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

GEF ID:	**5855**		
Country/Region:	**Mali**		
Project Title:	**Flood Hazard and Climate Risk Management to Secure Lives and Assets in Mali**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5236 (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; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$8,925,000**
Co-financing:	**$27,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$36,075,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Knut Sundstrom**	Agency Contact Person:	**Mame Diop RTS Glecrds**

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 and dated January 15, 2014, is attached to the PIF.	
Resource Availability	3. 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 ($9.94 million, including PPG and fees) is available from	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	YES. According to the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), the proposed project would contribute towards CCA objectives 1, 2 and 3.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	NOT CLEAR. While the project seems broadly in line with several of Mali's NAPA priorities, the PIF simply notes that it would contribute towards the implementation of priorities 6, 16 and 19. Among the many priorities, these do not seem to be the most relevant ones, but given the several numbered lists in the NAPA it is also unclear which priorities the PIF refers to. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please spell out the NAPA priorities towards which the proposed project would contribute. 07/10/2014 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies that the proposed project would directly address Mali's NAPA priorities	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		in the areas of watershed management and awareness-raising. The revised PIF also notes, however, that flood risk management was not fully addressed in the 2007 NAPA, but has since become a very high priority for the national government. By CEO Endorsement, in absence of a clear NAPA priority on flood risk management, please demonstrate that the proposed project nevertheless addresses a national adaptation priority that has been identified through inclusive, multi-stakeholder consultation.	
Project Design	6. 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?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on (i) investments in Mali's hydro-meteorological agency and observation system; (ii) the implementation of disaster risk management plans by the Directorate General of Civil Protection; (iii) the information system on sustainable land and water resources management, managed by the Sustainable Development Agency; (vi) support towards basic services provided through the National Local Government Investment Agency (ANICT); and (v) UNDP's Local Governance Programme. While the baseline initiatives seem relevant, it is not entirely clear how these benefit the targeted areas. Given the current status of hydro-meteorological and climate information services, as well as planned investments, what are the principal gaps and needs in the targeted	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		areas? Moreover, given the progress Mali has made in developing and implementing a National Climate Change Policy, how are commune-level and municipal planning processes integrating climate change adaptation under the baseline scenario? Finally, the PIF provides few details regarding the services provided through ANICT in the targeted areas and it is unclear how these would be affected by climate change - induced flood risks. The PIF does not specify how the baseline initiatives relate to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing provided in Table C. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide additional information regarding the baseline scenario for the targeted communes and municipalities, including how the relevant baseline initiatives operate in these areas; and (ii) specify how each baseline initiative relates to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing provided in Table C. 07/10/2014 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies the baseline scenario for the targeted regions, while noting that specific municipalities and villages will be identified during project preparation. The revised PIF further clarifies that the indicative co-financing figures are associated with domestic investments in hydro-meteorological services and disaster risk reduction, funding provided	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		to local governments through ANICIT, as well as UNDP support towards decentralization.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please review and adjust the Project Framework (Table B), if necessary. 07/10/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. The PIF provides a clear and concise description of the proposed three components and their principal outputs. In absence of the baseline scenario for the targeted areas, however, the additional reasoning for the proposed project cannot be adequately assessed. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly. 07/10/2014 -- YES. The revised PIF provides a clear and coherent description of the additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	YES. The role of public participation, including CSOs, has been adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	YES. Relevant risks and appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	NOT CLEAR. While the PIF provides a table over other LDCF-financed projects in Mali, it does not include the project â€˜PSG: Mali Natural Resources Management in a Changing Climate Project' (GEF ID: 5270). Moreover, the PIF could specify the regions targeted by each of the other relevant initiatives. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) include, in Section A.4 of the PIF, the World Bank-LDCF project â€˜PSG: Mali Natural Resources Management in a Changing Climate Project' (GEF ID: 5270); and (ii) specify the regions targeted by each of the other relevant initiatives.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		07/10/2014 -- YES.	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit the description of innovative aspects, sustainability and scaling up, as appropriate. 07/10/2014 -- YES. The proposed project would enable a cutting-edge monitoring system that would provide continuous flood forecasting and early warning. The project would also carry out advanced climate hazard analyses and mapping at the municipal level to inform local development planning processes and investments. To address the immediate risks of floods, the project would implement a range of biological and structural flood protection measures. By integrating climate change vulnerabilities and adaptation options into local development planning processes and budgets, and by building on national governance and financing mechanisms, the proposed project is well placed to deliver sustainable adaptation benefits, with a viable pathway to scaling up across a larger number of regions and municipalities.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts by component, if necessary. 07/10/2014 -- YES. The proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component are appropriate and adequate.	
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please adjust the indicative sources, types and amounts of co-financing, if necessary. 07/10/2014 -- YES. The indicative amount and composition of co-financing is adequate.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	YES. At $425,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the LDCF funding towards project	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		management is appropriate.	
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	YES. A PPG of $150,000 is requested, which is within the norm for projects of this size.	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16 and 17. 07/10/2014 -- YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to Section 5 above.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	June 13, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	July 10, 2014	
	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.**