



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9293		
Country/Region:	Mali		
Project Title:	Scaling up a Multiple Benefits Approach to Enhance Resilience in Agro- and Forest Landscapes of Mali's Sahel Regions (Kayes, Koulikoro and SÃ©gou)		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-2; CW-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$8,605,023
Co-financing:	\$60,208,841	Total Project Cost:	\$68,813,864
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Fatoumata Diallo

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	8/18/2015 - Not completed at this time. The project is not eligible under the selected CW focal area objectives CW1, Program 1 and CW2, Program 6. POPs are considered under CW-2 Program 3. Please, revise.  - The other GEF6 strategic objectives are relevant: LD1 Program 1, LD3	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Program 4, CCM2 Program 4, SFM-2.</p> <p>February 10, 2016 The CCM2/program 4 finances LULUCF activities. The AVN sub-component cannot be developed under such program. You should select another CCM program and adjust (reduce) the SFM incentive accordingly.</p> <p>March 28, 2016 - Table A: There is a misunderstanding: the CCM2/program 4 should have been reduced of the amount used for the AVN sub-component, but most of the CCM resources should still be used under the CCM2/program 4. This is the way to trigger the SFM incentive. Based on our understanding of the budget, the CCM resources (\$2,335,321) should be divided under CCM2/Program4 (\$1,467,890) and CCM1/Program 1 (\$ 867,431). With \$2,652,294 from LD and \$1,467,890 from CCM2/Program4, the project can eventually trigger up to \$2,060,092 from the SFM programme. Please revise.</p> <p>- Table A: There is a problem of</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>rounding up in the cofinancing column . The total (60,208,841) does not exactly match with the breakdown (60,208,842). Please, revise this difference of 1 dollar.</p> <p>- Please, note that this problem is also present in the table B for cofinancing, as well as in the table D for the Agency fees.</p> <p>March 29, 2016</p> <p>- After internal consultations, and exchanges with AfDB, we agreed on the following simplification: all CCM resources will be assigned under CCM2/Program 4.</p> <p>- The SFM resources will however stay at the same level. The ratio STAR/SFM of 2:1 is used without the CCM resources assigned to the AVN sub-component.</p> <p>- Please, note that the project grant is now under \$10 million, please, check the level of fees accordingly for the project and the PPG (9%).</p> <p>March 31, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>8/18/2015: YES. cf. PIF, p.22. The project is consistent with Mali's national strategies and plans under UNFCCC, UNCCD, and the Stockholm Convention. The</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>project was identified as a main priority for Mali at the NPFE (June 25-26, 2015). The project fits with the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategic Framework (GPRSF, 2012-2017) and other national policies and plans (agriculture, food security, strategic investment framework for SLM, etc.).</p> <p>cleared.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>08/19/2015 Not completed at this time.</p> <p>The PIF indicated that "Various factors account for the Sahel's environmental crisis, particularly the combined effects of population growth, reduced and erratic rainfall, and inappropriate policies and practices that have contributed to a deterioration of agro-ecosystems." Please articulate which drivers of global environmental degradation will be addressed in through this project, and how this project will resolve the issues of "Severe food crises resulting from periodic drought, poor harvests, ... and generally fragile ecosystems."</p> <p>For the section related to innovation,</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>please consider adding a few sentences showing that this project will integrate LD, CCM, SFM and CW components into a landscape/territory approach to generate multiple global environment benefits.</p> <p>Sustainability: Please write one paragraph to justify how this approach will continue once the project will have closed.</p> <p>Scaling-up: Please include a paragraph to show how the activities and policies from this project will be replicated and up-scaled in the country or in the region.</p> <p>Market transformation: Please write one paragraph to show how this project will lead Mali to low-carbon, high forest coverage, low-chemicals, and low land degradation economy.</p> <p>February 10, 2016                      - The part on the drivers has improved (4 pages long!), but the information is diluted with too many information. We recommend to write shorter sections, but more focused. A concept is supposed to be 10 page long: This PIF is 27 page long and the information is somehow difficult to</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>find.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the project justification (sections 1, 2, and 3 on the identification of problems, the description of baseline projects, and the incremental reasoning), you should better highlight the interlinkages between the different problems and the solutions related to SLM, SFM, CCM, CW, and housing issues in a rural environment. The innovative aspect of this project is the tentative to propose an integrated solution responding to multiple problems. But this tentative is not really highlighted and the project looks like an addition of independent activities.</li> <li>- We suggest to reinforce the notion of integration in the project and the science behind this concept. You should propose a definition of the landscape approach that will help you in restructuring the reasoning and the result framework (see Sayer et al., 2013; Denier et al., 2015, for instance). A clear definition and a method should help in developing a better reasoning and offer comprehensive solutions (including institutional aspects, decision making systems, sustainability, etc). For the time being, we are seeing more four independent set of activities (SLM, SFM, AVN, and CW) rather than an</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>integrated landscape approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We can understand the potential for innovation and scaling up. The word "sustainability" is used a certain number of times, but we do not understand how the project is tackling sustainability issues. We invite the Agency to rewrite the section 6 and provide clear sections on how "sustainability", "innovation", and "scaling up" are taken into account.</li> <li>- The project is proposing a set of capacity building activities and investments. Please explain the sustainability of the project approach. If you cannot, maybe the project strategy should be revised (with less micro-projects for instance, as sustainability is very challenging to demonstrate).</li> </ul> <p>March 28, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>08/19/2015 Not completed at this time.</p> <p>cf. PIF p.15, 16 &amp; 17: Yes, there is an incremental reasoning. The baseline scenario is provided by the P2RS (\$51 million, including a grant from AfDB of \$25 million), the government (\$7.7 million) and beneficiaries (\$1.2 million). GEF resources will complete on-the-ground activities and align the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>project to the GEF2020 vision (scaling up, integration, resilience, sustainability).</p> <p>However, please, present two scenarios (with the GEF and without the GEF), and provide more information and details on the estimations of the Global Environment Benefits.</p> <p>February 10, 2016                      The acceptable and quantifiable GEB are: 5,000 ha under SLM, 2,000 ha under pastoral rangeland management, 5,000 ha of better carbon storage through SFM, avoided GHG emissions of 150,000 tons, 2g TEQ p.a. decline in dioxine and furans emissions (the metrics will be refined at CEO endorsement). The sub-component on the Nubian Vault should lead to additional 350,000 tons of CO2 reduction (to be confirmed). Other local and secondary benefits should come after this response...</p> <p>The point is addressed (but the text could be reordered and shortened). See also item 8.</p> <p>March 28, 2016                      The incremental reasoning is easier to capture, while the PIF is still long.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Please see the item on carbon reasoning below.</p> <p>March 29, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>08/19/2015 Not completed at this time.</p> <p>- Once Table A is updated, please adjust accordingly the breakdown of resources in Table B.</p> <p>- Please, check the breakdown of resources for the different focal areas in the different tables (Table A, B, D, and E). And check if the information is coherent.</p> <p>- It is unclear whether the entire project consists of Technical Assistance components, as specified in Table B, or whether concrete investments are foreseen as part of the project. In particular, under Component 3, the demonstration and piloting of municipal waste management to eliminate uPOPs may benefit from inclusion of investment aspects. Please clarify whether, and if so, how, concrete investments are foreseen as part of the project.</p> <p>- Related thereto, it is not clear whether any co-financing is foreseen</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>for Component 3 targeting CW objectives. Please clarify if co-financing is foreseen for this component. If not, please present the reasons. In particular for investment activities, it would be advantageous to attract co-financing to enhance the financial sustainability of the project beyond project completion and to increase reach of the project.</p> <p>- The outputs related to CW are too broad and beyond the GEF strategy. The GEF can only support if chemicals are POPs &amp; mercury. The GEFSEC staff is available to discuss further the selection and reformulation of eligible CW outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>February 10, 2016</p> <p>- General comment: in the pages 12-15, we would like to invite you to focus on the demonstration of the GEF added value (meaning, how the GEF will complete the baseline and cofinancing activities) - it is not useful to repeat generalities, problems, and other statements already made earlier.</p> <p>- Many outputs are technical result oriented. However, we do not see the "glue" between the different outcomes and outputs. We do not see how these</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>different technical outputs are coherent in a landscape approach and what the difference is with a sectoral project (no outputs related to institutional changes, platforms, planning, capacity building, etc).</p> <p>Component 1:                      - At CEO endorsement, be more specific on the nature of SLM and Climate Smart Agriculture activities (outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3).                      - Without more explanation, the outputs 1.2.1 and 1.1.2 should preferentially be taken by cofinancing.</p> <p>Component 2:                      - If the outputs under the second component focus on scaling up SFM techniques, they are most welcome. However, we need better understanding of the role of the \$20 million of cofinancing. Please, clarify.</p> <p>Component 3                      - Activity 3.1.4 and 3.2.1 will produce primarily national benefit and should be supported by co-financing. Please clarify in the PIF.                      - POPs monitoring discussed in page 15 has been already supported by the GEF/UNEP project "Continuing Regional Support for the POPs Global</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Monitoring Plan under the Stockholm Convention in the Africa Region (ID 4886). Also this monitoring project is not discussed in page 24 of 5.</p> <p>Coordination. Please revise page 15 and page 24 of the PIF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page 19 discusses that "the project will strengthen regulatory measures, institutional and technical capabilities", but regulatory measures and institutional capacity have been supported by the GEF/UNEP project (ID3969), and the proposed project doesn't have relevant activities. Please revise the PIF so that coordination among two project will be implemented effectively.</li> </ul> <p>March 28, 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In practice, it is recommended to number the outputs, as it will be easier to compare at CEO endorsement. Please, number the outputs (1.1.1, 1.2.1, etc).</li> </ul> <p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include "# of" to quantify the output 2.1.3 related to "small investments in rural hydro-agricultural infrastructures.</li> <li>- Include "# of" to quantify the output 2.3.3. "innovative technologies for waste valorization.</li> <li>- Include "# of" to quantify the output</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>2.3.4. "initiatives to reduce, reuse and recycle solid wastes".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please remove the mention "incremental measures" for the outputs 2.2.3 and 2.3.1, be more specific specifying "1 rural habitat program in 10 communities based on the NV technology... and "3 pilot composting units".</li> </ul> <p>Component 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include "# of" to quantify the output 3.1.1 "# of tools for spatial planning...".</li> <li>- Please make the text describing the component 2 coherent with the description of Global Environment Benefits, notably in terms of SFM. In the text, p13, you mention "rehabilitation of wooded landscapes, improvement of forest management, defense of remaining forest ecosystems, SFM, agroforestry, reforestation by woodlots, ANR, community forestry"...</li> <li>In the section 5 on GEB, p18, you mention 14,000 ha under SLM, avoided deforestation and forest degradation, enhanced carbon stock through SFM, restoration, agroforestry - 7,000 ha, with 15,000 metric tons of avoided GHG emissions....</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Please refer to the carbon calculation method proposed in the following GEF publication:  <a href="https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/LULUCF%20brochure_web_version%20%281%29.pdf">https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/LULUCF%20brochure_web_version%20%281%29.pdf</a>                      We need to understand the baseline situation, the expected results, and how you will change the situation by forest protection, SFM, and/or reforestation. Depending on the targeted areas (in ha) and depending on the vegetation cover, you should make the demonstration on how you will gain in carbon storage and/or avoided deforestation.</p> <p>March 29, 2016                      Please, consider to use during the PPG an accepted methodology and tool for carbon calculation, as EXACT from FAO for instance. For the time being, please, check the references about forests in Mali (see for instance, <a href="http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1757e/i1757e.pdf">http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1757e/i1757e.pdf</a>). Please, develop a more conservative scenario for 1) avoided deforestation, 2) SFM, and 3) Reforestation.</p> <p>March 31, 2016                      Addressed.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Thanks to also have addressed complementary comments on CW.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	08/19/2015 Yes, p18. At CEO endorsement, confirm the role of CSO, NGO, farmer organizations, local communities, officials and authorities.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>8/18/2015, Not at this time. Please, revise the STAR and SFM amounts according to breakdown included the letter of endorsement.</p> <p>All STAR allocations are available, including \$3 million from CCM and \$4.06 million from LD.</p> <p>February 10, 2016 Not addressed for CCM and LD. Please, revise.</p> <p>March 28, 2016 - Please revise the table A (breakdown between CCM1/program1 and CCM2/Program4).</p> <p>- Please, note that the project grant is \$9.7 million: the PPG should be under \$200,000. No discussion took place with the GEF Secretariat to justify an</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		exception.  March 29, 2016 Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>8/18/2015, Not at this time.</p> <p>According to the letter of endorsement, For CW, up to \$2,652,294 can be assigned to the technical components and this amount should be reflected in Table A (actually the breakdown is right in Tables D and E). For LD, \$2,652,294 can be assigned to the technical components and this amount should be reflected in Table A. For CCM, \$2,335,321 can be assigned to the technical components and this amount should be reflected in Table A.</p> <p>February 10, 2016 - Not fully addressed: please check and switch the amounts for LD and CCM. - Same comment for the PPG: switch the LD and CCM amounts.</p> <p>March 29, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>8/18/2015 Yes. According to the letter of endorsement, for SFM, \$2,518,807 can be assigned to the technical components and this amount should be reflected in Table A.</p> <p>February 10, 2016 The SFM incentive cannot be triggered by CCM resources used for buildings (AVN) and should be adjusted (reduced) accordingly.</p> <p>March 28, 2016 The project is asking for \$2,060,091 from the SFM program. You should demonstrate that at least the double is provided by LD and CCM2/Program4.</p> <p>March 29, 2016 Addressed.</p> <p>March 31, 2016 At the time we are closing this review, the SFM resources cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>July 12, 2016 The SFM resources should be reduced down to \$1 million in the project</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>grant (total SFM: project grant of \$1,000,000, fees of 9.5% = \$95,000, no SFM for PPG). Please, submit a PIF with the revised numbers. The PIF will be recommended for clearance.</p> <p>July 14, 2016 Reductions have been made.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>08/18/2015 Not yet, please revise the document according to the review above, especially Boxes: 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</p> <p>Please also consider estimating consequential or indirect benefit of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions from this project. The PIF shows that the project will use more than \$2 million CCM resources but only mitigate 150,000 tonnes of CO2. This generates a ratio of \$133/tonne of CO2 reduction, which is not acceptable.</p> <p>February 10, 2016 Not yet. Please address the items 1, 3, 5, 7 (and 4 eventually) and check the last version of the PIF template (<a href="https://www.thegef.org/gef/guidelines_templates">https://www.thegef.org/gef/guidelines_templates</a>).</p> <p>The methodology, assumptions, and parameters used to estimate GHG</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>reduction are also not clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project states that the avoided deforestation and SFM will reduce 150,000 tCO<sub>2</sub> over 5,000 ha. Please, explain the reasoning (assumptions, types of natural habitats, types of practices, % of deforestation avoided). You should explain the initial and final states of the managed ecosystems and the calculation also for indirect benefits. We understand that the metrics can be estimated roughly at PIF level, but the reasoning should be clear.</li> <li>- You also have to use an internationally accepted methodology or model. We are not sure that the AVN method is an international one. Either, use an internationally accepted methodology and model, or compare the AVN method with an accepted method and justify the AVN method.</li> <li>- The project mentions also "350,000 CO<sub>2</sub> reduction by 2020", without units and without calculation. Please, clarify.</li> </ul> <p>March 28, 2016 The PIF has significantly improved, but cannot be recommended yet. Please, see the comments above.</p> <p>The methodology, assumptions, and parameters used to estimate GHG</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>reduction are also not clear for the SFM part. It is OK for the AVN activities at PIF level. See also the comment made in the cell 5 on the carbon reasoning and the GEB.</p> <p>March 29, 2016 Thanks for your revisions. Please, revise the carbon reasoning, using a more conservative estimation. Assign all the CCM resources to the CCM2/Program4.</p> <p>March 31, 2016 All points have been addressed. We thank the Agency for the prompt revision and are pleased to recommend it for technical clearance. Please, note that the SFM resources cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>July 14, 2016 Requested reductions have been made. The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance. Please, note that the SFM resources cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>August 24, 2016 A revised document was sent with reduced SFM and reduced project management costs. The project is recommended for technically clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 19, 2015	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 10, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 28, 2016	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

# CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		