1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3979	
GEF Agency project ID		607574	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Integrating climate resilience into agricultural production for food security in rural areas of Mali	
Country/Countries		Mali	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		LDCF-Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		UA	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture, and Ministry of Environment and Sanitation	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None involved	
Private sector involvement		None involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		April 2015	
Actual date of project completion		December 2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.075	UA
	Co-financing	0.075	UA
GEF Project Grant		2.106,818	UA
Co-financing	IA own	1.475	UA
	Government	3.0	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.025	UA
	Private sector	0	UA
	NGOs/CSOs	0	UA
Total GEF funding		2.181,818	UA
Total Co-financing		4.575	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.741,818	UA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 2017	
Author of TE		Peter Ton and Oumar Sy	

TER completion date	December 18, 2018
TER prepared by	Spandana Battula
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Cody Parker

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	-	S	-	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		HS	-	L
M&E Design		UA	-	S
M&E Implementation		UA	-	MS
Quality of Implementation		UA	-	MS
Quality of Execution		UA	-	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was to "enhance the capacity of Mali's agricultural sector to cope successfully with climate change, by incorporating Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) concerns and strategies into on-going agricultural development initiatives and mainstreaming CCA issues into agricultural policies and programming" (TE pg 20).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to "improve food security in rural areas by integrating CCA methods and techniques and the Farmer Field School (FFS) approach in the agricultural sector" (TE pg 21).

The project aimed to achieve this objective through three outcomes:

Outcome 1: Steering of agricultural practices improved in terms of climate-resilience.

Activity 1.1: Partnerships in place with at least 4 projects and/or government programs involved in the steering of improved soil and crop management practices in three different ecosystems identified in NAPA and at least three production systems (dry grains, cotton/rice, "market gardening");

Activity 1.2: At least 10% of the total growing areas supported by partner programs have improved their CCA practices and strategies and integrated genetic material, resulting in more resilient production systems

Outcome 2: Capacity building and promotion of improved agricultural practices through Farmer Field Schools (FFS).

Activity 2.1: 800 Farmer Field Schools that perfectly integrate CCA strategies and practices by supporting the farming adaptation process; and

Activity 2.2: At least 100 CCA Farmer Field Schools were supported by the Adaptation Fund for Climate Change.

Outcome 3: Mainstreaming of climate change considerations into agricultural sector policies and programs.

Activity 3.1: Mechanisms established for cross-sectoral coordination and increased awareness of resilient production and food security; and

Activity 3.2: Institutional capacity strengthened at national levels to develop policies, strategies and programs, moving from a reactive attitude to a proactive and informed approach.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

The TE does not mention any changes to the objectives and activities.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability
Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: Satisfactory

The project was consistent with GEF's focal area on climate change for least developed countries. As the project prioritizes implementation of adaptation measures, it was aligned with GEF's criteria for project design and financing. The project was highly relevant to Mali's commitments to UNFCCC and UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). The project contributed to the implementation of Mali's National Action Plan to strengthen resilience of local grain production to climate change, and diversification of revenue sources to enhance food security (CEO Endorsement pg 14). Relevance is therefore rated as Satisfactory.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE gave a Satisfactory rating to the effectiveness of the project and stated "the climate change adaptation is well integrated into the policies and agricultural programs. The FFS approach has gained a

lot of ground, but is still not the preferred approach for control of the project" (TE pg 72). The TER finds that due to efforts by the project, the climate change approach has been considered in all programs and projects concerning agricultural development which was the objective of the project. However, in terms of integrating Farmer Field Schools approach in policies, the TE mentioned the approach was "not always declared formally to be a favored or a unique extension approach in Mali" and the National Board of Agriculture did not want to impose the approach on other parties involved (TE pg 33). Thus, the TER also gives a satisfactory rating to project's effectiveness.

Outcome 1: Steering of agricultural practices improved in terms of climate-resilience:

For this outcome the project expected to achieve two partnerships with major projects in ecosystem and production systems as well as having 10% of the total growing areas supported by partner programs. The project was successful in establishing three ecosystems and four production systems with 8 partner projects; namely, the EU, FAO and GIZ. The project helped increase the sowing of seeds and improved climate change adaptation, and at least 123,168 ha (31%) of the area has been supported by partners (TE pg 70).

Outcome 2: Capacity-building and promotion of agricultural practices through Farmer Field School:

Under this outcome, the project established 1,335 Farmer Field Schools with an addition of 374 schools set up through partners, and incorporated climate change adaptation strategies and practices in the schools. To support the Farmer Field Schools with climate change adaptation materials and equipment, the project set up a pilot support fund using GEF project funding. The project intended to support at least 100 Farmer Field Schools, however, the TE stated "altogether, 34 local initiatives were supported to the tune of USD 41,082 (i.e. FCFA 28,551,825), with a return of FCFA 3,250,680 (10% of the total)" (TE pg 71). Thus, the number of initiatives were not achieved but the volume of the fund was reached.

Outcome 3: Mainstreaming of climate change considerations into agricultural sector policies and programs:

The project intended to establish mechanisms for cross-sectoral coordination and increased awareness of resilient production and food security. For this the project set up a steering committee and Working Group on Information and Knowledge in climate change adaptation for cross sectoral coordination. The National Assembly and the High Council of the Territorial Authorities became involved in the project, and even municipalities were involved at a local level. To strengthen institutional capacity, the project worked towards getting agricultural policies to incorporate climate change considerations, and the policies and programs saw the Farmer Field Schools as the best approach to agricultural extension.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The project experienced issues in administrative procedures and delays in the disbursement of funds which affected the implementation of activities. As per the mid-term evaluation, the constraints between FAO and institutional partners caused "delays that have had a negative impact in respect of the timetable for activities to be carried out, as they were often delayed over the winter… these delays have contributed to a halt in some funding for continuing advocacy and climate proofing in the municipalities" (TE pg 42). As the evaluation team could not access detailed financial reports from the project team, cost efficiency and financial management of the project cannot be assessed. Given the achievement of outcomes albeit delays in implementation, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to project efficiency.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Likely

The TE gave a Very Satisfactory rating to sustainability of the project outcomes because of the benefits of the trainings conducted by the projects and establishment of partnerships integrated in programs and projects. However, the TER finds that the Farmer Field School approach has not been completed integrated by the government and there is a lack of plan to implement climate change approach. Nonetheless, given the low financial, socio-political, and environmental risks, the TER gives a Likely rating to sustainability of the project benefits. Below is a detailed assessment of the sustainability criteria:

Financial: The financial risks to sustainability seem low as the TE stated that on the Farmer Field Schools plots "there is good proof of best performance of early seeds and Good Agricultural Practices. Producers trained in FFS also testify to an increase in their crops at home, a reduction of monetary costs associated with production, and an improvement in their net income. With thousands of producers trained in FFS, the Union Nieta de Bla claims that the application of the IPPM/FFS approach helped massively reduce the use of synthetic pesticides (8,697 liters used instead of the expected 181,408 liters). This translates into a reduction of costs in cotton treatments of about FCFA 40m over nearly 26,000 ha – all of which benefits the local economy" (TE pg 39).

Socio-political: The project has good support from technicians and producers and they have appreciated the training on Farmer Field Schools, and the skills and personal qualities created during the training are also shared by the community and by third parties. As per the TE "training of facilitator-technicians and producer-facilitators also has more direct social impacts. There are many managers who have gone through IPPM training and who today occupy other positions elsewhere. A good number of producer-facilitators have also assumed other responsibilities, either in their municipalities or within a Farming Organization" (TE pg 40).

Institutional: The climate change adaptation has been integrated well in Mali's agricultural policies and programs and the project has significantly contributed to the identification and inter-sectoral definition of ways and methods of adaptation. However, it is not clear how the adaptation activities will be implemented by the government, the decentralized organizations, municipalities and communities (TE pg 41).

Environmental: As per the TE, the methods promoted by the project are environmentally sustainable "project promotes the development of production and – depending on the case in question – a decrease in planted acreage. The project facilitates the recovery of degraded lands and encourages people to fight against soil erosion" (TE pg 40). Additionally, the Farmer Field School uses cultivation practices [that] are compatible with the health of producers, their families, their animals and the ecosystem. They avoid pollution of soils, areas and water with synthetic pesticides. The approach promotes the use of non-harmful biological treatments" (TE pg 40).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE mentioned that the evaluation team was not able to access detailed financial reports from the project, and thus it was unable to report the materialized co-financing amount.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project faced delays due to administrative issues between the FAO and institutional partners which affected the timetable of implementation of activities. The delays also affected some funding for continuing advocacy and climate proofing in the municipalities (TE pg 9).

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE noted that the ownership of the project was good in terms of technical and operational aspects, however as the Farmer Field School approach was not designated a unique or favored agricultural extension approach, the ownership of the project was moderately satisfactory in political terms (TE pg 10).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: Satisfactory

The project design provided a monitoring and evaluation plan with a budget of $80,507 that included a results framework with indicators, and targets, and had provision for inception workshop, project inception report, project implementation reports, technical reports, mid-term review and terminal evaluation report. It also provided for field based impact monitoring, supervision visits and rating of progress, and co-financing reports. Although the TE did not provide a rating for M&E design at entry, based on the M&E plan in the project documents, the TER gives a Satisfactory rating.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE briefly mentioned that the "Monitoring and Evaluation System has been satisfactory with regard to the follow-up and documentation of activities, and the reporting of results. Monitoring of the impact of field training for producers was not well covered" (TE pg 10). The project did conduct a mid-term review and terminal evaluation, but there is no mention of how the monitoring of activities was done in the TE. Thus, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory to M&E implementation.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The project's Implementing Agency was FAO and as per the TE "actions deployed by the FAO in this project effectively contributed to building the capacity of the agricultural sector in dealing with climate change. This strengthening took place on several levels: (A) at a national level, for the National Board of Agriculture and in an inter-sectoral way; (B) at the level of the decentralized system for agricultural extension; (C) at a regional level, through the networks of facilitators and partnerships with other organizations; and D) at a local level, through the creation of a critical capacity of knowledge and expertise in participatory agricultural extension that is adapted to the situation" (TE pg 26). However, the TE also stated that the project experienced delays in disbursement of funds and administrative issues which negatively affected project activities. Thus, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to quality of project implementation.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: UA

The TE does not provide an assessment of project execution by the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment, and therefore, the TER is unable to evaluate the quality of project execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not mention any environmental impacts.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE mentioned that the “Integrated Production and Pest Management cotton producers, trained in Farmer Field Schools, testify that their health has improved thanks to the abandonment of synthetic pesticides. Female market gardeners claim that their health and that of their children has improved significantly, thanks to the consumption of vegetables and fruit, which are now brought into the homes. Garden produce gives them more energy and strength, and their children fall sick less often” (TE pg 40).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities: The project provided training to technicians and producers in Farmer Field Schools which would help the participants in professionalizing their management of the agricultural holding.

b) Governance: The TE does not mention any impact on governance.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts of the project are reported.8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE stated “climate change adaptation, Farmer Field School, and Integrated Production and Pest Management approaches may well be scaled up. Many of the organizations, programs and projects are interested in them and adopt them” (TE pg 72).

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE did not provide any key lessons or good practices for other GEF projects.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following are recommendations provided by the TE (TE pgs 44-45):

a) The Government of Mali should become more involved in agricultural extensions so that there is more transparency regarding the available budget for agriculture;
b) FAO and its partners should consider expanding the benefits from the Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Farmer Field School (FFS) approaches so that these activities are disseminated to all producers and agricultural producers, through public and private organizations;
c) In order ensure quality service in FFS, technical support should be provided National Board of Agriculture in the development and implementation of a multi-year national plan for agricultural extension on the basis of Farmer Field Schools (FFS), and that a National Centre for FFS Extension (CNCEP) is created;
d) There should be a formulation of gender strategy for FFS and such a strategy should set clear targets for the number of women at all levels of the implementation system;
e) The FAO should take part in a capitalization and assessment exercise with autonomous organizations (such as the Niger Office, Office Riz Segou, and Malian Company for Textile Development), farming organizations, and the National Board of Agriculture, in order to work together and identify lessons to be learned from their respective multi-year experiences; and
f) For projects in francophone countries, the implementing agency should ensure that project teams have documents in French at their disposal (for example, guidelines and procedural documents, follow-up reports, etc.) to allow the projects to report in French as one of the official languages of the United Nations.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	**GEF IEO comments**	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE summarized the relevant outcomes but it is insufficient as it lacks detail. The TE did not provide an assessment of impacts.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE did not provide ratings for many of the evaluation criteria but only gave an overall assessment of outcomes and sustainability.	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE provided information on sustainability risks but there is no mention of an exit strategy.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE did not give lessons learned or best practices from the project.	**U**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does not include project costs and co-financing information.	**U**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE did not assess M&E implementation thoroughly and had no assessment for M&E design.	**MU**
Overall TE Rating		**MU**

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

The TER did not use any additional sources.