

## Climate security and sustainable management of natural resources in the central regions of Mali for peacebuilding

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10687

**Countries**

Mali

**Project Title**

Climate security and sustainable management of natural resources in the central regions of Mali for peacebuilding

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNDP

**Agency ID**

UNDP: 6317

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**

Katya Kuang-Idba

# PIF

## Part I – Project Informatic

### Focal area elements

#### 1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 -

GEFTF

- This project proposes \$2,589,726 under the LD2.5 on LDN: The LD2.5 objective was designed to highlight the importance of the enabling environment for LDN. In average, projects assigned a few hundred of thousands for these activities, and the field interventions are assigned to either SLM (LD 1.1), SFM (LD.1.2), restoration (LD1.3), or integrated approaches (LD.1.4). Please, revise accordingly.

LDCF

Yes

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - The table A is corrected. Addressed.

However, the changes should also be reflected in the section 4) about the alignment of the project under GEF7 LD strategies: please insert a text to justify the project under the LD.1.1 objective (SLM), LD1.3 (restoration), and LD1.4 (integration). The justification under the LD2.5 objective about the enabling environment for LDN and SLM is provided. Please, complete.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - Cleared.

##### Agency Response

21 October 2020

Table A has now been adjusted to break down the LD focal area funding as follows:

- LD-1-1 Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through Sustainable Land

Management (SLM): \$1,680,000

- LD-1-4 Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape: \$489,726
  - LD-2-5 Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN: \$420,000
- Changes made in the revised PIF are shown in yellow highlight.

#### **UNDP Response 28 October 2020 to GEFSEC comment (10/27/2020)**

More details were provided in the PIF under section 4) about the alignment of the project under the 3 LD objectives listed. *"The project directly addresses the objective of GEF Trust Fund Land Degradation of the LD focal area strategy: (i) Objective 1.1 Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through Sustainable Land Management (SLM). As part of the activities under component 2, the project will directly support agroecosystem services through improved SLM, such as the greening of farmlands (output 2.2) as well as communal restoration work in grass/shrubland and wetlands (output 2.4), participating to the achievement of LD-1-1; (ii) Objective 1.4 Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape. With the improvement of natural resources management through the set up of community committees (output 2.1), as well as capacity building activities to disseminate the adoption of improved agricultural practices that are less resources-intensive or harmful to the ecosystem (components 2, 3 and 4), the project will be supporting the achievement of LD-1-4. And (iii) Objective 2.5 Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN of the LD focal area strategy. As shown in the STAP LDN guidelines, put simply, the goal of LDN is to maintain or increase the amount of healthy and productive land. The project aims to create an enabling environment for this to happen – focusing on intragovernmental coordination for MEA implementation and spatial monitoring, natural resource governance at local level, and systemic interventions to reduce degradation and desertification, and restore ecosystem productivity (land, water, grazing) (LD-2-5)."*

#### **Indicative project/program description summary**

### **2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Clarifications requested. A number of these outputs are written as outcomes. Outputs should be easily measurable against the project's intended achievement or impact (outcomes).

GEFTF

Please, refer to the OECD glossary on result based management to revise the formulation of outputs (<https://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/2754804.pdf>), especially the outputs: 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 3.1: they are expressed as outcomes/consequences, do not reflect the value for money of activities, and are not quantified. Please, revise.

LDCF

For example, outputs 2.2 and 2.3 -- the technical and financial support will be provided through... trainings? programs? Please be specific and keep it simple. Land and water resources to be restored -- this will be a result of what measurable deliverable? A pilot? Please clarify the basic structure of the project in Table B.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Cleared for this stage of project development.

## Agency Response

21 October 2020

The following outputs have now been reworded, in accordance with the guidance provided, to read as follows:

- Output 1.1: *Action plan for achieving and monitoring targets for Land Degradation Neutrality* (GEFTF)
- Output 1.2: *Regional biennial climate risk and vulnerability assessments and maps developed, with an application of security sensitivity framework* (LDCF)
- The old Output 2.2 now adjusted (because of additional LDCF funding of \$1,5 million allocated by Government – please see revised LOE) to be two separate outputs:
  - Output 2.2: *Training and inputs provided to farmers in 9-12 target communes in Mopti for greening of farmlands* (GEFTF)
  - Output 2.3 *Capacity development programme for climate-smart agriculture delivered to farm households in target communes* (LDCF)
  - Output 2.4: *Communal restoration work undertaken over 21,000 hectares of degraded grass/shrubland and wetlands* (LDCF)
  - Output 3.1: *New cooperative climate-smart businesses established involving women, youth and displaced people* (LDCF)

## Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Not clear, more information requested. Is the table in the baseline section with 8 entries meant to reflect the entries listed as co-financing in Table C? If so, this table is incomplete. Please provide all co-financing initiatives on this table, with a brief summary of the specific activities financed by each initiative. Some of the existing entries contain enough information, others need more specificity, for example "Aims to improve the provision of farms and agri-based enterprises in rural areas with financial services adapted to their business models" is not sufficient information to capture the baseline co-financing.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - This is cleared for this stage of project development.

## Agency Response

21 October 2020:

Thank you for this comment. More detail has now been provided on the indicative co-finance, as requested. Also, although this project is both GEFTF and LDCF-funded, we have adjusted the PIF to follow the specific requirements for LDCF - in the way baseline projects and co-finance are reflected - and trust this will not be incompatible with the GEFTF requirements. In terms of donor projects, there are two baseline projects, not dealing with climate change adaptation, which can contribute co-finance to the project (Netherlands and a new one – USAID) and will become more climate-smart as a result (See Table 1). Then there are five additional projects that *are* dealing with climate change adaptation (so not reflected as part of the baseline scenario without adaptation), which can also provide co-finance to the project and help meet its adaptation and sustainable land management objectives. These have now been discussed in the section of the document on the alternative scenario with the project. Other related initiatives that are neither baseline projects nor co-finance are shown in separate tables – these are projects with which coordination is important (current ones) or from which lessons can be learnt (recent ones).

Note: The indicative co-finance figure total from the Government of Canada is made up of all or part of three separate initiatives, which is why the numbers at first glance may not appear to tally. The public sector co-finance has now also been included in the baseline table for clarity, with more information provided. The new project to be funded by the German Government on “Promotion of agricultural finance for agri-based enterprises in rural areas” has been removed, since insufficient information is currently available.

## GEF Resource Availability

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Yes.

**Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA**

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA**

**Agency Response**

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion GEFSEC< 10/8/2020 - Yes Mali still has resources under the current \$10 million access cap for LDCF.**

**Agency Response**

21 October 2020

21 October 2020

Noted

### **The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

### **Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

### **Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

### **Project Preparation Grant**

## Project Preparation Grant

### 5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/22/2020 - Yes.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Apologies, there was an oversight. Regarding the PPG, in light of COVID restrictions and potential travel limitations, wouldn't the PPG cost be, in fact lower? Please provide further information on what exactly the extra money will be used for and/or an indicative budget. Otherwise the Secretariat is generally not inclined to approve exceptions on this matter, but because of the security situation in Mali it may be considered with ample justification.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - The Secretariat cannot agree to an increased PPG fee. Please adjust the PPG request accordingly.

GEFSEC, 11/2/2020 - Cleared.

#### Agency Response

##### UNDP Response 30 October 2020 to GEFSEC comment (10/29/2020)

- The amount has been adjusted to US\$250,000 of PPG (US\$100,000 for GEFTF and US\$150,000 for LDCF)
- The PMC co-financing contribution was increased to US\$1,400,000 to represent 5% of total co-financing.

##### UNDP Response 28 October 2020 to GEFSEC comment (10/27/2020)

The additional resources were requested to provide for in-depth assessments, in particular Environmental and Social assessments due to the security situation in Mopti. The PPG phase will need to be very cautious about the risks leading to an intensification of the conflicts, insecurity and causes of tension. Even though international travel are likely to be reduced in the context of COVID-19, leading to cost savings, the cross-cutting nature of the project (LD and CCA), as well as the insecurity in the targeted areas, will lead to the need for (i) additional assessments and (ii) possibly costly alternative arrangements to collect the information (ie. working with organizations already involved in the field, including the MINUSMA). The assessments will require an ESMF to be prepared during the PPG phase to lay the foundation for an ESIA and ESMP. This ESMF will be developed following FPIC methodology and will include a detailed risk analysis in relation to natural resource management agreements. An agro-socio-ecological expert with local knowledge will feed in recommendations to mitigate the risk of inadvertently fueling existing conflicts at local level between particular pastoralist and farming communities, including detail on the project Grievance Redress Mechanism building on customary mechanisms and arrangements.



detail on the project grievance redress mechanism, building on customary mechanisms and arrangements.

A Security Plan will be developed in the PPG to ensure that measures are in place to protect project staff operating in the field. The UNDP Country Office will support the PPG consultant team to conduct regular assessments of the security situation (and COVID-19 pandemic impacts) in the country, and in Mopti Region, and to put in place appropriate measures, based on the Plan, to ensure the safety of all stakeholders involved in project design and implementation.

In addition, given the disproportionate impacts of insecurity on women, a gender and social inclusion expert with local knowledge will conduct a detailed Gender Analysis outlining and explaining gender inequalities, and the complex legal, cultural and religious constraints on women's participation, and draw up a Gender Action Plan to help overcome these, that is fully integrated into the detailed project design from the start.

The ESMF to be prepared during the PPG phase will also include a detailed risk analysis in relation to natural resource management agreements (including wetlands), and an agro-socio-ecological expert with local knowledge will feed in detailed recommendations to mitigate the risk of inadvertently fueling existing conflicts at local level, especially between pastoralist and farming communities. This includes proposing protocols for community natural resource management committees to develop their capacity, involve women, build on customary mechanisms, undertake negotiations, conclude verbal and written agreements (based on accessible maps) oversee enforcement of agreements, and resolve disputes.

More details on the studies needed to adequately respond to the risks incurred by the security situation in Mali are outlined in the SESP, attached as annex E to the PIF.

## Core indicators

### 6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - The LDCF has its own worksheet for core indicators and metadata, which was circulated to agencies following the adaptation task force meeting in April 2019. Please submit the adaptation core indicators on the roadmap.

GEFSEC, 10/22/2020 - There is no Annex B in the PIF on the roadmap. LDCF Core Indicators are still missing, as is the ToC.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - This is cleared.

### **Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

The LDCF worksheet has now been completed and added as Additional Annex B to the revised PIF.

### **UNDP Response 28 October 2020 to GEFSEC comment (10/22/2020)**

The LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators and Metadata spreadsheet and ToC are now uploaded

## **Project/Program taxonomy**

### **7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion GEFSEC< 10/8/2020 - Yes.

### **Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

Noted

## **Part II – Project Justification**

### **1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/22/2020 - Are there any specific climate information or projections downscaled for the Mopti region? The geo-referenced maps show some climate data, but can this be integrated into the barriers section? Repeat comment, due to portal, it did not seem to show in the last round of comments.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Please address. The only climate information seems to be from Mali's 3rd NC. Please provide some additional regional and context specific information regarding climate scenarios in this region. Pls check: <https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/>

GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - Cleared, thank you.

## Agency Response

### UNDP Response 28 October 2020 to GEFSEC comment (10/27/2020)

Climate information from a range of sources were provided (NAPA, historical data from Mali's meteorological services, 3<sup>rd</sup> NC, IPCC WG report on regional climate projections, research papers and USAID Mali Climate Vulnerability mapping). More information on projections is now available, based on the recent Mali Climate risk profile (BMZ, GIZ, KfW and PIK) as well as the climate knowledge portal of the World Bank. *"The recently submitted Mali Climate Risk profile confirms the increase in evapotranspiration (according to RCP6.0, evapotranspiration will increase by 2.4% by 2030, 3.7% by 2050 and 7% by 2070), as well as the decrease in soil moisture (-3.7% by 2080 according to RCP6.0). (...) The Mali Climate Risk profile report also identifies the risks climate change poses on water resources and agriculture sectors. The report projects an expected reduction in water availability per capita of 77% by 2080 (RCP2.6 and RCP6.0), taking into account the projected population growth. In addition, harvests of important crops such as Maize (-13%), Millet and Sorghum (-12%) and peanuts (-7%) are expected to decrease by 2080 (RCP6.0). The unreliability of rainfall during the rainy season (June-September) is also projected to increase by 2080-2099, with projected changes between -51mm to +37mm in July, -38mm to +88mm in August and -25 to +88mm in August, significantly impacting the risks of flood."*

## 2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Clarifications requested.

- The GGW Is mentioned in the baseline section - please elaborate on how this project will coordinate with the GGW?

- Please refer to the comment on co-financing. As part the baseline scenario, please also describe in more detail the 11 entries in Table C and exactly what is being financed there.

GEFSEC, 10/22/2020 - Thank you for the clarification. Please confirm that this project does not intend to coordinate directly with any GGW ongoing or burgeoning GGW interventions?

GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - This is cleared, thank you.

## **Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

More detail has been provided on the co-finance, both baseline co-finance (not dealing with climate change adaptation) and additional co-finance (supporting the project's adaptation and SLM objectives). The document has been adjusted to make it clear that none of the projects identified as baseline projects or as indicative co-finance to the project are explicitly linked to the Great Green Wall. The discussion of the Great Green Wall as an umbrella movement in which Mali participates has been moved further down in the document to make this clear.

### **UNDP Response 28 October 2020 to GEFSEC comment (10/22/2020)**

UNDP confirms there is no current plan to coordinate with the GGW initiative as there is no relevant ongoing or burgeoning GGW intervention in the Mopti region at the time of writing this PIF. However, during the PPG phase, UNDP will provide specific attention to upcoming initiatives and potential for partnering and coordinating.

## **3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020

GEFTF

- - With the information provided in the proposed PIF and the current complex situation in Mali, the reasoning is severely disputable and it is difficult to agree on the proposed reasoning: We are not sure it is the right timing to invest on inter-ministerial coordination while there are only a transition government and this status of uncertainty may last a certain time. We propose to revise the proposal along the following proposals:
  - o There is a robust LDCF and GEF project portfolio on adaptation and SLM in the southern and central regions of Mali: Kayes, Koulikoro, Segou, and Mopti. Most of these projects have tested and piloted integrated approaches and multi-stakeholder platforms at various levels. We want to see an analysis of

these projects before anything else.

- o See for instance the portfolio developed by FAO, UNDP, AfDB, and UNEP with the #10362, #9293, #9661, #5746. Please, pay particular attention on the lessons from the ground about local governance, integrated management and multi-stakeholder platforms. See also the Moringa Agroforestry fund (NGI, GEFID 9050), which was able in 2020 to work with 3,000 smallholder farmers on SLM and produce 4,000 tons of mango puree in a region affected by violence.
- o All these projects show that solutions should be searched on the ground, with local stakeholders including farmers and the private sector, and less at national level in the current context. Please, revise.

#### LDCF

- The project is centered around climate security and more sustainable NRM for "peacebuilding" in conflict affected zones in Mali, but there does not seem to be any conflict analysis or reference to a conflict analysis that will be done at PPG.
- Please refer to and integrate principles relating to conflict sensitive adaptation. In conflict affected situations, a do no harm approach is not always sufficient.
- The project title contains the term climate security, but the only activities relating to climate security seem to be KM related and coming out of a GEFTF-financed component. Some activities financed under the LDCF portion of component 2 seem to support activities that build community resilience and climate security and refer to building resilience to conflict -- how do these specific activities increase the resilience to conflict? Furthermore, they should be increasing the resilience of these communities and individual to climate change, so the "conflict" should be climate related. Please consider reframing some of these activities.
- Some of the activities under what is currently written as output 3.2 do not seem to be eligible for LDCF financing. Please revisit these activities and ensure they are relating to adaptation activities - particularly those relating to solar PV and the cookstoves.
- Lastly, how does the third component link with the first two?

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 -

#### GEFTF

- OK for the lessons from the GEF and LDCF portfolio at PIF level. To be elaborated at CEO endorsement
- OK for the focus on local level (and much less focus on the national level). Addressed at PIF level. To be elaborated at CEO endorsement.
- 
- LDCF
- Thank you for the detailed information. Cleared except for the following text:
  - - *mini-grid solar PV to supply secondary processing of climate-smart agriculture and aquaculture products (as well as providing more reliable sources of energy/access to energy for off-grid areas)*
  - *training for manufacture of fuel-efficient cookstoves (metal parts, combined with earth) that use less wood and take pressure off harvesting trees from regenerating woodlands and farms*

- *manufacture of biomass-based fuel briquettes*<sup>[5]</sup> (e.g. rice husks)<sup>[6]</sup> to supply fuel-efficient cookstoves and take pressure off harvesting trees from regenerating woodlands and farms

The logic and rationale are clear, but they should be reframed in a way that decreases emphasis on the fuel-efficiency of cookstoves, and rather on household resilience by diversification raw materials. Please delete references to fuel and cookstoves from the PIF, and reframe it in a different way.

- GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - This is cleared, thank you

- 

## Agency Response

### Comment 1: Interministerial coordination and political risk

Thank you for these important comments, which have been taken into account in the restructuring and resourcing of Component 1 in the revised PIF (see Table B and component outline). In order to use the project to make some progress towards implementation of Land Degradation Neutrality, whilst not risking failure, the following adjustments are proposed:

- Removing Output 1.2 which relies on inter-ministerial coordination and investment in IT infrastructure at a very uncertain time
- Maintaining Outputs 1.1 and 1.3 (the latter now numbered 1.2) but focusing these onto concrete outputs, and placing an independent research institute in the lead – the Mali Geographic Institute (IGM) and the Institute of Rural Economy (IER) respectively.

The Mali Geographic Institute (IGM) is in charge of the production, maintenance and diffusion of geographic reference information in Mali, including on land cover, land use and land degradation. The Institute of Rural Economy (IER) is the main research institution in Mali for the implementation of the national agricultural research policy, covering all of Mali's agro-ecological zones and addressing climate change adaptation.

### Comment 2/3/4: Learning from LDCF and GEF portfolio - solutions on the ground

The portfolio of LDCF and GEF projects on adaptation and SLM in the southern and central regions of Mali does indeed indicate the value of on-the-ground interventions in the Mali context and the importance of local solutions. These projects have now been more thoroughly reviewed and analyzed for the lessons they provide from the ground about local governance, integrated management, and multi-stakeholder platforms, and a set of recommendations has been made for the PPG phase in Additional Annex C Lessons from LDCF and GEF Projects.

An overall shift in emphasis away from the national scale has also been made, as described above. The share of funds for national and regional activities has now dropped from 13% of the total GEFTF/LDCF funds in the previous version of the PIF, to 6,5% of the total in the revised version (see Table B).

### Comment 5/6/7: Showing how project builds resilience to climate-induced conflict

The section on the root causes of challenges has been strengthened, drawing on material from the Social and Environmental Screening on security risk management, in order to:

- show the analysis of the security situation already conducted, and the plans for the PPG phase
- show how peace-building permeates the entire project logic (also see ToC) in the context of conflict over scarce natural resources, dwindling further as a result of climate change impacts compounding human-induced degradation.
- make clearer the logic around how building resilience to climate change is also building resilience to *climate-related* conflict.

### Comment 8/9: Component logic and relevance of solar power and fuel-efficient cookstoves for adaptation:

-

Major anticipated climate change effects in Mopti Region are: (i) increased temperatures and consequent increased evapotranspiration; (ii) increased inter-annual variability in rainfall, and more unpredictable monsoon pattern; (iii) a likely decrease in total rainfall; (iv) more frequent strong winds, with more sand and dust storms; (v) more intense and frequent flash floods in the inland Niger Delta region, and (vi) larger and more frequent locust swarms.

A key hazard associated with the first three effects (and the focus of this project's adaptation interventions) is more frequent and more intense droughts[1]. The impact of droughts caused by climate change is worsened by human-induced degradation of woodland and grassland by overgrazing, overextraction of fuelwood, and expansion of non-regenerative agriculture. The net result of these climate and anthropogenic effects is a shrinking of productive capacity, worsened further by conflict causing underutilization of existing capacity, and by continuing population growth reducing per capita capacity.

The project interventions in Components 2 and 3 enable adaptation to climate change through restoring and enhancing productive capacity by:

#### *Component 2*

- improving governance for better decision-making on land use, including access to pastures and water – so that conflicts are avoided and natural regeneration of productive capacity is enabled (Output 2.1)
- intervening on the ground to restore crop / agroforestry productive capacity through equipping small-scale farmers to regreen their farmlands (Output 2.2)
- intervening on the ground to maximize crop / agroforestry land productive capacity through supporting farmers on climate-smart agriculture and aquaculture (Output 2.3)
- intervening on the ground to restore pastureland productive capacity and water resources through communal restoration by village committees (Output 2.4)

#### *Component 3*

- developing needed inputs for the climate-smart agriculture supported in Output 2.3, e.g. liquid fertilizer, agroforestry seedlings (Output 3.1)
- enhancing the economic sustainability of the climate-smart agri- and aquaculture by adding value to its products (e.g. primary processing of drought-resistant millet, fish drying and smoking) and accessing local markets (Output 3.1)
- simultaneously developing households' adaptive capacity through diversifying economic activities and spreading risk (Output 3.1)
- facilitating the incubation of sustainable youth-led businesses and technological training that can enable the productivity-enhancing adaptation strategies of Component 2 (Output 3.2), for example:
  - businesses installing basic solar PV for well-points that enable irrigation[2] of dry-season vegetables as part of the climate-smart agriculture, and training of local youth to undertake maintenance
  - light industry for secondary processing that adds further value and sustainability to climate-smart agriculture products, e.g. millet into snack foods, porridge, wine, nutrition powder[3] and poultry feed[4]
  - mini-grid solar PV to supply secondary processing of climate-smart agriculture and aquaculture products (as well as providing more reliable sources of energy/access to energy for off-grid areas)
  - training for manufacture of fuel-efficient cookstoves (metal parts, combined with earth) that use less wood and take pressure off harvesting trees from regenerating woodlands and farms

- manufacture of biomass-based fuel briquettes<sup>[5]</sup> (e.g. rice husks)<sup>[6]</sup> to supply fuel-efficient cookstoves and take pressure off harvesting trees from regenerating woodlands and farms

The above hopefully makes clear the logic of promoting solar PV and fuel-efficient cookstoves as part of the adaptation strategies of restoring and enhancing productive capacity. Although these technologies are often thought of in relation to their GHG emission reduction potential, they can also be useful as part of such adaptation strategies. Interestingly, the Government of Mali's articulation of the national adaptation priorities made at the 2013 Climate Summit, which were also included in the NDC section on Adaptation, also points to these technologies' role in reducing women's workload as part of a general strategy for enhancing adaptive capacity:

"viii) capacity building in the face of climate change of all public and private sector actors, including women and young people, including (ix) resilient alternative income generating activities, cereal banks, access to micro finance, and new technologies that lighten women's working burden (improved cook stoves, solar equipment)."

Note: The project interventions in Component 1 support the on-the-ground efforts (of Components 2 and 3) through creating an enabling environment that supports strategies for restoration of land productivity and climate change adaptation, and sets a baseline for and tracks changes in communities' climate change vulnerability and adaptive capacity.

The project interventions in Component 4 enables lessons sharing for replication and scale-up.

---

[1] defined as prolonged periods of abnormally low rainfall, leading to a shortage of water

[2] Hydrological studies indicate significant underutilization of groundwater potential in parts of Mopti, though this needs to be undertaken with great caution.

[3] <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1541-4337.12012>

[4]

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307089652\\_Using\\_locally\\_produced\\_millet\\_as\\_a\\_feed\\_ingredient\\_for\\_poultry\\_production\\_in\\_Sub-Saharan\\_Africa](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307089652_Using_locally_produced_millet_as_a_feed_ingredient_for_poultry_production_in_Sub-Saharan_Africa)

[5] <http://www.fao.org/3/t0275e/T0275E06.htm#Chapter%2013.Briquetting%20in%20Africa>

[6]

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284358454\\_Physical\\_properties\\_of\\_rice\\_husk\\_and\\_bran\\_briquettes\\_under\\_low\\_pressure\\_densification\\_for\\_rural\\_applications](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284358454_Physical_properties_of_rice_husk_and_bran_briquettes_under_low_pressure_densification_for_rural_applications)

**UNDP Response 28 October 2020 to GEFSEC comment (10/27/2020)**

Mentions to fuel-efficient cookstoves and other activities related to fuel-efficiency (biomass-based fuel briquettes) were deleted in the PIF.



The activities related to “mini-grid solar PV to supply secondary processing of climate-smart agriculture and aquaculture products (as well as providing more reliable sources of energy/access to energy for off-grid areas)” had already been deleted from the PIF in the previous submission.

The use of PV-powered pumps for water supply and the training of youth for their maintenance was however kept as it is considered necessary for the conduct of an adaptation activity (water access for consumption and irrigation).

#### **4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

##### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Yes.

##### **Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

Noted

#### **5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

##### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - More information requested. It is difficult to ascertain the additional cost basis and reasoning of the proposed adaptation activities because there is insufficient information regarding the baseline investments which are providing co-financing. Please refer to the items on co-financing and the baseline scenario.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - This item is cleared for this stage of project development, thank you for the additional information.

##### **Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

The baseline table has been updated to include and describe all the indicative co-financing, providing a clearer basis on which to assess the incremental cost reasoning.

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Please provide the LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators and Metadata spreadsheet.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Not addressed, please provide.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - Cleared thank you

**Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

The spreadsheet has now been completed and added to the Additional Annexes to the revised PIF.

**UNDP Response 28 October 2020 to GEFSEC comment (10/27/2020)**

The LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators and Metadata spreadsheet is now uploaded

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - The information provided on these three elements is adequate for this stage of project development.

**Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

Noted

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC< 10/8/2020 - Yes.

**Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

Noted

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Yes the information provided is sufficient for this stage of project development. One clarification requested: How does the project intend to undertake the stakeholder engagement as listed during PPG in light of potential travel restrictions?

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

Stakeholder engagement is planned for the PPG phase, supported by UNDP and involving Malian national consultants. For the duration of the COVID-19 pandemic, protocols for social distancing will be observed wherever face-to-face meetings are held. The PPG team lead international consultant will participate in meetings by video call, if travel to Mali is not possible. Consultative workshops will be held in Bamako and Mopti City or Sévaré, and travel allowances will be provided with PPG funds to make it possible for district and commune-level stakeholders representing local government and civil society to attend the workshops. The PIF has been adjusted to reflect this (see Section 2 – Stakeholders).

### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - The information provided here is well noted and the Secretariat would appreciate additional information on the gender dimensions specific to the Mopti region and this project in the next stage of project development.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Noted and cleared.

### **Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

This is noted for the PPG phase – particularly information specific to Mopti.

## Private Sector Engagement

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC< 10/8/2020 - Yes.

### Agency Response

21 October 2020:

Noted

## Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - More information requested.

- The Secretariat suggests including environmental and climate related risks, especially those that may strongly influence the project as drought, climate change, and rainfalls. There is useful information in the 1) Description about climate change. We recommend improving the description of these risks, include projections (by 2050 or 2030 depending on data availability), and propose mitigation measures, potentially institutional, capacity building measures.
- Risk 4 about security: the project may be affected not only by conflicts in the considered region of Mopti, but also by

conflicts and other events (food insecurity) in distant regions with potential migration flows. Please, revise.

- Additionally, does the transitional government not pose any risk to the ability of the proponents to implement this project? And lastly, has fiduciary risk been taken into account?

GEFSEC, 10/22/2020 - This is cleared for this stage of project development.

## Agency Response

21 October 2020:

The Risks table in the revised PIF has now been updated to cover points a), b) and c) above, with three new risks added, together with mitigation measures (see Table 4):

**Risk 3:** The central regions of Mali face increasing risks of climate change-induced disasters – including more intense and frequent flash floods in the inland Niger Delta region, and worse and more frequent droughts as a result of erratic rainfall combined with increased temperatures

**Risk 4:** Conflict with jihadists in the Northern regions of Mali and neighbouring Burkina Faso results in significant additional numbers of people migrating into Mopti Region

**Risk 5:** The political upheaval and transition at national level results in a lack of support the proposed project

Further in relation to point c), assurances have been provided by AEDD through UNDP Mali that the Agency remains fully committed to the development, submission and implementation of the GEFTF/LDCF project, despite the political transition, which does not affect day-to-day operations by technical officials. Several other GEF-funded UNDP-supported projects remain underway, despite challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic and the security situation in the country.

Fiduciary risk has not been added as a risk at this stage. This is because the UNDP Country Office in Mali has recently embarked upon the process of conducting due diligence through appointing consultants to undertake a Harmonized (HACT) Assessment of AEDD as the executing entity for the project, which will include the issue of fiduciary risk.

## Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?  
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Please indicate the specific coordination mechanism used with the portfolio of LDCF-financed activities in Mali (Currently there are 7, with one just beginning PPG which is also an LD/LDCF project in the Kayes region); as well as with GCF-financed initiatives. Lessons, learning, and knowledge sharing are key to successful implementation and prevent any risk of duplication. The GCF currently has 19 initiatives either recently approved or in the pipeline for Mali, and the Secretariat would appreciate a brief analysis on whether and if there are any synergies with this proposed project. Two GCF projects are mentioned in the baseline section, but additional detail would be much appreciated.

GEFSEC, 10/22/2020 - This is cleared for this stage of project development with one clarification – what about the GCF projects under development in the pipeline?

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - This is cleared for this stage of project development.

## Agency Response

21 October 2020:

This is indeed critical to the project's success, to achieving synergies with the many other initiatives, and avoiding duplication. For this reason, the GEFTF/LDCF project's knowledge platform (Output 4.1) is designed to include not just project stakeholders but also all related initiatives (peace-building, adaptation, mitigation, sustainable agriculture etc). This will enable a systematic sharing of updates on progress, learning in a mutually supportive environment from each other's successes and failures, and refining tools and approaches used for maximum harmonization and effectiveness of all projects' results.

In relation to the coordination of projects currently under implementation under AEDD, there are monthly meetings with the project teams chaired by Mr Boureïma Camara, Director-General of AEDD, who is also representative of AEDD as National Designated Authority for the GCF. This has now been mentioned in the PIF (see section following table of baseline projects). These meetings are often extended to other government partners. In addition to this, there are technical meetings held on specific topics such as the review of TORs, study reports or specific documents. Regarding the steering of these projects, it is the Minister of the Environment, Sanitation and Sustainable Development who chairs the committee. UNDP is in regular interaction with AEDD on the implementation of projects.

The following projects were under the coordination of AEDD during 2020 and participating in these meetings:

- 1) AFD-funded and IFAD-supported *Support Programme for Village Communities* (PACV)
- 2) BMUB-supported IKI-funded pilot project on *Supporting the National Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change* in Mali (ASNaCC)
- 3) LDCF-funded UNDP-supported project on *Flood hazard and climate risk management to secure lives and assets in Mali*
- 4) GEF-funded UNDP-supported project on *Generating Global Environment Benefits through Improved Environmental Information, Planning and Decision Making Systems* LDCF-funded UNDP-supported project on *Strengthening the resilience of Women producer groups and*

*vulnerable communities*

- 5) Review process for the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)
- 6) PAGEDD (which also includes support for the Mali Climate Fund)

GCF projects currently under implementation in Mali are just four, two of which are regional (under AfDB - *Improving the resilience of populations and ecosystems in the Niger Basin by managing natural resources sustainably*, and under BOAD - *Climate finance facility to scale up solar energy investments in Francophone West Africa*). The standalone projects are through BOAD - *Mali solar rural electrification project*, and through IBDR/IDA - *Strengthening the adaptive capacity and climate resilience of vulnerable communities in Mali by developing hydro-meteorological weather warning services to support adaptation planning*. The latter project is highlighted in the table showing important concurrent projects for coordination.

## **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 -

GEFTF

The project is well anchored in the LDN targets recently approved by the Minister of the environment (2020).

LDCF

More information requested. How is this project anchored in and expected to coordinate with the in country NAP process? Are there any more recent climate policies with which this project is aligned (more recent than 2011)?

GEFSEC, 10/22/2020 - What about the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process? Thank you

GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - Cleared.



## Agency Response

21 October 2020:

Since the formulation of the 2007 *NAPA* and the 2011 *National Policy on Climate Change* (PNCC) and *National Strategy for Climate Change* (SNCC), the only high-level climate change strategy document that has been produced is the NDC – likely as a result of the challenging political and security situation that has been ongoing since 2012. A clear articulation of adaptation priorities was made at the 2013 Climate Summit, however, and these were included in the NDC section on Adaptation. These are now clearly highlighted in the PIF and read as shown below.

It is also noted that the German Government's BMUB-funded programme implemented through GIZ and UNDP, *Programme for the support of the National Adaptation Strategy to Climate Change in Mali*, conducted at national level and with a focus in Kayes, Sikasso, Koulikoro and Ségou, 2014-2019 (\$5,5 million) should have useful lessons that can be applied in Mopti Region, and this will be investigated during the PPG.

"The Climate Change Adaptation priorities set out in the 2007 NAPA, highlighted at the 2013 Climate Summit and updated in the 2016 NDC, including: (i) restoration of degraded ecosystems aimed at reforesting 325,000 hectares, promoting assisted natural regeneration and combating erosion and sand encroachment; (ii) the development of smart agriculture improved seeds, livestock and fish varieties resilient to climate change, with sustainable hydro-agricultural development of 92,000 ha; (iii) creation of 3,300 km of transhumance corridors to reduce conflicts between farmers and herders, with 21 fenced pastoral areas covering 400,000 ha; (iv) rainwater harvesting and storage with creation of 20 drinking water supply systems and 200 surface water bodies and intake structures for 75,000 rural households; (v) development of 100 MW of renewable energy including photovoltaic energy, wind turbines, small hydroelectricity and biomass energy; (vi) use of meteorological information for disaster early warning systems and weather forecasting; (vii) management of the silting up of rivers and channels, and rehabilitating and constructing dugout wells and ponds for drinking water, livestock, crop irrigation and dry season gardening; (viii) capacity building in the face of climate change of all public and private sector actors, including women and young people, including (ix) resilient alternative income generating activities, cereal banks, access to micro finance, and new technologies that lighten women's working burden (improved cook stoves, solar equipment)."

### UNDP Response 28 October 2020 to GEFSEC comment (10/22/2020)

Currently, the NAP process in Mali is still nascent. Based on the orientations from UNFCCC, the NAP roadmap was developed, and preliminary studies were conducted. The AEDD is now capitalizing the results from the different studies for the design of the NAP. The process was further delayed by the socio-political instability over the last months. However, as presented in the PIF, the project is aligned with a number of national priorities and responds to the vulnerability risks highlighted by different studies. It is therefore strongly expected that this project will be aligned with the priorities defined in the NAP.

## Knowledge Management

-----  
**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Yes. There is a KM approach outlined with room for development at PPG.

**Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

This is noted for the PPG phase

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Yes.

**Agency Response**

**art III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - The LOE Is signed by Issa Fahiri Kone - who is NOT the current OFP. Please advise.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Cleared.

**Agency Response**

21 October 2020:

The Letter of Endorsement provided previously was signed by the outgoing GEF OFP. A new LOE has now been provided in the annexes to the revised PIF, as Additional Annex D. The new letter is signed by Mr Amidou Goïta, GEF Operational Focal Point for the Republic of Mali since 9 March 2020. The new letter also reflects a revised total of LDCF funds, since an additional \$1,5 million has recently been allocated to the project by Government.

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

NA

## Agency Response

## EFSEC DECISION

## RECOMMENDATION

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/8/2020 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and the below general comments and resubmit for consideration.

1) A Theory of change needs to be elaborated for this project, proposing clear pathways for change. Please refer to the STAP primer on this topic: <https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>

GEFSEC, 10/22/2020 -

It seems the review sheet is empty, this is possibly due to the portal glitch yesterday 21 October. Please correct. Additionally, no ToC document has been added onto the roadmap, nor the LDCF core indicators.

GEFSEC, 10/22/2020 - Not yet.

Please refer to the flagged items and resubmit for consideration. Furthermore, the Secretariat cannot locate any Theory of Change neither in the portal submission nor on the roadmap.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - Please adjust the PPG request. Additionally, as the PMC is around 5% of the GEF financing, GEF policy now indicates that there must be proportionality between the PMC and the financing provided. Being that the co-financing is at around 28.3 million, the PMC contribution from the co-financing must be around \$1.4 million. Please revise and resubmit for consideration, thank you

GEFSEC, 11/3/2020 -

1- The link to the LoE in the PIF in Portal is to an old LOE and should be changed to the new LOE to avoid confusion. Please adjust.

2- Co-financing: please note that the co-financing from Donor Agencies such as "GCF, Government of Netherlands, Monaco and Canada" should be classified as "Donor Agency". Please adjust.

Note:

THE SECRETARIAT IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONTENT OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THIS DOCUMENT. THE SECRETARIAT IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONTENT OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THIS DOCUMENT.

There is an indicative M&E Plan – Please note that the clearance of the PIF does not imply an approval of the M&E - the M&E plan version to be presented at CEO Endorsement is the one to be assessed by the Secretariat.

GEFSEC, 11/4/2020 - The above are cleared.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

### Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/8/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/27/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/2/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

