**Request for CEO endorsement/Approval**

**Project Type:**

**the GEF Trust Fund**



**Submission Date: March 9, 2010**

**Resubmission: May 19, 2010**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Expected Calendar** | |
| **Milestones** | **Dates** |
| Work Program (for FSPs only) | June 2007 |
| Agency Approval date | June 2010 |
| Implementation Start | September 2010 |
| Mid-term Evaluation (if planned) | September 2013 |
| Project Closing Date | September 2016 |

**part i: project Information**

**GEFSEC Project ID:** 3377

**gef agency Project ID:** P099709

**Country(ies):** Mali

**Project Title:** Fostering Agricultural Productivity in Mali

**GEF Agency(ies):** , UNDP

**Other Executing partner(s):** Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livestock, Ministry of Environment and Sanitation, Office du Niger, APCAM

**GEF Focal Area(s):** Land Degradation

**GEF-4 Strategic program(s)**: LD SP#1, LD SP#2

**Name of parent** **program/umbrella project:** Strategic Investment program for SLM in Sub Saharan Africa (SIP)

1. **Project framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective (GEO)**: The Project Global Environment Objective is to increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in the targeted production systems. | | | | | | | | |
| Project Components | Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA2 | **Expected Outcomes** | **Expected Outputs** | GEF Financing1 | | **Co-Financing1** | | **Total ($)** |
| (Mi US$) | % | (Mi US$) | % |
| 1. Technology transfer and Service provision | Inv. and TA | Dissemination and adoption of SLWM practices and technologies  Increase availability and diversity of public and private advisory services for producers | **Component 1.1 – Farming system modernization:** Innovative SLWM technologies and approaches in agriculture, rangeland management and agroforestry adopted  Percentage of producers who have adopted SRI at ON  Number of farmers, POs, agribusiness entrepreneurs, and supply chain inter-professional organizations that have implemented SLWM sub-projects  Agriculture Modernization Funding Mechanism used for SLWM projects is functional at the regional level  Use of POPs decreased | **World Bank** | | | | |
| 3,800,000 | 10 | 33,200,000 | 90 | 37,000,000 |
| **Component 1.2 – Capacity building for POs and service providers**:  Training modules elaborated and developed by local training resources  Number of services providers and POs trained in SLWM techniques |  | | | | |
|  |  | 12,300,000 | 100 | 12,300,000 |
| **Component 1.3 – Facilitating rural credit development** | - | - | 3,100,000 | 100 | 3,100,000 |
| **Component 1.4 – Generating technologies** | - | - | 6,700,000 | 100 | 6,700,000 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Components | Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA2 | **Expected Outcomes** | **Expected Outputs** | GEF Financing1 | | | **Co-Financing1** | | **Total ($)** |
| (Mi US$) | % | | (Mi US$) | % |
| 2. Agricultural productivity Infrastructure | Inv. and TA | Increase in reliable water resources for agricultural production | Irrigated area developed | - | - | | 67,000,000 | 100 | 67,000,000 |
| 3. Comprehensive programmatic approach and sector monitoring | TA |  | **Component 3.1 – Policy dialogue and coordination**  Country Strategic Investment Framework (CSIF) implemented by the GoM and stakeholders  Vertical/horizontal coordination mechanisms for agricultural development and SLWM in place | **World Bank** | | | | | |
| 600,000 | 14 | 3,600,000 | | 86 | 4,200,000 |
| **Component 3.2 – Sector monitoring and evaluat.**  Selected tools and indicators refined and applied to monitor SLWM up-scaling  Comprehensive SLM knowledge base established  Geographic Information System operational for monitoring natural resources evolution | **World Bank** | | | | | |
| 1,800,000 | 33 | 3,700,000 | | 67 | 5,500,000 |
| **Component 3.3 – delivery of core public services:** GEF project activities implemented efficiently and closely monitored | UNDP | | | | | |
| 1,900,000 | 15 | 11,200,000[[1]](#footnote-1) | | 85 | 13,100,000 |
| **Component 3.4 – Project coordination and M&E:** |  | | | | | |
| 0 | 0 | 4,400,000 | | 100 | 4,400,000 |
| **Total Project Costs (\*)** | | | | 8,100,000 |  | 145,200,000[[2]](#footnote-2) | |  | 153,300,000\* |

**1** List the $ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component. **2** TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

**B. Sources of confirmed** [**Co-financing**](http://gefweb.org/Documents/Council_Documents/GEF_C21/C.20.6.Rev.1.pdf) **for the project**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Name of Co-financier (source)*** | ***Classification*** | ***Type*** | ***Project*** | ***%*** |
| IDA |  | Loan | 70,000,000 | 46 |
| IFAD | Multilat. Agency | Loan | 32,000,000 | 22 |
| European Commission | Multilat. Agency | Grant | 19,500,000 | 13 |
| Government | Natl’l Gov’t | Cash/Kind | 30,400,000 | 19 |
| UNDP- Mali | Impl. Agency | Grant | 300,000 |  |
| **Total Co-financing** | | | 152,200,000\* | 100 |

\* The total cofinancing includes the PPF refinancing (MUS$0.95) and unallocated resources (MUS$6.05) within the IDA and Govt contributions in the Wb Financing plan. Also note that the WB financing plan does not include the UNDP-Mali cofinancing.

**C.**  F**inancing Plan Summary For The Project ($)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Project Preparation a*** | ***Project***  ***b*** | ***Total***  ***c = a + b*** | ***Agency Fee*** | ***For comparison:***  ***GEF and Co-financing at PIF*** |
| GEF financing | 450,000 | 8,100,000 | 8,550,000 | 769,500 | 8,100,000 |
| * *World Bank* | *300,000* | *6,200,000* | *6,500,000* | *585,000* | *6,200,000* |
| * *UNDP* | *150,000* | *1,900,000* | *2,050,000* | *184,500* | *1,900,000* |
| Co-financing | *(500,000[[3]](#footnote-3))* | 152,200,000 | 152,200,000 |  | 60,420,000 |
| **Total** | 950,000 | 160,300,000\* | 160,750,000 | 769,500 | 68,520,000 |

**(\*** reflects the IDA PPF refinancing (MUS$0.95) and unallocated resources (MUS$6.05)

**D.**  **GEF Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Focal Area(s) and Country(ies)1  - N/A**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***GEF Agency*** | ***Focal Area*** | ***Country Name/***  ***Global*** | ***(in $)*** | | |
| ***Project (a)*** | ***Agency Fee ( b)*\*** | ***Total c=a+b*** |
| World Bank | LD | Mali | 6,200,000 | 585,000 | 7,085,000 |
| UNDP | LD | Mali | 1,900,000 | 184,500 | 2,234,500 |
| **Total GEF Resources** | | | 8,100,000 | 769,500 | 9,319,500 |

1 No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

**\*** Relates to the project and any previous project preparation funding that have been provided and for which no Agency fee has been requested from Trustee.

**E. Consultants working for technical assistance components**:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Component* | *Estimated person months* (GEF only) | *GEF* *amount ($)* | *Co-financing ($)* | *Project total ($)* |
| World Bank |  |  |  |  |
| *Local consultants\** | 28 | 33,600 | 244,000 | 277,600 |
| *International consultants\** | 28 | 98,000 | 480,000 | 578,000 |
| UNDP |  |  |  |  |
| *Local consultants\** | 72 | 86,400 | - | 86,400 |
| *International consultants\** | 25 | 87,500 | - | 87,500 |
| Total | 153 | 305,500 | 724,000 | 1,029,500 |

**\*** Details provided in Annex C

**f. Project management Budget/cost \_ no gef resources used**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Cost Items* | *Total Estimated person months using GEF resources* | *GEF amount* ***($)*** | *Co-financing ($)* | *Project total ($)* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |

\* Details provided in Annex C

**G.** **Does the project include a “non-grant” instrument?** yes  no    
 (If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected   
 reflows to your agency and to the GEF Trust Fund).

**H. Describe the budgeted M &E Plan:**

The project is expected to pave the way for a smooth transition towards a sector-wide approach. Financing mechanisms, including disbursements, will follow national and regional procedures. Operational coordination will be under the responsibility of MinAgri that will establish a Technical Execution Coordination Committee[[4]](#footnote-4) (TECC) to monitor project implementation, ensure coordination of field interventions and build synergies among project stakeholders. Implementation of activities in the field under component 1 will be led by APCAM and its subsidiaries at the regional level (CRAs). The ON will be the executing agency for large scale irrigation investments under subcomponent 2.2 and the MinAgri will implement small-scale irrigation under subcomponent 2.1 and will be responsible for overall implementation of component 3.

As part of its sector supervision and evaluation mandate, the CPS[[5]](#footnote-5) of the MinAgri will be responsible for the overall project monitoring and evaluation. At the national level, it will dedicate two staff members to this function. The project will also provide technical assistance and capacity building support. At the regional level, one staff in the Agricultural Regional Division and one staff in each CRA[[6]](#footnote-6) will be dedicated to data collection, compilation and communication to the central level. Protocols involving all relevant regional public services will detail data collection modalities for each target production system.

Consistent with the project’s objective of improving policy decision making, project resources will facilitate communication and dissemination of M&E results to all stakeholders. The project will support improvement of producers’ knowledge of their own production systems as well as understanding the value chains. The project will also support APCAM and its network of CRAs to assimilate the information and circulate readily synthesized analysis to rural farmers (through producer organizations and value chains inter-professional organizations).

The CPS will delegate responsibility for collection of production yield measurements to the Mali Rural Economics Research Institute (IER – *Institut d’Économie Rurale*), and for data collection on urban markets to the Agricultural Market Observatory (OMA - *Observatoire des Marchés Agricoles*). Producer organizations, relevant public services and other implementing entities will also be actively involved in the overall collection and measurement methodology. Budget allocations will be available to undertake on-demand studies and field surveys relevant to the M&E process.

The CPS will also delegate all environmental/social and SLWM-related M&E activitiesto its counterpart at the Ministry of Environment and Sanitation (MES-CPS). The MES-CPS will be responsible for close monitoring of the Bank’s safeguard policies. Two dedicated staff will be assigned to work closely with the M&E team from MinAgri./CPS

Component 3.2 of the project (US$6.2 million) will support all activities related to agricultural, livestock and environment sector monitoring and evaluation. Component 3.4 (US$4.5 million) will cover project-specific M&E needs and will finance impact evaluations at mid-term and at the end of the project, to assess outcomes and results on the ground (at the farm, producer and value chains levels).

part ii: project justification:

1. **State the issue, how the project seeks to address it, and the expected global environmental benefits to be delivered:**

Please refer to PAD pages: 4, 44, 122, and annex 15 of the project document

1. Describe the consistency of the project with national and/or regional priorities/plans:

In December 2006 Mali adopted its second Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, known as the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Framework (GPRSF) covering the period 2007-2011. The GPRSF is designed as the first phase of the ten-year action plan to achieve the MDGs and is embedded in the Government’s long term vision “Mali 2025”. Its overall growth is to promote redistributive growth and poverty reduction by boosting productive sectors and consolidating public sector performance. Environmental protection and better management of natural resources are priority areas for intervention. The GPRSF highlights the following challenges for Mali to achieve sustainable development: (i) mainstreaming environment issues in all sector policies and implementation plans at the national, regional and local levels; (ii) control of desertification and degradation of land and waterways, in particular in the Niger river; and (iii) protection of wildlife and aquatic species.

A National Environment Protection policy ( NEPP) has been adopted by the government of Mali that integrate three strategic axes for intervention: (1) strengthening and dissemination of technical and methodological results and tools available for environment protection; (ii) promoting a multisector approach to environmental issues; and ,(iii) protecting and restoring deteriorated areas and cultivated land. For the GoM, desertification and land degradation appear to be key issues to be urgently tackled at the national level. The response of the Malian government to the massive soil degradation that is occurring is specifically addressed through the Desertification and National Action program (NAP) and the action plan for the integrated management of soil fertility. These plans outline the type of solutions that would enable land management to be better prioritized in Mali. At the sectoral level, the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment, as well as other ministries have realized the long-term impact of unsustainable land use.

While degradation is taking place on many types or arable and non-arable land, the rate of degradation accelerates significantly on agricultural land. The Ministry of Agriculture therefore recently adopted the Agricultural Development Framework Law, which emphasizes the need for the Ministry of Agriculture and producer organization to promote sustainable land management, with a particular focus on issues such as land tenure, land degradation and soil fertility decrease, restoration of cultivated area, while advocating for the promotion of environment friendly agricultural practices. As such the proposed operation targeting agricultural productivity is consistent with the national strategies and implementation approaches.

1. **Describe the consistency of the project with** [**gef strategies**](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Templates_and_Guidelines/C31-10%20Revised%20Focal%20Area%20Strategies-07-23-07_Final.pdf) **and strategic programs:**

Mali has been selected as a priority country under the TerrAfrica Initiative (2005) and has been included in the Strategic Investment Plan (SIP), under which this project will be submitted and for which the World Bank is the lead The project is consistent with the GEF Land Degradation strategy and will directly contribute to the implementation of its SP1 as well as SO 1 and 2agency and UNDP the main key support to GoM.. In accordance with the GEF strategy, the focus on land management to secure ecosystem services for farmers and pastoralists is (i) to provide and create an enabling environment for SLM (ii) upscale sustainable practices among land users on existing productive land, and (iii) to strengthen producer organizations and extensionists to ensure productive land systems long-term sustainability. The project is also consistent with the GEF Operational Program (OP15) regarding the mitigation and prevention of land degradation and desertification. Moving towards a longer-term programmatic approach to SLM investments in Mali, in line with the TerrAfrica Initiative, all SIP activities in Mali will facilitate harmonization of activities and a more strategic targeting of planned activities not only with the GEF but in the broader donor community. This will entail: (i) coordinating efforts at the political, strategic, technical, and program levels through Government leadership and deep stakeholder involvement; (ii) developing and consolidating activities that support SLM; (iii) increasing the quality and quantity of contributions and exchanges of knowledge, data, and expertise; and, (iv) mobilizing and channeling financial resources more efficiently. Lastly, the operation conforms with the agreed SIP principles, as: (i) Mali has demonstrated commitment to the SLM related objectives of NEPAD’s environment and agriculture programs (EAP, CAADP); (ii) The operation contributes to reaching SIP results; (iii) It will help the implementation of NAP/CCD; (iv) its commits beneficiaries to using harmonized indicators and benchmarks to measure SLM scale up and progress toward established goals at regional program level; (v) it exceeds the 1:4 financial leveraging ratio (GEF:non-GEF).

1. **Justify the type of financing support provided with the GEF resources.**

The GEF resources would support technology generation and dissemination, as well as strengthening of the capacity of service providers and end-users to mainstream SLWM practices in crop and livestock production, rangeland management and agro-forestry. The GEF funding will help develop field interventions that contribute to mainstream and scale-up of the sustainable management approach within Mali’s agriculture sector. Also, GEF will help mainstream the SLWM programmatic approach and will assist the implementation of the Country Strategic Investment Framework (CSIF) for sustainable land management.

The activities of 3.3 component will include a UNDP/GEF financing (US$ 1.9 million) and a UNDP co-financing (US$ 0.3 million) that will consist in providing as follows: (i) capacity-building of POs and service providers on SLWM (hence supporting subcomponent 1.2, US$ 1.3 million); (ii) monitoring and evaluation of the impact of agriculture on the environment and on the degree of adoption of SLWM practices, thus ensuring that the Ministry for the Environment plays its role in monitoring and supporting the agricultural sector (hence in liaison with subcomponent 3.2, for US$ 0.7 million); and (iii) contribution to the overall PAPAM coordination and M&E needs (i.e. subcomponent 3.4, US$ 0.2 million). Further details on the contents and implementation of this subcomponent are to be found in UNDP's Project Document (ProDoc) for the PAPAM.

1. **Outline the Coordination with other related initiatives:**

As a fully blended IDA/GEF operation, the project will build upon on-going Bank/UNDP technical assistance on SLWM policy provided to the Ministry of Environment and Sanitation (MES), and institutional reviews under the TerrAfrica Initiative. The Bank, GTZ and other donor partners are supporting the preparation of a SLWM country strategic investment framework (CSIF) that will identify priority areas for intervention. The project’s interventions will rely on the ecosystem and SLWM technical study funded by TerrAfrica where a number of best practices were made available for the various production systems (see Annex 18). Dissemination has already been initiated by the SLWM technical committee through a dedicated GIS mapping tool[[7]](#footnote-7). The project will contribute to mainstreaming SLWM best practices in the target production systems. Advisory services on reducing land degradation will also be delivered through the project under the GEF Strategic Investment Program (SIP). UNDP will play a leading role in environmental governance, notably in relation to better engaging the MES in the overall supervision and implementation of the project, and in strengthening the environmental monitoring and impact evaluation of the agricultural and livestock sectors. UNDP will also contribute to disseminate climate-resilient agricultural techniques in project targeted production basins.

1. **Discuss the value-added of GEF involvement in the project demonstrated through** [**incremental reasoning**](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents__(PDF_DOC)/GEF_31/C.31.12%20Operational%20Guidelines%20for%20Incremental%20Costs.pdf):

To achieve Mali’s objectives in the NEPP and other related national strategies, momentum must be sustained to align sectors and stakeholders around a country-led programmatic approach to SLM scale up in the country. Additional GEF support will help catalyze this shift by leveraging WB and UNDP programs, in coordination with other donors and various stakeholders, including TerrAfrica partners such as NEPAD. GEF support under SIP will be instrumental in allowing the country to move to a longer-term, larger scale programmatic approach with Government leadership, deep stakeholder involvement, and sector and donor alignment. Without GEF support, the ability to engage into solid and mainstreamed policy and institutional dialogues and related governance issues on SLM will be limited, the financial leveraging, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness inherent in piece-meal project approaches as the monitoring, evaluation and benchmarking among GEF and non-GEF operations facing similar challenges in the country will remain weak. Recent experiences demonstrate the importance of SLM approach to increase the scale and the efficacy of resources and to align sectors and stakeholders around a country-led programmatic approach. The absence of GEF funding would inhibit the operation to address long term environmental and land degradation issues that negatively impact the economy of Mali.

With GEF support, long-term sector alignment and stakeholder participation on SLM will be strengthened, policy and institutional dialogues harmonized, and as far as productivity increase is concerned, alternative technical options will be developed in collaboration with research institutions and disseminated to farmers through producer organizations. GEF support will be critical on the ground to help Mali develop and promote conservation farming, integrated pest management and other alternative cropping techniques, more friendly to the environment or able to restore soil quality. This IDA/GEF operation is seen as a real opportunity to strengthen growth in agriculture while conserving the productive capacity of the land. The GEF support will also strengthen cross-fertilization and maximize impact per dollar invested, capitalize on the comparative advantages of the agencies and their leveraging impact through a diversified set of delivery mechanisms, and promote coordinated donor engagement over a longer timeframe. For more details on incremental analysis see Annex 15 in the Project Document.

1. **Indicate risks, including climate change risks, that might prevent the project objective(s) from being achieved and outline risk management measures:**

A detailed matrix of potential risks and mitigation measures is presented in Section III E of the Project Document.The overall risk of the operation is rated as moderate, since the project will incorporate the lessons learned from on-going Bank and partners’ investment in Mali. Past evaluations have shown that most of the risks are found in the enabling environment and this operation seeks to improve it. Building local ownership and popular support for this operation through the communication strategy will contribute greatly to minimize risks. In addition, the operation’s proposed approach combined with strengthened M&E on SLM implementation will further help to reduce the risk. Other specific risks that include mitigation measures within project activities/administration include: (i) weak capacity of service providers and facilitators to disseminate SLM knowledge; (ii) inadequate mass of properly trained facilitators; and, (iii) potential risk of diversion of funds and inadequate accounting records. To mitigate these risks, both the GEF project and the IDA investment will pay attention to capacity building, especially for public services and producer organizations that will be key stakeholders for project implementation and for further efforts in promoting SLM investments.

1. **explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design**:

Cost-effectiveness of the project has been determined by: (a) conducting a fuller risk assessment and a financial appraisal of SLWM activities and alternatives, to be initiated under the TerrAfrica Initiative; (b) conducting an “alternative designs” exercise when developing the project’s logical framework, thus enabling the project proponents to select the best options; and (c) ensuring that all requirements for project management, fiduciary responsibility, and independent oversight are met. More specifically:complete with more information

Significantly, during the 2007-11 CAS discussions, a strategic decision was made to consolidate and realign the agriculture portfolio in order to scale up progress in the sector investment program. Three key projects were retained as part of a renewed World Bank ARD strategy to address: (i) grassroots socio-economic development, through the Rural Community Development Project; (ii) supply chain promotion, through the Agricultural Competitiveness and Diversification Project; and (iii) fostering agricultural productivity by scaling-up SLWM practices. This decision was consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the 2006 CEM and the 2004-06 CAS completion report. Thus in this blended operation, IDA and GEF play complementary roles – the IDA loan will support a quick start approach aimed at immediate needs of increasing production and rehabilitating the sector and returnees while the GEF grant will be used to strive to enhance the longer term) benefits of environmentally sound agricultural practices, land use, and natural resource management.

A fully blended project was chosen to demonstrate how immediately increasing local production could be fully integrated with measures to ensure greater sustainability, rather than with separated and unrelated initiatives. Moreover, a blended project was preferred to a standalone project because of limited technical capacity and financial resources, and because it would facilitate more coordination between the agriculture and environment ministries, where the requisite skills and knowledge for project implementation are. A standalone GEF project would have a more limited impact compared with a larger blended IDA-GEF project, which can more widely mainstream environmental considerations.

**part iii: institutional coordination and support**

**A. Institutional arrangement:**

Details are presented in Section III B and Annex 6 of the Project Document. As far as GEF activities are concerned, the Ministry of Environment will be part of the overall project steering committee and an active member of the proposed Technical Execution Coordination Committee. At the regional level, it has been decided that in all regions, the Environmental Regional Division will co-chair the coordination committee.

**B. Project Implementation Arrangement**:

Details are presented in Section III B and Annex 6 of the Project Document. Field activities and investments will be undertaken by producer organizations under the overall leadership of APCAM and CRAs. However, all training activities and SLWM investments will be overseen by the Ministry of Environment at the national and by the Environmental Division at the Regional level. Producer organizations will receive support from the Ministry of Environment is selecting service providers and trainers in the field of SLWM, as well as technical advice for the design and implementation of SLWM small-scale investments projects under component 1 and for irrigation investments under component 2. The Ministry of Environment will have to lead the policy dialogue toward the finalization and implementation of the CSIF.

**part iv: explain the alignment of project design with the original PIF**:

During project preparation as a result of the planning process of a fully blended project that regrouped a number of co-financing institutions, such as IDA, IFAD, the European Commission and UNEP, small changes were made to the structure of the project. However it may be clarified that these changes do not change the content and approach for the GEF contribution to the overall project. The modifications to the project structure are highlighted below:

**(a) Project Title:** Project title under PIF was: Restoring agricultural and pastoral productivity. The project title now is: Fostering agricultural productivity in Mali. The concept of “restoring productivity” is integrated in a title with larger scope of 'fostering productivity'.

**(b) Project Objectives:** PIF objective was “to raise agricultural productivity by securing ecosystem services within priority agricultural landscapes, improving the competitiveness of supply chains, enhancing service providers, and increasing the availability of financing to land users. During preparation the project objective was split into two objectives: a Project Development Objective (PDO) and a Global Environment Objective (GEO). The PDO is: to increase the productivity of smallholder producers involved in productions systems and within the geographic areas targeted by project interventions. The GEO is to increase the application of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) techniques in the targeted production systems. This distinction aimed at giving a clearer visibility to the SLWM dimension of the project and to increase the weight of SLWM field investments beyond the GEF financing. This was critical to keep a strong focus on SLWM aspects whereas other important co-investors, EU and IFAD, joined the project with large budget for small- and large-scale irrigation.

**(c)** **Financial plan**: At PIF stage the financing included a GEF contribution of US$ 8.55 million[[8]](#footnote-8) which was complementing US$ 60.42 million in baseline co-financing, for a total cost of US$ 68.52 million. At CEO stage the GEF contribution of US$ 8.55million is complementing an increased baseline cofinancing of US$ 152.2 million, for a total cost of US$ 160.3 million.

**(d) Scope, targeted production basins**: Based on the available budget at the PIF stage, the project was focused on two core production systems: cotton and rice at Office du Niger. However owing to additional co-financing presented in section (c) above, the scope of the project has been expanded but the targeting strategy remains as to concentrate investments on specific production systems within targeted production basins. This will come along with an opportunity to scale-up SLWM techniques and practices beyond cotton and rice productions. Targeted production systems and basins are presented in paragraph 17 of section II A of the Project Document.

**(e) Scope of the GEF dimension**: at the PIF stage, the SLM part of the project was mainly focused on land issues, including land management and degradation, soil restoration, etc. With additional financiers joining the project, especially for small- and large-scale irrigation, it was agreed with the GoM to expand the environment dimension of the project to water management. This includes a strong focus on water savings at Office du Niger where the project will be the main driver in promoting alternative rice production and water saving techniques under the SRI approach (System of Rice Intensification). To highlight this expanded approach and the importance of the water dimension, it was agreed to revise the SLM acronym in SLWM for Sustainable Land and Water Management.

**(f) Components:** As a result of project preparation and reviews by peer reviewers, the project design has been simplified and components / sub-components have been reorganized to be fully aligned with implementing agencies. Changes have been done in close consultation with the Malian counterparts in view of the available funding and in order to address concerns about capacities on the ground to implement project activities. More specifically, no activity as proposed earlier has been dropped, former PIF components have only moved as follows:

* Component 1 on “**Policy and institutional support at all levels**” has been transferred to component 3, where sub-component 3.1 will support CSIF implementation (see annex 4 of Project Document);
* Component 2 on “**Investments at sub-national, local and farm levels**” is now fully integrated in the farming system modernization financing mechanism under component 1; this includes training and advisory packages on SLWM techniques that will come along small- and large-scale irrigation investments to be financed under the new component 2; best-bet SLWM options will propose to producers for investments as described in annex 18 of Project document;
* Component 3 which aimed at “**Building national awareness and capacities**” is now part of sub-component 1.2 that will strengthen capacities of producer organizations, service providers and extensionists. This will include strengthening capacities in the field of SLWM techniques and investment projects. All activities related to agricultural and livestock sector monitoring, environment and SLWM-related activities monitoring, will remain in component 3.2.

**(g) Result chain and framework:** A result chain has been developed (see annex 3 of Project Document) to better reflect the project logic and gradual potential outcome from the short term to the longer term for food security and sustainable shared agricultural growth. It shows how the SLWM dimension is mainstreamed in the project strategy for productivity increase. In the result framework, specific indicators have been developed to monitor progress for each targeted production systems with a key reference product and its core SLWM indicator (see section II B paragraph 16). Most of the outputs and outcomes proposed at the PIF stage have been revised and reformulated to better fit the overall project result chain, the PDO and GEO, and to stick to the “SMART” recommendations for indicator formulation, especially the measurable criterion in the Malian context.

**(h) Institutional set-up and implementation arrangements:** Project arrangements as described at PIF stage were pretty vague. The project preparation process spent much time and energy on refining the project institutional set-up and implementation arrangements in a very complex and weak institutional context. Detailed arrangements are detailed in annex 6 of the Project Document and will be further detailed in the Project Implementation Manual to be finalized by project negotiations. The Bank and UNDP ensured a clear participation of the Ministry of Environment in project decision making processes, in project activity and investment monitoring and evaluation.

**part v: Agency(ies) certification**

|  |
| --- |
| This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agency Coordinator, Agency name | Signature | Date | Project Contact Person | Telephone | Email Address |
| Steve Gorman  Executive Coordinator  The World Bank | SG signature | March 9, 2010 | Paola Agostini | (202) 473 7620 | pagostini@worldbank.org |

**Annex A: Project Results Framework**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Development Objective** | **Project Outcome Indicators** | **Use of Project Outcome Information** |
| Increase the productivity of smallholder agricultural and agribusiness producers in the targeted productions systems and project areas. | Increase of rice production in project targeted areas  Increase of rice yield on small scale irrigation perimeters supported by the project  Increase of cowpea yield in project production basins  Increase of milk production per milking cow in the targeted areas. | Determine if the project approach is relevant and efficient in delivering agricultural productive infrastructure, equipment and advisory services.  Asses the efficiency of financing mechanisms. |
| **Global Environmental Objective** | **GEF Outcome Indicators** | **Use of Project Outcome Information** |
| Increase the use of SLWM practices in the targeted production systems and project areas. | Increase in areas under SLWM practices in the project target production basins (for a given list of priority SLWM techniques).  Increase of POs / producers adopting SLWM practices | Confirm the relevance of the proposed SLWM techniques and the efficiency of the dissemination strategy. |
| **Intermediate Outcomes** | **Intermediate Outcome Indicators** | **Use of Intermediate Outcome Monitoring** |
| 1 - **Technology transfer and service provision to agricultural producers** | | |
| Dissemination and adoption of technologies, cropping and breeding practices, including SLWM practices | Percentage of producers that have adopted new cowpea seeds  Percentage of dairy producers that have adopted improved husbandry practices  Percentage of producers that have adopted SRI techniques at ON  Percentage of POs’ sub-projects that (i) have achieved their objectives;  (ii) are cofinanced by a credit | Assess if the proposed technologies are adapted to producer needs and if transfer mechanisms are efficient Confirm the relevance and interest of the proposed sustainable practices.  Confirm the relevance of the demand-driven approach for technologies and the project support to credit facilitation |
| **2 - Irrigation infrastructure** | | |
| Increase in reliable water resources for agricultural production. | Irrigated areas developed (number of additional hectares). | Assess the efficiency of the project approach in delivering irrigation infra. |
| Targeted areas with improved drainage (number of hectares drained) | Assess the impact of project drainage investments |
| **3 - Comprehensive programmatic approach, sector monitoring and project coordination** | | |
| Improved sector coordination and more consistent field interventions | Reduction in the number of stand-alone projects in the agricultural and livestock sector (MinAgri + MEP) | Confirm that project activities facilitate sector coordination. |
| Sector monitoring | Regular production of reliable statistical data and sector analysis | Check project contribution to policy decision making based on reliable data and analyses. |

**Arrangements for results monitoring**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Target Values** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | | |
| **Intermediate Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** | |
| **Project Outcome Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rice production increase in targeted areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | End of cropping season | Annual survey | Office du Niger DNA and CRAs | |
| - Sabalibougou + M’Béwani + PIV (6t/ha) | 0 | 0 | 15,000t (2,500ha) | 21,150t (3,525ha) | 23,850t (3,975ha) | 25,200t (4,200ha) | 25,200t (4,200ha) |
| - Bas-fonds (Low-Land) (1.5t/ha to 1.8t/ha) | 0 | 0 | +580t (385ha) | +1875t (1,250ha) | +3,170t (2,115ha) | +3,750t (2,500ha) | +3,750t (2,500ha) |
| Rice yield increase on small scale irrigation perimeters supported by the project | CPS / ON Data 2009 survey |  |  |  |  |  |  | End of cropping season | Annual survey | DNA and CRAs | |
| - PIV | 4.0t/ha | 4.0t/ha | 4.1t/ha | 4.2t/ha | 4.3t/ha | 4.3t/ha | 4.3t/ha |
| - Bas-fonds | 1.5t/ha | 1.5 t/ha | 1.6 t/ha | 1.7 t/ha | 1.8 t/ha | 1.9 t/ha | 2.0t/ha |
| Cowpea yield increase in project areas | 250 kg/ha (CPS 2009) | 250 kg/ha | 250 kg/ha | 350 kg/ha | 450 kg/ha | 600 kg/ha | 700 kg/ha | End of crop-ping season | Annual survey | DNA and CRAs | |
| Increase of milk production per milking cow | 1.5l/d (DNPIA 09) | 1.5l/d | 2.0l/d | 2.5l/d | 3.5l/d | 4.5l/d | 6.0l/d | Daily record by producers | Bi-monthly | MEP / DNPIA | |
| Total number of producers reached by project support | 0 farm / yr Cumul  Pers. | 30,000 30,000  300,000 | 60,000 90,000  900,000 | 60,000 150,000  1.5M | 60,000 210,000  2.1M | 60,000 270,000  2.7M | 30,000 300,000  3.0M | Bi-annual | Progress reports | CPS | |
| **Global Environment Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increase in areas under SLWM techniques in project production basins | <5% (données STP 2009) | <5% | 5% | 15% | 15% | 20% | 25% | Mid-cropping season | Annual survey | | ON / MinAgri / DNA and CRA |
| Percentage producers that have adopted SLWM practices | <5% (données STP 2009) | 5% | 10% | 20% | 40% | 50% | 60% | Mid-cropping season | Annual survey | | DNA and CRA |

**Component 1 - Technology transfer and service provision to agricultural producers**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  | | **Target Values** | | | | | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | |
| **Intermediate Outcome Indicators** | | **Baseline** | | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | | **YR4** | | **YR5** | | **YR6** | | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Share of producers that have adopted new cowpea varieties in the target production basins  (Bankass/Koro +Bla/Tominian) | <1%  (PASAOP data 2009) | | <1% | | 10% | | 20% | | 30% | | 40% | | 50% | Annually, Mid-cropping season | Annual survey on a sample of producers | MinAgri / DNA |
| **[AFTAR]** Dairy producers that have adopted improved husbandry practice  (Mopti, Ségou, Sikasso) | <5% (PASAOP data 2009) | | <5% | | 10% | | 25% | | 30% | | 40% | | 50% | Annual | Survey of a sample of producers | MEP / DNPIA |
| **[SLWM]** Percentage of producers that have adopted the system of rice intensification (ON + PIV) | <1% | | <1% | | 5% | | 10% | | 15% | | 25% | | 30% | Annually, Mid-cropping season | Annual survey on a sample of producers | Office du Niger  MEA |
| Percentage of POs’ sub-projects that have achieved their objectives as stated in request | 0 | | 0 | | 25% | | 50% | | 75% | | 80% | | 80% | Annual | External technical audit | APCAM et CRA |
| Percentage of POs’ sub-projects that are cofinanced by a bank or MFI credit | 0 | | 0 | | 20% | | 35% | | 50%% | | 75% | | 75% | Quarterly | Quarter progress report | APCAM et CRA |

**Component 2 – Irrigation Infrastructures**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  | | **Target Values** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | |
| **Intermediate Outcome Indicators** | | **Baseline** | | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| **[AFTAR]** Total irrigation area developed (hectares) | Cumul (ha)  Total / year | | 0 | | 2,980  2,980 | 5,095  2,115 | 6,585  1,490 | 7,295  710 | 7,295  - | Annual | Progress reports | Office du Niger DNGR |
| - Office du Niger (ha/year) | 0 | | 0 | | 2,200 | 500 | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| - PIV (ha/year) | 0 | | 0 | | 300 | 525 | 450 | 225 | - |  |  |  |
| - Bas-fonds (ha/year) | 0 | | 0 | | 385 | 865 | 865 | 385 | - |  |  |  |
| - PPM[[9]](#footnote-9) (ha/year) | 0 | | 0 | | 100 | 225 | 175 | 100 | - |  |  |  |
| Number of producers benefitting from newly or improved irrigated land | 0 Pers.[[10]](#footnote-10) Farms | | 0 0 | | 16,700 1,670 | 42,900 4,290 | 66,200 6,620 | 77,400 7,740 | 77,400 7,740 | Annual | Progress reports | Office du Niger DNGR |
| - Office du Niger (5ha / exploitation agricole) | 0 farm units | | 0 | | 440 | 540 | 540 | 540 | 540 |  |  |  |
| - PIV + Bas-fonds + PPM | 0  farm units | | 0 | | 1,230 | 2,520  3,750 | 2,330  6,080 | 1,120  7,200 | 7,200 |  |  |  |

**Component 3 – Comprehensive programmatic approach, sector monitoring and project coordination**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Target Values** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | |
| **Intermediate Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| Reduction in the number of stand-alone projects in the agricultural and livestock sector (MinAgri + MEP) | 110 | 110 | 110 | 105 | 100 | 90 | 80 | Annual | GoM budget | CPS |
| Number of donors using the pooled financing mechanism | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | Annual | Progress report | CPS |
| Regular production of reliable statistical data and sector analysis: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual | Progress report | CPS MEA |
| * Number of rural households monitored | 610 RuralStruc IER 2008 | 610 | 900 | 1,200 | 1,800 | 1,800 | 1,800 | Bi-annual | Surrvey report | CPS APCAM/CRAs |
| Rice yield and production assessment | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Annual | Progress report | CPS |
| Increase of Government spending on SLWM | 4.7% [2007]  IFPRI data 2009 | 4.7% | 5% | 5.2% | 5.4% | 5.6% | 6.1% | Annual | GoM budget | CPS MEA |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | **Target Values** | | | | | | **Data Collection and Reporting** | | |
| **Intermediate Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline** | | | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR4** | **YR5** | **YR6** | **Frequency and Reports** | **Data Collection Instruments** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** |
| **Sector Monitoring** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Regular production of reliable statistical data and sector analysis: | |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Number of agricultural surveys produced | | 1-2 | 2 | | 2 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | Annual | Progress report | CPS |
| * Number of producers / households monitored for targeted crop and livestock production | | 400 RuralStruc IER 2008 | 400 | | 400 | 750 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | Bi-annual | Progress report | CPS APCAM/CRAs |
| **Core Public Services** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of animal health specialists entering a graduating curriculum: | |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veterinarians | | 0 | 0 | | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Annual | Progress report | CPS MEP |
| Technicians | | 0 | 0 | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Improved quality control of crops and livestock inputs | |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review of legislation for vet. medicinal products | | n/a | n/a | | n/a | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Mid-term review | Progress report | DNSV |
| Number of quality control inspections (vet medicine, pesticides and fertilizers) | | tbd |  | |  |  |  |  |  | Bi-annual | Progress report | CPS DNA, DNSV |
| **Project Coordination and Evaluation** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project steering committees | | n/a | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | Bi-annual | Progress report | CPS |
| Number of TECC meetings | | n/a | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | Quarterly |

**Annex B: Responses to Project Reviews** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF)

1. **Response to GEFSEC Comments of Review of March 14, 2008**

*Comment 1: Please provide in the project document a detailed monitoring and evaluation program with baseline information (area of land under SLM at the beginning of the project, Number of people trained or receiving SLM services, number of training courses, Number of revised PDSEC, expansion rate of land under cotton production at the beginning of the project, adoption rate of SLM technologies) and consistent with the SIP framework.*

**Response**: Detailed results framework and M&E plan are presented in Annex 3 of the Project Document.

*Comment 2: Please detail quantitative outputs and indicators as indicated in the review.*

**Response**: Detailed outputs and indicators are presented in Annex 3 of the Project Document.

*Comment 3: Confirm budget breakdown and cofinancing.*

**Response**: Financing plan has been revised to take into account new co-financiers (IFAD and EU). Detailed budget is presented in Annex 5 of the Project Document with Incremental Cost Analysis for the GEF financing in annex 15.

*Comment 4: Ensure a good participation and communication strategy, notably at local level with Producers Organizations.*

**Response**: APCAM and CNOP have been actively participating in project formulation and design. They will be fully empowered to implement component 1 of the project. The financing mechanism for the modernization of farming systems under component 1.1 will be fully producer-led. POs will be in charge of the selection of small-scale investment projects at the local and regional levels. Details are given in annex 6 on implementation arrangements.

*Comment 5: A full risk assessment is awaited in the project document.*

**Response**: A detailed matrix of potential risks and mitigation measures has been developed and is presented in section III E in the Project Document.

*Comment 6: Please provide your own cost-effectiveness analysis*

**Response**: Please refer to section H of this Memo which details the cost effectiveness of the project.

*Comment 7: Please detail pilot sites information*

**Response**: The project will not have pilot sites per se but will focus on production basins that are described in the eco-systemic diagnosis undertaken during project preparation as part of the PPG activities and presented online at <http://ige.nfrance.com/~k1009/jws1/>.

1. **Responses to Comments in the STAP review (March 17, 2008)**

***Comment 1- What are the participatory methods used to design an SLM approach? Please specify the methods clearly to ensure the appropriate stakeholders are included in developing the approach, and to verify the appropriate mechanisms are used to encourage participation.***

**Response:** The project will build upon institutions and decision-making mechanisms set up under its two predecessor projects, PASAOP and PNIR. It will also replicate and complement ongoing value chain development strategies undertaken by the recently approved PCDA.

Based on these strategies and the lessons learned, the project will pay particular attention to improving the implementation and financing mechanisms to reach directly end-users. It will strongly favor stakeholder participation within the decision making process in regards to developing and implementing project activities.

Interventions of this project will be technically focused and geographically concentrated to ensure a tangible and measurable impact in targeted production systems. This approach will enable to easily identify the key-stakeholders within the production system, an important step in developing and engaging in participatory processes, with focus on smallholder producers and their producer organizations (PO). The project will pay attention to POs’ inclusiveness, representativeness, social responsibility and accountability. Capacity building programs will strengthen POs so that they can expand their membership and reach as many farmers as possible.

As part of the preparation of project safeguards instruments, stakeholder consultations have been organized in different locations around the country. These are presented in annex 10 of the Project Document (paragraphs 20 to 24) and gave the opportunity to present the project concept and design, its strategy for productivity increase and for mainstreaming SLWM activities, the potential social and environment adverse risks and the proposed mitigation measures. At the national level, APCAM and CNOP were the key producer representatives who participated in all key preparation steps and contributed to the project design, to the elaboration of its content and to the discussion on the project institutional set-up and implementation arrangements. All field visits and discussion at the regional level involved the Regional Agricultural Chambers.

To make these approaches operational, the project will put in place a “modernization fund”. With this fund the project will strengthen and expand the range and quality of services delivered to producers. End-users can access this fund directly, based on their demand, and therefore decide themselves what activities they like to pursue. The project also targets with that to prefigure an operational mechanism of the National Agricultural Development Fund prescribed in Mali’s 2006 LOA. The fund will include support to ensure sustainable access to advisory services and foster linkages with rural credit.

In regards to developing the SLM approach, the project will apply the same implementation approach and the same logic throughout the project as described above.

Producers will be able to directly apply for SLWM investments and services through the ‘modernization fund’. In order to guarantee environmental long-term sustainability of the intensification efforts of the agricultural production systems, a wide range of SLM practices is available that can reinforce ecosystem resilience and productivity aiming at plot level, community level or landscape level. The project will focus on promoting a few SLM interventions that respond to the constraints and potentials of the specific production systems. In addition, a wider range of SLM options and technologies will be made available to end-users. Organized training in regards to SLWM options, will allow farmers to make informed decisions, which techniques they like to pursue.

Thus, the project will apply a very straightforward participatory approach that allows end-users to directly decide what SLM investments and services they like to work with. In additions, SLWM interventions will also be integrated within the profitable modernization packages, thus mainstreaming SLWM practices and principals directly within the productivity related activities.

***Comment 2- How will the five global benefits the project intends to achieve be measured and monitored? What methods will be used to measure an increase in vegetation, an increase in carbon sequestration? What specific POPs will the project address?***

Response: For each of the production systems, a number of SLWM techniques have been identified (see Annex 18) that contribute to creating global environmental benefits (GEB). A list of practices will be confirmed at the beginning of the project for which training and technical assistance will be available to POs and communities. Based on these practices, the global environmental benefits will be measured and computed.

The five GEB the project intends to achieve are listed below including the approaches and techniques to measure the benefits. A number of delimited sites for each of the production systems will be identified, with and without project intervention, and monitored throughout the project.

1. An increase of vegetation with a subsequent increase in carbon sequestration;

The measurement will be done with a two-pronged approach, i) through satellite image comparison at the beginning of the project (baseline), mid-term and at the end of the project, and ii) through on-the-ground measurements that will complement satellite image results, especially below-ground carbon sequestration, and vegetation increase in the under-storey that are difficult to detect through satellite imagery. A landscape approach will be applied to the monitored sites. At first a qualitative approach with stakeholders on the ground will be initiated. The dynamics concerning land degradation and concerning the impact of SLWM practices are identified, and what were the driving factors that influenced the vegetation cover, carbon sequestration or land degradation. It will then been proceeded to do measurements, for instance on SLWM practices (e.g. total length of live-fences x carbon content of unit of live-fence length, tons of compost applied and carbon increase in soils measured via lab methods). All the contributions will be added up, and carbon increase computed.

1. A reduction in the severity of land degradation

This will follow a similar approach to previous GEB. Both GEBs will be monitored in a comprehensive approach at the landscape level of the M&E site. It is important to apply a system’s approach, as reduction in severity of land degradation and increase in carbon sequestration, for instance, are inherently linked. Land degradation issues and their severity need to be established, evaluated and quantified at the beginning of the project (e.g. deforestation activities), which will be monitored throughout the project. The measurements will be done according to well-established scientific methods.

1. A reduction in the use of POPs with a subsequent improvement in water quality;

With agro-ecological approaches promoted through the SLWM practices, the use of pesticides in the agriculture system will be evaluated at the beginning of the project, and alternative strategies based on an IPM approach developed. This will allow reducing pesticide use, which will have a beneficial impact on biodiversity of insect communities, reduction of water pollution and reduction in exposing humans to these toxic health hazards.

1. The preservation and restoration of biological diversity

The proposed SLWM practices in this project will have a wide range of beneficial impact on biodiversity, depending on the production system, the sub-systems and the location and niches within the production system. Preservation and restoration of biological biodiversity will be achieved in forests (flora, fauna, and soil microbes), pastures (herbaceous and woody species), agricultural soils (soil microbial enrichment through organic matter substrate), agricultural land (crop diversification, including diversification with agro-forestry species; insect species diversity, including natural enemies to pests). It is foreseen that many of the SLWM practices have a biodiversity preserving and restoring effect. Measurements are done via species inventory of forest land, pastoral and agricultural land.

1. The preservation of the agro-sylvo-pastoral ecosystem stability and integrity.

Ecosystems with a high integrity should be relatively resistant to environmental changes and stresses and should be able to recover to their original conditions relatively quickly after a perturbation. Of course it is difficult to know ahead of time what stresses or disturbances will occur during the project period and in a given location. Most likely there will be climate stresses (such as dry spells, flooding), others could be fires, cricket invasion, or disturbance caused by humans, such as forest cutting etc. Thus, within each of the production basins, a monitoring system needs to be developed, with some potential scenarios given the likelihood of disturbances. Nevertheless, the monitoring system needs to remain flexible, and adapt quickly its monitoring strategy, in case some unforeseen events occur that influence the ecosystems’ integrity.

***How will changes be tracked within the project and what mechanisms are proposed to ensure that beneficial change is monitored after the project completes?***

The mechanisms proposed to monitor changes and to disseminate information about these changes during and after the project are based on internet based tools and information. The project will establish and support a website for SLWM in Mali. The project M&E on SLWM will be integrated within this website where monitored changes will be accessible. During project preparation, a Geographic Information System has been developed, including a geo-referenced catalogue for SLWM activities, already online at <http://ige.nfrance.com/~k1009/jws1/>.

***Comment 3- What are the risks that farmers may not adopt organic fertilizers, and/or other land management practices in which it may not be appropriate for farmers to invest. Measuring carbon can be a methodological challenge. How does the project intend to overcome these barriers, as well as challenges related to increasing soil carbon in degraded areas?***

**Response:** The project document now includes a detailed risk analysis (see Project Document in Section III E paragraph 66). However the above points are clarified herein.

Organic fertilization or the management of organic matter for soil improvement will be a priority SLM intervention for the project in each of the targeted production systems. Organic matter content in soils is directly related to soil productivity and soil health. Soils with low organic matter contents tend to be depleted and less productive. Thus, increasing and maintaining soil organic matter contents is essential for achieving productive agricultural systems and maintaining important ecosystem services. Farmers in Mali are well aware of the importance of organic matter for soil productivity, and in many areas, organic matter amendments are provided to crops. In places, where farmers have not yet used this practice, soils are often depleted, less productive and the use of chemical fertilizer does not result in expected yield increases anymore. In these locations, demonstrations of organic matter inputs have shown to be highly effective for farmers’ understanding of OM importance.

The question about adoption or non-adoption of OM inputs is therefore not relevant in general terms, as OM inputs will be an SLM priority intervention for the project. The question rather relates to what techniques of OM inputs can be proposed that respond to farmers’ opportunities to apply them. Many techniques and practices are known and available in Mali that can contribute to above and belowground carbon sequestration, such as cover crops, composting, production of organic inputs through agro-forestry systems, tree planting, soil and water conservation, improved grazing systems, to mention a few. A thorough analysis of the available techniques has been done during the preparation of this project and is summarized in the study “*Diagnostic Ecosystémique et Technique pour la Gestion Durable des Terres au Mali*, 2009”. Each subsystem in the targeted production systems has specific constraints and potentials in regards to carbon sequestration, and it will be the role of the project to identify the techniques, practices and interventions in each of the production systems that best suit the farmers based on their available resources and their needs.

For the measurement of carbon please see response to comment 2 above.

1. **Response to GEFSEC Comments of Review of March 14, 2008**

*Comment 1: At PIF level, some exchanges between the GEFSEC and the IAs were dealing with the nature and the formulation of outputs. The PIF was revised following GEFSEC guidance. However, in the request for CEO endorsement, it seems that we lost some of these improvements.*

*This is mainly a question of presentation, as all the information seems available in the annex4. Please, revise the outputs under each component in the table A, p.1 and 2. Outputs are not mentioned in the logical framework. We find indeed 2 indicators instead of outputs in the framework. At CEO Endorsement, outputs should be concrete and where applicable should reflect targets that have been established during project preparation (e.g. 10 staff trained to operate and maintain an early warning system, data capture in 5 regions of costal lowlands). Thanks to revise accordingly.*

**Response:** The outputs have been adjusted to better align with the PIF and Annex 4 in Table 1 of the CEO Memo.

*Comment 2: The information on pilot sites of intervention was requested at PIF level for CEO endorsement. During the PPG, $70,000 were programmed for such activities (project sites and baseline identification). Please, provide the adequate information on sites or basins to figure out how the GEF will have an added value.*

**Response:** A first analysis of project sites and target production basins has been done during pre-appraisal and appraisal. Information on Sites and basins are presented in PAD Table 1 page 5, and Annex 4 Table 2 page 46. Work is currently ongoing on data collection and baseline identification that will be integrated in the M&E manual prior to effectiveness. Target production systems and reference products are described in detail in Annex 1.

*Comment 3: (a) Please, explain the sustainability of the approach and how the national institutions are supposed to internalize all the scientific and monitoring component. We understand that the project will bring resources to restore production of reliable statistics and strengthen capacities of the rural sector's Statistists and Planning unit.*

*(b) We do not find in the risk assessment and mitigation measures, what will be done to trigger structural changes and give a chance to these services and administrations to be active beyond the project duration.*

**Response:** The approach relies on supporting two poles of key project stakeholders: (i) build the strategic capacities of CPS for policy / strategy formulation and sector coordination; and (ii) strengthen the operational capacities of APCAM and POs for field activities and investments. It is expected from project inputs (in terms of training, studies and consultation processes) and from project outputs (analytical works, household surveys and production and environmental assessment) to help these stakeholders better understand the need for reliable information and field data for policy formulation and field investment result and impact monitoring.

As far as funding resources beyond the duration of the project are concerned, the elaboration of the agricultural investment program based on a Mid-Term Expenditure Framework will integrate the annual budgeting of field surveys and impact assessment. Through the implementation of the National Agricultural Development Fund, POs will be able to access resources to undertake their own surveys, production and yield measurements, and impact evaluation. This National Fund has been already established by the GoM and operating procedures are being prepared by the Ministry of Agriculture in close collaboration with POs which will ensure continuity and also mitigates the associated risk

*Comment 4: Some clarifications are expected to figure out the use of GEF resources in the component 3.*

* *Same comment done in the cell.9: please revise the outputs.*

**Response:** As described under Part IV section f) of the CEO Memo, the project design has been simplified as compared to the PIF and components / sub-components have been reorganized. Component 3 comprises parts from PIF Component 1 “Policy and institutional support at all levels” now under 3.1; from PIF component 3 “Building national awareness and capacities”, now under 3.2. It also includes project management and project monitoring under 3.4. The outputs have been revised in the Memo.

In line with advice by the Bank lawyer, financial management and disbursement specialists during the appraisal mission the costs by component and the sources were reconfirmed and now reflect the actual contributions towards various activities. Activities have been regrouped to get one specific group of activities financed by one specific donor under each component and sub-component. This didn’t change the project activities and outputs, but moved them from one sub-component to another.

For the GEF elements, it was agreed with the GoM that GEF-WB will be focused on field investments (component 1.1); studies and integration of SLWM in the elaboration of the National Agricultural Investment program (C3.1) and environment M&E (C3.2). The GEF-UNDP will be used for supporting the Min of Environment in formulating strategies, developing training and disseminating information on SLWM.

*- The component 3.4 for instance is too high and should be under 10% (below $810,000). Please, reduce the management/coordination costs.*

*- Moreover, the cofinancing ratio for the project is 1 for 15. But for the component 3.4, the WB sub-component is providing a cofinancing of 1:4.3 and no cofinancing is provided by the UNDP sub-component. Please, revise*

**Response:** Sub-component 3.4 has been revised and it has been agreed with the Malian counterparts to use only IDA-resources for project coordination and management (MUS$3.7 / 4.5% of total costs). No GEF resources will be used for this subcomponent. This Memo has been revised accordingly.

*Comment 5: Risks - Somehow addressed. Please check cell 13. thanks*

**Response:** See response to comment 3 b.

*Comment 6: Please, provide complementary information on the role of UNDP and the use of GEF resources. The document does not detail enough the UNDP's component (strategy, framework for intervention, outputs, and partners), although the UNDP's component will bring a key support to Producer organizations*

**Response:** UNDP will provide support through training, technical assistance and consultancies to the Ministry of Environment (STP/CIGQE) in developing information and communication strategies, trainings for technical staff and producers in the field of SLWM. Please see Annex 4 of the Bank PAD which describes the UNDP supported subcomponent.

UNDP-PRODOC is being prepared and will be submitted separately

*Comment 7: - Please confirm the costs for international and local consultants. Confirm these costs are following the IA policies. It seems there is a increase of the usual practises in the region.*

**Response:** Costs have been checked and confirmed by the FAO expert who helped Costab elaboration and as per the prescribed consultant costs. Final costing will be reconfirmed on a case by case basis during project implementation by the Financial Management Division of the Min of Agri. The latter will control if requests are aligned with the current GoM’s policies and consistent with fee level and expenditure practices.

*Comment 8: - Please justify the travel ($311, 200) and office ($580,800) sub-components*

**Response:** Travels include activities such as: (i) Participation in regional and international training or exchange workshop on CSIF formulation and implementation; (ii) South-South exchanges and field visits within Africa or other regions on specific SLWM topics such as system of rice intensification, irrigation water management and savings. The “Office” budget line includes 2 vehicles for STP for overall supervision and field activity monitoring, and office equipment for the regional divisions and small rehabilitation of training facilities in three regions.

*Comment 9: - Is the annex 5 completed in the PAD (p.71)?*

**Response:** The Annex has now been completed to include the cost by components.

*Comment 10: Some clarifications will be welcome.*

*- More than half of the project seems to be used for programme coordination and monitoring (the component 3 = $3.2 million).*

**Response:** Only sub-component 3.4 deals with project coordination and M&E. C3.1 and 3.2 aim at producing reliable information, statistical data and analytical works for policy formulation and sector coordination monitoring. The project aims at helping the GoM restore its capacities to get a clear picture and assessment of the agricultural sector performances and natural resources evolution to pilot investments and adjust its policies. Sub-component 3.3 will support key divisions within MinAgri, MinEnv and Min of Livestock in delivering core public services that are critical for productivity increase and natural resources management.

*Comment 11: - UNDP has been instrumental in many SIP projects, providing an added value in term of capacity building and coordination of donors. For this project, please clarify the niche of UNDP. Do they bring any cofinancing? What is the baseline situation on their component. Why there is no cofinancing on their sub-component 3.4.*

**Response:** UNDP’s value-added is seen as supporting the Ministry of Environment in participating actively in the piloting, implementation, supervision and evaluation of project activities. It is expected from UNDP that it will help STP/CIGQE to develop SLWM strategies and toolkits to promote SLWM approaches, disseminate information on available techniques, and to develop capacity building modules for technical staff and producers. At an earlier stage, UNDP Mali office mentioned that UNDP will bring its own specific cofinancing which will be elaborated in their ProDoc to be submitted separately.

C3.4 is now 100% financed by IDA. Other subcomponents are cofinanced but each group of activities has only one source of financing to facilitate legal agreement, financial management and implementation.

*Comment 12: - The Co-financing from EU is classified under "bilateral". Please confirm*

**Response:** The error has been corrected: EU financing that comes through a TF managed by the WB is classified as multilateral.

*Comment 13: Please confirm the cofinancing for each component (e.g. the cofinancing is not enough for the component 3.4 and management costs are too high).*

**Response:** As mentioned above, cofinancing arrangements have been revised and clarified based on comments received from Country Lawyer, Financial management and Disbursement Specialists at Decision Meeting. Revisions have been made to the PM costs which are now funded solely by IDA.

**Annex c: consultants to be hired for the project using gef resources**

**World Bank**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Position Titles*** | ***US$ / person*** | ***Estimated time*** | ***Tasks to be performed*** |
| **For Project Management** | | | |
| ***Local*** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| ***International*** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | | | |
| **For Technical Assistance** |  |  |  |
| ***Local*** |  |  |  |
| CSIF trainers | 1,200  US$/month | 24 months | Design and implement training modules and information session on CSIF for stakeholders and POs |
| SLWM impact assessment | 300  US$/week | 16 weeks | Undertake mid-term and final impact evaluation of SLWM investments |
|  |  |  |  |
| ***International*** |  |  |  |
| CSIF formulation / implementation | 3,500  US$/week | 12 weeks | Provide support to policy makers on CSIF finalization and implementation |
| GIS management | 3,500  US$/week | 36 weeks | Provide support for web-based information system design and maintenance |
| SLWM PO investment designer | 3,500  US$/week | 48 weeks | Provide support to project and APCAM in designing SLWM PO investments |
| SLWM impact assessment | 3,500  US$/week | 16 weeks | Undertake mid-term and final impact evaluation of SLWM investments |
| Justification for Travel, if any:   * Participation in regional and international training or exchange workshop on CSIF formulation and implementation; * South-South exchanges and field visits within Africa or other regions on specific SLWM topics such as system of rice intensification, irrigation water management and savings, etc. | | | |

**Annex d: status of implementation of project preparation activities and the use of funds**

1. **explain if the ppg objective has been achieved through the ppg activities undertaken.**

The PPG objective was to generate specific outputs that will help to guide and finalize full project design. This objective was fully achieved, generated outputs helped to (i) identify project areas of interventions, (ii) define baselines, adapted SLM technics and approaches, (iii) clarify institutional arrangements and stakeholders to be involved, (iv) setup knowledge management tools, (v) identify climate impacts. In addition, the grant was used for stakeholder consultations for the establishment of the SLM programmatic agenda in the country.

1. **describe findings that might affect the project design or any concerns on project implementation, if any:**

N/A

1. **provide detailed funding amount of the ppg activities and their implementation status in the table below:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Project Preparation Activities Approved*** | ***Implementation Status*** | ***GEF Amount ($)*** | | | | ***Co-financing***  ***($)*** |
| ***Amount Approved*** | ***Amount Spent To date (Feb. 2010)*** | ***Amount Committed*** | ***Uncommitted Amount\**** |
| Investment Priorities Identification | Ongoing | 180,000 | 70,100 | 180,000 |  | 100,000 |
| Analysis, Diagnostic and Stocktaking | Ongoing | 120,000 | 50,000 | 120,000 |  | 200,000 |
| Communication and Monitoring and Evaluation System | Ongoing | 80,000 | 10,000 | 80,000 |  | 100,000 |
| Project Sites and Baseline Identification | Ongoing | 70,000 | 10,000 | 70,000 |  | 100,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  | 450,000 | 140,100 | 450,000 | 0 | 500,000 |

1. \* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

**annex e: calendar of expected reflows**

Not applicable

1. Cofinancing of 0.3 m from UNDP – Mali has been included in the CEO Memo in line with the UNDP budgeting in the Prodoc (but is not reflected in the WB PAD). Therefore the total for component 3 appears different to the WB PAD. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. (\*) The total cofinancing and consequently total cost in Table A above differs from Table B, since it does not reflect the IDA PPF refinancing (MUS$0.95) and unallocated resources (MUS$6.05) which are integrated amounts in the total IDA and Govt resources but cannot be allocated by components. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The amount of cofinancing for the PPG is inclusive of the IDA loan as PPF. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. TECC will include directors and heads of the main entities involved in project implementation: Divisions of sector Ministries, APCAM, CNRA and Office du Niger. It will meet once a month under the chairmanship of the CPS director. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *Cellule de Planification et de Statistiques* (Statistics and Planning Unit) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. CRAs: *Chambre Régionale d’Agriculture* – Regional Agricultural Chambers [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <http://ige.nfrance.com/~k1009/jws1/> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Including US$450,000 for project preparation. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. *Petit Périmètre Maraîcher* (Small scale irrigation perimeter for vegetable production) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Baseline: 10 people par farm unit [↑](#footnote-ref-10)