjust the indicative co-financing figures, if necessary.</p> <p>11/20/2012 â€™ The co-financing figures have been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. In line with its role, UNDP would bring \$2.5 million towards the proposed project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? • Convention Secretariat? 	NA	NA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 24 and 25. 11/20/2012 â€™ NOT YET. Please refer to Section 8. 12/11/2012 â€™ YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	11/20/2012 â€™ Please refer to Section 13.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 31, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 11, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	YES. The proposed PPG (\$100,000) would support (i) the assessment of needs and technical feasibility; (ii) project development; (iii) stakeholder consultations and (iv) financial planning.

	2. Is itemized budget justified?	YES. The itemized budget is justified and the proposed rates for local and international consultants are appropriate.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	NOT YET. The PPG will be recommended for approval once the PIF is ready for clearance. 12/11/2012 -- YES.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 31, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 11, 2012

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.