



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

GEF ID:	5746		
Country/Region:	Mali		
Project Title:	Scaling up and Replicating Successful Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Agroforestry Practices in the Koulikoro Region of Mali		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-3; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$1,543,835
Co-financing:	\$7,785,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,528,835
PIF Approval:	May 12, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes	Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	Yes
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	The project is a multifocal area project using the following on STAR resources: LD: \$1,050,800 (+ \$99,826 of fees), CC: \$1,361,000 (+ \$129,295 of fees), BD: \$355,250 (+ \$33,749 of fees), for a total of \$2,767,050 and \$262,870 of fees (\$3,029,920 with fees).	Yes

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>With the PPG (\$100,000 +\$9,500 of fees), the total resources that are requested reach \$3,139,420, under the \$3,140,000 that are still available.</p> <p>Table A: Please note that CC allocations should must be used for CCM objectives. CCA are not eligible under the GEF trust fund, but for the LDCF or SCCF. Please revise the table A.</p> <p>April 30, The budget has been reduced down to a MSP of \$1,543,836 (\$1,690,500 with fees): LD:\$1,050,890, BD: \$320,298; CC (marginal adjustment): \$172,648.</p> <p>A PPG of \$109,500 is also requested.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>3/27/2014 CCM JS Yes. The project has added funding request from CCM focal area. The requested amount (\$1,400,070 â€“ PPG and feed included) is consistent with the remaining CCM allocation for Mali (\$1,540,000).</p> <p>April 30, 2014 Cleared.</p>	Yes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	NA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>With \$3 million of STAR allocations from three different focal areas, we would like to invite UNEP to see if the SFM incentive can be triggered. It might be a way to trigger up to \$1 million of additional resources.</p> <p>March 27, 2014 The project is using \$913,242 (+\$86,758 of fees) from the SFM/REDD+ incentive program (= \$1 million).</p> <p>April 30, 2014 Unfortunately, the project cannot trigger the SFM program anymore.</p>	NA
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>No. Revise the table A according to the comments made in the cell 3. Please revise tables B, D, and E accordingly.</p> <p>Please identify appropriate CCM objectives the project may contribute towards and revise the project design.</p> <p>March 27 The project is developed under LD1, LD3, CCM5, SFM/REDD+2, and BD2 objectives. Addressed.</p> <p>April 30, 2014 The project is developed under LD1, LD3, and BD2 objectives. It is enough at concept stage. The BD resources are limited, but clarifications will be needed at CEO approval about the way to use them. The project is</p>	<p>- Table A: the table should provide the details of GEF funds and cofinancing for each outcome. Please, revise. - Complete the table with the right phrasing from the GEF5 strategies for the outcome LD 3.2, the outputs 3.2 and 3.4. - Same comment for the BD outcome 2.1 and the output 2.</p> <p>June 13, 2016 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		developed under BD2. However the text makes reference to the Baoule Biosphere reserve and management of protected areas. Either the project can deliver on the BD2 objective on mainstreaming or the project can focus on the BD1 objective on protected areas.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	<p>3/12/2014 Please identify Mali's low carbon development strategies and priorities from national communications that the project supports.</p> <p>3/27/2014 Yes. However, it is requested to revise the explanation provided based on the comments summarized below. The proposal describes the priorities set in the country's national communication in different sections of the PIF. Please explain how the project will align with these priorities and contribute towards meeting the mitigation-related goals. Please consolidate, and add the information in the relevant section in the PIF. Please also address the consistency of the project with Mali's recent climate technology needs assessment.</p> <p>4/2/2014 CCM JS Yes. Cleared.</p>	<p>At CEO endorsement, please improve the whole section to better explain how the project fits into the different national strategies that are considered.</p> <p>June 1, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>No. Please include an analysis of baseline projects that leads you to identify the problems the project seeks to address.</p> <p>03/27/2014</p>	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>The description of baseline scenario is not yet sufficient to provide a comprehensive outlook of the situation in the target region. The linkages among unsustainable practices in agriculture, livestock production, forestry, fisheries and gaps in social structures have not been analyzed and discussed. This makes identification of the main driver of greenhouse gases emissions and underlying causes difficult.</p> <p>Description of baseline projects is insufficient to determine the existing gaps and the role the proposed project will play.</p> <p>The project intervention area appears to be the same as that of the recently endorsed GEF-World Bank project (GEF ID 5270) in Mali. Given that the goals and proposed activities of the both projects are very similar, there may be a significant risk of duplication. Please also clarify whether the listed WB-GEF baseline project in the PIF is the same.</p> <p>4/2/2014 CCM JS No. The revision made is appreciated, however the previously requested information is still missing. a) The main drivers of GHG emissions in the region are not prioritized and the underlying causes of GHG emissions are not identified. b)The project only describes unsustainable practices in agriculture, livestock, forestry and fisheries sector in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>a generic fashion. The project vaguely mentions GHG emissions from these sectors, but does not clarify whether it seeks to address all or only some of them.</p> <p>C) It does not clarify the source and scale of the drivers of these emissions (e.g. fuel wood demand).</p> <p>d) The relevance of baseline projects with regard to climate change mitigation has not been clarified. The proposed project does not explain how mitigation issues are addressed in the baseline projects, and what remains to be done to address the existing gaps related to mitigation.</p> <p>Thank you for the information related to the World Bank project. It is understood that the proposed project will be operating in different cercles within the same district as the World Bank project.</p> <p>e) However, the proposal does not clarify why a multiplication of localized activities would enhance replication potential and enable the project outcomes to go beyond local level impact. The merits of simultaneous operations of two very similar projects within the same districts by different agencies are not clarified, nor have potential problems been articulated.</p> <p>April 30, 2014</p> <p>The main problems and the baseline projects are identified. It is acceptable at a concept level. We will expect a more detailed problem analysis during the PPG.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>We cannot review this table and the text for the time being. Please, revise them keeping in mind that the project should also fit CCM and potentially SFM objectives, in addition to LD1, LD3, and BD2 objectives.</p> <p>March 27, 2014 Not yet from the Climate Change Mitigation perspective. The project components consist of a number of activities such as community forest under sustainable management, degraded lands under sustainable land management etc. that may generate carbon benefits. However, it is unclear how the proposed project components address the major causes of GHG emissions adequately. The description of each component is very preliminary and insufficient to understand how mitigation concerns, objectives and activities will be integrated into the proposed activities within each component.</p> <p>Though importance of climate resilience is understood, the direct and prioritized focus on adaptation through component 3 is unclear. It would be more appropriate to put resilience in context of the focal area objectives that the project aims to contribute towards. The importance and relevancy of the inclusion of national carbon monitoring system in the project component is unclear.</p> <p>4/2/2014 CCM JS No. The previous comments are still</p>	<p>The result framework is sound and appropriately detailed.</p> <p>- However, we are not seeing outcomes or activities reflecting the BD Objective 2, outcome 2.1 on sustainably managed landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation, output 2 on national and sub-national plan that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem valuation (fc. table A). Please revise.</p> <p>June 13, 2016 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>applicable. The components are too discrete and involve numerous sectors. This may lead the project to lack focus and may jeopardize achievement of project outcomes.</p> <p>April 30, 2014 The project framework has significantly improved and acceptable at PIF level. At CEO approval, please explain the use of BD resources (BD1 or BD2).</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>to be completed, including CCM and SFM benefits in addition to LD and BD benefits.</p> <p>March 27, 2014 The identified GEB are associated to the restoration of 50,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands, 50,000 ha of pastoral lands, and 10,000 ha of community forests. However, given the unclear baseline scenario/projects, incremental reasoning cannot be substantiated. An estimation of CO2e benefits has not been provided.</p> <p>4/2/2014 CCM JS No. An estimation of CO2e emissions reduction (at least at the tier 1 level) is required at the PIF stage.</p> <p>April 30, 2014 The multiple benefits generated by the improvement of ecosystem services are described. It will be recommended during the PPG to include a monitoring</p>	<p>Not fully. Basically, the GEB are related to the restoration/improvement of ecosystem services coming from 50,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands under SLM and 50,000 ha of pastoral lands. However, what are the BD related GEB? Protection of the Globally Threatened biodiversity from the Boucles du Bahoule KBA? Please, revise this section once the result framework will have been revised (including national and sub-national plan incorporating biodiversity and ecosystem valuation).</p> <p>June 13, 2016 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		programme and appropriate indicators to capture these multiple benefits, and notably the causal relationships between the enhancement of vegetation cover and livelihoods (social and economical benefits), with a particular interest to vulnerable groups.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		For the gender issues, we take note of the disaggregation of data between male and females in the monitoring program. We would like to suggest to add a study on the inequity issues between the sexes. It seems important to better understand this dimension of inequity, to fine-tune some outputs and activities at one point. June 13, 2016 Addressed.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Addressed.	Addressed.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	3/27/2014 No. There is a major risk of duplication with other GEF projects in the country. Please also ensure a comprehensive risk assessment during the PPG. 4/2/2014 CCM JS Please see the comments for section 6. April 30, 2014 Ok at PIF level. Please, include a comprehensive risk analysis at CEO approval.	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Please, at CEO approval, detail the coordination modes with these other initiatives (or new initiatives identified during the PPG).	Addressed.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>3/27/2014 The project potential for replication and scaling up seems limited as currently described. The proposed activities do not identify actions that would enable the climate change mitigation benefits to go beyond the targeted areas and population after the project completion. Once Q6, Q7 and Q8 have been addressed, please add activities to ensure replication and scaling up capacity beyond project completion.</p> <p>4/2/2014 CCM JS No. The comment provided in the earlier review has not been addressed.</p> <p>April 30, 2014 CCM resources are no more committed. The comment is not valid anymore.</p>	Addressed.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Addressed.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Addressed.
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to	Please confirm the cofinancing at CEO approval. If possible, improve it.	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	March 27, 2014 Please review after revision of the result framework. The cofinancing reflects the initiatives in the same area. During PPG, please check there is no double counting with other GEF projects (see SAWAP for instance). Please note that cofinancing can be in kind or in cash, but not both together. You have to provide the breakdown for each line of cofinancing. April 30, 2014 Please, confirm at CEO approval.	Addressed.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The management costs represent 6.14% from the \$2,607,050 used for the technical components. March 27, 2014 The management costs represent 5.16 percent. Please, confirm and justify at CEO endorsement. April 30, 2014 Management costs reach 10 percent. It can be acceptable for a MSP, but please at CEO approval, provide and justify the budget.	Addressed.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the	The PPG amount is in the norm.	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		The LD tracking tools are available. The BD tracking tools are missing. June 13, 2016 Addressed.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Addressed.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The PIF needs to be significantly revised . Please, revise the proposal assigning CCM resources to an eligible GEF5-CCM objective that is appropriate for the country goals. The STAR resources cannot finance adaptation. In addition, we would like to invite the Agency to explore the opportunity to use the SFM incentive program. Around \$3 million of STAR resources are used: if you focus the project on SFM and agroforestry, it might be possible to trigger up to \$1 million from the SFM/REDD+ program.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>March 27, 2014 Not yet from the Climate Change Mitigation perspective. Please address the remaining comments.</p> <p>4/2/2014 CCM JS</p> <p>The PIF cannot be technically cleared as presented. The comments provided on March 27, 2014 have not been adequately addressed. Please see sections 6, 7, 8, 11 and 13.</p> <p>The agency is requested to contact the GEFSec to discuss the feasibility of revising the concept as a Medium Sized Project (MSP).</p> <p>April 30, 2014 The PIF is recommended for approval. Please, see the items in the cell 25 to consider at CEO approval.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Please address the following points at CEO approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify the BD objective (BD1 or BD2). - Provide a detailed problem analysis and quantification. - Include a comprehensive risk analysis. - Detail the Monitoring & Evaluation Program. - Please, include appropriate indicators to capture the multiple benefits, and notably the causal relationships between the enhancement of vegetation cover and livelihoods (social and economical benefits), with a particular interest to vulnerable groups. 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detail the coordination modes with other initiatives (or new initiatives identified during the PPG). - Confirm the cofinancing at CEO approval 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>Not yet. please, address the points above.</p> <p>June 13, 2016 Thanks for the revised project package: the project is recommended for CEO approval.</p>
	First review*	March 11, 2014	June 01, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2014	June 13, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 04, 2014	

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