

REPORT
Final evaluation of the Sustainable Land and Water
Management and Environmental Support Project for the
PAPAM: Program for the Increase of Agricultural Productivity
in Mali.
Component UNDP/GEF- PIMS 4138-Mali



*Au service
des peuples
et des nations*



FONDS POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT MONDIAL
POUR INVESTIR DANS NOTRE PLANÈTE

Arona FALL, international consultant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

SYNOPTIC PRESENTATION SHEET OF THE PROJECT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY P 7 to11

PART 1: INTRODUCTION P12 to 13

1.1 Considered mission

1.1.1 General Objective

1.1.2 Specific objectives

1.2 Methodological Approach / Mission Schedule

1.2.1 Organization of the mission

1.2.2 Methodological sequences

1.2.3 Mission schedule

1.2.4 Expected deliverables

PART 2: BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT P14 to 17

2.1 Development Context

2.1.1 Physical and human context

2.1.2 Socio-economic Context

2.1.3 Context of development management

2.1.4 Institutional Context for Natural Resource Management

2.1.5 Major constraints to sustainable agricultural development

2.1.6 Major changes observed during implementation

2.2 Project Description

PART 3: EVALUATION RESULTS ... P 17 to 34

3.1 Analysis of the project implementation process

3.1.1 Formulation/approval process

3.1.2 Starting the project

3.1.2.1 Conduct of LPAC

3.1.2.2 Holding the kick-off workshop

3.2 Analysis of the conceptual quality of the project document

3.2.1 Analysis of the project identification form

3.2.2 Structuring the project document

3.2.3 Design of the Results Framework

3.3 Analysis of the project performance

3.3.1 Relevance

3.3.1.1 Alignment with Terms of Reference (global and national) 3.3.1.2 Review of relevance to recipient needs

3.3.1.3 Level of gender mainstreaming

3.3.1.4 UNDP Comparative Advantages

3.3.2 Consistency

3.3.3 Effectiveness

3.3.3.1 Status of Targets and Products

3.3.3.2 Progress toward UNDP-GEF Results and the Immediate Objective

3.3.4 Partnership Strategy

3.3.5 Efficiency

3.3.6 Impacts

3.3.7 Communication/Advocacy

3.3.8 Sustainability

3.4 Analysis of Management Arrangements

3.4.1 Methods of implementation

3.4.2 Resource Mobilization / Financial Execution

3.4.2.1 Resource mobilization

3.4.2.2 Financial Execution

3.4.2.3 Co-financing Status

3.4.3 Monitoring/Evaluation

PART 4: MAJOR DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTEREDP 35

PART 5 CONCLUSIONS/INFORMATION/RECOMMENDATIONS. P35/ 45

5.1 Conclusions

5.2 Lessons Learned/Best Practices in SMART

5.2.1 Best practices in WDM

5.2.2 Prospects for scaling up SLM best practices

5.3 Recommendations

5.4 Synopsis of Conclusions/Memorandum of Recommended Actions

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference

Appendix 2: Evaluation Schedule

Appendix 3: Mailing Group Evaluation PAPAM

Appendix 4: List of the main documents used

Appendix 5: List of people met

Appendix 6: Evaluation Matrix

Appendix 6A: Matrix of Evaluation Results by Criteria

Appendix 6B: Progress Matrix

Annex 7: Synopsis of the status of targets, outputs and outcomes/results

Appendix 7A: Overall Indicative Project Schedule

Appendix 7B: Project Implementation Timeline

Annex 8: Identification of GDTE good practices

Annex 9: Synopsis of Conclusions and Recommendations/Memorandum of Recommended Actions

Annex 10: UNGEG Code of Conduct Form

Appendix 11: Final Review Report Approval Form

Annex 12: Matrix of Responses to Comments Received from the UNDP/GEF Unit

Appendix 13: LPAC Partner Observation/Notification Sheet Format

Appendix 14: PIF/Project Document Suitability Analysis

Appendix 15: Maintenance Guides

Appendix 16: Project document structuring analysis table

Appendix 17: Results and Resources Framework (CRS/Mission)

Appendix 18: Project Alignment with Terms of Reference

Annex 19: Resource Mobilization/Financial Execution

Appendix 20: Strengths and Weaknesses of the WDMP

Appendix 21: Abstract

Annex 22: Co-financing Status

LIST OF FRAMES

Box 1: Success Story #1: "Enhanced Home in a Bank".

Box 2: Success story #2 "Consultation and advocacy/lobbying frameworks for women's access to land".

Box 3: Success Story #3 "Use of Stone Cord".

Box 4: Success Story #4 "Microprogram to produce and broadcast GDTE messages through 6 community radio stations".

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	
AEDD	Agency for the Environment and Sustainable Development
BM	World Bank
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
CDN	National Determined Contribution
LPAC	Local Project Appraisal Committee
DNA	National Directorate of Agriculture
CPAP	Country Program Action Plan
DNEF	National Directorate of Water and Forests
DREF	Regional Direction of Water and Forests
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF	Global Environment Fund
GIE	Economic Interest Grouping
Ha	Hectare
HDI	Human Development Index
LOA	Agricultural Orientation Law
MinAgri	Ministry of Agriculture
MEADD	Ministry of the Environment, Sanitation and Sustainable Development
MEEA	Ministry of Environment, Water and Sanitation
OP	Peasant Organization/Producers
PAPAM	Agricultural Productivity Improvement Program in Mali
PGDTE	Sustainable Land and Water Management Project
PIF	Project identification form
PMF/FEM	GEF Small Grants Program
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
PRODOC	Project document
ToR	Terms of Reference
M&E	Follow-Up-Evaluation

I. Basic information				
Title of the project		Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) and environmental support for the PAPAM: Program for the Increase of Agricultural Productivity in Mali UNDP-GEF Components		
Alignment of the project with global and national frameworks	SDG / Target		SDG 2 / Target 4	
	PRSC		Axis 1 /Objective: Food security and improvement of the incomes of rural producers	
	UNSC/CPD/CPAP		*Effect 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali (2013-2015); *UNDAF outcome (extended from 2008 to 2014) № 1	
	UNDP Strategic Plan		*Main product 1.3 * Flagship Program № 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems	
	GEF Program		Strategic Programs PS#1 and PS#2 GEF Operational Program (OP15)	
UNDP identification		PIMS NO.	4138	
		In Atlas	Award N°: 00059873 Project number: 00075081	
GEF identification		PIMS NO.	4138	
		GEF ID NO.	3377	
II. Brief Description: The UNDP-GEF project, which falls under the components (1) Technology Transfer and Provision of Services, and (3) Programmatic Approach to Sectoral Monitoring of the Major Program "Promoting Agricultural Production in Mali - PAPAM", has two outcomes: Strengthening the capacities of producer organizations and service providers, and Ensuring Sectoral Monitoring and Evaluation. By pursuing these two results, the project should contribute to the overall environmental objective of increasing and expanding the use of good practices in SLM, with a view to improving ecosystem resilience and productivity in Mali's fragile agricultural areas.				
Geographic location		Continent/Country	Africa / Mali	
		Operational sites	Sikasso Region / Circles of Sikasso, Bougouni and Koutiala	
			Mopti Region / Bankass, Koro and Douentza Circles	
Duration of the project		5 ½ years, or 66 months	Start of activities: 13/04/ 2015	
III. Arrangements for implementation				
Method of implementation		NIM		
Implementing Partner		Ministry of the EEA through the Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development (AEDD)		
Other partners		DNA, DNPIA, DNGR, IER, DNEF, BM, FIDA, CE		
PIF Approval Date : 14/03/2008	Date approved by the GEF Secretariat : 28/05/2010	Date LPAC : 01/08/2014	Date signature project document : 16/09/2014	Date Kick-off workshop: 16/06/2015
Mid-term evaluation: November 2,018			Final evaluation: June- July 2020	
IV. Financing (in US\$)				
Sources of Funds	Budgets in the approved project document	Actual expenditures as of June 30, 2020	Comments	
GEF	1, 900, 000	1, 675,054	Rate: 88.16%.	
UNDP	300, 000	814,581	Exceeding \$514,581	
TOTAL	2, 200, 000	2, 489,635	Rate: 113.17%.	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

REMINDER OF THE CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The project is conceived as an integral part of the major development program "Promoting Agricultural Production in Mali - PAPAM", which program is structured around three components:

(1) Technology transfer and supply service; (2) Irrigation infrastructure; and, (3) Programmatic approach to sector monitoring.

The financing package for this major program reflects an estimated total budget of US\$160 million structured around it: (i) World Bank-led agricultural investment, including a mix of IDA and IFAD loans; (ii) EC grants; (iii) government investment in the agricultural sector; and (iv) GEF funding executed by the World Bank and UNDP and focused on promoting Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) and improving and monitoring the sustainability of agricultural systems. For a duration of 5 years and ½, with a total cost of US\$ 2,200,000, the project is financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for US\$ 1,900,000 and UNDP for US\$ 300,000. The in-kind contribution of the Government of Mali amounts to US\$300,000. Co-financing from other partners amounts to US\$ 5,500,000. The project has two outcomes: [1] To strengthen the capacities of producer organizations and service providers and [2] To ensure sectoral monitoring and evaluation.

PLANNED MISSION

This mission concerns the final evaluation of the UNDP-GEF project "Sustainable Land and Water Management and Environmental Support to PAPAM. Organized at the request of the Government of Mali, UNDP and GEF, the final evaluation aims to provide partners with assessment information on: the status of expected results, lessons learned and relevant recommendations for the consolidation and enhancement of achievements for the purpose of extending good SLM practices to other geographical areas.

Specifically, the final evaluation should pursue the following objectives: (1) Assess overall performance against the objectives as defined in the project document and other related documents; (2) Assess the relevance of project actions to national priorities, as well as to UNDP and GEF strategic objectives; (3) Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the project; (4) Critically analyze the project implementation and management measures as well as constraints to scaling up good SLM practices; (5) Assess the sustainability of project interventions and consider the impact of the project especially of each good practice on the lives of the communities benefiting from the intervention; (6) Document lessons learned and best practices related to project design, implementation and management that could be useful for other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The organization of the mission was impacted by the suspension of air flights in light of the current pandemic. Thus, the international consultant carried out the mission remotely from June 15 to July 28, 2020, with the support of a national consultant. In this context, exchanges were facilitated by the implementation of a mailing group "Mailing Group Evaluation PAPAM". The work was carried out according to the following steps: Setting up of the "Mailing Group Evaluation PAPAM" cf. Annex 2; Documentary review; Elaboration and submission of the draft Initial Report indicating in particular the methodological approach, the draft evaluation matrix, the chronogram for carrying out the evaluation; Exchanges with the Reference Group/ Mission Follow-up (stakeholders including UNDP, the project team, the Environment and Sustainable Development Agency - ESDA) in order to examine/validate the initial report; Finalization of the Inception Report; Collection of data and information/Interviews with the various local stakeholders by a national consultant; Elaboration of the implementation synoptic table; Elaboration of the draft evaluation report; Exchanges with the technical committee for review and validation of the draft evaluation report/ Collection of observations and amendments; Drafting of the final evaluation report.

KEY EVALUATION FINDINGS / LESSONS LEARNED / BEST PRACTICES FROM GDTE

The analysis of the process of setting up the project and its implementation leads to the following conclusions:

(1) the "insecurity" risk had been identified, but it was not properly managed to minimize its negative effects; (2) the formulation/approval process was too long, and this led to a certain lack of consistency between the PIF and the signed project document; (3) the report of the project launch workshop does not constitute, as it should

have been, a fundamental reference that has been developed and shared with all stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to implementation; **(4)** the design of the strategic results framework as presented in the project document suffered from insufficient application of results-based management and quality control; **(5)** the alignment of the project with the reference frameworks for sustainable development at the global and national levels justifies its satisfactory relevance (5/6). However, the results chain has been incompletely defined leading to moderately satisfactory coherence (3/6); **(6)** From a design point of view, the results chain does not integrate relevant and gender-sensitive elements. However, in the field, the responsibilities assumed by women in implementation have enabled them to impose their position as leaders and main actors in certain key sectors (good practices concerning training/dissemination and extension of improved stoves, reforestation, etc.);

(7) The immediate objective is based on two pillars: **(i)** a strategic pillar determined by UNDP-GEF Result 2 with an unsatisfactory level of achievement, and **(ii)** an operational pillar determined by UNDP-GEF Result 1 with a satisfactory and effective level of achievement.

Overall, progress toward the immediate objective is moderately satisfactory (3/6); **(8)** the review of implementation noted equivalent positive changes in lessons learned and best practices in SLM that need to be taken to scale : the innovative approach to SLM, with the development of a catalog of best practices (improved bench mark; use of stone cord through contour-based landscaping; wood production planting; assisted natural regeneration); the establishment of consultation and reflection frameworks involving women leaders of women's organizations, mayors and traditional chiefs in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to combat gender inequalities; the use of local radio stations, which has facilitated access by producers in areas affected by the security crisis to messages on good practices in SLM. However, the sustainability of the gains made, and therefore the scaling up of best practices, risks being annihilated by insecurity, and the simultaneous and continuous non-functioning of the three "wickets": Training wickets developed by the project with a large volume of training sessions; Support/Consultancy wickets run by SLM providers; Financing wickets provided by the project to support producers (small equipment, agricultural inputs, etc.); **(9)** The main factors that have influenced progress are as follows: The long time that elapsed between the approval of the project identification form (PIF) and the kick-off workshop; the "insecurity" risk that had been identified but which was not properly managed to minimize its negative effects; the insufficient application of results-based management and quality control in the design of the strategic results framework; the low level of the community financing mechanism to support communities in the development of sustainable livelihoods (access to equipment, materials, and agricultural inputs...); the delay that has always been recorded at the beginning of the year in the transfer of cash advances; **(10)** Overall, project implementation is moderately satisfactory (3.5/6). The matrix below summarizes the ratings :

Evaluation Notes :			
1 Monitoring and evaluation	Rating	2 Executing agency/implementing agency	Rating
Designing Monitoring and Evaluation at Entry	4	Quality of implementation by UNDP: implementing agency	3
Implementation of the monitoring and evaluation plan	3	Quality of execution: executing agency	4
Overall quality of monitoring and evaluation	3,5	Overall quality of implementation and execution	3,5
3 Outcome Evaluation	Rating	4 Sustainability	Rating
Relevance	5	Financial Resources	3
Coherence	3	Sociopolitical	2
Efficiency	3	Institutional framework and governance	3
Efficiency	3	Environmental	4
Impact	4	Overall probability of sustainability	3
Sustainability	3		
Progress toward the Immediate Objective	3		
Progress UNDP/GEF Outcome 1	5		
Progress UNDP/GEF Outcome 2	2		
Overall score for project completion	3,5		

RECOMMENDATIONS

To the Government, UNDP, and GEF :

1. Rapidly implement a partnership focused on scaling up WDM best practices in a programmatic approach through a **pilot WDM development program for rural eco-villages/ecocommunities**. This partnership should also support the development of a national strategy for the creation of eco-villages by the WDM with an action plan over a 30-year horizon.
2. Limit the formulation/approval process to a period not exceeding 20 months.

To the Government and UNDP :

1. Arrange for the effective participation of key partners in CLEP, or receive (in their absence) formally their comment sheets and opinions with respect to their recommendation for project approval. A suggested format is provided in Annex 13.
2. Organize the project kick-off workshop no later than two months after the operational start, so that the report is a fundamental reference elaborated and shared with all the stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to the implementation (agreement on the Global Indicative Planning of the project -GIP proposed in Annex 7A ; understanding of the roles, support services and responsibilities of the UNDP country office, the UNDP/GEF Unit vis-à-vis the project team; finalization of the first annual action plan based on the project results framework highlighting indicators, targets, means of verification, as well as assumptions and risks to date....)
3. Organize joint field visits extended to other partners.

To the Government :

1. To do everything possible to promote political, economic, cultural and social dialogue, which the State must manage in accordance with its perennial public service mission, which includes human security and the preservation of the integrity of the Malian territory.
2. Encourage and facilitate the establishment of frameworks for consultation and reflection involving women leaders of grassroots women's organizations, mayors and traditional chiefs in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to combat gender inequalities. In the context of decentralization, the aim here is to promote a local land governance body.

UNDP and the UNDP/GEF Regional Unit:

1. Ensure continuous business intelligence to ensure consistency between the Project Identification Form (PIF) and the project document.
2. Establish and implement a close follow-up plan through field visits.

At the UNDP :

1. Ensure that the delay in transferring cash advances at the beginning of the year is eliminated.
2. To ensure, for the benefit of the national side, regular training on the NIM modality. This training should also be geared towards national ownership of the UNDP Atlas management and monitoring platform.

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Considered mission

1.1.1 General Objective

This mission concerns the final evaluation of the UNDP-GEF project "Sustainable Land and Water Management and Environmental Support to PAPAM: Program for the Increase of Agricultural Productivity in Mali". Organized at the request of the Government of Mali, UNDP and GEF, the final evaluation aims to provide partners with assessment information on: the status of expected results, lessons learned and relevant recommendations for the consolidation and enhancement of achievements for the purpose of extending good SLM practices to other geographical areas.

1.1.2 Specific objectives

The final evaluation should have the following specific objectives:

- ⇒ Assess overall performance against the objectives as defined in the project document (PRODOC) and other related documents;
- ⇒ Assess the relevance of project actions to national priorities and the strategic objectives of UNDP and GEF ;
- ⇒ Evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the project ;
- ⇒ To critically analyze the project implementation and management measures as well as the constraints related to the scaling up of good practices in WDM;
- ⇒ Assess the sustainability of the project interventions and consider the impact of the project, especially of each good practice on the life of the communities benefiting from the intervention;
- ⇒ Document lessons learned and best practices related to project design, implementation and management that could be useful to other projects in the country and around the world.

1.2 Methodological Approach / Mission Schedule

1.2.1 Organization of the mission

The organization of the mission was dictated by two factors: (1) the suspension of air flights, in view of the current pandemic. Thus, the international consultant remotely piloted the mission; (2) the recruitment, during the mission, of a national consultant from the "Field visits/Interviews with the various local actors" stage.

In this context, Annex 3 reflects the "Mailing Groupe Evaluation PAPAM" mailing group set up to facilitate exchanges.

1.2.2 Methodological sequences

The proposed evaluation follows a participatory and critical approach. Based on a shared knowledge of the current situation objectively established with regard to implementation, the aim is to encourage the full and complete participation of the different actors in order to identify the signs of success and/or failure of the project. This will make it possible to define a memorandum of actions to be carried out in order to scale up good WDM practices. To this end, the mission was conducted according to the following steps:

- (1) Establishment of the "Mailing Group Evaluation PAPAM"; (2) Exchanges/ brainstorming at the level of the "Mailing Group Evaluation PAPAM" on, in particular: the requirements of the UNDP Evaluation Office, the directives, rules and procedures established by UNDP and the GEF, the methodological approach, the draft evaluation matrix, the implementation synopsis, the working documents, and the timetable for carrying out the evaluation; (3) Documentary review: Strategic Framework for Economic Recovery and Sustainable Development 2019-2023; New Vision "Mali 2040"; National Report on Human Development "Public-Private Partnerships, Human Development and Poverty Reduction"; Agenda 2030; Result of the Rapid Integrated Assessment Exercise; National Voluntary Report on Progress on SDOs; Priority Investment Plan/National Determined Contribution (NDC); UNDP Strategic Plan; UNDAF (2008-2012)/UNDAF Country Program (2006-2012), as well as the amendments extending them until December 2014, as well as the various related monitoring/evaluation reports; Country Program Document 2020-2024; All ROARs since the start of the project; Statements of challenges and performance for the period 2014-2019; GEF Strategy for Sustainable Land Management; Strategic Programs PS-1/PS-2; Operational Program PO-15; Strategic Investment Program; PIF; LPAC Report; Project Document; All PTAs; FACES at the beginning of the year; Annual activity reports; PIRs; CDRs; Steering Committee reports; Mid-term evaluation report; Audit reports and management response monitoring reports; UNDP-GEF Unit mission report; Field visit reports; Technical notes/documents produced by the project; Project procedure manual.... ;
- (4) Preparation and submission of the draft Initial Report; (5) Exchanges with the Reference Group/mission follow-up to review/validate the Initial Report; (6) Finalization of the Initial Report; (7) Collection of data and information/Interviews with the various local stakeholders by a national consultant; (8) Finalization of the implementation synoptic table and preparation of the draft evaluation report; (9) Exchanges with the technical committee for review and validation of the draft evaluation report;
- (10) Exploitation of observations and amendments; (11) Drafting of the final evaluation report.

1.2.3 Mission schedule

The mission took place from June 15 to July 28, 2020 according to the detailed schedule, subject of appendix 2.

1.2.4 Expected products

The mission will result in the following products:

- An initial report describing in particular: the methodological approach, with a detailed chronogram ;
- The Interim Evaluation Report ;
- The final report of the evaluation.

PART 2: BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Reminder of the development context

2.1.1 Physical and human context

Mali is a landlocked country in West Africa covering an area of 1,241,238 km², 60 percent of which is desert. Its population is estimated at 19.5 million, and the growth rate is about 2.7 percent per year. The climate is characterized by an alternation between dry and wet seasons of varying duration. Annual rainfall varies from 1400 mm in the south to less than 100 mm in the north. The area under cultivation in Mali is 3.9 million hectares, ninety percent of which is **rainfed. The country is divided into four agro-climatic zones.**

AGRO-ECOLOGICAL ZONES OF MALI

2.1.2 Socio-economic Context

Agriculture employs more than 80 percent of the labor force and nearly 70 percent of the population live in rural areas and nearly 80 percent depend on agricultural production for their livelihoods. The rural sector remains one of the main drivers of Mali's economy and still accounts for more than one-third of GDP (subsistence agriculture for 15 percent; modern agriculture for 5 percent; livestock, forestry for 4 percent, and fisheries for 1 percent). Cotton is the main agricultural export product, contributing 25 percent to total export earnings in 2005. Agriculture in Mali is essentially rainfed and production varies considerably from one climatic zone to another. Despite its very high agricultural potential, Mali is still characterized by chronic food and nutritional insecurity.

2.1.3 Context of development management

Mali has equipped itself with : (i) a global reference framework: the Strategic Framework for Economic Recovery and Sustainable Development (CREDD), and (ii) important strategic documents to ensure the management of natural resources. These include

In the environmental field :

- the Esquisse du schéma national d'aménagement du territoire (ESAT) ;
- the preliminary drafts of the regional planning and development schemes ;
- the National Policy for the Protection of the Environment (PNPE) ;

In the area of agricultural development and poverty reduction :

- the Agricultural Orientation Law (LOA) of 2006 ;
- the ECOWAS roadmap for the development of a National Agricultural Sector Investment Program (PNISA) ;
- the Strategic Framework for Growth and Poverty Reduction (GPRSF).

2.1.4 Institutional Context for Natural Resource Management

At the national level, responsibilities for natural resource management are shared among the ministries in charge of: Agriculture (Ministry of Agriculture, MinAgri); Environment (Ministry of Environment, Sanitation and Sustainable Development -MEADD). Responsibility for the overall coordination of natural resource and land management lies with MINAGRI. The Planning and Statistics Unit (Cellule de Planification et de Statistique du Secteur Développement Rural, CPS/SDR) has primary responsibility for the planning, use and management of natural resources. Other units involved are the National Directorate of Agriculture (DNA) and the National Directorate of Rural Engineering (DNGR);

The Institute of Rural Economy (IER); the Rural Development Offices; the National Directorate of Sanitation and Control of Pollution and Nuisance (DNACPN); the National Directorate of Water and Forestry (DNEF); the Environment and Sustainable Development Agency (AEDD).

2.1.5 Major constraints to sustainable agricultural development

The sustainable development of agriculture is hampered by poor land and water management. The most important soil degradation processes in Mali are: wind erosion; overgrazing; water erosion; declining soil fertility; habitat loss and deforestation; salinization and alkalization; water pollution and eutrophication; and climate change, which is a cross-cutting threat.

2.1.6 Major changes observed during implementation

During the project implementation period, some major changes were observed: (i) the HDI Human Development Index increased continuously between 2015 and 2017 while the incidence of income poverty of the general population decreased over the same period; (ii) with a growth rate of 3.6 percent per year, the population is expected to reach 20.5 million in 2020, with the working age population (15 years and older) representing 52.7 percent of the total population; (iii) the number of adult agricultural workers has increased by an average of 7.35 percent per year as against 6.61 percent for women, while agricultural production (cereals) has increased by an average of 12.59 percent per year ; (iv) the political/regulatory environment has been marked by the implementation of the Land Policy, the definition of the Priority Investment Plan in accordance with Mali's commitments on the National Determined Contribution, and administrative reorganization with the completion

of the territorial division process; (v) with respect to natural capital, more than 100.000 ha of forests are disappearing each year, and reforested areas have declined by 24%.

The implementation of the project was completed at a time when Mali is embarking on a new strategy aligned with the Sustainable Development Objectives and the ambitions of the African Union's "Agenda 2063": The "Strategic Framework for Economic Recovery and Sustainable Development (CREDD 2019-2023)". This strategy is part of a new vision of development, namely "A well-governed Mali, where harmonious living together of the different components of society is restored, peace consolidated and collective and individual security ensured in unity, cohesion and diversity, where the process of wealth creation is inclusive and respectful of the environment and where human capital is developed for the benefit of young people and women in particular".

2.2 Project Description

The UNDP-GEF project is conceived as an integral part of the major development program "Programme d'Accroissement de la Productivité Agricole au Mali- PAPAM. "This program is structured around three components: **Component 1:** Technology transfer and provision service;

Component 2: Irrigation infrastructure ;

Component 3: Programmatic Approach to Sector Monitoring. The financing package for this major program reflects an estimated total budget of US\$160 million structured around: (i) agricultural investment led by the World Bank, and jointly financed by loans from IDA and IFAD; (ii) EC grants; (iii) government investment in the agricultural sector; and (iv) Global Environment Facility (GEF) financing executed by the World Bank and UNDP and focused on promoting Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) and improving and monitoring the sustainability of agricultural systems.

The UNDP-GEF project, which falls under components 1 and 3 of the AHSMP, has two outcomes: **Outcome 1:** Strengthen the capacities of producer organizations and service providers; and **Outcome 2:** Ensure sectoral monitoring and evaluation. By pursuing these two outcomes, the project should contribute to the overall environmental objective of increasing and expanding the use of good WDM practices, in the interests of improving ecosystem resilience and productivity in Mali's fragile agricultural areas. For a duration of 5 years and ½, with a total cost of US\$ 2,200,000, the project is financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for US\$ 1,900,000 and UNDP for US\$ 300,000. The in-kind contribution of the Government of Mali amounts to US\$300,000. Other co-financing amounts to US\$ 5,500,000.

PART 3: EVALUATION RESULTS

3.1 Analysis of the project implementation process

3.1.1 Formulation/approval process

PIF Approval Date : 14/03/2008	Date approved by the GEF Secretariat : 28/05/2010	Date LPAC : 01/08/2014	Date signature project document : 16/09/2014	Date Kick-off workshop: 16/06/2015
---	--	----------------------------------	--	---

Examination of the chronogram leads to the following findings :

- ⇒ the formulation/approval process was abnormally long. There were 87 months between the approval of the BIP and the kick-off workshop, and 51 months between the date of approval by the GEF Secretariat and the LPAC held on August 1, 2014;
- ⇒ the period between PIF approval and the kick-off workshop is sufficient to induce changes in project guidelines. This leads to an examination of the consistency between the PIF and the signed project document;
- ⇒ the "insecurity" risk had been identified, but it was not properly managed to minimize its negative effects.

While the formulation/approval process is dynamic, it must be limited in time to expedite the start of activities. The GEF Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies, and Governments should agree on an appropriate timing between the different phases of the formulation/approval process over a period not exceeding 20 months (A timeline is proposed in **Annex 7B**).

3.1.2 Starting the project

3.1.2.1 Conduct of LPAC

A review of the LPAC report organized on 01/08/2014 reveals that :

- ⇒ Some key partners were not represented, including: the Ministry of Rural Development/National Directorate of Rural Engineering (DNGR); the National Directorate of Industrial and Animal Productions (DNPIA); the Institute of Rural Economy (IER); the National Directorate of Water and Forestry (DNEF); the World Bank (WB) and the European Commission (EC) ;
- ⇒ the recommendations of LPAC were not accompanied by a memorandum of action that should lead each party concerned to carry out within a specific time frame, the actions favouring, in particular, coordination/synergy between the project and the major PAPAM.

Given the importance of LPAC at the country level (the last instance before the project document is signed), the UNDP Office and the government implementing body will need to make arrangements for :

- (i) the effective participation of key partners, or receive (in their absence) formally their comment sheets and opinions with regard to their recommendation for project approval. A suggested format is provided in **Annex 13**;
- (ii) consideration of the recommended actions in the terms of reference of the kick-off workshop.

3.1.2.2 Holding the kick-off workshop

The project kick-off workshop, which was to be organized within the first 2 months after the operational start, was held 10 months after LPAC. This workshop is of paramount importance in the life of the project. Its organization should allow :

- (1) the project team, the UNDP country office, the UNDP/GEF Unit (Regional Technical Advisors), and all other stakeholders to agree on the Global Indicative Project Plan (GIP proposed in **Annex 7A**);
- (2) to all the partners of : (i) understand the roles, support services and responsibilities of the UNDP country office, UNDP/GEF Unit vis-à-vis the project team; (ii) discuss the roles, functions and responsibilities within the project decision-making structures, including reporting, means of communication, and conflict resolution mechanisms ;
- (3) Finalization of the first annual action plan based on the project results framework, highlighting indicators, targets, means of verification, assumptions and risks to date;
- (4) a detailed overall presentation of reporting, monitoring/evaluation, and annual auditing requirements.

It is clear that the report of the project kick-off workshop should constitute a fundamental reference elaborated and shared with all the stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to the implementation.

A review of the report indicates that the objectives of the workshop were not sufficiently addressed:

- ❖ the delay in the formulation process / effective start of operational activities. The operational activities started on April 13, 2015, a year reflected in the PIF as the year of completion.
- ❖ the four points mentioned above ;
- ❖ LPAC's recommendations, particularly those concerning coordination/synergy between the project and the major AHS On-Line Program, monitoring and evaluation.

In the context of the project, a benefit should have been gained by making this workshop an inception workshop followed by the first Project Steering Committee (PSC) to which the inception report will be submitted.

This implies :

- a duration of at least three days: two days for workshop work and one day for the CPP ;
- substantial preparatory work on all the adjustments/improvements to be submitted to the PPC (Results Framework, coordination agreements, monitoring-evaluation mechanism....).

All in all, the start was made without laying the foundations for a discussion/exchange process that could :

- (a) reduce the effects of the delay already experienced, and,
- (b) address the shortcomings noted in the rigorous application of results-based management.

In total, **the effective operational duration is 56 ½ months** (starting on 15/04/2015, and cessation of activities at the end of December 2019).

It would be logical, for the duration of a project, to take into account :

- ⇒ a first stage of at least three months corresponding to the setting up of the team;
- ⇒ a second stage, which will be the actual duration of operational activities;
- ⇒ a third stage devoted to the closing of the project (three months).

A chronogram is proposed in **Appendix 7B**.

3.2 Analysis of the conceptual quality of the project document

3.2.1 Analysis of the project identification form

The analysis of the project identification sheet reflects an overly ambitious programmatic framework, which even exceeds that of the Grand PAPAM. The title, the effects and the products are part of a sustainable development of Agriculture in the broad sense (integration of rainfed crops/irrigated crops/livestock/livestock/fishing, forestry). The matrix in **Annex 14** provides a comparative analysis between the PIF and the UNDP/GEF project document. This confirms that the period between the approval of the PIF and the kick-off workshop was sufficient to induce changes in the project guidelines.

The PIF as approved is expected to lead to a project document other than the UNDP/GEF under-evaluation. To avoid such a situation, the UNDP/GEF Unit will need to ensure continuous strategic monitoring throughout the PIF/Project Document formulation process.

3.2.2 Structuring the project document

Referring to the analysis in **Appendix 16**, it is apparent that :

- ⇒ in form, the format requirements for a UNDP/GEF project document have been met. However, developments in results-based management are insufficient;
- ⇒ In some important parts of the project document, it is not easy to identify what is AHS On Reserve and what is WLEMP (1.3 long-term solution and barrier analysis, 1.3.1 long-term solution, 1.3.2 expected quantifiable overall environmental benefits, 2.5 key indicators, risks and assumptions, 2.5.1 indicators, 2.5.2 project risks and impacts, 2.6 cost-effectiveness, 2.8. sustainability, 2.9 replicability).

The ideal would have been :

- ❖ rigorously formulate a PGDTE description with a specific chapter regarding coordination with the AHS On Reserve Program;
- ❖ develop a results framework using the sections: 2.3 "Design Principles and Strategic Considerations" and 2.4 "Objectives, Outcomes, Outputs, Activities".

3.2.3 Design of the Results Framework

The design of the strategic results framework, as presented in the project document, suffered from insufficient application of results-based management and quality control.

It should be noted that :

- ✚ the vertical MDG/National Priority/UNDAF-CPD/PS/GEF Results/UNDAF-CPD/PS/GEF Results/Component/Strategic Objective/Effect is not consistently established ;
- ✚ The logical chain Result / Main Activities / Targets / Indicators / Sources of Verification / Timeframe / Costs / Implementation Structure / Partner Structures / Responsible Structure / Risks and Assumptions, has not been defined.

This did not fail to induce difficulties in :

- (i) annual planning of the project team (establishment of ATPs) ;
- (ii) quality control by the UNDP Office in its Atlas system. The terminology needs to be clarified (Result here =Effect /Outcome).

The project team has had the merit of conducting a fairly comprehensive process in establishing ATPs.

As mentioned above, the results framework requires a vertical arrangement, and a horizontal logical chain, leading to a discrete matrix, i.e., each element of which corresponds to precise terminology and measurable content. In order to assess project performance in the most comprehensive way, the **Results and Resources**

Framework (R&RF/Mission), subject of Annex 17, has been elaborated on the basis of the developments contained in sections 114 to 147 of the signed project document.

The CRS/Mission highlights an immediate Objective "To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems" which is based on two levers:

- ⇒ A **strategic lever** determined by Output 2.1 "A geo-referenced system for monitoring and planning the management of agro-ecosystems is developed and adopted as part of the M&E framework for AHSMP and the agricultural sector" of UNDP-GEF Result 2 "A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional". Achieving this result will provide the government with an indispensable tool for its mission of strategic steering of agricultural development;
- ⇒ **Operational leverage** determined by Output 1.1 "Training resources on SLM are developed, tested and improved dynamically based on user feedback, and then deployed at project sites, dissemination of the AHS On-Line capacity building approach" and Output 1.2 "Knowledge is disseminated, innovation infused and technological breakthroughs adopted by beneficiaries as part of PAPAM's approach to strengthening FOs' capacities for SLM" of UNDP-GEF Result 1 "SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private advisory services for the benefit of producers is increased". The purpose of UNDP-GEF Result 1 is based on the development of demonstrative pilot actions that enable grassroots communities to work towards sustainable wealth creation through the scaling up of good practices. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that the indicators mentioned for the Immediate Objective only concern operational leverage. This will have implications in the evaluation of progress.

Moreover, it should be recalled that the shortcomings noted also stem from the failure to comply with the provisions described in the project document under Chapter 2.6 Cost-Effectiveness/Section 153: "the UNDP/GEF project will be part of a joint IDA/IFAD/EU/UNDP/GEF project on 'Increasing Agricultural Productivity in Mali', with which it will share resources and structures through coordinated planning and implementation".

3.3 Analysis of project performance

The analysis reflected in **Appendix 6A** (Matrix of Evaluation Results by Criteria) leads to the following findings/conclusions:

3.3.1 Relevance

3.3.1.1 Alignment with global and national sustainable development frameworks :

The analysis of the current context leads to a rigorous alignment of the project with :

- ✦ to **Target 1** "Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of natural resources" of **MDG 7** "Ensure environmental sustainability", at the start of the project and,
- ✦ **Target 4** "By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and output, contribute to the conservation of ecosystems, enhance resilience to climate change, extreme weather events, droughts, floods and other disasters, and progressively improve land and soil quality" of **MDG 2** "Eradicate hunger, achieve food security, improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture" at the close of business;
- ✦ **Axis 1** of the Strategic Framework for Growth and Poverty Reduction (GPRSP): "Food security and improvement of incomes of rural producers";
- ✦ **UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2017): Principal Outcome 1.3** "Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and wastes", and **UNDP Flagship Programme No 1** of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020 "Biodiversity and ecosystem management integrated into sectoral planning,

development and production activities must safeguard biodiversity and provide ecosystem services that support human well-being";

- ✈ **GEF Strategic and Program Objectives: SO1/SP1** "Support sustainable agriculture and rangeland management", and **SP2** "Support sustainable forest management in production areas";
- ✈ **UNDAF: Effect 2.4** of the Joint UN Framework for Support to the Transition in Mali: "The means of production and subsistence of vulnerable populations in rural, peri-urban and urban areas are strengthened and diversified for better food and nutritional security" and, **UNDAF Result No 1** (extended from 2008 to 2014): "The most vulnerable rural areas benefit from improved food security, sustainable development, sustainable renewable energy services and job creation;
- ✈ **to CPAP: Result** "Framework agreements related to the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters are operational"; and

Output "Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local authorities is strengthened".

In this way, the relevance of the project is established with regard to its alignment with the reference frameworks for sustainable development at the global and national levels.

Moreover, in the current context, local ownership of SDOs should translate into the relevance of a project as soon as it is aligned with a SDO target.

3.3.1.2 Review of Relevance to Recipient Needs

The relevance of the project is based on the two intended outcomes that address immediate concerns: **(i)** populations active in the exploitation of agro-silvo-pastoral resources in the project intervention zones (individual producers, producer organizations, cooperatives). In fact, the finality resulting from the results is based on a strong reduction of land degradation, which allows the settlement of populations, the maintenance of production space, and the achievement of better and sustainable yields; **(ii)** central and decentralized government entities with regard to support for strategic steering; **(iii)** NGOs, as well as the private sector that are involved in support/advice for the benefit of rural producers.

3.3.1.3 Level of gender mainstreaming

From a design point of view, the results chain does not integrate relevant and gender-sensitive elements. However, in the field, the responsibilities assumed by women in the implementation have enabled them to impose their position as leaders and main actors in certain key sectors (good practices regarding training/dissemination and extension of improved stoves, afforestation, etc.). Moreover, it should be noted that it is in the women's intervention where the project recorded the most notable results.

After the mid-term evaluation, the document should have been revised to reflect, among other things, gender mainstreaming. Given this operational reality, the conceptual deficit does not call into question the relevance of the project.

3.3.1.4 UNDP Comparative Advantages

UNDP's intervention is in line with the continuity of cooperation with Mali by exploiting the lessons learned from previous cycles, particularly those relating to :

- (i)** to strengthen the capacity for strategic management of development. Output 2.1 of UNDP-GEF Result 2 is a strategic lever that will provide the Government with an indispensable tool for its mission of strategic management of agricultural development;
- (ii)** the development of demonstrative pilot actions enabling grassroots communities to work towards sustainable wealth creation by scaling up good practices. Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 constitute an operational lever for this purpose.

UNDP's commitment is also justified by its role as a leading agency in policy dialogue and support for resource mobilization.

☞ **Overall assessment: Satisfactory relevance (5/6)**

3.3.2 Consistency

From the point of view of the analysis of programmatic links, the project document is consistent with the global objectives of sustainable development, the National Priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan, the GEF Objectives, the United Nations Framework and the UNDP program in Mali.

However, and as noted in the analysis of the Strategic Outcomes Framework (Section 3.2.3.2), the results chain was incompletely defined.

The design of the strategic results framework, as presented in the project document, suffered from insufficient application of results-based management and quality control.

It should be noted that :

- ✦ the vertical MDG/National Priority/UNDAF-CPD/PS - GEF-OP vertical linkages/ Component/Strategic Objective/Objective/Effect are not established in a coherent manner ;
- ✦ The logical chain Result / Main Activities / Targets / Indicators / Sources of Verification / Timeframe / Costs / Implementation Structure / Partner Structures / Responsible Structure / Risks and Assumptions, has not been defined.

This did not fail to induce difficulties in : **(i) the annual planning of the project team (preparation of PTAs); (ii) quality control by the UNDP Office in its Atlas system.** The terminology needs to be clarified (Result here =Effect/Outcome). As mentioned above, the results framework requires a vertical arrangement, and a horizontal logical chain, leading to a discrete matrix, i.e., each element of which corresponds to a precise terminology and measurable content.

In order to assess the performance of the project in the most comprehensive way, the Results and Resources Framework (R&RF), which is the subject of **Appendix 17**, was developed using developments from sections 114 to 147 of the signed project document.

🔊 **Overall assessment: Moderately satisfactory consistency (3/6)**

3.3.3 Effectiveness

On the basis of the Results and Resources Framework established by the mission, the detailed review of implementation was made in **Annex 7** "Synopsis of the status of targets, outputs and outcomes/results".

This provides the following summary of the status of the targets, outputs, UNDP-GEF Outcomes and Immediate Objective.

3.3.3.1 Status of Targets and Products

3.3.3.1.1 Targets and Outputs of UNDP-GEF Result 1 "SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private consulting services for the benefit of producers is increased".

- **Current Status of Output 1.1** "Training resources on SLM are dynamically developed, tested and improved based on user feedback, and then deployed at project sites, disseminating the AHSAP capacity building approach".

The two targets [Target 1 "At least 60% of the surveyed users find the WDM toolkit appropriate, useful, relevant, and easy to use, and confirm that they have used it" and Target 2 "The final evaluation generally validates the survey results and confirms whether and how successful the toolkit has been"] were achieved in a timely manner.

More than 65% of users surveyed found the GDTE toolkit useful, both in terms of quality and content.

The operational duration of the project was 56 ½ months out of 66 months, i.e. a reduced duration of 8 ½ months.

With the targets achieved, it is noted that: **the level of achievement of Output 1.1 is satisfactory and effective (5/6)**

- **Current status of Output 1.2** "Knowledge is disseminated, innovation infused and technological breakthroughs adopted by beneficiaries as part of the AHS On-Line approach to strengthening FOs' capacity for SLM. The required activities were planned and executed in a timely manner, allowing the two targets to be achieved during the 56 1/2 months out of 66 period.

Thus, **the level of achievement of Product 1.2 is satisfactory and effective (5/6).**

3.3.3.1.2 Targets and Outputs of UNDP-GEF Result 2 "A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional".

- **Current Status of Output 2.1** "A geo-referenced system for monitoring and planning the management of agro-ecosystems is developed and adopted as part of the M&E framework for PAPAM and the

agricultural sector": The baseline situation of the project has been established, and two major studies have been conducted (Impact of SLM achievements on the regeneration of the vegetation cover; Estimation of carbon gain in SLM investments in the regions of Sikasso and Mopti). The first training activities on the monitoring system were carried out. However, the major actions that should lead to a monitoring system for the components of the selected agro-ecosystems that are operational have not been carried out.

Therefore, the targets [Target No. 2.1.1 "By the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system for the selected agro-ecosystem components is available for the project area"; Target No. 2.1.2 "At the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of being updated independently and sustainably maintained by MES with minimum external assistance"; Target 2.1 "From year 4 of the project, an annual environmental bulletin of the agroecosystems is published by MEADD"] have not been achieved.

Thus, **the level of achievement of Product 2.1 is unsatisfactory (2/6).**

- **Current status of Output 2.2** "Support is provided for coordination and monitoring and evaluation at the PAPAM program level:

The activities have been carried out (Ensure the operating costs of the project implementation coordination unit; Support the organization of annual audits and other studies related to project coordination, supervision and M&E; Support the maintenance and use of the goods and equipment acquired). **While the level of achievement of Output 2.2 is satisfactory**, Output 2.1 is in fact the determinant of UNDP-GEF Result 2.

3.3.3.2 Progress toward UNDP-GEF Results and the Immediate Objective

The analysis in **Appendix 6B, "Progress Matrix"**, leads to the progress summarized below:

❖ **Progress toward UNDP-GEF Outcome 1**

Through the achievement of outputs, the level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 1 is **satisfactory and effective. That is, a rating of 5/6.**

Four success stories/lessons learned are listed below:

Box 1 / Success Story #1

Box 2/ Success Stories #2

T
e
g *The consultation and reflection frameworks organized with more than 350 participants including 275 women leaders of women's organizations from the 6 intervention circles, mayors and traditional chiefs constitute a success in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to fight against gender inequalities.*

At the initiative of the project, the meeting of Bougouni, resulted in the call reproduced below. This call from groups and organizations of women leaders, local, administrative and technical authorities of the circles of Sikasso, Bougouni, Bankass, Koro, Douentza, Koutiala for the access of rural women to secure agricultural land is a strong act for effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and strategy to fight against gender inequalities.

Bougouni Appeal, June 21, 2019 "We, Representatives of Women's Organizations, local, administrative and technical authorities participating in the workshop on advocacy/lobbying for women's access to agricultural land in rural areas organized by the Land and Water Management Project (PGDTE).

Considering, the Agricultural Orientation Law

Considering the adoption of the Agricultural Land Law and its implementing decree

Considering the role and place of women in the sustainable management of land and water and environmental protection,

Considering the role and place of women in economic, social and cultural development ;

Considering the role and place of women in scaling up good practices in sustainable land and water management and environmental protection,

Considering that land tenure insecurity is a handicap to the scaling up of GDTE good practices by women;

Confirm the insufficient consideration of land tenure security on agricultural land for rural women.

Recognize that women are major actors in the implementation of the Agricultural Development Policy (ADP) in general and in the promotion of good WDM practices in particular,

Reaffirm the need to :

Improve the implementation of the Agricultural Land Law (boost the land commissions, set up commissions in areas where they do not exist, set up a committee to monitor the implementation of the Agricultural Land Law),

Include the allocation of agricultural land to rural women in communal, local and regional development plans;

Encourage greater involvement of administrative, customary and political authorities.

Confirm our willingness to support all initiatives aimed at improving women's access to secure agricultural land.

To this end, we are committed to participate fully in the implementation of the following strategies:

Information and sensitization of women on the agricultural land law;

Organization of consultation frameworks on agricultural land with all potential actors;

Advocacy with authorities for women's access to secure agricultural land,

Organization of exchange visits to localities where women's access to land is a reality,

Establishment of a follow-up committee to follow up on the recommendations of this workshop.

Do we agree to mobilize to influence public authorities and decision-makers to reduce measures for women's access to secure agricultural land?

"I want a Secure Farmland "

Done, in Bougouni, on June 21, 2019.

Representatives of Women's Organizations, local, administrative and technical authorities".

Box 3/Success Story #3: *The use of stone cord through contour-based landscaping (CBA) leads to a significant increase in yields with a view to sustainable wealth creation.*

Photo: Training session for POs in Bougouni on the stony cordon

In spite of the arduousness of this work, the women were involved in transporting the stones to make the pebble lines. After three years, the project organized 17 training sessions in stone cord that mobilized 472 people including 97 women. This enthusiasm is motivated by the 35% increase in crop yield thanks to the use of this technology.

Box 4/ Success story n° 4: *The project has taken a very good initiative by producing a micro-program on the production and broadcasting in 6 free radios, of awareness messages on the fifteen GDTE good practices in the 5 most spoken languages of each terroir. The use of local radio stations has facilitated access to messages on good GDTE practices for producers in areas affected by the security crisis.*

Progress toward UNDP-GEF Outcome 2

Non-achievement of strategic targets [At the end of year 3 of the project, a complete monitoring system of the selected agroecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is available for the project area; At the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of independent and sustainable updating maintained by MES with minimal external assistance; From year 4 of the project, an annual environmental bulletin of agroecosystems is published by MEADD], leading to :

Unsatisfactory achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 2 (2/6).

❖ Progress toward the Immediate Objective

As noted in the discussion of the design of the Results Framework (Section 3.2.3), the Immediate Objective is based on two levers: **(1)** a strategic lever determined by UNDP-GEF Result 2, the achievement of which will provide the government with a tool that is essential to its mission of strategically steering agricultural development; and **(2)** an operational lever determined by UNDP-GEF Result 1, the purpose of which is based on the development of demonstrative pilot actions that enable grassroots communities to work towards sustainable wealth creation by scaling up good practices.

The indicators mentioned concern only operational leverage, which has been achieved to a satisfactory level. It must be noted that the strategic lever constituted by UNDP-GEF Result 2 has an unsatisfactory level of achievement. Overall, progress toward the Immediate Objective is moderately satisfactory (3/6).

👉 Overall assessment: Moderately satisfactory effectiveness (3/6)

3.3.4 Implementation Partnership Strategy

The establishment and operation of the project was facilitated by the participation of government stakeholders at the local and national levels. At the operational level, the success stories noted stem from the participation of the populations, technical and scientific partners and service providers. However, it should be noted that the shortcomings noted in the design of the results framework also resulted in the absence of formal partnerships, designed on the basis of concerted efforts towards the achievement of UNDP/GEF Results 1 and 2. In particular, it is noted that:

- ⇒ for UNDP/GEF Result 1, no benefit was derived from the existence of the GEF Small Grants Programme (GEF-SGP), by making the sites true convergence/synergy zones between the WGDP and the GEF-SGP for the promotion of sustainable livelihoods ;
- ⇒ for UNDP/GEF Result 2, the coordination agreements required to give this result its full strategic leverage have not been established between the project and the Planning and Statistics Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture.

In this situation, there was no mechanism for dialogue between partners and advocacy/communication specifically dedicated to the choice of effects, the determination, and the monitoring of the role of each partner.

3.3.5 Efficiency

The analysis made with respect to progress toward UNDP/GEF Outcomes 1 and 2 (Section 3.3.3.2), as well as the review of Table B "Financial Execution by Outcome Table" below, indicate that implementation has been :

- ⇒ efficient for UNDP/GEF Result 1: satisfactory progress, with a financial implementation rate of 65.72 percent. This leads to a **fairly satisfactory efficiency for UNDP/GEF Result 1 (Rating 4/6)**;
- ⇒ Unsatisfactory efficiency for UNDP/GEF Result 2. Unsatisfactory progress toward UNDP/GEF Result 2 with a financial implementation rate of 192.68 percent, leading to unsatisfactory **efficiency for UNDP/GEF Result 2 (Rating 2/6)**.

Implementation was **moderately** efficient **(3/6)**.

3.3.6 Impacts

The implementation review noted positive changes with respect to :

- ⇒ GDTE's innovative approach, with the development of a catalog of best practices, now constitutes a tool whose use must be extended throughout the Sahelian zone of the continent ;
- ⇒ The advent of new types of behavior at the community level in resource management to contribute to sustainable development, in particular through : **(i) the** adoption of the improved banco household by women. This has immediate effects on the removal of woodland resources, and thus on carbon sequestration and gain; **(ii) the** use of the stone cord through contour-based management (ACN). This leads to a significant increase in yields with a view to creating sustainable wealth; **(iii) the establishment of** frameworks for consultation and reflection involving women leaders of women's organizations in the six intervention circles, mayors and traditional chiefs. This initiative constitutes a success in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to fight against gender inequalities.

Overall assessment: The changes induced are satisfactory (4/6)

3.3.7 Communication/Advocacy

The project has taken a very good initiative by producing a microprogram on the production and broadcasting in 6 free radios, awareness messages on the fifteen good practices of GDTE in the 5 most widely spoken languages of each land that are Bamanankan, Fulfulde, Cenara, Mamara and Dogosso with its 3 dialects. Other efforts have been made, particularly in communication and image through :

- (i)** the production of numerous tools (key rings, calendars, diaries, T-shirts, caps, etc.) ;
- (ii)** the production of training materials (technical sheets on good practices, etc.).

A toolkit on best practices in Sustainable Land and Water Management has been produced. It remains understood that a rather important work still needs to be done on the communication aspect to promote the image of the PGDTE by also calling upon traditional communicators.

3.3.8 Sustainability

The positive changes noted lead to an improvement in the living environment and living conditions of the populations, as well as the preservation of natural resources. From this point of view (**framework and living conditions/environment**) the probability is fairly good for the sustainability of the gains (**4/6**). However, there is a risk that the sustainability of the achievements will be annihilated by :

(1) the socio-political environment, in particular insecurity. The related problems must find a definitive solution through political, economic, cultural and social dialogue, which the State must manage in accordance with its perennial public service mission, which includes human security and the preservation of the integrity of the Malian territory. This risk is high, and induces an insufficient probability (**2/6**) for sustainability;

(2) The simultaneous and continuous non operation of the three "wickets": Training wickets developed by the project with a large volume of training sessions; Support/Consultancy wickets run by SLM providers; and Financing wickets provided by the project to support producers (small materials, inputs, etc.). It should be emphasized that for the first two windows (Training and Support/Advice), the State must ensure their existence and continuous operation, in view of its role as a pilot of sustainable agro-silvo-pastoral development. In fact, training and support/advice are an integral part of the public service mission that the State must assume. The existence and continuous operation of a financing window is the first obstacle to be removed in order to promote sustainable livelihoods (sustainable wealth creation). To this end, UNDP and the government should make every effort to establish partnerships between the public and private sectors (oil and mining companies, etc.) to support the development of a community-based financing mechanism for the benefit of communities. In this context, both from an **institutional** and a **financing point of view**, the probability for sustainability is medium (**3/6**).

It should be emphasized that the actions that led to the changes in behavior are part of an integral rural development approach characterized by transformations that take time to produce their effects. They are part of a programmatic approach to sustainable human development (SHD) based on Research and Development linking the fight against poverty and the preservation of the environment. In this respect, the management of experiments towards sustainable results requires a step of time that is not far from a decade! Partnerships will have to be established according to this time step. An interesting alternative would be, to implement the recommendations, to initiate a pilot program for the development of eco villages, rural eco-municipalities through SLM at the level of the six sites.

Overall assessment: Average probability (3/6)

3.4 Analysis of Management Arrangements

3.4.1 Methods of implementation

The year 2016 marked a turning point in the application of the principles of UN reform, particularly those relating to simplification and harmonization, by operating in accordance with harmonized and common country programming instruments such as the UNDAF results matrix, the use of cash transfers, PTAs, etc.

The project was implemented over an effective operational period of 561/2 months under the National Implementation Modality (NIM) and following the procedures of the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT), by the

Ministry of Environment, Sanitation and Sustainable Development (MEADD), through the Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development (AEDD - NIM implementation structure of the project).

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) that was set up was also to act as the Project Steering Committee (PSC). However, the reports of the PSC meetings do not reflect elements relevant to the effective functioning of the PSC as a PSC (monitoring and evaluation of the project by ensuring the quality of products, monitoring of processes by using evaluations to improve performance, accountability and learning).

The UNDP Office 's support is considered satisfactory overall despite the longer time taken by Operations to set up the funds. However, it should be noted that training efforts on the NIM modality have not been consistent in terms of the appropriation and use of the various monitoring and quality control possibilities in the Atlas system.

3.4.2 Resource Mobilization/ Financial Execution

3.4.2.1 Resource Mobilization Chart

Years	Allowances introduced at the beginning of the year (ASL)		Effective dates of the first transfers of funds
	UNDP	GEF Total	
2014	49,000	-	-
2015	80,000	150,000	TRANSFER OF 34,910,000 ON MAY 28, 2015/ VOUCHER 66067
2016	240,038	212,646	TRANSFER OF 90,850,000 ON MAY 12, 2016/ VOUCHER 72369
2017	68,045	343,336	TRANSFER OF 92,500,000 ON FEBRUARY 21, 2017/ VOUCHER 77100
2018	150,000	587,774	TRANSFER OF 158,630,000 ON APRIL 10, 2018/ VOUCHER 85084
2019	170,000	723,063	TRANSFER OF 224,762,200 ON MARCH 5, 2019/ VOUCHER 89861
2020	100,000	1, 227,761	-
Total	857,083	3, 244,580	

A review of the Resource Mobilization Table above reveals that :

- ⇒ the allocations put in place (ASL) were made beyond ;
- ⇒ There was always a delay at the beginning of the year in the transfer of UNDP funds to projects. In view of the dates of the first annual transfers, it is clear that, each year, operational activities were not funded until the second quarter. This situation has accentuated the delay already recorded in the effective start of operational activities.

3.4.2.2 Table of Financial Execution by Outcome

(Amounts in US\$)

	Approved budget (project document)			Actual expenditures (CDRs at 30/6/2020)			Execution rate % of		
	UNDP	GEF	Total	UNDP	GEF	Total	UNDP	GEF	Total
Result n° 1	-	1, 200,000	1, 200,000		788,620	788,620	-	65,72	65,72
Result n° 2	100, 000	600, 000	700, 000	643,521	705,271	1, 348,792	644	117,55	192,68

Management costs of the project	200,000	100,000	300,000	171,060	181,163	352,223	85,53	181,16	117,41
Total	300,000	1,900,000	2,200,000	814,581	1,675,054	2,489,635	271,53	88,16	113,17

The shortcomings noted in the design of the results framework also resulted in inadequate positioning of the AWP in Atlas. Indeed, a complete results chain would have made it possible to have, for each UNDP/GEF result, the exact outputs and their exact costs.

The operation of the CDRs as of 30/06/2020 led to the above Table of Financial Execution by Result.

We note as follows:

- an overall execution rate of 113.17% ;
- UNDP's contribution reached an increase of US\$ 514,581, or 171.53% without a formal budget review;
- The GEF contribution reflects a balance of US\$224,946 for which consecutive activities have not been defined.

3.4.2.3 Co-financing Status

In the financial package, two co-financing arrangements were foreseen for a total amount of USD 5,300,000:

(1)- the contribution of the Government of Mali, estimated at USD 300,000 in kind. This co-financing was carried out through : (i) the support of the 8 regional and local Focal Points, and the civil servants assigned to the project (mainly civil servants from the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture, as well as their decentralized services); (ii) the renting of the project offices by the AEDD;

(2)- certain investments that are part of the co-financing to the GEF AHSMP program, and which are financed by the EC, IFAD and the WB for an amount of 5,000,000 USD.

The analysis shows that co-financing was not the subject of co-financing letters or coordination agreements. This failure does not make it possible to assess the validity of the investments made which could be accounted for under the second co-financing. Only the UNDP co-financing was effective, even exceeding the forecasts (US\$814,581 against US\$300,000).

3.4.3 Monitoring/Evaluation

The monitoring/evaluation system is sufficiently well described with an indication of the financial resources required and the responsibilities of the parties involved. However, the statutory nature of the report of the start-up workshop has not been defined. This leads to a rating of **(4/6)**. The analysis of the implementation allows to note that :

- ⇒ Apart from the final report that the project had to prepare in October 2019, the various reports were produced (quarterly, annual, implementation reports of the IRP project);
- ⇒ The planned evaluations were conducted with a certain time lag:
 - ✚ The mid-term evaluation was conducted in 2018 instead of 2017. This did not give the project enough time to implement the recommendations;
 - ✚ The final evaluation was carried out from June 15 to July 28, 2020, when it should have been organized three months before the end of the activities (October 2019). In view of the current COVID 19 pandemic, the international consultant remotely piloted the mission, with the support of a national consultant ;
- ⇒ The monitoring system through site visits by the UNDP office and the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit has not been dynamic to enable the teams concerned to directly assess the progress of project activities. Only one field visit/BTOR report is available, and its content does not provide any direct assessment element;

- ⇒ the project has developed a fairly adequate monitoring system. On the other hand, the UNDP Atlas management and monitoring platform is not yet accessible to the national party, and the results drawn by the Office are not shared with the counterpart, and in particular with the GEF focal point;
- ⇒ the audits have been properly organized. The reports do not raise any particular observations that negatively impact the rating of the project.

In addition, and as mentioned in section 3.4.1 Implementation modalities, the Project Steering Committee (PSC) that was established was also to act as the Project Steering Committee (PSC). However, the reports of the PSC meetings do not reflect elements relevant to the effective functioning of the PSC as a PSC (monitoring and evaluation of the project by ensuring the quality of products, monitoring of processes by using evaluations to improve performance, accountability and learning). Thus, the monitoring and evaluation system is moderately satisfactory **(3/6)**.

Overall, the design and implementation of M&E is moderately satisfactory **(3.5/6)**.

PART 4: MAJOR DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED

The main factors that have influenced progress are as follows:

- 1) The long delay between the approval of the Project Identification Sheet (PIF) and the kick-off workshop ;
- 2) The "insecurity" risk that had been identified but not properly managed to minimize its negative effects ;
- 3) Insufficient application of results-based management and quality control in the design of the strategic results framework ;
- 4) The low level of the local financing mechanism to support communities in the development of sustainable livelihoods (access to equipment, materials, and agricultural inputs);
- 5) The delay that has always been recorded at the beginning of the year in the transfer of cash advances.

PART 5: CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The analysis of the process of setting up the project and its implementation leads to the following conclusions:

- 1) The "insecurity" risk had been identified, but it was not properly managed to minimize its negative effects;
- 2) The formulation/approval process was unusually long. It took 87 months from the approval of the PIF to the kick-off workshop. This period was long enough to induce changes in the project guidelines and thus destroy the coherence between the PIF and the signed project document;
- 3) The composition of the LPAC held on 01/08/2014 was not optimal due to the fact that some key partners were not represented, notably: the Ministry of Rural Development/National Directorate of Rural Engineering (DNGR); the National Directorate of Animal Production and Industries (DNPIA); the Institute of Rural Economy (IER); the National Directorate of Water and Forestry (DNEF); the World Bank (WB) and the European Commission (EC) ;
- 4) The report of the project kick-off workshop does not constitute, as it should have been, a fundamental reference elaborated and shared with all the stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to the implementation. Indeed, the objectives of the workshop did not sufficiently take into account : (i) the recommendations of LPAC, particularly those concerning coordination/synergy between the project and PAPAM, monitoring-evaluation,

and (ii) the need to finalize a first annual action plan based on the project results framework, highlighting indicators, targets, means of verification, and assumptions and risks to date;

- 5) The design of the strategic results framework, as presented in the project document, suffered from insufficient application of results-based management and quality control. The logical chain Results/Main Activities/Targets/Indicators/Verification Sources/Timeframe of Achievement/Costs/Implementation Structure/Partner Structures/Responsible Structure/Risks and Assumptions, was not defined ;
- 6) The alignment of the project with the reference frameworks for sustainable development at the global and national levels justifies its **satisfactory relevance (5/6)**. This relevance is also underpinned by the two intended outcomes that address immediate concerns: (i) populations active in the exploitation of agro-silvo-pastoral resources; (ii) central and decentralized governmental entities with regard to support for strategic management;

(iii) NGOs, as well as the private sector involved in support/advice for the benefit of rural producers ;
- 7) From a design point of view, the results chain does not integrate relevant and gender-sensitive elements. However, in the field, the responsibilities assumed by women in the implementation have enabled them to impose their position as leaders and main actors in certain key sectors (good practices regarding training/dissemination and extension of improved stoves, afforestation, etc.). Moreover, it should be noted that it is in the women's intervention where the project recorded the most notable results. After the mid-term evaluation, the document should have been revised to reflect, among other things, gender mainstreaming. Given this operational reality, the conceptual deficit does not call into question the relevance of the project;
- 8) From the point of view of the analysis of programmatic links, the project document is consistent with the global objectives of sustainable development, the National Priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan, the GEF Objectives, the United Nations Framework and the UNDP program in Mali. However, the results chain has been defined incompletely, leading to a **moderately satisfactory level of coherence (3/6)**;
- 9) With regard to UNDP-GEF Result 1 "SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private advisory services for the benefit of producers is increased".

Targets have been met and the level of achievement of the two targeted products is satisfactory. The operational duration of the project was 56 ½ months out of 66 months, i.e. a reduced duration of 8 ½ months. This leads to a **satisfactory and effective level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 1)**;

- 10) As for UNDP-GEF Result 2 "A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional", none of the strategic targets have been met. This leads to an **unsatisfactory achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 2 (2/6)**;
- 11) The Immediate Objective rests on two levers: (1) a strategic lever determined by UNDP-GEF Result 2, the achievement of which will provide the government with an indispensable tool for its mission of strategic steering of agricultural development; and (2) an operational lever determined by UNDP-GEF Result 1, the purpose of which is based on the development of demonstrative pilot actions enabling grassroots communities to work towards sustainable wealth creation by scaling up good practices. The indicators mentioned concern only the operational leverage, which has been satisfactorily achieved.

It is clear that the strategic lever constituted by UNDP-GEF Result 2 has an unsatisfactory level of achievement. **Overall, and in terms of effectiveness, progress towards the Immediate Objective is moderately satisfactory (3/6)**;
- 12) In terms of progress towards Results and financial execution, implementation has been **moderately efficient (3/6)**;

- 13) The implementation review **noted positive changes with respect to :** **(1)** the innovative approach to SLM, with the development of a catalog of good practices that now constitutes a tool whose use must be extended throughout the Sahelian zone of the continent; **(2)** the advent of new types of behavior at the community level in resource management to contribute to sustainable development, in particular through : **(i)** the adoption of the improved banco fireplace by women. This translates into immediate effects on woodland removals, and thus on carbon sequestration and gain; **(ii)** the use of the stony cord through contour-based management (CBM). This leads to a significant increase in yields with a view to creating sustainable wealth; **(iii)** the establishment of frameworks for consultation and reflection involving women leaders of women's organizations in the six intervention circles, mayors and traditional chiefs. This initiative constitutes a success in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to fight against gender inequalities.

The induced changes are satisfactory (4/6) ;

- 14) Undeniably, the positive changes noted lead to an improvement in the living environment and the living conditions of the populations, as well as the preservation of natural resources. However, the sustainability of the gains made risks being annihilated by : **(1)** insecurity. The related problems must find a definitive solution through political, economic, cultural and social dialogue, which the State must manage in accordance with its long-term public service mission, which includes human security and the preservation of the integrity of the Malian territory; **(2)** the simultaneous and continuous non-functioning of the three "Guichets": (2) the non simultaneous and continuous operation of the three "Windows": Training Window developed by the project with a large volume of training sessions; Support/Consultancy Window run by SLM service providers; Financing Window provided by the project to support producers (small equipment, inputs, etc.). It should be emphasized that for the first two windows (Training and Support/Advice), the State must ensure their existence and continuous operation, in view of its role as a pilot of sustainable agro-silvo-pastoral development. Indeed, training and support/advice are an integral part of the public service mission that the State must assume.

The existence and continued operation of a funding window is the first hurdle that must be removed to promote sustainable livelihoods (sustainable wealth creation). To this end, UNDP and the government will have to make every effort to establish partnerships between the public and private sectors (oil companies, mining companies, etc.) to support the development of a community-based financing mechanism for the benefit of communities.

Overall assessment: Average probability (3/6)

- 15) The main factors that have influenced progress are as follows:
(1) insecurity; **(2)** the long delay between the approval of the Project Identification Sheet (PIF) and the kick-off workshop ;
(3) insufficient application of results-based management and quality control in the design of the strategic results framework; **(4)**
(4) the low level of the local financing mechanism to support communities in the development of sustainable livelihoods (access to equipment, materials, and agricultural inputs, etc.); **(5)** the delay that has always been recorded at the beginning of the year in the transfer of cash advances;
16) The statutory process for the operational closure of a project was not respected, with at least one last quarter devoted to the major actions mandated: drafting of the final report, final independent evaluation, final audit, final Steering Committee;

- 17) The analysis shows that co-financing was not the subject of co-financing letters or coordination agreements. This failure does not make it possible to assess the validity of the investments made and which can be accounted for as co-financing;

18) Overall project implementation was moderately satisfactory (3.5/6).

5.2 Lessons Learned/Best Practices in SMART

5.2.1 Best practices in WDM

The following lessons can be drawn from the conduct of the evaluation and constitute best practices in SLM that need to be taken to scale:

- ✦ GDTE's innovative approach, with the development of a catalog of best practices : **(i) the** adoption of the improved banco fireplace by women. This results in immediate effects on removals from the woodland formations, and hence on carbon sequestration and gain; **(ii) the** use of the stone cord through contour-based landscaping (ACN). This leads to a significant increase in yields with a view to sustainable wealth creation;
- (iii) Timber Production Planting; (iv) Assisted Natural Regeneration.** The above-mentioned catalog now constitutes a tool whose exploitation must be extended throughout the Sahelian zone of the continent ;
- ✦ The establishment of frameworks for consultation and reflection involving women leaders of women's organizations from the 6 intervention circles, mayors and traditional chiefs. This initiative is a success in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to fight against gender inequalities;
- ✦ The use of proximity radios, which has facilitated the access of producers in areas affected by the security crisis to messages on good GDTE practices.

5.2.2 Prospects for scaling up SLM best practices

The positive changes noted are supported by the implementation of best practices in TDM. As a result, scaling up, like sustainability, risks being overwhelmed by : **(1) insecurity.** The related problems must find a definitive solution through political, economic, cultural and social dialogue, which the State must manage in accordance with its long-term public service mission, which includes human security and the preservation of the integrity of the Malian territory; **(2) the** simultaneous and continuous non-functioning of the three "wickets": the training wicket developed by the project with a large volume of training sessions; the support/advice wicket run by SLM service providers; and the financing wicket provided by the project to support producers (small equipment, inputs, etc.).

It should be emphasized that for the first two windows (Training and Support/Counseling), the State must ensure their existence and continuous operation, in view of its role as a pilot of sustainable agro-silvo-pastoral development. In fact, training and support/advice are an integral part of the public service mission that the State must assume. The existence and continuous operation of a financing window is the first obstacle to be removed in order to promote sustainable livelihoods (sustainable wealth creation). To this end, UNDP and the government should make every effort to establish partnerships between the public and private sectors (oil and mining companies, etc.) to support the development of a community-based financing mechanism for the benefit of communities. It should be emphasized that the actions that have led to changes in behavior are part of an integral rural development approach characterized by transformations that take time to produce their effects. They are part of a programmatic approach to sustainable human development (SDH) based on Research and Development linking the fight against poverty and the preservation of the environment. In this context, the management of experiments towards sustainable results requires a time step that is not far from a decade! Partnerships will have to be established according to this time step. An interesting alternative would be, to implement the recommendations, to initiate a pilot program for the development of eco villages, rural eco-municipalities by SLM at the level of the six sites.

5.3 Recommendations

✦ To the Government, UNDP, and GEF :

1. Rapidly implement a partnership focused on scaling up WDM best practices in a programmatic approach through a pilot WDM development program for rural eco-villages/ecocommunities. This partnership should also support the development of a national strategy for the creation of eco-villages by the WDM with an action plan over a 30-year horizon.

2. Limit the formulation/approval process to a period not exceeding 20 months.
3. Ensure that co-financing is subject to co-financing letters signed by the parties concerned.

📌 **To the Government and UNDP :**

1. Arrange for the effective participation of key partners in LPAC, or receive (in their absence) formally their comment sheets and opinions with respect to their recommendation for project approval. A suggested format is provided in Annex 13.
2. Organize the project kick-off workshop no later than two months after the operational start, so that the report is a fundamental reference elaborated and shared with all stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to the implementation :

agreement on the Global Indicative Project Plan - GIP proposed in Annex 7A; understanding of the roles, support services and responsibilities of the UNDP country office, UNDP/GEF Unit vis-à-vis the project team; finalization of the first annual action plan based on the project results framework highlighting indicators, targets, means of verification, as well as assumptions and risks to date;

3. Organize joint field visits extended to other partners

📌 **To the Government :**

1. To do everything possible to promote political, economic, cultural and social dialogue, which the State must manage in accordance with its perennial public service mission, which includes human security and the preservation of the integrity of the Malian territory.
2. Encourage and facilitate the establishment of frameworks for consultation and reflection involving women leaders of grassroots women's organizations, mayors and traditional chiefs in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to combat gender inequalities. In the context of decentralization, the aim here is to promote a local land governance body.

📌 **UNDP and the UNDP/GEF Regional Unit:**

1. Ensure continuous business intelligence to ensure consistency between the Project Identification Form (PIF) and the project document.
2. Establish and implement a close follow-up plan through field visits.

📌 **At the UNDP :**

1. Ensure that the delay in transferring cash advances at the beginning of the year is eliminated.
2. To ensure, for the benefit of the national side, regular training on the NIM modality. This training should also be geared towards national ownership of the UNDP Atlas management and monitoring platform.

5.4 Synopsis of Conclusions/Memorandum of Recommended Actions

Sectors/ Criteria evaluation	Conclusions	Memorandum of Recommended Actions		
		Recommended actions	Responsible Party	Deadline
Insecurity	The "insecurity" risk had been identified, but it was not properly managed to minimize its negative effects.	To do everything possible to promote political, economic, cultural and social dialogue, which the State must manage in accordance with its perennial public service mission, which includes human security and the preservation of the integrity of the Malian territory.	Government	Ongoing
Process formulation/ approval	The formulation/approval process was unusually long. It took 87 months from the approval of the PIF to the kick-off workshop. This period was long enough to induce changes in the project guidelines and thus destroy the coherence between the PIF and the signed project document.	Limit the formulation/approval process to a period not exceeding 20 months.	Government, UNDP, and GEF	As soon as the project is identified
		Ensure that co-financing is subject to co-financing letters signed by the parties concerned.	Government, UNDP, and FE	During project formulation
		Ensure continuous business intelligence to ensure consistency between the Project Identification Form (PIF) and the project document.	UNDP and UNDP/GEF Regional Unit	Upon approval of the PIF
Local Project Review Committee	The composition of the LPAC held on 01/08/2014 was not optimal due to the fact that some key partners were not represented, notably: the Ministry of Rural Development/National Directorate of Rural Engineering (DNGR); the National Directorate of Industrial and Animal Productions (DNPIA); the Institute of Rural Economy (IER); the National Directorate of Water and Forestry (DNEF); the World Bank (WB) and the European Commission (EC).	Arrange for the effective participation of key partners in LPAC, or receive (in their absence) formally their comment sheets and opinions with respect to their recommendation for project approval. A proposed format is provided in Annex 13.	Government and UNDP	One month before LPAC

Sectors/ Criteria evaluation	Conclusions	Memorandum of Recommended Actions		
		Recommended actions	Responsible Party	Deadline
Organization of the kick-off workshop	The report of the project kick-off workshop does not constitute, as it should have been, a fundamental reference elaborated and shared with all the stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to the implementation. Indeed, the objectives of the workshop did not sufficiently take into account : (i) the recommendations of LPAC and (ii) the need to finalize a first annual action plan on the basis of the project results framework, highlighting indicators, targets, means of verification, as well as assumptions and risks to date.	Organize the kick-off workshop for future projects, so that the report can be a fundamental reference elaborated and shared with all stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to implementation (agreement on the Global Indicative Project Planning; understanding of the roles, support services and responsibilities of UNDP, UNDP/GEF Unit; finalization of the first annual action plan based on the project results framework).	Government and UNDP	No later than two months after operational start-up
Results Framework Design	The design of the strategic results framework as presented in the project document, suffered from insufficient application of results-based management and Targets/Indicators/Verification sources/Time frame/Costs/Implementation structure/Partner structures/Responsible structure/Risks and hypotheses, was not defined.	Rigorously apply results-based management in future formulations.	Formulation team	As soon as it is formulated

Sectors/ Criteria evaluation	Conclusions	Memorandum of Recommended Actions		
		Recommended actions	Responsible Party	Deadline
	The alignment of the project with the reference frameworks for sustainable development at the	Reflecting gender mainstreaming in the development of the project completion report	AEDD	Immediate

Relevance	<p>global and national levels justifies its satisfactory relevance (5/6). This relevance is also underpinned by the two intended outcomes that address immediate concerns: (i) populations active in the exploitation of agro-silvo-pastoral resources; (ii) central and decentralized government entities with regard to support for strategic management; (iii) NGOs, as well as the private sector involved in support/advice for the benefit of rural producers From the design point of view, the chain of results does not integrate the relevant elements that reflect gender mainstreaming. However, in the field, the responsibilities assumed by women in implementation have imposed their positioning as leaders and main actors in certain key sectors (good practices concerning training/dissemination and extension of improved stoves, afforestation, etc.). Given this operational reality, the conceptual deficit does not call into question the relevance of the project.</p>			
------------------	---	--	--	--

Sectors/ Criteria evaluation	Conclusions	Memorandum of Recommended Actions		
		Recommended actions	Responsible Party	Deadline
Coherence	The project document is consistent with the global objectives of sustainable development, national priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan, the GEF Objectives, the United Nations Framework and the UNDP program in Mali. However, the results chain has been defined incompletely, leading to a moderately satisfactory level of coherence (3/6) .	Rigorously apply results-based management in future formulations.	Formulation team	As soon as it is formulated

Impact Sustainability /	<p>Positive changes are noted in: the innovative approach to SLM, with the development of a catalog of good practices; the advent of new types of behavior at the community level for sustainable development. The changes induced are satisfactory (4/6). There is a risk that the sustainability of what has been achieved will be annihilated by : (1) insecurity; (2) the simultaneous and continuous non-functioning of the three "wickets": Training wickets; Support/Advice wickets and Financing wickets provided by the project to support producers (small equipment, inputs, etc.). It should be emphasized that for the first two windows (Training and Support/Advice), the State must ensure their existence and continuous operation, in view of its role as a pilot of sustainable agro-silvo-pastoral development.</p>	<p>Rapidly implement a partnership focused on scaling up WDM best practices in a programmatic approach through a pilot WDM development program for rural eco-villages/ecocommunities. This partnership should also support the development of a national strategy for the creation of eco-villages by the WDM with an action plan over a 30-year horizon.</p>	Government, UNDP and GEF	Immediate
-------------------------	--	---	--------------------------	-----------

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference

International consultant to carry out the final evaluation of the Sustainable Land and Water Management and Environmental Support Project for the PAPAM: Program for the Increase of Agricultural Productivity in Mali, UNDP-GEF Component. PIMS_4138_Mali_PAPAM

Rental :	Bamako, MALI
Application Deadline :	16-Apr-20 (Midnight New York, USA)
Type of Contract :	Individual Contract
Post Level :	International Consultant
Languages Required :	English French
Duration of Initial Contract :	21 days

Background

Please note that all offers (technical and financial proposals, copies of diplomas, etc.) duly signed must be sent to the e-mail address mali.procurement@undp.org with the reference and title of the file. Your proposal must be received no later than Thursday, April 16, 2020 at 5:00 p.m. sharp.

This project was initially designed to be a component of a broader development program entitled "Promoting Agricultural Production in Mali" (PAPAM) with an estimated total budget of \$160 million to be distributed between 2010 and 2016/7. It is also part of the GEF-4 Strategic Investment Program, where various GEF agencies have provided funding from multiple sources to improve Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in recipient countries in Africa, including Mali. A large part of the AHSMP program in Mali consists of a World Bank agricultural investment lead, which includes a mix of IDA and IFAD loans, EC grants, government investments in the agricultural sector, and GEF funding executed by the World Bank (\$6.2 million) and UNDP (\$1.9 million). Although relatively small, the GEF program component is significant. GEF, World Bank and UNDP interventions complement each other and focus on promoting Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems and the engagement of the Ministry of Environment, Water and Sanitation in improving and monitoring the sustainability of agricultural systems and practices. Due to the political crisis in Mali, implementation of the PAPAM program has been delayed. This issue will be addressed during the implementation of the program in a post-conflict context, as investments in agricultural development are necessary.

The PAPAM Program is structured around three components :

- (1) technology transfer and provisioning services ;
- (2) irrigation infrastructure; and
- (3) the programmatic approach to sector monitoring.

Through two important results, this UNDP-GEF project will specifically contribute to components 1 and 3 of the AHSMP as follows: UNDP-GEF Outcome 1] Strengthen the capacities of producer organizations (POs) and service providers (under MYFF Sub-component 1.2); and [UNDP-GEF Outcome 2] Ensure sectoral monitoring and evaluation (MYFF Sub-components 3.2 and 3.4).

The project strategy is to address the drivers of land and natural resource degradation through a barrier removal approach. The choice of outcomes and sites to co-sustain the overall objectives of the AHS program. Given the limited budget allocated to the UNDP-GEF component of PAPAM, this project will have a limited scope in the field. To compensate for this, it will focus on the added value of strengthening the capacities of FOs and ensuring conditions conducive to the dissemination of innovation in production practices within the PAPAM program. It will do so by addressing the obstacles to change, which in turn will address the main factors of natural resource degradation in Mali's agricultural production systems. The primary and underlying determinant of land and natural resource degradation in Mali is the application of inappropriate land management techniques, attributed to the low dissemination of knowledge on best practices in Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM). The impact of climate change on these environmentally weakened land-use systems carries a high risk of increasing the speed and extent of depletion

of natural resources, which form the basis of agriculture, livestock and forestry. The projected rise in temperatures and reduced and more variable rainfall will have a negative impact on agricultural seasons, productivity of land use systems, water availability, vegetation cover and biological diversity. Increased migration of people and animals is expected to occur to areas with high rainfall, which would increase pressure on natural resources in these areas, and could lead to conflicts over access to and use of natural resources. The overall environmental objective of the project is to increase and broaden the use of SLM practices in order to halt, reduce and reverse land degradation, focusing on areas where the agricultural investment component will be implemented. This will be achieved through the widespread adoption and dissemination of SLM technologies, using public and private sector advisory services. Project investments will focus on four main food crop production systems (irrigated rice and market gardening, rainfed cereals, fodder production, and livestock production) with potential for increased productivity based on confirmed domestic demand. These production systems have already been studied by research programs, and innovative techniques are readily available. In each production system, a reference agricultural product and WGDT technologies have been selected to guarantee their production potential, productivity gains and significant environmental impacts. The objective is that by the end of the project, 60% of the AHS On-Farm Food Security Program beneficiary producers will have adopted WGDE technologies. The project will also develop WGDE consulting services at the level of community and socio-professional organizations.

The project will result in the improvement of ecosystem resilience and productivity in fragile agricultural areas of Mali. Monitoring will be carried out through the project's second output - an efficient system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems. The project aims to develop a comprehensive monitoring system for the selected agro-ecosystems by the end of year 3. The environmental benefits of the project will be the reduction of the rate, and then the gradual reversal, of land degradation by increasing the areas covered by the WGDE, compared to the baseline situation.

This project proposal is aligned with the UNDAF (2008-2012) and the UNDP country program (2006-2012). These programming frameworks have been extended until December 2014. It is fully in line with the fourth strategic priority which aims to "increase food security, rural development and employment opportunities for vulnerable rural communities". The project is also consistent with the GEF's sustainable land management strategy and will contribute directly to the implementation of strategic programs PS-1 and PS-2 - with UNDP providing leading support to the government in the area of SLM. The project is also consistent with Operational Programme OP-15 on the Mitigation and Prevention of Land Degradation and Desertification. It is also consistent with the agreed principles of the GEF-led Strategic Investment Program (SIP).

Duties and Responsibilities

General objective of the final evaluation:

The purpose of this evaluation, conducted at the request of the Government of Mali, UNDP and the GEF, is to provide program partners with assessment information on the achievement of project outputs, to draw lessons and to make relevant recommendations for the direction to be taken to achieve the expected results, and to consolidate and sustain the achievements of the program for the purpose of extending it to other geographical areas.

Specific objectives:

- Assess overall performance against the objectives as defined in the project document (PRODOC) and other related documents;
- Assess the relevance of project actions to national priorities and the strategic objectives of UNDP and GEF
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the project; - Evaluate the project's efficiency and effectiveness

- To critically analyze the project implementation and management measures as well as the constraints related to the scaling up of good practices in WDM;
- Assess the sustainability of project interventions and consider the impact of the project especially of each good practice on the lives of the communities benefiting from the intervention; and,
- Document lessons learned and best practices related to project design, implementation and management that could be useful to other projects in the country and around the world.

Methodology:

The international consultant will detail in the initial report the methodological approach that will be followed for the realization of the mission. However, the conduct of the mission should include the following steps:

- Scoping meeting with the Consultant to introduce the Consultant to stakeholders including UNDP, the project team and the AEDD, clarification of the terms of reference and exchanges on the methodology ;
- Consultation of the existing bibliography: exploitation of all the documentation produced within the framework of the implementation of the project ;
- During this phase, the consultant will conduct a literature review which will consist of, among other things, collecting available information on approaches, tools, and mechanisms for planning, implementing and monitoring the project as well as documentation generated during project implementation;
- For this purpose, a list of mandatory documents to be considered by the consultant will be provided to the consultant by the project team and UNDP.

Participatory approach:

- It is the organization of working meetings with the main actors and beneficiaries on the results of the project. Within this framework, the consultant will meet national and regional/local partners as well as the main technical and financial partners and programs and projects involved in sustainable land management;
- It will be suggested to the consultant to use a questionnaire, field visits and interviews with technical services and Producer Organizations (POs) at the sites where the training sessions were held.
- At the level of each circle, there are regional and local Focal Points to which the consultant will rely for the organization of his mission in the field. The consultant will be asked to evaluate the Memorandum of Understanding between the Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development (AEDD) and the Regional Directorates of Water and Forestry (DREF) and Agriculture (DRA) of the regions of Sikasso and Mopti, as well as the added value of the Focal Points in the achievement of project results.

Location of the study:

- The study will be conducted in the District of Bamako and the regions of Sikasso (Cercles de Sikasso, Bougouni and Koutiala) and Mopti (Cercles de Bankass, Koro and Douentza).

Deliverables:

It is expected from the consultant:

- A brief methodological note describing the methods, tools, samples, partners to be visited, sites to be visited, and a schedule to be validated by stakeholders
- one (01) copy of the draft evaluation report to be validated by stakeholders
- three (03) copies of the final report incorporating comments from stakeholders, UNDP, Regional Office and GEF team in Addis.

All documents will be written in French and submitted in both paper and electronic formats (Word, Excel and Powerpoint).

NB: all the consultant's presentations with stakeholders will be made in Powerpoint.

Competencies

Tasks of the consultant :

The main tasks assigned to the consultant are:

- development of the study methodology ;
 - the elaboration of the chronogram of the realization of the study ;
 - participation in debriefing sessions with brief summaries:
 - participation in the validation meeting of the study's inception report
 - the organization of meetings with all the actors at the national, regional and local levels in the conduct of the mission;
 - the design of the concept note for the tools for collecting data in the field from producer organizations, beneficiaries of the intervention and on the project sites ;
 - the organization of working sessions with the members of the national steering committee of the project, the technical and financial partners of the project and the project team, in charge of validating each step of the mission.
 - the collection of data on the impact of the achievements of the good practices on the life of the beneficiary communities at the level of the 6 intervention circles of the project;
 - the choice of sites to be sampled ;
 - informing and sensitizing officials on the scaling up of good practices in SLM in the project area and beyond;
 - the production of the interim report of the final evaluation ;
 - participation in the technical committee meeting to review and validate the draft final assessment report ;
-
- the production and submission of the final evaluation report.

Interactive Skills :

- Recognizes and responds appropriately to the ideas, interests and concerns of others with a high degree of sensitivity to difference;
- establishes performance standards and objectives, and assumes responsibility for them.

Results Orientation :

- plans and produces quality results to achieve the desired objectives.

Innovation and discernment :

- contributes with innovative and practical ideas and approaches to deal with difficult situations ;
- strives to provide quality, customer-centric services (both internally and externally).

Communication :

- Demonstrates good written and oral communication skills.
- Job knowledge and expertise ;
- Executes daily tasks in an orderly, efficient and systematic manner, adapting to fluctuating workloads;
- Uses information technology as a tool and as a resource;
- Is motivated and demonstrates an ability to pursue personal development and learning;
- Good knowledge of initiatives to develop and implement education programs on climate and flood risks in Mali ;
- Experiences with UNDP and Global Environment Facility procedures for programmatic management.

Required Skills and Experience

Consultant profile :**Education :**

- The study will be conducted by an international consultant (individual), with at least a master's degree in agronomy, agro-economics, environment, social sciences, or any degree deemed equivalent;

Experience :

- have at least ten (10) years of relevant professional experience in the evaluation of environmental projects and sustainable development ;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring methodologies and field project evaluation methods ;
- technical knowledge of the main target areas (sustainable land management, agro-economics, rural development, ecology, forestry, earth sciences), or related fields ;
- knowledge of UNDP and GEF ;
- skills in capacity building for producers and impact monitoring
- have at least one similar experience in a post-conflict country.
- Fluency in French (oral and written).
- A good knowledge of the context of Mali and the regions where the project operates is an asset.
- Have diverse skills in project management ;

Languages Required :

- The candidate must have a perfect command of French:
- Working knowledge of English is an asset.

Appendix 2: Evaluation Schedule

The work was carried out according to the schedule summarized in the matrix below:

Periods	Work axes	Products Targeted
1st week : From Monday 15th At Friday June 19, 2020	<p>-Implementation of the "Mailing Group Evaluation PAPAM";</p> <p>-Exchanges/ brainstorming at the level of the "Mailing Group Evaluation PAPAM" on, in particular: the requirements of the UNDP Evaluation Office, the directives, rules and procedures established by UNDP and the GEF, the methodological approach, the draft evaluation matrix, the synoptic of the implementation, the working documents, and the timetable for carrying out the evaluation;</p> <p>-Documentary review: National reference documents: Strategic Framework for Economic Recovery and Sustainable Development 2019-2023; New Vision "Mali 2040"; National Report on Human Development "Public-Private Partnerships, Human Development and Poverty Reduction"; Agenda 2030; Results of the Rapid Integrated Assessment Exercise; Voluntary National Report on progress made on SDOs; Priority Investment Plan/National Determined Contribution (NDP); UNS documents: UNDP Strategic Plan; UNDAF (2008-2012)/UNDP Country Programme (2006-2012), as well as the amendments extending them until December 2014, as well as the various related monitoring/evaluation reports; Country Programme Document 2020-2024; All ROARs since the start of the project; Statements of challenges and performance over the period 2014-2019; Results of the UNDP environmental and social impact assessment; Relevant GEF documents: GEF Strategy for Sustainable Land Management; Strategic Programs PS-1/PS-2; Operational Program PO-15; Strategic Investing Program; Key UNDP/GEF project documents: PIF; LPAC Report; Project Document; All ATPs; Early Year FACES; Annual Activity Reports; RIPS; CDRs; Steering Committee Reports; Mid-Term Evaluation Report; Audit Reports and Management Response Monitoring Reports; UNDP-GEF Unit Mission Report; Field Visit Reports; Technical Notes/Documents produced by the project; Project procedure manual; Partnership agreements related to project implementation and reports to donors; Conventions/Protocols/Memorandum of Understanding concerning notably the support-advice; Description of the Program "Promoting Agricultural Production in Mali" -PAPAM, as well as the related monitoring/evaluation reports; ADR reports; World Human Development Reports; SDO monitoring reports;</p> <p>-Elaboration and submission of the draft Initial Report ;</p> <p>-Exchanges with the Mission Reference/Monitoring Group (stakeholders including UNDP, the project team, the Environment and Sustainable Development Agency -ESDA) to review/validate the initial report;</p> <p>-Finalization of the Initial Report</p>	<p>Initial mission report</p>

Period	Work axes	Products Targeted
2nd week : From Monday 22nd At Friday June 26, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Collection of data and information through the circulation at the level of the "Mailing Groupe Evaluation PAPAM", of the synoptic of the implementation (format in annex 5). - Interviews with the different local actors by a national consultant. The synoptic will allow the collection of data/information and appreciations/orientations of the different actors. 	Draft implementation synopsis
3rd and 4th week : From Monday 29/06 At Friday July 10, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Finalization of the implementation summary table and development of the draft evaluation report. The document review and contacts for clarification and/or requests for additional information will allow : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ finalize the synoptic implementation table (Annex 5) and the ad hoc matrix for the identification of good GDTE practices (Annex 6), from which the findings/conclusions and recommendations of the mission (see format provided in Annex 7) will be derived, with a view to extending good GDTE practices to other geographical areas; ⇒ writing the draft evaluation report; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Synopsis of the implementation ; -Draft evaluation report
5th and 6th week : From Monday 13/07 At Friday July 24, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Exchanges with the technical committee for the review and validation of the draft assessment report; -Exploitation of observations and amendments ; -Writing the final evaluation report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Compendium of comments and amendments from the meeting ; -Final Evaluation Report

Appendix 3: Mailing Group Evaluation PAPAM

Institution/Entity	Focal points	Contacts	
		Email	Phone
UNDP	Oumar TAMBOURA	Oumar.tamboura@undp.org	76318080
Consultant	Arona FALL	maodofall.fall@gmail.com	00 (221) 77 167 33 85
Environment and Sustainable Development Agency (AEDD)	Boureima CAMARA	bouricamara@gmail.com	66805756
Project team	Mamadou DIALLO	Mamadou.mamoudou.diallo@undp.org	76013791
Operational focal point	Issa Fahiri KONE	issafahiri@yahoo.fr	66712210
Steering Committee	Modibo SACKO	ozone@afribone.ml	66744018
National Directorate of Agriculture (DNA)	Diakaridia COULIBALY	Cdiak58@gmail.com	76337001
National Directorate of Rural Engineering (DNGR)			
Rural Development Office			
National Directorate of Sanitation and Control of Pollution and Nuisances (DNACPN)			
National Directorate of Water and Forests (DNEF)	Seyni TRAORE	Seynitraore2000@yahoo.fr	79352500

Institution/Entity	Focal points	Contacts	
		Email	Phone
National Direction of Livestock	Otogolo KONE	otogolokone@yahoo.fr	76374331
National Directorate in charge of Fisheries			
Planning and Statistics Unit (Cellule de Planification et de Statistique du Secteur Développement Rural, CPS/SDR)	Brehima KANTE	brehimkante@gmail.com	69177300
Institute of Rural Economy (IER)	Sayon KAMISSOKO	sayonkamiss@yahoo.fr	76013683

UNDP/GEF Unit	Regional Technical Advisors :	Lela FIKROU Lela.fikrou@undp.org	Addis
Organization of producers at the national level	Yahiya KANE	Kaneyahaya91@gmail.com	66899392
Organization of producers at the level of the District of Bamako			
Organization of producers in the region of Sikasso	Asaph DEMBELE	Asaph_dembele@yahoo.fr	76148372
Organization of producers at the level of the Cercle de Sikasso	Bakary KONE	Bakaryk41@yahoo.fr	79329992
Organization of the producers at the level of the Cercle de Bougouni	N'Golo TRAORE	Ngolotraore840@yahoo.fr	79069429
Organization of producers at the level of the Circle of Koutiala	Tayirou TRAORE	Village N'Tosso, cordon pierreux	65621019

Institution/Entity	Focal points	Contacts	
		Email	Phone
Organization of producers at the level of the Cercle de Bankass	Oumou SANGARE	Oumousank1@yahoo.fr	79352740
Organization of producers at the level of the Cercle de Koro	Fidele TOGO	Koporo, assisted natural regeneration	65666348
Organization of producers at the level of the Circle of Douentza	Oussou KOITA	Koitaousmane60@gmail.com	79113380
Decentralized technical service of the National Directorate of Agriculture covering sites in the District of Bamako.			
Decentralized technical service of the National Directorate of Agriculture covering sites in the Sikasso region (Cercles de Sikasso, Bougouni and Koutiala).	Aassaidou MAIGA	zamaiga@gmail.com	76086244
Decentralized technical service of the National Directorate of Agriculture	Mahamadou MAIGA, Local Focal Point	mamadouhamamaiga@yahoo.fr	76318891

covering sites in the Mopti region (Bankass, Koro and Douentza circles).			
Organization of producers in the Mopti region	Abdoulaye YARO	Abdoulayevaro379@gmail.com	65762152

Institution/Entity	Focal points	Contacts	
		Email	Phone
Decentralized technical service of the National Directorate of Water and Forestry (DNEF) covering sites in the District of Bamako.			
Decentralized technical service of the National Directorate of Water and Forestry (DNEF) covering the sites in the Sikasso region (Cercles de Sikasso, Bougouni and Koutiala).	Sékou A T TOURE, Sikasso Regional Focal Point covering the circles of Bougouni, Sikasso and Koutiala	Cheicktoure29@yahoo.fr	74361110
Decentralized technical service of the National Directorate of Water and Forestry (DNEF) covering the sites in the Mopti region (Bankass, Koro and Douentza Circles).	Ousmane SAMASSEKOU Mahamadou MAIGA, Local Focal Point covering only the circle of Bankass, Mopti region. Ousmane SAMASSEKOU, Local Focal Point covering only the circle of Douentza, Mopti region.	ousamassekou@yahoo.fr	76010848
Permanent Secretary of the network of SLM providers in the regions of Sikasso and Mopti	Lassana Arouna FOFANA	lafsarco@yahoo.fr	76477275

Emails available :

Mamadou.mamoudou.diallo@undp.org
issafahiri@yahoo.fr
ozone@afribone.ml Cdiak58@gmail.com
Seynitraore2000@yahoo.fr otogolokone@yahoo.fr
brehimkante@gmail.com
sayonkamiss@yahoo.fr
Kaneyahaya91@gmail.com
Asaph_dembele@yahoo.fr
Bakaryk41@yahoo.fr Ngolotraore840@yahoo.fr
Oumousank1@yahoo.fr
Koitaousmane60@gmail.com
zamaiga@gmail.com mamadouhamamaiga@yahoo.fr
Abdoulayeyaro379@gmail.com Cheicktoure29@yahoo.fr
ousamassekou@yahoo.fr
lafsarco@yahoo.fr

Appendix 4: List of the main documents used

National reference documents

- Strategic Framework for Growth and Poverty Reduction (GPRSP) for the period 2007-2011 ;
- Agricultural Orientation Law (LOA) of 2006 ;
- Roadmap of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) for the development of a National Agricultural Investment Program - PNISA ;
- National Policy for the Protection of the Environment (PNPE).
- New national development strategy on a five-year horizon entitled "Strategic Framework for Economic Recovery and Sustainable Development 2019-2023";
- New long-term vision "Mali 2040";
- National Report on Human Development entitled "Public-Private Partnerships, Human Development and Poverty Reduction";

- Agenda 2030 ;
- Priority Investment Plan in accordance with Mali's commitments on the National Determined Contribution (CDN);
- Action plans and national communications on post-Rio conventions;

SNU Documents

- ⇒ UNDP Strategic Plans 2008-2013 /2014-2018/2019-2023
- ⇒ UNDAF (2008-2012)/UNDAF (2008-2012)/UNDP Country Programme (2006-2012), as well as the amendments extending them until December 2014, as well as the various related monitoring/evaluation reports;
- ⇒ CPAP/CPD 2008-2012/CCAT 2013-2014/CPAP 2015-2019/ Country Program Document 2020-2024 ;
- ⇒ Results-Oriented Annual Reports - ROAR ;

Relevant GEF documents

- ❖ GEF Strategy for Sustainable Land Management ;
- ❖ Strategic Programs PS-1 and PS-2 ;
- ❖ Operational Programme OP-15 on mitigation and prevention of land degradation and desertification ;
- ❖ Strategic Investing Program

Key documents of the UNDP/GEF project

- Project Identification Form (PIF)
- Report of the Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) that recommended approval of the project
- Project document

- Report of the kick-off workshop for the sustainable land and water management and environmental support project for the AHS On Reserve program in Sikasso
- Annual Work Plans (AWPs)
- FACES at the beginning of the year (first cash advances)
- Annual activity reports submitted to the Steering Committee
- Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
- CDRs
- Annual inventory reports
- Reports of the Steering Committees
- Mid-term evaluation report
- Map showing project sites
- Audit reports and management response monitoring reports
- Report of the support mission/monitoring/monitoring of the UNDP-GEF Unit based in Addis Ababa
- Technical notes/documents produced by the project
- Project Procedure Manual (Financial and administrative guidelines applied by the project team)
- Partnership Agreements, Conventions/Protocols
- Report on the Capitalization of the Achievements of the Training Sessions of the POs of the Regions of Sikasso and Mopti during the Three Years (2017 - 2018 - 2019)
- Evaluation of the quality of the adoption of good practices in SLM in the intervention zone (Sikasso and Mopti regions)
- Evaluation of the effect of the adoption of the improved stove in banco on wooded areas in the intervention zone of the sustainable land and water management project (Sikasso and Mopti regions)
- Capitalization of the experiences of the Network of TDM Service Providers
- Report on the capitalization of programs for the dissemination of good practices in sustainable land and water management by the project's radio partners in the regions of Sikasso and Mopti.
- Impact of GDTE's achievements on the regeneration of the vegetation cover on behalf of the PGDTE.

APPENDIX 5: List of people met (cf. Mailing group)

Names and First Names	Securities/Professions	Contacts

APPENDIX 6: EVALUATION MATRIX

Criteria evaluation	Questions keys	Sub questions specific	Sources of data	Methods / Collection tools of the data	Indicators/ Standard of success	Methods for analyze the data
Relevance	*Does the results chain of the logical framework respond to: national priorities also	*To what extent are the results aligned with national priorities, MDGs/MDGs and GEF objectives? *Does the results chain in the logical framework	National reference documents; monitoring/evaluation reports on the cooperation cycle between UNDP and the Government; UNDAF;	Documentary review, Interviews with UNDP, UNS agencies, Government, partners	-Comprehensive Results Framework reflecting a rigorous results chain: MDGs/National Priorities/UNDAFs/UNDP Strategic	Triangulation of data Critical analysis of maintenance results

	expressed in the UNDAF, in the UNDP Strategic Plan; the main objectives of the GEF?	respond to the : (i) problems identified in the SCP and (ii) the main objectives of the GEF? * To what extent did the design take into account lessons learned from previous projects/programs? * Does the project meet the needs of the beneficiaries? * To what extent was gender taken into account in the project design?	CPD/CPAP; UNDP Strategic Plan; Project Document, revised if necessary, PTA; quarterly and annual activity reports - PIRs; Steering Committee reports; review/evaluation reports; audit reports and Management Response monitoring reports; field visit reports, etc.		Plan/GEF Objectives -Relevance of recommended strategic and programmatic directions	
--	---	--	--	--	---	--

Criteria evaluation	Questions keys	Sub questions specific	Sources of data	Methods / Collection tools of the data	Indicators/ Standard of success	Methods for analyze the data
---------------------	----------------	------------------------	-----------------	--	---------------------------------	------------------------------

Coherence	Is the project design consistent with the requirements of results-based management, based on global sustainable development goals, National Priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan, GEF Goals, the UN Framework and the UNDP Country Programme?	<p>*Has the results chain been fully defined (outcome, outputs, indicators, targets, baseline...) taking into account global goals, national priorities, UNDAF, UNDP Strategic Plan, GEF objectives, and the Country Program?</p> <p>*Have the indicators and targets been defined in a "SMART" way (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound)?</p> <p>*Is there an adequacy between the implementation mechanism, the means mobilized on the one hand and the targeted results on the other?</p> <p>* Does the monitoring/evaluation system identify/anticipate beneficial effects for development (e.g. climate change adaptation, income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, better governance, etc.)?</p>	National reference documents; monitoring/evaluation reports on the cooperation cycle between UNDP and the Government; UNDAF; CPD/CPAP; UNDP Strategic Plan; Project document, revised if necessary, PTA; quarterly and annual activity reports - PIRs; Steering Committee reports; review/evaluation reports; audit reports and management response monitoring reports.	Documentary review, Interviews with UNDP, UNS agencies, Govt, partners	Comprehensive results framework reflecting a rigorous results chain: MDGs/National Priorities/UNDAF/UNDP Strategic Plan/GEF Objectives	Analysis of results frameworks Triangulation of data Critical analysis of maintenance results
------------------	--	---	---	--	--	---

Criteria evaluation	Questions keys	Sub questions specific	Sources of data	Methods / Collection tools of the data	Indicators/ Standard of success	Methods for analyze the data
---------------------	----------------	------------------------	-----------------	--	---------------------------------	------------------------------

Efficiency	What is the degree of achievement of the expected results (status of outputs/targets achieved, level of achievement of outcomes, etc.)?	<p>*What is the level of realization of the products and effects?</p> <p>*What was the monitoring and evaluation system?</p> <p>* What was the partnership strategy (resource mobilization, synergy with other TFPs?)?</p> <p>*What were the success factors in the implementation?</p> <p>*What were the constraints encountered and the solutions provided?</p> <p>*How have the identified risks been managed?</p> <p>* What was the level of UNDP's contribution?</p>	Follow-up reports- Evaluation ; PIFs; ROAR ; Project Description; Logical Framework ; Partnership agreements ; Reporting to Partners ; Activity reports ; Evaluation Reports ; Reports of the Steering Committees...	Documentary Review- Interview with : UNDP, UN agencies, national directorates, TFPs, project coordination, implementing agents, beneficiaries, local authorities...	<p>-Degree of achievement of targets/Products</p> <p>-Status of indicators</p> <p>-Importance of the partnership established</p> <p>- Ratios of completion time / scheduled deadlines</p>	<p>Analysis of documents/reports</p> <p>Triangulation of data</p> <p>Critical analysis of maintenance results</p>
Criteria evaluation	Questions keys	Sub questions specific	Sources of data	Methods / Collection tools of the data	Indicators/ Standard of success	Methods for analyze the data

Efficiency	To what extent have the current outcomes been efficiently achieved?	<p>*What was the volume of contributions mobilized?</p> <p>*Were the management arrangements appropriate, and what was the level and quality of support from UNDP/operations?</p> <p>* Were the allocated resources available on time, and what were the timelines for delivery of outputs and actual expenditures?</p> <p>* Are the results achieved commensurate with the resources used?</p>	<p>Project Document; Logical Framework ; Results and Resources Framework ; ROAR ; PTA, Activity reports, financial reports, evaluation reports, annual reports, Audit reports, Steering Committee reports/ Tripartite Meetings, Data extracted from Atlas Minutes of meetings .</p>	<p>Documentary Review- Interview with : UNDP, UN agencies, national directorates, TFPs, project coordination, implementing agents, beneficiaries, local authorities...</p>	<p>-Resource mobilization rate</p> <p>-Financial implementation rate of budgets by product</p> <p>-Level of correlation physical achievements/ actual expenditures</p> <p>-Ratios of completion time / scheduled deadlines</p>	Critical analysis of documents and interview results
-------------------	---	---	---	--	--	--

Criteria evaluation	Questions keys	Sub questions specific	Sources of data	Methods / Collection tools of the data	Indicators/ Standard of success	Methods for analyze the data
---------------------	----------------	------------------------	-----------------	--	---------------------------------	------------------------------

Impact	What changes (or early signs of change) were expected or not expected as a result of the implemented projects?	<p>*What are the notable changes observed in the living environment and living conditions of the populations, and the reduction of pressure on the environment between the initial situation and the period under review?</p> <p>*Is there an improvement in the support/advice provided by government institutions to, among other things, improve the preservation of natural resources?</p>	<p>Project Document; Logical Framework ; Results and Resources Framework ; ROAR ; PTA, Activity reports, financial reports, evaluation reports, annual reports, Audit reports, Steering Committee reports, Data extracted from Atlas Minutes of meetings</p>	<p>Documentary Review- Interview with : UNDP, UN agencies, national directorates, TFPs, project coordination, implementing agents, beneficiaries, local authorities...</p>	<p>Evolution of the HDI; Poverty index; Rate of net forest degradation; Share of green funds in the state budget Inequality reduction rate ; Response times of government institutions in support/advice</p>	<p>Critical analysis of documents and interview results</p>
---------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

Criteria evaluation	Questions keys	Sub questions specific	Sources of data	Methods / Collection tools of the data	Indicators/ Standard of success	Methods for analyze the data
	Do the	*Is there a strategy in	Project Document;	Documentary	Evolution of the	

Sustainability	<p>achievements lead to a sustainable improvement in the living environment and living conditions of the population, as well as the preservation of natural resources?</p>	<p>the project/program descriptions to ensure the sustainability of what has been achieved and what are the results?</p> <p>*Is there an improvement in the existence and effective functioning of natural resource governance bodies, at national and local levels?</p> <p>* To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic or environmental risks to the maintenance of long-term outcomes?</p> <p>*What are the prospects for replicating the actions carried out without external assistance?</p>	<p>Logical Framework ; Results and Resources Framework ; ROAR ; PTA, Activity reports, financial reports, evaluation reports, annual reports, Audit reports, Steering Committee reports, Data extracted from Atlas Minutes of the meetings, Follow-up reports / completion of partners....</p>	<p>Review- Interview with : UNDP, UN agencies, national directorates, TFPs, project coordination, implementing agents, beneficiaries, local authorities...</p>	<p>national public investment budget for the replication of achievements ; Rate of net forest degradation; Share of green funds in the state budget ; Texts/institutional frameworks for the governance of natural resources, at national and local levels ; Timeliness and quality of support/advice provided by national and local capacities.</p>	<p>Critical analysis of documents and interview results</p>
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

Appendix 6A: Matrix of Evaluation Results by Criteria

Evaluation Criteria: RELEVANCE		
Evaluative Questions		Answers
Key Question	Specific sub-questions	
Does the Results Chain respond to: national priorities also expressed in the UNDAF, in the UNDP Strategic Plan; the main objectives of the GEF?	<p>*To what extent are the results aligned with national priorities, MDGs/MDGs and GEF objectives?</p> <p>*Does the Results Chain respond to : (i) problems identified in the SCP, and (ii) the main objectives of the GEF and environmental and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</p> <p>* To what extent did the design take into account lessons learned from previous projects/programs?</p> <p>*Does the project meet the needs of the targeted beneficiaries at the local, regional and national levels?</p> <p>* To what extent was gender taken into account in the project design?</p>	<p>The analysis of the current context leads to a rigorous alignment of the project with :</p> <p>- Target 2 of MDG 7 - Target 4 of MDG 2 - Axis 1 of the Strategic Framework for Growth and Poverty Reduction - UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2017): Main Output 1.3 and Flagship Program № 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020 - GEF Strategic Objectives and Programs: OS1/ SP1 and SP2 - UNDAF: Outcome 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali, and UNDAF Outcome № 1 (extended from 2008 to 2014) - to the CPAP: Outcome "Framework agreements relating to the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters are operational" and Output "Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local communities is strengthened". In addition, the relevance of the project is based on the two targeted results which respond to immediate concerns: (i) populations active in the exploitation of agro-silvo-pastoral resources in the project intervention zones (individual producers, producer organizations, cooperatives). In fact, the finality resulting from the results is based on a strong reduction of land degradation, which allows the settlement of populations, the maintenance of production space, and the achievement of better and sustainable yields; (ii) central and decentralized government entities, NGOs, as well as the private sector that are involved in support/advice for the benefit of rural producers.</p> <p>From a design point of view, the results chain does not take into account elements that reflect gender sensitivity. However, the reality of rural women's intervention in the activities to impose their positioning in the responsibilities for conducting the activities. After the mid-term evaluation, the document should have been revised to include, among other things, gender mainstreaming. Given this operational reality, the conceptual deficit does not call into question the relevance of the project.</p> <p>Overall assessment: Satisfactory relevance (5/6)</p>

Evaluation Criteria: COHERENCE		
Evaluative Questions		Answers
Key Question	Specific sub-questions	
Is the design of the project consistent with the requirements of results-based management, based on the Global Sustainable Development Goals, the National Priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan, the GEF Objectives, the United Nations Framework and the UNDP program in Mali?	<p>*Has the results chain been fully defined (outcome, outputs, indicators, targets, baseline...) taking into account global goals, national priorities, UNDAF, UNDP Strategic Plan, GEF objectives, and the Country Program?</p> <p>*Have the indicators and targets been defined in a "SMART" way (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound)?</p> <p>*Is there an adequacy between the implementation mechanism, the means mobilized on the one hand and the targeted results on the other?</p> <p>* Does the monitoring/evaluation system identify/anticipate beneficial effects for development (e.g. climate change adaptation, income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, better governance, etc.)?</p>	<p>From the point of view of the analysis of programmatic links, the project document is consistent with the global objectives of sustainable development, the National Priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan, the GEF Objectives, the United Nations Framework and the UNDP program in Mali. However, and as noted in the analysis of the Strategic Outcomes Framework (Section 3.2.3.2), the results chain was incompletely defined.</p> <p>The design of the strategic results framework, as presented in the project document, suffered from insufficient application of results-based management and quality control.</p> <p>It should be noted that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✦ the vertical MDG/National Priority/UNDAF-CPD/PS - GEF-OP vertical linkages/ Component/Strategic Objective/Objective/Effect are not established in a coherent manner ; ✦ The logical chain Result / Main Activities / Targets / Indicators / Sources of Verification / Timeframe / Costs / Implementation Structure / Partner Structures / Responsible Structure / Risks and Assumptions, has not been defined. <p>This did not fail to induce difficulties in : (i) the annual planning of the project team (preparation of PTAs); (ii) quality control by the UNDP Office in its Atlas system. The terminology needs to be clarified (Result here =Effect/Outcome). As mentioned above, the results framework requires a vertical arrangement, and a horizontal logical chain, leading to a discrete matrix, i.e., each element of which corresponds to a precise terminology and measurable content.</p> <p>In order to assess the performance of the project in the most comprehensive way, the Results and Resources Framework (R&RF), which is the subject of Appendix 17, was developed using developments from sections 114 to 147 of the signed project document.</p> <p>Overall assessment: Moderately satisfactory consistency (3/6)</p>

Evaluation Criteria: EFFECTIVENESS	
Evaluative Questions	Answers

Key Question	Specific sub-questions	
What is the degree of achievement of the expected results (status of outputs/targets achieved, level of achievement of outcomes, etc.)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *What is the level of realization of the products and effects? *What was the monitoring and evaluation system? * What was the partnership strategy (resource mobilization, synergy with other TFPs)? *What were the success factors in the implementation? *What were the constraints encountered and the solutions provided? *How have the identified risks been managed? * What was the level of UNDP's contribution? 	<p>UNDP-GEF Outcome Targets and Outputs 1</p> <p>Current Status of Output 1.1 Both targets were met on time.</p> <p>More than 65% of users surveyed found the GDTE toolkit useful, both in terms of quality and content. The operational duration of the project was 56 ½ months out of 66 months, a reduced duration of 8 ½ months. The targets having been met, the level of achievement of Output 1.1 is satisfactory and effective.</p> <p>Current Status of Output 1.2: Required activities were planned and executed on time, enabling the achievement of the two targets during the 56 1/2 months out of 66 period. Thus, the level of achievement of Output 1.2 is satisfactory and effective.</p> <p>UNDP-GEF Outcome Targets and Outputs 2</p> <p>Current status of Output 2.1: Initial training activities on the monitoring system have been completed. However, the major actions that should lead to an operational monitoring system for the components of the selected agro-ecosystems have not been carried out. Consequently, the targets [Target 2.1.1, Target 2.1.2, and Target 2.1] were not achieved. Thus, the level of achievement of Output 2.1 is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Current Status of Output 2.2: Activities have been completed. While the level of achievement of Output 2.2 is satisfactory, Output 2.1 is in fact the determinant of the UNDP-GEF Result.</p> <p>Progress toward UNDP-GEF Result 1: Through the achievement of outputs, the level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 1 is satisfactory and effective. A rating of 5.</p> <p>Progress toward UNDP-GEF Result 2: Failure to achieve strategic targets leads to unsatisfactory achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 2, which is rated 2.</p> <p>Progress toward the Immediate Objective: The indicators mentioned only concern operational leverage, which has a satisfactory level of achievement. It must be noted that the strategic lever constituted by UNDP-GEF Result 2 has an unsatisfactory level of achievement. In total, progress towards the Immediate Objective is moderately satisfactory, i.e. an overall rating of 3 for the project. It should be noted that the shortcomings noted in the design of the results framework have also resulted in the absence of formal partnerships, designed on the basis of concerted efforts towards the achievement of UNDP/GEF Results 1 and 2. In this situation, there was no mechanism for dialogue between partners and advocacy/communication specifically dedicated to the choice of outcomes, determination, and monitoring of the role of each partner.</p> <p>Overall assessment: Moderately satisfactory effectiveness (3/6)</p>

Evaluation Criteria: EFFECTIVENESS		
Evaluative Questions		Answers
Key Question	Specific sub-questions	

<p>To what extent have the current outcomes been efficiently achieved?</p>	<p>*What was the volume of contributions mobilized? *Were the management arrangements appropriate, and what was the level and quality of support from UNDP/operations? * Were the allocated resources available on time, and what were the timelines for delivery of outputs and actual expenditures? * Are the results achieved commensurate with the resources used?</p>	<p>The analysis made with respect to progress toward UNDP/GEF Outcomes 1 and 2 (Section 3.3.3.2), as well as the review of Table B "Financial Execution by Outcome Table" below, indicate that implementation has been : efficient for UNDP/GEF Result 1: satisfactory progress, with a financial implementation rate of 65.72 percent. This leads to a fairly satisfactory efficiency for UNDP/GEF Result 1 (Rating 4/6); Unsatisfactory efficiency for UNDP-GEF Result 2: Progress toward UNDP-GEF Result 2 unsatisfactory with a financial implementation rate of 192.68 percent. This leads to unsatisfactory efficiency for UNDP/GEF Result 2 (Rating 2/6).</p> <p>Overall assessment: Overall, implementation was moderately efficient, with an overall rating of 3.</p>
--	---	---

Evaluation Criteria: IMPACT		
Evaluative Questions		Answers
Key Question	Specific sub-questions	

What changes (or early signs of change) were expected or not expected as a result of the implemented projects?	<p>*What are the notable changes observed in the living environment and living conditions of the populations, and the reduction of pressure on the environment between the initial situation and the period under review?</p> <p>*Is there an improvement in the support/advice provided by governmental and non-governmental institutions to, among other things, improve the preservation of natural resources?</p>	<p>The implementation review noted positive changes with respect to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GDTE's innovative approach, with the development of a catalog of best practices, now constitutes a tool whose use must be extended throughout the Sahelian zone of the continent ; The advent of new types of behavior at the community level in resource management to contribute to sustainable development, in particular through : (i) the adoption of the improved banco household by women. This has immediate effects on the removal of woodland resources, and thus on carbon sequestration and gain; (ii) the use of the stone cord through contour-based management (ACN). This leads to a significant increase in yields with a view to creating sustainable wealth; (iii) the establishment of frameworks for consultation and reflection involving women leaders of women's organizations in the six intervention circles, mayors and traditional chiefs. This initiative constitutes a success in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to fight against gender inequalities. <p>Overall assessment: The changes induced are satisfactory (4/6)</p>
--	---	---

Evaluation Criteria: SUSTAINABILITY		
Evaluative Questions		Answers
Key Question	Specific sub-questions	

Do the achievements lead to a sustainable improvement in the living environment and living conditions of the population, as well as the preservation of natural resources?	<p>*Is there a strategy in the project/program descriptions to ensure the sustainability of what has been achieved and what are the results?</p> <p>*Is there an improvement in the existence and effective functioning of natural resource governance bodies, at national and local levels?</p> <p>* To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic or environmental risks to the maintenance of long-term outcomes?</p> <p>*What are the prospects for replicating the actions carried out without external assistance?</p>	<p>The positive changes noted lead to an improvement in the living environment and living conditions of the populations, as well as the preservation of natural resources. However, the sustainability of the gains made risks being annihilated by : (1) insecurity. The related problems must find a definitive solution through political, economic, cultural and social dialogue, which the State must manage in accordance with its long-term public service mission, which includes human security and the preservation of the integrity of the Malian territory; (2) the simultaneous and continuous non-functioning of the three "wickets": the training wicket developed by the project with a large volume of training sessions; the support/advice wicket run by SLM service providers; and the financing wicket provided by the project to support producers (small equipment, inputs, etc.). It should be emphasized that for the first two windows (Training and Support/Advice), the State must ensure their existence and continuous operation, in view of its role as a pilot of sustainable agro-silvo-pastoral development. In fact, training and support/advice are an integral part of the public service mission that the State must assume. The existence and continuous operation of a financing window is the first obstacle to be removed in order to promote sustainable livelihoods (sustainable wealth creation). To this end, UNDP and the government should make every effort to establish partnerships between the public and private sectors (oil and mining companies, etc.) to support the development of a community-based financing mechanism for the benefit of communities. It should be emphasized that the actions that have led to changes in behavior are initiated according to an integral rural development approach characterized by transformations that take time to produce their effects. The aim is to be part of a programmatic approach to sustainable human development (SHD) based on Research and Development linking the fight against poverty and the preservation of the environment. In this context, the management of experiments towards sustainable results requires a time step that is not far from a decade! Partnerships will have to be established according to this time step. An interesting alternative would be, to implement the recommendations, to initiate a pilot program for the development of eco villages, rural eco-municipalities by SLM at the level of the six sites.</p> <p>Overall assessment: Average probability (3/6)</p>
--	--	---

Appendix 6B: Progress Matrix

Rating scale from 1 to 6: Very Unsatisfactory /HU = 1; Unsatisfactory /U = 2; Moderately Satisfactory /MS = 3; Satisfactory/S = 4; Very Satisfactory/S = 5 to 6

	Indicators	Reference situation	Targets End of project	Evaluation obtained	Rationale for the evaluation
--	------------	---------------------	------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------

Immediate objective of the project : Increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.	The percentage of producers who will adopt DWDM technologies		Considered as 5%.	At least 60% of AHS On-Farm Food Security Program beneficiary producers have adopted SLM technologies.	S	Target Achieved
	Increasing project areas using TDM techniques		No project introduces TDM techniques	50% of the production areas targeted by the project use EDM techniques.	S	Target Achieved
	Evaluation obtained for the Immediate Objective :				MS	See below
	Progress Towards the Immediate Project Objective: As noted in the discussion of the design of the Results Framework (Section 3.2.3), the Immediate Objective rests on two levers : (1) a strategic lever determined by UNDP-GEF Result 2 , the achievement of which will provide the government with an indispensable tool for its mission of strategic steering of agricultural development; and (2) an operational lever determined by UNDP-GEF Result 1 , the purpose of which is based on the development of demonstrative pilot actions enabling grassroots communities to work towards sustainable wealth creation through the scaling up of good practices. The indicators mentioned concern only the operational leverage, which has been satisfactorily achieved. It must be noted that the strategic lever constituted by UNDP-GEF Result 2 has an unsatisfactory level of achievement. Overall, progress toward the Immediate Objective is moderately satisfactory.					
	Indicators	Reference situation	Targets End of project	Evaluation obtained	Rationale for the evaluation	

Effect 1 / Outcome 1 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 1 : GDTE Technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private consulting services for the benefit of producers is increased.	Output 1.1: Training resources on SLM are developed, tested and improved dynamically based on user feedback, and then deployed at project sites, disseminating the AHSWP capacity building approach. Indicator: The quality and level of innovation of the content of the GDTE toolkit was developed by the project through product 1.1.	No toolbox developed	Target 1: At least 60% of users targeted by the survey find the WDM toolkit appropriate, useful and relevant, and easy to use, and confirm that they have used it.	S	The required activities were planned and executed in a timely manner.
			Target 2: The final evaluation generally validates survey results and confirms whether and how successful the toolkit is.	S	More than 65% of users surveyed found the GDTE toolkit useful in terms of quality and content.
	Evaluation obtained for Product 1.1 :				S

	Indicators	Reference situation	Targets End of project	Evaluation obtained	Rationale for the evaluation
--	------------	---------------------	------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------

Effect 1 / Outcome 1 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 1 : GDTE Technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private consulting services for the benefit of producers is increased (continued)	Output 1.2: Knowledge is disseminated, innovation infused, and technological breakthroughs adopted by beneficiaries as part of the AHSUMP approach to strengthening FOs' capacity for SLM.	Indicator 1: The number of public SLM extension advisory services and private agencies (individual or collective) present in the target areas.	To be defined during the start-up phase	Target 1.2.1: At least one SLM consulting agency is functional in each commune and at least one private SLM service provider is present in each village in the target area.	S	Planned activities were completed on time. Target 1.2.1 achieved
		Indicator 2: Number of POs under contract	Reference situation: 0%.	Target1.2.2: At least 25% of POs are under contract with service providers	S	Planned activities were completed on time. Target 1.2.2 achieved
	Evaluation obtained for Product 1.2 :				S	As the targets were met during the 561/2 months out of 66, the level of achievement of Output 1.2 is satisfactory and effective.
Assessment Achieved for UNDP-GEF Outcome 1 :					S	Through the effective delivery of outputs, the level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 1 is satisfactory and effective. Three cases of success/lessons should be noted.

	Indicators	Reference situation	Targets End of project	Evaluation obtained	Rationale for the evaluation
--	------------	---------------------	------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------

Effect 2 / Outcome 2 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 2 : A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional.	Output 2.1: A geo-referenced system for monitoring and planning the management of agro-ecosystems is developed and adopted as part of the M&E framework for the AHSMP and the agricultural sector.	Indicator 1: Existence of a comprehensive and publicly accessible system for planning and monitoring the agro-management ecosystem.	Baseline situation: Lack of a comprehensive system for monitoring the impacts of agriculture	Target 2.1.1: By the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system for the selected agroecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is available for the project area.	Unsatisfactory/U	Training activities have been carried out, but the monitoring system of the selected agro-ecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is not operational: Target not achieved
				Target 2.1.2: At the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of independent and sustainable updating maintained by MES with minimal external assistance.	Unsatisfactory/U	Training activities have been carried out, but the monitoring system of the selected agro-ecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is not operational: Target not achieved

	Indicators	Reference situation	Targets End of project	Evaluation obtained	Rationale for the evaluation
--	------------	---------------------	------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------

Effect 2 / Outcome 2 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 2 : A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional. (continued)	Output 2.1: A geo-referenced system for monitoring and planning the management of agro-ecosystems is developed and adopted as part of the M&E framework for the AHSMP and the agricultural sector. (continued)	Indicator 2: The quality and quantity of information contained in the monitoring system and the number and quality of reports published annually on the state of agroecosystems	Baseline situation: Only an annual state of the environment is produced by the MEEA, and it does not provide precise information on the state of agro-ecosystems (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load, etc.).	Target 2.1: Beginning in year 4 of the project, an annual agroecosystem environmental newsletter is published by the MEEA.	Unsatisfactory/U	Unrealized activities Target not met
		Evaluation obtained for Product 2.1 :			Unsatisfactory/U	Unrealized activities
	Product 2.2	Evaluation obtained for Product 2.2 :			S	Support provided to the project
	Assessment Achieved for UNDP-GEF Outcome 2:				Unsatisfactory/U	See below
	Non-achievement of strategic targets [At the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system for the selected agro-ecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is available for the project area; At the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of being updated independently and sustainably maintained by MES with minimal external assistance; From year 4 of the project, an annual environmental bulletin of agro-ecosystems is published by the MEEA], leading to an unsatisfactory achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 2, the achievement of which was to constitute a strategic lever enabling the government to have a tool indispensable to its mission of strategic steering of agricultural development.					

Annex 7: Synopsis of the status of targets, outputs and outcomes/results

I-Reminder of the Strategic Outcomes Framework

	Indicator	Reference level	Targets End of the project	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Objective of the project Increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.	1. The percentage of producers who will adopt SLM technologies in the targeted areas	Considered as 5% or a very low figure <i>Note: Absolute numbers for AHS target beneficiaries must be established during project start-up and percentages calculated.</i>	At least 60% of AHS On-Farm Food Security Program beneficiary producers have adopted SLM technologies.	Project M&E System Reports Sector Monitoring & Evaluation Reports Other project reports	Weak sectoral coordination Limited professional and private sector capacity Natural risks (droughts, crop devastation and epizootic)
	2. Increasing the project areas using TDM techniques	Status quo (no project introduces TDM techniques) <i>Note: Absolute figures for the AHSUNC target area must be established during project start-up and percentages calculated.</i>	50% of the production areas targeted by the project use EDM techniques.	Producer surveys Ministry of Agriculture Annual Reports Remote Sensing Imaging	Overexploitation of natural resources continues Financial Management: The Program is complex Full stakeholder participation: from national to local level

	Indicator	Reference level	Targets End of the project	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
RESULT 1 SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private advisory	3. Quality and level of innovation of the content of the WDM toolkit to be developed by the project through product 1.1, as	No toolbox developed by the project	(3a) At least 60% of the users targeted by the survey find the WDM toolkit appropriate, useful and relevant, and easy to use,	Project M&E system reports Other project reports Annual management reports of providers (public and private) of SLM services Surveys of producers (users)	Limited implementation capacity Competition on project coordination Social and environmental barriers: The fragmented

	Indicator	Reference level	Targets End of the project	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
services for the benefit of producers is increased (AHSSP Subcomponent 1.2)	assessed by (3a) users through surveys and (3b) final evaluation.		and they confirm that they have used it. (3b) The final evaluation generally validates survey results and confirms whether and how successful the toolkit is in infusing	Final evaluation	institutional environment and weak public and private capacities can slow down implementation.

	Indicator	Reference level	Targets End of the project	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
RESULT 1 (continued) SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private advisory services for the benefit of producers is	4. The number of public SLM extension counseling services and private agencies (individual or collective) present in the target areas	To be defined during the start-up phase	At least one SLDM consulting agency is functional in each commune and at least one private SLDM service provider is present in each village in the target area.	Project M&E System Reports Other project reports Annual management reports of providers (public and private) of SLM services Surveys of producers (users) Final evaluation	Limited implementation capacity Competition on project coordination Social and environmental barriers: the fragmented institutional environment

	Indicator	Reference level	Targets End of the project	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
increased (AHSSP Subcomponent 1.2)	5. The number of POs under contract with service providers for SLM consulting.	0%	At least 25% of POs are under contract with service providers for EDM consulting.	Note: The following criteria will guide the evaluation/surveys: <u>relevance and ease of use</u> (in relation to the target audience and the objectives of product 1.1), <u>usefulness and relevance</u> (to the extent that it solves real problems with applicable solutions), <u>level of adoption</u> (by end-users) and <u>level of innovation</u> (introduction of something different, a new idea, method or equipment)].	and weak public and private capacities can slow down implementation.

	Indicator	Reference level	Targets End of the project	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
RESULT 2 A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional (Subcomponents 3.2)	6. Existence of a comprehensive and publicly accessible system for the planning and monitoring of the agro-management ecosystem.	Inexistence of a comprehensive system for monitoring the impacts of agriculture	(6a) By the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system for the selected agro-ecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is available for the project area.	Project M&E System Reports Other project reports Surveys of users of the monitoring system (universities, consultants, RS experts)	Limited implementation capacity Limited capacity of the professional sector

	Indicator	Reference level	Targets End of the project	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
and 3.4 of the AHSMP).			(6b) At the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of being updated independently and sustainably maintained by MES with minimal external assistance.	Annual Environmental Bulletin of Agroecosystems Project M&E System Reports Other project reports Safeguard measures on the project's GDTE	
				Surveys of project beneficiaries Project Environmental Impact Reports	

	Indicator	Reference level	Targets End of the project	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
RESULT 2 (continued) A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional (Subcomponents 3.2	7. The quality and quantity of information contained in the monitoring system and the number and quality of reports published annually on the state of agro-ecosystems.	Only an annual state of the environment is produced by the MEEA, and it does not provide precise information on the state of agro-ecosystems (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load, etc.).	Beginning in year 4 of the project, an annual environmental bulletin on agro-ecosystems is published by the MEEA.	Project M&E System Reports Other project reports Surveys of users of the monitoring system (universities, consultants, RS experts) Annual Environmental Bulletin of Agroecosystems Project M&E System Reports	Limited implementation capacity Limited capacity of the professional sector

	Indicator	Reference level	Targets End of the project	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
and 3.4 of the AHSMP).				Other project reports Safeguard measures on the project's GDTE Surveys of project beneficiaries Project Environmental Impact Reports	

II-Detailed Review of Achievements/ Degree of Achievement of Targets, Outputs and Outcomes/Results

SDG/Targets: MDG7/Target 1; and SDG 2/Target 4
National Priorities: GPRSP-Axis 1 /Objective: Food security and improvement of incomes of rural producers
UNDP Strategic Results: Key Output 1.3, and Flagship Programme № 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020
GEF Programs: OS1/ SP1: Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management, SP2: Supporting sustainable forest management in production areas
United Nations System Program: Outcome 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali 2013-2015; and UNDAF Outcome № 1 (2008-2014)
CPAP: Outcome CPAP: Framework agreements on the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters are operational, and Output CPAP: Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local communities is strengthened.
Immediate Objective: To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.
Component 1: Strengthening the capacities of FOs and service providers
Outcome 1 / Outcome 1 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 1: SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private consulting services for the benefit of producers is increased.
❖ Output 1.1: Training resources on SLM are developed, tested and improved dynamically based on user feedback, and then deployed at project sites, disseminating the AHSWP capacity building approach.
Indicator: The quality and level of innovation of the content of the GDTE toolkit was developed by the project through product 1.1.
Reference situation: No toolbox developed.

Target 1: At least 60% of users targeted by the survey find the WDM toolkit appropriate, useful and relevant, and easy to use, and confirm that they have used it.	
Main activities	Achievements
Activity 1: Assess the specific needs of the beneficiaries in the sites (Mopti and Sikasso regions) in relation to (i) knowledge of SLM techniques; (ii) technology adoption; and (iii) availability of equipment and use.	-Prospecting and consultation missions of local actors on the intervention sites (Mopti and Sikasso): 15 consultation meetings were held in the 6 circles, mobilizing more than 1500 participants, including 450 women from all stakeholders, in order to encourage their commitment and adherence to the project. These consultations made it possible to review the project's intervention strategy. Instead of recruiting two regional assistants, the participants expressed the wish to proceed with the deployment of 8 Local Focal Points, including 2 regional ones, as project relays and proximity support agents. Field survey conducted among the producers showed that 26% of the respondents were economically motivated for the adoption of ANR and 41% for stony cord because these technologies are likely to improve agricultural yields.
Main activities	Achievements
Activity 2: Develop an initial toolkit on SLM techniques that can be used by extension services in the field	Design of the GDTE Toolbox
Activity 3: Train the trainers, establish and implement the plan for their deployment	Elaboration of the pedagogical animation sheets on the 20 GDTE good practices considered as priorities 4 workshops held, 60 participants including 10 women, members of the technical commission. 20 highest priority good practices were selected. Simplification of the technical content by emphasizing the animation approach. 5,000 sheets were edited and used by 42 trainers.
Activity #4: Prototype, test and evaluate products based on user feedback	2 workshops for the design of the renovated toolbox from 35 to 40 good practices by a technical commission composed of partner NGOs and research structures, 20 participants including 5 women with gender mainstreaming
Activity 5: Ensure the adaptation, improvement and renovation of the toolbox, as well as communication and awareness raising	Study carried out; identification of stakeholders. Communication strategies developed (internal and external) with appropriate supports, key messages developed and an action plan in 6 major axes elaborated. A validation workshop was held with 25 participants, including 8 women. Visibility and readability of stakeholders
Extent to which Target 1 was met: Required activities were planned and carried out on time. More than 65% of the users surveyed found the WEM toolkit useful, in terms of quality and content: Target No. 1 exceeded.	

RESULT 1: SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private advisory services for the benefit of producers is increased (AHSSP Subcomponent 1.2)	
Indicator No. 1: The quality and level of innovation of the content of the GDTE toolkit to be developed by the project through product 1.1	
Baseline situation: No toolbox developed by the project	
Target n°2 : The toolbox is a success in breathing innovation into WDM	
Main activities	Achievements
Activity n°1: Train trainers in SLM, in facilitation and communication techniques, in advocacy lobbying	5 sessions organized. 42 Participants including 9 women per session. Sikasso: 24 trained including 6 women/Mopti 18 trained including 3 women. The trainers mastered the technical itineraries of each good practice and conducted more than 136 training sessions for producer organizations in the regions of Sikasso and Mopti. 96% of those trained have mastered the technical itineraries and have adopted the good practice. The region was able to benefit from local expertise on sustainable land management issues.

<p>Activity n°2: Organize training sessions in SLM for producers in the regions of Sikasso and Mopti</p>	<p>In the two regions (Sikasso and Mopti), from 2017 to 2019, the Sustainable Land and Water Management Project (PDGTE) provided a total of 136 training sessions for POs. They brought together 3840 participants of whom 1954 were women (50.89%) and 1886 men (49.11%). The training sessions covered 17 Good Practices out of the 40 Good Practices of WDM identified and deemed relevant in the dry cereal production basins of the Mopti and Sikasso regions. Among the 17 BPs, those that have most mobilized producers are the following: Composting in pit: 883 beneficiaries; Improved fireplace in banco: 776 beneficiaries; Stone cord: 472 beneficiaries; Wood production plantation: 424 beneficiaries; RNA: 327 beneficiaries.</p> <p>These five (5) Good Practices represent 75% of the beneficiaries of the training sessions provided.</p> <p>A participation rate of 54.38% of women in the Mopti region and 48.87% of women in the Sikasso region.</p> <p>In the Sikasso region, during the three years (2017-2018 and 2019), the Sustainable Land and Water Management Project (PDGTE) provided 81 training sessions. These sessions were attended by 2,435 beneficiaries, including 1,245 men and 1,190 women (51.1% and 48.9% respectively). These sessions covered eleven (11) Good Practices in SLDM out of the 40 identified in the dry cereal production basins of the Mopti and Sikasso regions. Out of the eighty-one (81) training sessions conducted, this graph indicates that twenty-two (22) concerned pit composting, twenty-one (21) improved hearths, thirteen (13) stony cord, twelve (12) wood production plantations and one training session respectively in BCER, land tenure security and improved seeds. High participation of women, 581 (98.5%) of whom (98.5%) attended the training sessions on the improved cookstove in banco.</p> <p>In the Mopti region, during the three years (2017-2018 and 2019), fifty-five (55) training sessions were conducted by the Sustainable Land and Water Management Project (SLWMP). A total of 1405 people have benefited from them, including 764 women (54.6%) and 641 men (45.6%). These sessions focused on nine (9) Good Practices of Sustainable Land and Water Management. The data indicate 169 male beneficiaries (51.7%) and 158 female beneficiaries (48.3%) at the training sessions on the RNA. Concerning the improved household in banco, there are 184 female beneficiaries (97.8%) and only 4 male beneficiaries (2.2%). Composting in the pit is of greater interest to women than men with 195 beneficiaries and only 82 beneficiaries respectively.</p>
---	--

Main activities	Achievements
<p>Activity n°3: Support the integration of SLM in the PDESC of communities and the curricula of schools and agro-silvo-pastoral institutes in the regions of Sikasso and Mopti.</p>	<p>2 training workshops for mayors and promoters of institutes held in Sikasso, 80 participants including 15 women.</p> <p>3 workshops on integrating good practices in GDTE into curricula, 45 teachers</p>
<p>Activity n°4: Implement the recommendation of the 6th meeting of the NPC: "Associate the National Directorate of Land Management (DNAT) and the National Directorate of Technical and Vocational Education (DNETP)".</p>	<p>Three (3) DNAT agents and two (2) DNETP agents accompanied the integration process in the two regions.</p> <p>Nineteen (19) functional agro-silvo-pastoral schools identified in the two regions of intervention of the project.</p> <p>Twenty-five (25) teachers from the agro-silvo-pastoral schools of Bougouni are introduced to the dimension of integrating SLM in the curricula of agro-silvo-pastoral schools.</p>

	<p>Forty (40) teachers and promoters of agro-silvo-pastoral training institutes and schools are trained on the forty (40) good practices in SLM in the two regions;</p> <p>Ten (10) agro-silvo-pastoral training institutes and schools in the two regions integrate the gender dimension in their curricula;</p> <p>Twelve (12) local authorities integrate the SLM dimension into their CSSPs</p>
<p>Activity n°5 : Organize the training of members of the Rural Development and Environment Commission of the National Assembly (AN) and the Advisors of the High Council of Territorial Communities (HCCT) in order to advocate for the inclusion of the dissemination of the RNA and the improved stove in the draft laws.</p>	<p>A training workshop for the members of the Rural Development and Environment Commission of the National Assembly (AN) and the Councillors of the High Council of Territorial Collectivities (HCCT) was held/</p> <p>43 participants including 09 women</p> <p>The elected representatives made a special mention to the project on the results achieved and asked UNDP to support the duplication of this experience to other regions of Mali. They welcomed the holding of this session which brought together for the first time two institutions (AN and HCCT) of the republic around a subject of national interest, such as the issue of land degradation in Mali.</p>
<p>Extent to which Target 2 is met: Required activities have been planned and executed. Target 2 achieved</p>	
<p>Level of achievement of Product 1.1 :</p> <p>The operational duration of the project was 561/2 months out of 66 months, i.e. a reduced duration of 8 ½ months. Targets having been met, the level of achievement of Product 1.1 is satisfactory and effective.</p>	

SDG/Targets: MDG7/Target 1; and SDG 2/Target 4
National Priorities: GPRSP-Axis 1 /Objective: Food security and improvement of incomes of rural producers
UNDP Strategic Results: Key Output 1.3, and Flagship Programme No 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020
GEF Programs: OS1/ SP1: Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management, SP2: Supporting sustainable forest management in production areas
United Nations System Program: Outcome 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali 2013-2015; and UNDAF Outcome No 1 (2008-2014)
CPAP: Outcome CPAP: Framework agreements on the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters are operational, and Output CPAP: Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local communities is strengthened.
Immediate Objective: To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.
Component 1: Strengthening the capacities of FOs and service providers
Outcome 1 / Outcome 1 UNDP-GEF Outcome 1: SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private consulting services for the benefit of producers is increased.
❖ Output 1.2: Knowledge is disseminated, innovation infused, and technological breakthroughs adopted by beneficiaries as part of the AHSUMP approach to strengthening FOs' capacity for SLM.

Indicator 1: The number of public SLM extension advisory services and private agencies (individual or collective) present in target **areas/Benchmark:** To be defined during the start-up phase.

Target 1.2.1: At least one SLM consulting agency is functional in each commune and at least one private SLM service provider is present in each village in the target area.

Main activities	Achievements
Activity 1: Support the establishment of the network of SLM service providers /Promote the creation of networks of specialized service providers, which FOs and other entities can pay for important services (such as technical advice, market information, etc.)/Encourage the emergence of private SLM service providers Organize the training of members of the network of SLM service providers and advocacy and lobbying	4 workshops organized, 160 participants including 50 women, definition of the mission and vision of the network, adoption of the associative form of association 1 workshop organized, 45 participants including 12 women. Adoption of the texts and creation of a statute and rules of procedure and a charter of good conduct. Availability of a seat in Koutiala offered by a member organization. Functionality of the local networks by circle composed of 5 members. 4 workshops organized, 180 participants including 34 women. Mastery of the technical itineraries of the 40 good practices and of the animation approach of the 15 good practices
Activity n°2: Support the development of a networking plan for the members of the network of SLM service providers	2 workshops organized with 90 participants including 24 women. Deployment plan for 97 organizations in 148 communes. These organizations provide quality and proximity support to producers. 450 NGOs, GIE, OPs, and consulting firms make up this network of service providers in the two regions. A code of conduct for a better use of space was signed between the different parties in order to reduce conflicts of interest.

Main activities	Achievements
Activity 3: Support the organization of the General Assembly of members of the network of SLM providers in the two project intervention regions	Holding of 3 GA, 160 participants including 32 women. Manual of procedure validated, increase of the annual contribution rate from 15 000 to 30 000 FCFA per year. Validation of the 2018 to 2020 action plan. Mobilization of a permanent secretary for the perpetuation of the network for a period of 6 months.
Activity 4: Support the official launch of the activities of the network of SLM providers in the Sikasso and Mopti regions.	Official launching ceremony of the network's activities in Koutiala in the presence of the Technical Advisor to the Minister of the Environment with 350 participants including 124 women, sensitization of 2,000 producers to the plantation of wood and improved fireplace in banco. Presentation of the network's website, provision of materials and computer equipment for the functionality of the network. Restitution of the studies carried out in order to provide the members of the network with tools for the contractualization of services.

Extent to which Target 1.2.1 was met: Planned activities were completed on time. **Target 1.2.1 achieved**

Target1.2.2: At least 25% of FOs are under contract with service providers for SLM consulting.

Main activities	Achievements
Activity 1: Organize a study on the effects of the adoption of the improved banco fireplace on woodland removals	Survey conducted among beneficiaries by the Regional Center for Agronomic Research of Sikasso (CRRRA). Reasoned sampling was used for this study. A total of 31 housewives out of 75 trained on the improved banco household were surveyed in three sites in the circles of Sikasso and Koutiala. Analysis of the results obtained shows that in 2019, these rates

are 78.66% in Sikasso and 100% in Koutiala, respectively. The adoption of a banco-improved stove saves 25% and 20% of wood energy in Koutiala and Sikasso, respectively. The results of the survey showed that there are 1716 FABs in Koutiala compared to 311 FABs in Sikasso. The volumes of wood saved following the adoption of a single improved stove in banco per year are 3,469 m³ and 1,901 m³ respectively in Koutiala and Sikasso. Based on these numbers of improved stoves identified, the total volume of wood saved would be 6544,880 m³ per year. Therefore, the conversion of this volume of wood results in an area of preserved woodland formation of 283.50 ha per year in Koutiala and 13.85 ha in Sikasso. On average, the energy wood saved per day per fob costs 100 FCFA in Koutiala against 75 FCFA in Sikasso. Thus, the effective use of all these fireplaces would result in savings of 71,147,625 FCFA per year for both circles. The results also show that the adoption of an improved stove in the banco allows for the storage of 0.867 tons of carbon in Koutiala and 0.475 tons of carbon in Sikasso, respectively, for a total amount of carbon stored of 1636,220 tons for the two circles. In perspective, the organization of training sessions on the improved stove in banco is the best strategy for the large-scale adoption of the good practice, given its importance in the preservation of the environment/woodlands and the household economy.

Main activities	Achievements
Activity n°2 : Implement the partnership agreements with FENABE, MOBIOM, CRRRA, Sahel Eco, AMEDD, and RRI and accompany the producers in the adoption of PBs, pastoral (local conventions, pastoral tracks....) and free radios.	<p>12 conventions established with the free radios on the realization of radio microprograms around the diffusion of messages on the 40 good practices in 6 national languages.</p> <p>8 agreements have been established with the CRRRA on the discounting of adoption rates for best practices and sector impact studies.</p> <p>6 partnership agreements with Fenabe, Icrisat around the technological parks of Flola and Madina on the choice of 18 pilot farmers.</p> <p>A convention on NRM established with the rural Commune of Danou, cercle de Bougouni, which mobilized more than 7 inter-village consultation frameworks from the 11 villages of the commune. More than 450 participants were mobilized, including 124 women.</p> <p>245 service contracts have been drawn up with partner structures for the implementation of activities. These agreements have accelerated the implementation and even the achievement of the project's results. This success is due to the mastery of the technical itineraries on the good practices resulting from the trainings and to the yields resulting from the use of certain good practices such as the stony cordon which displays 4t/ha for maize against 2 tons without stony cordon. Trials at the demonstration plots in the Madina Technology Parks in partnership with Icrisat yielded 5684.72 t/ha for the contour line management (ACN) and 4659.03 for the micro-dose against 3610.42 t/ha without treatment, on the sotubaka maize variety.</p>

Main activities	Achievements
Activity 3: Organize a reflection framework on advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land in rural areas and strategies to combat gender inequalities in Bougouni.	2 consultation and reflection frameworks organized with more than 350 participants including 275 women leaders of women's organizations from the 6 intervention circles, mayors and traditional chiefs. Rural Land Law of 2017 presented. This law aims to protect owners, possessors and users of agricultural land against any unfounded contestation, disturbance of the enjoyment of their rights or against any risk of unjustified eviction. 25 mayors and traditional chiefs have allocated plots of land to women's organizations covering 80 ha to carry out wood production plantations with a success rate of 87%.
Product Status 1.2: As the targets were met during the 561/2 months out of 66, the level of achievement of Output 1.2 is satisfactory and effective.	

Level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 1 :

Through the effective delivery of outputs, the **level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 1 is satisfactory and effective.**

Three **cases of success/lessons** should be noted :

- ✦ the consultation and reflection frameworks organized with more than 350 participants including 275 women leaders of women's organizations from the 6 intervention circles, mayors and traditional chiefs constitute a success in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to fight against gender inequalities ;
- ✦ The adoption of the improved banco fireplace by women has immediate effects on removals from the woodlands, and thus on carbon sequestration and gain;
- ✦ The use of the stone cord through a contour-based landscaping (ACN) induces a significant increase in yields with a view to creating sustainable wealth.

OUTCOME 2: A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional (AHS On-Farm Action Plan Sub-components 3.2 and 3.4).

Indicator: Existence of a comprehensive and publicly accessible system for planning and monitoring the agro-management ecosystem.

Baseline situation: Lack of a comprehensive system for monitoring the impacts of agriculture

Target 1.1: By the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system for the selected agro-ecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is available for the project area.

Main activities	Achievements
Activity n°1: Carry out a study on the baseline situation of the project	<p>Field survey conducted, validation workshop held with 60 participants including 17 women. Definition of reference targets.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The percentage of producers who will adopt SLM technologies in the targeted areas (5%) 2. The increase in project areas using TDM techniques (5%) 3. Quality and level of innovation of the content of the GDTE toolkit to be developed by the project through product 1.1, as assessed by (3a) users through surveys and (3b) final evaluation (no toolkit available, 0). 4. The number of public SLM extension advisory services and private agencies (individual or collective) present in the target areas (0) 5. The number of POs under contract with service providers for SLM consulting. (5%) 6. Existence of a comprehensive and publicly accessible system for the planning and monitoring of the agro-management ecosystem (non-existence of a device)

	7. The quality and quantity of information contained in the monitoring system and the number and quality of reports published annually on the state of agro-ecosystems (0)
--	--

OUTCOME 2: A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional (AHS On-Farm Action Plan Sub-components 3.2 and 3.4).	
Indicator 1: Existence of a comprehensive and publicly accessible system for planning and monitoring the agro-management ecosystem.	
Baseline situation: Lack of a comprehensive system for monitoring the impacts of agriculture	
Target 1.1: By the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system for the selected agro-ecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is available for the project area.	
Main activities	Achievements
Activity 2: Organize training for users and providers of spatially based data	An organized workshop. 42 participants including 15 women. The participants exchanged on the different systems of production of the following data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Information System Database (SIFOR) - Database of the Geographical Institute of Mali (IGM) - National Environmental Information Management System - The two of bush - The data produced by the Direction Régionale du Plan de la Statistique de l'informatique de l'aménagement et de la population (DRPSIAP) - The fusion of statistical and geospatial-GPS data
Activity n°3: Set up a system for monitoring the implementation of project activities	Monitoring & evaluation system produced by a national consultant 96 monthly reports are produced annually by the Focal Points/ 20 quarterly reports are produced by M&E experts/136 reports from the training sessions of the POs are elaborated and evaluated. 7 NPC meetings were held with 20 statutory members per meeting including 6 women/4 capitalization reports are produced/ 4 reports are produced/

	<p>5 annual reports are produced/5 PTBAs are developed/55 workshop reports are produced/5 5 PIR reports/ audit reports and Cheick spots</p> <p>All the reports produced made it possible to take stock of the project's progress, identify and circumscribe the difficulties encountered. All reports were subject to quality assurance and timeliness.</p>
<p>Degree to which Target 1.1 is achieved: Training activities have been carried out, but the monitoring system for the elements of the selected agro-ecosystems (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is not operational: Target 1.1 not achieved</p>	

<p>OUTCOME 2: A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional (AHS On-Farm Action Plan Sub-components 3.2 and 3.4).</p>	
<p>Indicator No. 1: Existence of a comprehensive and publicly accessible system for planning and monitoring the agro-management ecosystem.</p>	
<p>Baseline situation: Lack of a comprehensive system for monitoring the impacts of agriculture</p>	
<p>Target 1.2: At the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of independent and sustainable updating maintained by MES with minimal external assistance.</p>	
Main activities	Achievements
<p>Activity n°1: Set up a system for monitoring the impacts of agriculture on natural resources and agrosystems</p>	<p>The Geographic Information System for Monitoring Agricultural Impacts (GISSAG) is available and validated by all project stakeholders. The only constraint is that it is not operational.</p> <p>A validation workshop was held, 45 participants including 9 women.</p> <p>The process of training the actors of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development for its appropriation could not be effective by the end of the operational phase of the project. Given the fact that it is a decision-making tool used by the public authorities to dialogue with partners, the actors have high hopes for its continuation.</p>
<p>Activity 2 : Activities related to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the development of a digital terrain model (DTM) of the regions of Mopti and Sikasso ; ➤ the installation of a receiving station for the recovery of MODIS sentinel images, and Landsat ; 	<p>Unrealized activities</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the provision of SRTM's digital terrain models for the entire Mopti and Sikasso regions; ➤ the acquisition of topographic data by UAVs 	
---	--

OUTCOME 2: A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional (AHS On-Farm Action Plan Sub-components 3.2 and 3.4).	
Indicator 2: The quality and quantity of information contained in the monitoring system and the number and quality of reports published annually on the state of agroecosystems.	
Baseline situation: Only an annual state of the environment is produced by the MEEA, and it does not provide precise information on the state of agro-ecosystems (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load, etc.).	
Target 1.2: At the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of independent and sustainable updating maintained by MES with minimal external assistance.	
Main activities	Achievements
Activity n°3: Study of the impact of GDTE's achievements on the regeneration of the vegetation cover	<p>A study carried out followed by field surveys. A validation workshop held.</p> <p>The regeneration of the vegetation cover following the application of the GDTE BPs reaches a total area of 1002.85 hectares of which 750 hectares are in the Mopti region and 252.85 hectares in the Sikasso region.</p> <p>The specific diversity is more important in the Bougouni circle with 72 species or taxa identified. On the other hand, in the circles of Sikasso and Koutiala, the specific diversity is 32 and 33 species recorded.</p>
Activity 4: Study on estimating the carbon gain in SLM investments in the regions of Sikasso and Mopti	<p>A survey carried out on about twenty sites. A validation workshop organized</p> <p>The results presented highlight the environmental problems in the two regions covered by the PGDTE, notably land degradation due to erosion, the decline in soil fertility due to agricultural intensification and the shortage of wood energy, particularly in the Mopti region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7 GDTE good practices have been identified that contribute favourably to carbon sequestration and gain; - The area covered by the 7 good practices identified is estimated at 252.85 hectares in the Sikasso region and 750 hectares in the Mopti region;

	<p>The production of herbaceous biomass is highest in the Sikasso region, in BP fields surveyed, and varies between 3 t and 1.7 tons per hectare, compared to 300 kg per hectare in the Mopti region;</p> <p>The carbon gain in the area covered by the study is estimated at 21.93 kilotonnes of carbon, which corresponds to 80.41 kilotonnes of CO2 emissions avoided.</p>
--	---

Main activities	Achievements
<p>Activity n°5 : Support the elaboration of a practical guide on the Land Management System/Mobilize a consulting firm specialized in Land Management and agroecosystem information in order to implement a Geographic Information System that will be 100% geo-referenced and that must include at least : available natural resources (water, forests, wetlands, other natural vegetation, relief) and related information on their use; the identification of critical areas for agro-ecological and hydrological services and their role in subsistence agriculture; special functions such as the incidence of bush fires, non-agricultural economic activities, population concentrations; and an overlay of detailed information on the agricultural system</p>	<p>Unrealized activities</p>
<p>Activity n°6: Support the development and improvement of tools to monitor land degradation and rehabilitation as well as the evolution of the ecosystem (obtaining a refined system capable of independent and sustainable updating, maintained by MES with minimum external assistance). These tools will enable lessons to be learned from ongoing experiences and increase the effectiveness of investments in the field.</p>	<p>Unrealized activities</p>
<p>Degree to which Target 1.2 is achieved: Training activities have been carried out, but the monitoring system for the elements of the selected agro-ecosystems (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is not operational: Target 1.2 not achieved</p>	

OUTCOME 2: A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional (AHS On-Farm Action Plan Sub-components 3.2 and 3.4).	
Indicator 2: The quality and quantity of information contained in the monitoring system and the number and quality of reports published annually on the state of agroecosystems.	
Baseline situation: Only an annual state of the environment is produced by the MEEA, and it does not provide precise information on the state of agro-ecosystems (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load, etc.).	
Target: Beginning in year 4 of the project, an annual environmental newsletter on agro-ecosystems is published by the MEEA.	
Main activities	Achievements
Activity: Support the publication by the MEEA (starting in year 4 of the project) of an annual environmental newsletter on agro-ecosystems.	Unrealized activities
Degree to which the Target was met: Activities not completed/Target not met	

SDG/Targets: MDG7/Target 1; and SDG 2/Target 4	
National Priorities: GPRSP-Axis 1 /Objective: Food security and improvement of incomes of rural producers	
UNDP Strategic Results: Key Output 1.3, and Flagship Programme No 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020	
GEF Programs: OS1/ SP1: Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management, SP2: Supporting sustainable forest management in production areas	
United Nations System Program: Outcome 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali 2013-2015; and UNDAF Outcome No 1 (2008-2014)	
CPAP: Outcome CPAP: Framework agreements on the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters are operational, and Output CPAP: Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local communities is strengthened.	
Immediate Objective: To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.	
Component 2: Sector Monitoring and Evaluation	
Outcome 2 / Outcome 2 or UNDP-GEF Result 2: A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems is in place and functional.	
❖ Output 2.2: Support for coordination and monitoring and evaluation at the AHS program level is provided.	
Main activities	Achievements
Activity 1: Ensure the operating costs of the project implementation coordination unit	Activities carried out.
Activity #2: Support the organization of annual audits and other studies related to project coordination, supervision and M&E	
Activity 3: Supporting the maintenance and use of acquired goods and equipment	
Level of achievement of Product 2.2: Achieved Product	
Level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 2 : Non-achievement of strategic targets [By the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system of selected agro-ecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is available for the project area; By the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of independent and sustainable updating maintained by MES with minimal external assistance; From year 4 of the project, an annual environmental bulletin of agro-ecosystems is published by the MEEA], leading to an unsatisfactory achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 2, the achievement of which was to constitute a strategic lever enabling the government to have a tool indispensable to its mission of strategic steering of agricultural development.	

SUMMARY OF STATUS OF TARGETS, OUTPUTS, OUTCOMES/RESULTS, AND OBJECTIVE

Outcome 1 / Outcome 1 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 1: SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private consulting services for the benefit of producers is increased.		
Products	Targets	Achievements
Output 1.1: Training resources on SLM are developed, tested and improved dynamically based on user feedback, and then deployed at project sites, disseminating the AHSWP capacity building approach.	Target 1: At least 60% of users targeted by the survey find the WDM toolkit appropriate, useful and relevant, and easy to use, and confirm that they have used it.	The required activities were planned and executed in a timely manner. More than 65% of the users surveyed found the WEM toolkit useful, both in terms of quality and content: Target n°1 exceeded.
	Target #2: The final evaluation generally validates survey results and confirms whether and how successful the toolkit is	The required activities have been planned and executed. Target no. 2 achieved
Output 1.1: The operational duration of the project was 561/2 months out of 66 months, a reduced duration of 8 ½ months. The targets having been achieved, the level of achievement of Output 1.1 is satisfactory and effective.		
Output 1.2: Knowledge is disseminated, innovation infused, and technological breakthroughs adopted by beneficiaries as part of the AHSUMP approach to strengthening FOs' capacity for SLM.	Target 1.2.1: At least one SLM consulting agency is functional in each commune and at least one private SLM service provider is present in each village in the target area.	Planned activities were completed on time. Target 1.2.1 achieved
	Target 1.2.2: At least 25% of FOs are under contract with service providers for SLM consulting.	The planned activities have been carried out. Target 1.2.2 achieved
Output 1.2: Targets were met during the period of 561/2 months out of 66, resulting in a satisfactory and effective level of achievement of Output 1.2.		
Level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 1 : Through the effective delivery of outputs, the level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 1 is satisfactory and effective. Three cases of success/lessons should be noted : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the consultation and reflection frameworks organized with more than 350 participants including 275 women leaders of women's organizations from the 6 intervention circles, mayors and traditional chiefs constitute a success in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to fight against gender inequalities ; The adoption of the improved banco fireplace by women has immediate effects on removals from the woodlands, and thus on carbon sequestration and gain; The use of the stone cord through a contour-based landscaping (ACN) induces a significant increase in yields with a view to creating sustainable wealth. 		
Outcome 2 / Outcome 2 or UNDP-GEF Result 2: A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional.		

Products	Targets	Achievements
Output 2.1: A geo-referenced system for monitoring and planning the management of agro-ecosystems is developed and adopted as part of the M&E framework for the AHSMP and the agricultural sector.	Target 2.1.1: By the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system for the selected agro-ecosystem components is available for the project area.	The baseline situation of the project has been established. The training activities have been carried out, but the monitoring system for the components of the selected agro-ecosystems is not operational. Target not met
	Target 2.1.2: At the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of independent and sustainable updating maintained by MES with minimal external assistance.	Two important studies were conducted (Impact of SLM achievements on the regeneration of vegetation cover; Estimation of carbon gain in SLM investments in the Sikasso and Mopti regions). However, the monitoring system of the selected agroecosystem components is not operational: Target not met
	Target 2.1: Beginning in year 4 of the project, an annual agroecosystem environmental newsletter is published by the MEEA.	Unrealized activities : Target not met
	Targets not met: The level of achievement of Product 2.1 is insufficient.	
	Product Status 2.1 :	
Output 2.2: Support for coordination and monitoring and evaluation at the AHS program level is provided.	Activities carried out.	
Product Status 2.2:	The level of achievement of Product 2.2 is satisfactory.	
Level of achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 2 : Non-achievement of strategic targets [By the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system of selected agro-ecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is available for the project area; By the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of independent and sustainable updating maintained by MES with minimal external assistance; From year 4 of the project, an annual environmental bulletin of agro-ecosystems is published by MEEA], leading to an unsatisfactory achievement of UNDP-GEF Result 2, the achievement of which was to constitute a strategic lever enabling the government to have a tool indispensable to its mission of strategic steering of agricultural development.		

Immediate project objective: To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.		
Indicators	Targets	Achievements
Indicator 1: Percentage of producers adopting SLM technologies in targeted areas	Target: At least 60% of AHS On-Farm Assistants have adopted SLM technologies.	Target Exceeded
Status of Indicator 1: Satisfactory Indicator Level		
Indicator 2: Increase in project areas using TDM techniques	Target: 50% of the production areas targeted by the project use DWDM techniques.	Target Achieved
Status of Indicator 2: Satisfactory Indicator Level		
<p>Progress Towards the Immediate Project Objective: As noted in the discussion of the design of the Results Framework (Section 3.2.3), the Immediate Objective rests on two levers : (1) a strategic lever determined by UNDP-GEF Result 2, the achievement of which will provide the government with an indispensable tool for its mission of strategic steering of agricultural development; and (2) an operational lever determined by UNDP-GEF Result 1, the purpose of which is based on the development of demonstrative pilot actions enabling grassroots communities to work towards sustainable wealth creation through the scaling up of good practices. The indicators mentioned concern only the operational leverage, which has been satisfactorily achieved. It must be noted that the strategic lever constituted by UNDP-GEF Result 2 has an unsatisfactory level of achievement.</p> <p>Overall, progress toward the Immediate Objective is moderately satisfactory.</p>		

Appendix 7A: Global Indicative Project Plan (GIP)

	MAJOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT/MANAGEMENT ACTIONS
--	--

ANNEES	Formulation	Planning PTA	Committee of Piloting	Meeting Coordination Team of project	Visits Organized For partners (Government- UNDP- Assembly...)	Report From follow-up	Evaluation	Audits	Other actions (Presentations, International Meetings/ Side event...)
2014								-	
2015								-	
2016								Audit Exercise 2015	
2017								Audit Exercise 2016	
2018								Audit Exercise 2017	
2019								Audit Exercise 2018	
2020							Final evaluation: June-July	Audit Exercise 2019	
2021									

Appendix 7B: Project Implementation Timeline

Month	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

Actions major																				
Elaboration PIF																				
Formulation Project document																				
LPAC																				
Approval/ Signature																				
Setting up Project team																				
First Planning Strategic																				
Workshop of Start																				
Steering Committee																				
Operational start-up																				

APPENDIX 8: GDT GOOD PRACTICES

8.1 KEY CONCEPTS :

For the conduct of the process of identifying good practices in SLM, it is necessary to clarify the understanding of the key concepts:

- **The Environment** is perceived as being the whole constituted by their environment of existence, the interactions between them and this, for a possible life / in symbiosis;
- **Sustainable Development (SD)** allows **The Human Being** to :
 - To live in security, in a society of: peace, freedom and justice. This first foundation of SD is part of good governance;
 - To satisfy, at any time and in any place, his essential social needs. This second foundation aims at eradicating poverty in all its forms;
 - To thrive in a natural environment in continuous equilibrium. This third foundation imposes, at all levels (local, national, continental, global), the preservation of the environment;
- In a country like Mali, the exploitation of agro-sylvo-pastoral resources is undeniably the driving force behind the sustainable development sought.

Justification of the identification and extension of good practices in GDTE :

On the basis of the concepts indicated above, it can be said that the extension of good practices in SLM should lead to a model of sustainable local development and grassroots democracy, where people, in security, live in a society of peace, freedom and justice and their socio-economic and cultural needs are met at all times in a natural environment in continuous equilibrium.

Ultimately, the extension of GDTE best practices will help to ensure sustainable food and energy security while contributing to the fight against climate change and the preservation of the environment both locally and globally, also providing a better quality of life for the benefit of populations.

8.2: AD HOC MATRIX FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF GOOD PRACTICES GDTE

Strategic area of intervention	Evaluative Questions		Good practices identified	Main obstacles to scaling up good practices in SLM	Recommended actions
	Key Question	Sub questions			
Good Local Governance	To what extent do local and regional authorities benefit from a political, legal and regulatory framework that enables them to steer the sustainable development at the local level?	Is there an appropriate political, legal and regulatory framework to make the exercise of the transferred competences more effective?			
		Level of political dialogue on decentralization?			
		How is SD piloting carried out?			
		Validity of the approach implemented?			

Strategic area of intervention	Evaluative Questions		Good practices identified	Main obstacles to scaling up good practices in SLM	Recommended actions
	Key Question	Sub questions			
Good Local Governance (continued)	To what extent do local authorities have the capacity to exercise their full range of competences?	What is the level of improvement in the organizational frameworks for local governance?			
		Degree of development of a local public service (increased mobilization of resources...)?			
		Does the support/advice provide grassroots communities with tools and mechanisms for planning, implementation and continuous monitoring of living conditions and environmental changes?			
		Does the support/advice help develop citizen control of local public action?			

Strategic area of intervention	Evaluative Questions		Good practices identified	Main obstacles to scaling up good practices in SLM	Recommended actions
	Key Question	Sub questions			
Sustainable food and energy security	To what extent does the exploitation of the agro-sylvo-pastoral potential guarantee sustainable food and energy security?	What is the local application of the national institutional framework for steering agricultural development (planning, programming, mobilization and coordination of partners, implementation of structural investments, support/advice...)? monitoring-evaluation...)?			
		What is the approach defined and implemented/validity of the support-advice with respect to : -management of natural capital (land, forests, water)? - Predicting/mitigating the risks of conflicts and disasters?			
		To what extent does the design and implementation of farms (collective, individual/private perimeters) promote the integration of rainfed agriculture/irrigated agriculture/livestock/livestock/fishery-aquaculture/forestry?			

Strategic area of intervention	Evaluative Questions		Good practices identified	Main obstacles to scaling up good practices in SLM	Recommended actions
	Key Question	Sub questions			

Sustainable food and energy security (continued)	To what extent does the exploitation of the agro-sylvo-pastoral potential guarantee sustainable food and energy security? (continued)	What are the infrastructure development standards for water control/integrated water resources management?			
		What is the level of access to renewable energy sources / mobilization of local renewable energy sources, in particular solar energy solutions, and sustainable and high quality production of plant fuel?			
		What is the approach defined and implemented with regard to fruit growing, reforestation (with local forest species with medicinal value)?			
		Level of opening up of production areas?			
		What is the availability (with research) of technical packages facilitating training/counseling of producer organizations and the local private sector?			

Strategic area of intervention	Evaluative Questions		Good practices identified	Main obstacles to scaling up good practices in SLM	Recommended actions
	Key Question	Sub questions			
	Does the level of access to basic	Is there a minimum platform of basic social infrastructure and equipment in the priority sectors of education (formal and non-formal), health and drinking water supply?			

Coverage of the basic social needs of the villagers.	social rights and services enable people to improve their living conditions and environment in a sustainable way?	What are the social protection capacities/measures for vulnerable groups (during and after crises and shocks)?			
		Level of development of rural communication and advocacy for the consumption of local products?			
		Degree of valorization of local knowledge and know-how?			
		Level of improvement of the living environment (adapted local architecture, waste management/recovery...) ?			

Annex 9: Synopsis of Conclusions and Recommendations/ Memorandum of Recommended Actions

Sectors/ Criteria evaluation	Conclusions	Memorandum of Recommended Actions		
		Recommended actions	Responsible Party	Deadline
Insecurity	The "insecurity" risk had been identified, but it was not properly managed to minimize its negative effects.	To do everything possible to promote political, economic, cultural and social dialogue, which the State must manage in accordance with its perennial public service mission, which includes human security and the preservation of the integrity of the Malian territory.	Government	Ongoing
Process formulation/ approval	The formulation/approval process was unusually long. It took 87 months from the approval of the PIF to the kick-off workshop. This period was long enough to induce changes in the project guidelines and thus destroy the coherence	Limit the formulation/approval process to a period not exceeding 20 months.	Government, UNDP, and GEF	As soon as the project is identified
		Ensure that co-financing is subject to co-financing letters signed by the parties concerned.	Government, UNDP, and FE	During project formulation

	between the PIF and the signed project document.	Ensure continuous business intelligence to ensure consistency between the Project Identification Form (PIF) and the project document.	UNDP and UNDP/GEF Regional Unit	Upon approval of the PIF
Local Project Appraisal Committee	The composition of the LPAC held on 01/08/2014 was not optimal due to the fact that some key partners were not represented, notably: the Ministry of Rural Development/National Directorate of Rural Engineering (DNGR); the National Directorate of Industrial and Animal Productions (DNPIA); the Institute of Rural Economy (IER); the National Directorate of Water and Forestry (DNEF); the World Bank (WB) and the European Commission (EC).	Arrange for the effective participation of key partners in LPAC, or receive (in their absence) formally their comment sheets and opinions with respect to their recommendation for project approval. A proposed format is provided in Annex 13.	Government and UNDP	One month before LPAC

Sectors/ Criteria evaluation	Conclusions	Memorandum of Recommended Actions		
		Recommended actions	Responsible Party	Deadline
Organization of the kick-off workshop	The report of the project kick-off workshop does not constitute, as it should have been, a fundamental reference elaborated and shared with all the stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to the implementation. Indeed, the objectives of the workshop did not sufficiently take into account : (i) the recommendations of LPAC and (ii) the need to finalize a first annual action plan on the basis of the project results framework, highlighting indicators, targets, means of verification, as well as assumptions and risks to date.	Organize the kick-off workshop for future projects, so that the report can be a fundamental reference elaborated and shared with all stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to implementation (agreement on the Global Indicative Project Planning; understanding of the roles, support services and responsibilities of UNDP, UNDP/GEF Unit; finalization of the first annual action plan based on the project results framework).	Government and UNDP	No later than two months after operational start-up

Results Framework Design	The design of the strategic results framework as presented in the project document, suffered from insufficient application of results-based management and Targets/Indicators/Verification sources/Time frame/Costs/Implementation structure/Partner structures/Responsible structure/Risks and hypotheses, was not defined.	Rigorously apply results-based management in future formulations.	Formulation team	As soon as it is formulated
---------------------------------	--	---	-------------------------	-----------------------------

Sectors/ Criteria evaluation	Conclusions	Memorandum of Recommended Actions		
		Recommended actions	Responsible Party	Deadline
Relevance	The alignment of the project with the reference frameworks for sustainable development at the global and national levels justifies its satisfactory relevance (4/6) . This relevance is also underpinned by the two intended outcomes that address immediate concerns: (i) populations active in the exploitation of agro-silvo-pastoral resources; (ii) central and decentralized government entities with regard to support for strategic management; (iii) NGOs, as well as the private sector involved in support/advice for the benefit of rural producers From the design point of view, the chain of results does not integrate the relevant elements that reflect gender mainstreaming. However, in the field, the responsibilities assumed by women in implementation have imposed their positioning as leaders and main actors in certain key sectors (good practices concerning training/dissemination and extension of	Reflecting gender mainstreaming in the development of the project completion report	AEDD	Immediate

	improved stoves, afforestation, etc.). Given this operational reality, the conceptual deficit does not call into question the relevance of the project.			
--	---	--	--	--

Sectors/ Criteria evaluation	Conclusions	Memorandum of Recommended Actions		
		Recommended actions	Responsible Party	Deadline
Coherence	The project document is consistent with the global objectives of sustainable development, national priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan, the GEF Objectives, the United Nations Framework and the UNDP program in Mali. However, the results chain has been defined incompletely, leading to a moderately satisfactory level of coherence (3/6) .	Rigorously apply results-based management in future formulations.	Formulation team	As soon as it is formulated
Impact Sustainability /	Positive changes are noted in: the innovative approach to SLM, with the development of a catalog of good practices; the advent of new types of behavior at the community level for sustainable development. The changes induced are satisfactory (4/6) . There is a risk that the sustainability of what has been achieved will be annihilated by : (1) insecurity; (2) the simultaneous and continuous non-functioning of the three "wickets": Training wickets; Support/Advice wickets and Financing wickets provided by the project to support producers (small equipment, inputs, etc.). It should be emphasized that for the first two windows (Training and Support/Advice), the State must ensure their existence and continuous operation, in view of its role as a pilot of sustainable agro-silvo-pastoral development.	Rapidly implement a partnership focused on scaling up WDM best practices in a programmatic approach through a pilot WDM development program for rural eco-villages/ecocommunities. This partnership should also support the development of a national strategy for the creation of eco-villages by the WDM with an action plan over a 30-year horizon.	Government, UNDP and GEF	Immediate

Annex 10: UNGEG Code of Conduct Form

Evaluators/Consultants :

1. Must present complete and fair information in their assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Shall disclose all evaluation findings and information about their limitations and make them available to all those involved in the evaluation who are legally entitled to receive the results.
3. Shall protect the anonymity and confidentiality to which the persons who communicate information to them are entitled. Evaluators must allow sufficient time, minimize wasted time, and respect individuals' right to privacy. Evaluators must respect the right of individuals to provide information in confidence and ensure that so-called sensitive information cannot be traced back to its source. Evaluators are not required to evaluate individuals and must maintain a balance between the evaluation of management functions and this general principle.
4. Sometimes discover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting assessments. These cases should be reported confidentially to the appropriate authorities investigating the matter. They should consult with other relevant supervisory bodies when in doubt as to whether and how to report matters.
5. Must be sensitive to beliefs, habits and customs and demonstrate integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders. In accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be aware of and address issues of discrimination and gender disparity. Evaluators should avoid anything that might offend the dignity or self-respect of those with whom they come into contact during an evaluation. Recognizing that an evaluation may negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate the purpose and results of the evaluation in a manner that fully respects the dignity and sense of self-respect of the stakeholders.
6. Are responsible for their performance and what results from it. Evaluators must be able to present the evaluation, its limitations, findings and recommendations in writing or orally in a clear, accurate and honest manner.
7. Must follow recognized accounting procedures and exercise prudence in the use of evaluation resources.

Review Consultant Agreement Form


Agreement on Compliance with the United Nations System Code of Conduct on Evaluation :

Consultant's Name : Arona FALL

I confirm that I have received and understand the United Nations Code of Conduct on Evaluation and agree to abide by it.

Signed in Saint-Louis, June 08, 2020- Signature

Arona FALL

: 

Review report approved by :

Mandating unit

Name : _____

Signature : _____ Date :

UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name : _____

Signature : _____ Date :

Annex 12: Matrix of Responses to Comments Received from the UNDP/GEF Unit

(annexed as a separate file)

Appendix 13: LPAC Partner Observation/Notification Sheet Format

	Project Title :
--	-----------------

Local Examination Committee (LPAC)	Date of LPAC :	
Partner	Institution :	
	Designated Focal Point	Names and First Names :
		Contacts (mail, phone...) :
OBSERVATIONS/FINAL OPINION OF THE PARTNER		
I. General observation :		
II. Specific Observations		
References in the project document (Part, Paragraph, Subparagraph, Section, Annex....)	Comments	
III. Final opinion of the partner on the approval of the project :		
Date :	Signature Focal Point	

APPENDIX 14: PIF/PROJECT DOCUMENT FIT ANALYSIS

A)-BASIC ELEMENTS			
	PIF	PROJECT DOCUMENT	COMMENTS
TITLE OF THE PROJECT	Restoring agricultural and pastoral productivity	Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) and environmental support to PAPAM: Program for the Increase of Agricultural Productivity in Mali, UNDP-GEF Components	The title of the PIF corresponds to that of an even larger program than the AHS On Reserve! That of the UNDP-GEF project is more realistic.
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM	Strategic Investment Program for LMS in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP)	Strategic Investment Program GEF-4/ "Promoting agricultural production in Mali" (PAPAM)	-
IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS	Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livestock and Ministry of Environment	Ministry of the Environment, Water and Sanitation (MEEA) - Environment and Sustainable Development Agency (AEDD)	The PIF would lead to complex implementation arrangements with three departments.
Objective of the project	Increase agricultural productivity by securing ecosystem services in priority agricultural landscapes, improving the competitiveness of supply chains, improving service providers, and increasing the availability of financing for land users.	To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.	The observation made for the title also applies to the lens.

B)-RESULTS FRAMEWORK					
COMPONENT	PIF		PROJECT DOCUMENT		COMMENTS
	RESEARCH EFFECTS	EXPECTED REVENUES	SEARCH EFFECT	EXPECTED REVENUES	

1- Political and institutional support for a comprehensive programmatic approach	<p>policy harmonization and increased capacity for integrated land management at all levels</p> <p>Country Leadership and Donor and Sector Alignment and Coordination</p> <p>Increased government and private sector funding for LMS</p> <p>SLM-policy context and strengthened regulatory framework</p> <p>Enhanced diversification opportunities</p> <p>Risk management, particularly against price volatility, is strengthened</p>	<p>SLM Investment Framework (SLMIF) adopted and implemented by Government and stakeholders</p> <p>LMS issues and approaches are better reflected in local development planning</p> <p>Local land use plans developed in targeted areas</p> <p>Vertical/horizontal coordination mechanisms for agricultural development and SLM in place</p>	<p>GDTE technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private consulting services for the benefit of producers is increased.</p>	<p>Training resources on SLM are dynamically developed, tested and improved based on user feedback, and then deployed at project sites, disseminating the AHS On-Line capacity building approach.</p> <p>-Knowledge is disseminated, innovation infused and technological breakthroughs adopted by beneficiaries as part of PAPAM's approach to strengthening FOs' capacities for SLM</p>	<p>The effects and outputs are appropriate to solve the problem of strategic steering of the sustainable development of Agriculture (in the broadest sense: integration of rainfed/ irrigated crops/livestock/livestock). Fishing / Forestry). This is too ambitious! The UNDP-GEF project presents a more relevant and coherent programmatic framework.</p>
--	---	---	---	---	--

COMPONENT	PIF		PROJECT DOCUMENT		COMMENTS
	RESEARCH EFFECTS	EXPECTED REVENUES	RESEARCH EFFECTS	EXPECTED REVENUES	

2- Reinforce awareness and capacities at national, regional and local levels	<p>⇒ Capacity of producer organizations and extension agents strengthened to provide SLM services</p> <p>⇒ Strengthened local government capacity to effectively manage forest and pastoral areas</p> <p>⇒ Strengthened national, regional and local government capacity to effectively oversee LMS activities and provide advisory services</p>	<p>➤ Training modules designed and developed by local training resources</p> <p>➤ Extension agents are fully trained and capable of disseminating and applying SLM techniques.</p> <p>➤ Local governments, as well as utilities, have been trained to carry out their oversight and management functions for LMS-related activities.</p>	-	-	-
--	--	--	---	---	---

COMPONENT	PIF		PROJECT DOCUMENT		COMMENTS
	RESEARCH EFFECTS	EXPECTED REVENUES	RESEARCH EFFECTS	EXPECTED REVENUES	

3- Investments in the field	<p>SLM applications in the field at scale</p> <p>MLS strategies and techniques adopted on and off the farm in cotton and rice production areas (Office du Niger, small-scale irrigation systems, village irrigation schemes, etc.).</p> <p>Expansion of the cotton production area has decreased</p> <p>Productivity of the chains and cultivated land increased or maintained</p> <p>Agricultural pressure on natural resources has decreased</p>	<p>Innovative SLM approaches piloted and promoted in agro-sylvo-pastoral production systems</p> <p>SLM options and technologies available in the Demand Driven Funds menu</p> <p>SLM technology adoption rates have increased</p> <p>Use of POPs has decreased</p> <p>National Pooled Funding Mechanism for Agriculture and SLM established</p>	-	-	-
-----------------------------	--	---	---	---	---

COMPONENTS	PIF		PROJECT DOCUMENT		COMMENTS
	RESEARCH EFFECTS	EXPECTED REVENUES	SEARCH EFFECT	EXPECTED REVENUES	

4- Monitoring and evaluation of the LMS	<p>Short, medium and long term changes in land management monitored and evaluated</p> <p>LMS information used at the local, national and international levels to enable comparative analysis in a variety of contexts</p>	<p>Selected tools and indicators refined and applied to monitor SLM ramp-up</p> <p>Existence of a comprehensive knowledge base on LMS</p> <p>Information, technical notes and tools disseminated to all stakeholders</p> <p>Operational Geographic Information System for monitoring the evolution of natural resources</p> <p>GEF Project Activities Implemented and Closely Monitored by the Ministry of Environment</p>	<p>A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems exists and is functional.</p>	<p>-A geo-referenced system for monitoring and planning the management of agro-ecosystems is developed and adopted as part of the M&E framework for AHSMP and the agricultural sector;</p> <p>-Support for coordination and monitoring and evaluation at the AHS program level is provided</p>	<p>The effects and outputs are appropriate to solve the problem of strategic steering of the sustainable development of Agriculture (in the broadest sense: integration of rainfed/ irrigated crops/livestock/livestock). Fishing / Forestry).</p> <p>This is too ambitious! The UNDP-GEF project presents a more relevant and coherent programmatic framework.</p>
---	---	--	---	--	---

C)-IDENTIFIED RISKS		
PIF	PROJECT DOCUMENT	

IDENTIFIED RISKS	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IDENTIFIED RISKS	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	COMMENTS
<p>-The overall risk of the operation is considered moderate, since the project will incorporate lessons learned from the Bank's and partners' continued investment in Mali. Previous evaluations have shown that most of the risks are in the enabling environment and this operation aims to improve it.</p> <p>-Other risks include: (i) weak capacity of service providers and facilitators to disseminate knowledge about LMS; (ii) insufficient numbers of trained facilitators; and (iii) potential risk of misappropriation of funds and inadequate accounting records.</p>	<p>-The communication strategy and approach proposed will help to minimize risks.</p> <p>-Similarly, the GEF project and IDA investment will pay attention to capacity building, particularly for utilities and producer organizations that will be key stakeholders in implementation and for additional efforts to promote investments in SLM.</p>	<p>*Mali is emerging from a crisis and the situation remains tense and can be dangerous in rural areas.</p> <p>* National capacity for SLM in rural areas will take longer to develop than expected and this will have a limited impact on the overall adoption of SLM techniques. Also, there will be resistance to change based on the cultural traditions of the beneficiary communities, including gender roles.</p>	<p>*The project will follow the appropriate UNDSS instructions and applicable protocols. All project staff will be trained in field security.</p> <p>*The project's strategy is focused on achieving results that are commensurate with its level of ambition. The first activity in Output 1.1 includes a needs assessment, aimed at providing the project team with sufficient data on how to design and implement SLM training and how to maximize its impact on capacity building. In conjunction with the needs assessment, an analytical study on the barriers to the effectiveness of the training in question and to the adoption of innovation and technology, which AHSULE can help introduce in relation to SLM. Particular attention will be paid to elements related to the cultural traditions of the beneficiary communities, including the roles of women and men respectively, which can be an element of resistance to change.</p>	<p>It is clear that the time lag between the PIF design period and the project document design period leads to differences in risk identification.</p> <p>The security risk remains the main one</p>

C)-IDENTIFIED RISKS (CONTINUED)				
PIF		PROJECT DOCUMENT		COMMENTS
IDENTIFIED RISKS	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	IDENTIFIED RISKS	PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES	

Idem above	Same as above	<p>* The project may have a negative impact on the cultural traditions of the beneficiary communities, including gender roles.</p>	<p>.</p> <p>*The UNDP-GEF project has been structured in such a way that strict safeguards to avoid the negative impacts and risks of agricultural investments will be an integral part of the training program, to be developed with the support of the project.</p> <p>*More specifically, the following answer was given in the UNDP screening with respect to Question 6.1 (<i>Is the project likely to significantly affect the cultural traditions of the communities concerned, including gender roles</i>)?</p> <p>"To the extent that agricultural practices that degrade the land and result in the loss of ecosystem services related to water, soil and carbon resources can be interpreted as 'cultural traditions' and/or when these practices are deeply 'embedded in these traditions', as well as the roles of men and women respectively, then it is possible to answer YES, the project will try to influence them - but it is so that its practices are much more sustainable and not gender discriminatory. An example would be the "traditional" use of fire as a clearing technique before the land can be prepared for cultivation.</p>	<p>The risk would have been defined differently: the failure to take into account cultural traditions and local know-how.</p>
------------	---------------	--	---	---

Appendix 15: Maintenance Guides

Government Departments/Services

- Missions and attributions within the framework of the implementation of the project
- Support received (Type, Description)
- Appreciation of this support, in particular the coherence and relevance with national priorities
- Assessment and Judgment of UNDP/GEF Contribution: Assessment of UNDP's added value in terms of its contribution to capacity building and the development of strategic and planning frameworks and monitoring and evaluation of the Facility, to field operations.
- Assessment of the Coordination Mechanism
- Data on achievements and their use
- Changes (or early signs of change) noted in the structure at the strategic and operational level
- Various achievements of the supports
- Success factors
- Constraints and recommended solutions
- Main lessons learned
- Strategies put in place to continue and or maintain the gains achieved
- Availability of statistical information to inform product indicators;

NGOs/Providers

- Support received, Appreciation of support
- Consistency and relevance of products
- Main changes noted
- Main achievements
- Key success factors
- Assessment of the main constraints
- Implementation strategies to maintain what has been learned
- Key Lessons Learned
- Specific recommendations

Beneficiaries

- Support received (Type, Description)
- Appreciation of support
- Relevance of support (particularly in relation to identified constraints)
- Quality of the achievements/support
- Data on the application of the skills acquired through training courses

- Data on the use of support received
- Increase in revenues as a result of support received
- Changes (or early signs of change)
- Strengths and weaknesses of the support received
- Difficulties related to the exercise of the activity
- Solutions adopted to overcome these difficulties
- strategies put in place to continue and/or maintain activities
- Specific recommendations

Technical and Financial Partners (TFP)

- Assessment based on indicators and reference situation
- Availability of internal data to measure indicators
- Assessment of the level of concordance between products and effects
- Partnership with UNDP
- Mobilization of resources within the timeframe/key challenges
- Functioning of the Monitoring and Evaluation and Aid Coordination Mechanism
- Appreciation of the various achievements
- Monitoring data and partnership assessments
- Appreciation of the approach to achieve results
- Effectiveness and efficiency of interventions
- Data on their use, knowledge translation
- Data on the budgetary provisions for post-UNDP/GEF support funding
- Is an exit strategy implemented
- Assessment of the main success factors
- Assessment of the main constraints
- Specific recommendations

Appendix 16: Project document structuring analysis table

Chapters and Sub-Chapters of the Project Document	Comments
SITUATION ANALYSIS	

1.1 CONTEXT AND IMPORTANCE AT THE GLOBAL LEVEL <i>1.1.1 Environmental Context</i> <i>1.1.2 Socio-economic context</i> <i>1.1.3 Institutional context.</i> <i>1.1.4 Policy Context</i>	<p>From sub-chapter 1.1 to section 1.2.3 the developments, although they were developed for the PAPAM project, they remain relevant to the UNDP/GEF project. The format required for a UNDP/GEF project document is respected.</p>
1.2. THREATS AND ROOT CAUSES <i>1.2.1 Environmental degradation due to poor land management</i> <i>1.2.2 Cross-cutting Threat - Climate Change</i> <i>1.2.3 Population Growth</i>	
1.3 LONG-TERM SOLUTION AND ANALYSIS OF OBSTACLES <i>1.3.1 Long-term solution</i>	<p>The elements reflected in sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 relate to the AHSAP, an effort to frame the UNDP/GEF project has not been made.</p>
<i>1.3.2 Expected quantifiable overall environmental benefits</i>	
<i>1.3.3 Barrier Analysis</i>	<p>The developments are relevant to the UNDP/GEF project.</p>
1.4 STAKEHOLDER AND BASELINE ANALYSIS <i>1.4.1 Stakeholder analysis</i> <i>1.4.2 Analysis of the reference situation</i> <i>1.4.3 Note on foreign exchange position</i>	
II. STRATEGY 2.1. PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND POLICY COMPLIANCE <i>2.1.1 Project Rationale</i> <i>2.1.2 Consistency with GEF Policies and Strategies</i> <i>2.1.3 GEF Value Added Compared to the Reference Scenario</i>	<p>"The execution of the project by the National Directorate of Agriculture and the broad participation of the planned actors in the implementation of the project will ensure better institutional integration of the project in the ongoing development processes" is not consistent for the UNDP/GEF project.</p>

Chapters and Sub-Chapters of the Project Document	Comments
2.2. NATIONAL OWNERSHIP <i>2.2.1 Eligibility of the country</i> <i>2.2.2 Country impulse</i>	<p>The developments are relevant but, for the overall coherence of the UNDP/GEF project, only those</p>
2.3. DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS <i>2.3.1 Framework for the UNDP-GEF PAPAM Project</i>	
2.4. PROJECT OBJECTIVE, RESULTS AND OUTPUTS/ACTIVITIES <i>Operational objective of this PRODOC</i> <i>Outcome / UNDP-GEF Component № 1</i> <i>Outcome / UNDP-GEF Component № 2</i>	

2.5 MAIN INDICATORS, RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS <i>2.5.1 Indicators</i> <i>2.5.2 Risks and Impacts of the UNDP-GEF Project</i>	elements related to the project should be included in the sections opposite.
2.6 COST-EFFECTIVENESS	
2.8. SUSTAINABILITY	
2.9 REPRODUCIBILITY	
III. PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK 3.1 PROGRAMMATIC LINKS 3.2 HIERARCHY OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	
3.3 STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK	
IV. OVERALL BUDGET AND WORK PLAN	

Chapters and Sub-Chapters of the Project Document	Comments
V. MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS 5.1 OPERATIONAL COORDINATION OF THE PROJECT	<p>The provisions indicated are more relevant to the AHS On Reserve program. A refocus on the UNDP/GEF project should have been made.</p>
5.2 FIELD IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES AND PROVISION OF SERVICES TO PRODUCERS	
VI. MONITORING & EVALUATION FRAMEWORK 6.1 MONITORING & EVALUATION AT THE PAPAM PROGRAM LEVEL	
6.2 MONITORING & EVALUATION AT THE UNDP-WFP PROJECT LEVEL	
6.3 COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	
6.4 AUDIT CLAUSE	
VII. LEGAL BACKGROUND	-

Appendix 17: Results and Resources Framework (CRS/Mission)

SDG/Targets: MDG7/Target 1; and SDG 2/Target 4						
National Priorities: GPRSP-Axis 1 /Objective: Food security and improvement of incomes of rural producers						
UNDP Strategic Results: Key Output 1.3, and Flagship Programme № 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020						
GEF Programs: OS1/ SP1: Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management, SP2: Supporting sustainable forest management in production areas						
United Nations System Program: Outcome 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali 2013-2015; and UNDAF Outcome № 1 (2008-2014)						
CPAP: Outcome CPAP: Framework agreements on the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters are operational, and Output CPAP: Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local communities is strengthened.						
Immediate Objective: To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.						
Component 1: Strengthening the capacities of FOs and service providers						
Outcome 1 / Outcome 1 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 1: SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private consulting services for the benefit of producers is increased.						
❖ Output 1.1: Training resources on SLM are developed, tested and improved dynamically based on user feedback, and then deployed at project sites, disseminating the AHSWP capacity building approach.						
Indicator: The quality and level of innovation of the content of the WDM toolkit was developed by the project through Output 1.1/ Benchmark: No toolkit developed/Target 1: At least 60% of the users targeted by the survey find the WDM toolkit appropriate, useful and relevant, and easy to use, and confirm that they have used it. Target 2: The final evaluation generally validates survey results and confirms whether and how successful the toolkit has been.						
Main activities	Period of realization	Costs	Implementation structure	Partner structures	Structure responsible	Risks and assumptions
Activity 1: Assess the specific needs of the beneficiaries in the sites (Mopti and Sikasso regions) in relation to (i) knowledge of SLM techniques; (ii) technology adoption; and (iii) availability of equipment and use.	05/2015		AEDD	DLCA/DREF/DRA, APCAM, PAPAM CPS	PDTE	Technoloies adopted Adequacy equipment of

Main activities	Period of realization	Costs	Implementation structure	Partner structures	Structure responsible	Risks and assumptions
-----------------	-----------------------	-------	--------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Activity 2: Develop an initial toolkit on SLM techniques that can be used by extension services in the field	11/2016		AEDD	CRRA/DLCA/NUD/ MOBIOM HELVETAS APCAM	PDTE	Level of ownership of the toolbox
Activity 3: Train the trainers, establish and implement the plan for their deployment	03/2017		AEDD	MOBIOM, AMEDD, CRRA	PDTE	Level of the fomateurs
Activity #4: Prototype, test and evaluate products based on user feedback	03/2017		AEDD	CRRA, DLCA, SAHEL ECO	PDTE	Inappropriate content
Activity 5: Ensure the adaptation, improvement and renovation of the toolbox, as well as communication and awareness raising	05/2017		AEDD	CRRA, APCAM, DLCA	PDTE	Accessibility of the messages to be broadcast
Product Cost 1.1						

SDG/Targets: MDG7/Target 1; and SDG 2/Target 4
National Priorities: GPRSP-Axis 1 / Objective: Food security and improvement of incomes of rural producers
UNDP Strategic Results: Key Output 1.3, and Flagship Programme № 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020
GEF Programs: OS1/ SP1: Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management, SP2: Supporting sustainable forest management in production areas
United Nations System Program: Outcome 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali 2013-2015; and UNDAF Outcome № 1 (2008-2014)
CPAP: Outcome CPAP: Framework agreements on the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters are operational, and Output CPAP: Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local communities is strengthened.
Immediate Objective: To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.
Component 1: Strengthening the capacities of FOs and service providers

Outcome 1 / Outcome 1 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 1: SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private consulting services for the benefit of producers is increased.						
❖ Output 1.2: Knowledge is disseminated, innovation infused, and technological breakthroughs adopted by beneficiaries as part of the AHSUMP approach to strengthening FOs' capacity for SLM.						
Indicator 1: The number of public SLM extension consulting services and private agencies (individual or collective) present in target areas/ Benchmark: To be defined during the start-up phase/Target: At least one SLM consulting agency is functional in each commune and at least one private SLM service provider is present in each village in the target area.						
Indicator 2: The number of POs under contract with service providers for SLM consulting / Benchmark situation: 0%.						
Target: At least 25% of FOs are under contract with service providers for SLM consulting						
Main activities	Period of realization	Costs US	Implementati on structure	Partner structures	Structure responsible	Risks and assumptions
Activity 1: Organize training in SLM for farmer leaders within major national and/or regional advocacy organizations	06/2018		AEDD	DLCA, AOPP, CRRA, AMEDD APCAM	SAHEL ECO	Structuring of organizations

Main activities	Period of realization	Costs US	Implementati on structure	Partner structures	Structure responsible	Risks and assumptions
Activity 2: Sensitize leaders of chambers of agriculture on the need to include SLM in their priorities/organize awareness-raising activities on the microeconomic benefits of SLM, and on the benefits of maintaining and increasing the productivity of agro-ecosystem services for regional development.	04/2019		AEDD	CRRA, ICRISAT DREF, DRA, DRPIA APCAM	DLCA	Level of integration of WDM into work plans
Activity n°3: Ensure technical assistance in SLM through the use of international expertise or local staff to support FOs' activities	09/2018		AEDD	DNA, CPS, DNAT, DNEF	UNDP	Availability of expertise
Activity 4: Promote the creation of networks of specialized service providers, which FOs and other entities can remunerate for important services (such as technical advice, provision of market information, etc.)/Encourage the emergence of private providers of SLM services.	03/2018		AEDD	DLCA, OP, GIE, Design Office	PDTE	Network membership level, Structuring form

Main activities	Period of realization	Costs US	Implementati on structure	Partner structures	Structure responsible	Risks and assumptions
Activity 5 : Organize training for small producers in the regions of Mopti and Sikasso to help them adopt SLM practices that mitigate the adverse effects of climate change (including conservation tillage or conservation agriculture, agroforestry, etc.), (e.g. sustainable pasture management, silvo-pastoral systems and improved forest management)/support SLM practices that improve soil inputs of ecosystem services and lead to increased biomass production and reliable crop yields.	05/2017 AT 09/2019		AEDD	DREF, DRA, DLCA CRRRA IER ICRISAT FENABE APCAM	PGDTE	That the Women's POs be involved in the training sessions.
Product Cost 1.2						
Total Cost of Outcome 1 / Outcome 1 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 1		1, 200,000				

SDG/Targets: MDG7/Target 1; and SDG 2/Target 4
National Priorities: GPRSP-Axis 1 /Objective: Food security and improvement of incomes of rural producers
UNDP Strategic Results: Key Output 1.3, and Flagship Programme № 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020
GEF Programs: OS1/ SP1: Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management, SP2: Supporting sustainable forest management in production areas
United Nations System Program: Outcome 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali 2013-2015; and UNDAF Outcome № 1 (2008-2014)
CPAP: Outcome CPAP: Framework agreements on the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters are operational, and Output CPAP: Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local communities is strengthened.
Immediate Objective: To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.
Component 2: Sector Monitoring and Evaluation
Outcome 2 / Outcome 2 or UNDP-GEF Result 2: A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems is in place and functional.
❖ Output 2.1: A geo-referenced system for monitoring and planning the management of agro-ecosystems is developed and adopted as part of the M&E framework for the AHSMP and the agricultural sector.
Indicator 1: Existence of a comprehensive and publicly accessible system for planning and monitoring the agro-management ecosystem / Reference situation: Lack of a comprehensive system for monitoring the impacts of agriculture / Target 1.1: By the end of year 3 of the project, a comprehensive monitoring system for the selected agroecosystem components (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load) is available for the project area / Target 1.2: At the end of the project, the system is refined and capable of being updated independently and sustainably maintained by MES with minimum external assistance Indicator 2: The quality and quantity of information contained in the monitoring system and the number and quality of reports published annually on the state of the agro-ecosystems / baseline situation : Only an annual state of the environment is produced by the MEEA, and it does not provide precise information on the state of agroecosystems (soils, vegetation, endemic species, water quantity and chemical load, etc.). Target End of project: Beginning in year 4 of the project, an annual environmental bulletin on agroecosystems is published by the MEEA.

Main activities	Period of realization	Costs	Implementation structure	Partner structures	Structure responsible	Risks and assumptions
-----------------	-----------------------	-------	--------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Activity n°1: Support the elaboration of a practical guide on the Land Management System/Mobilize a consulting firm specialized in Land Management and agroecosystem information in order to implement a Geographic Information System that will be 100% geo-referenced and that must include at least : available natural resources (water, forests, wetlands, other natural vegetation, relief) and related information on their use; the identification of critical areas for agro-ecological and hydrological services and their role in subsistence agriculture; special functions such as the incidence of bush fires, non-agricultural economic activities, population concentrations; and an overlay of detailed information on the agricultural system	08/2018 A 07/2019		AEDD	IGM, DNAT, DNA, DNPIA, CPS IER DNEF GEDEFOR APCAM SECO NGO AN	PGDTE	Functionality of the device, Empowerment and appropriation of the system by the national betting system
--	-------------------------	--	------	---	-------	---

Main activities	Period of realization	Costs	Implementation structure	Partner structures	Structure responsible	Risks and assumptions
Activity n°2: Support the development and improvement of tools to monitor land degradation and rehabilitation as well as the evolution of the ecosystem (obtaining a refined system capable of independent and	08/2020 No breakthroughs in this activity		AEDD	IGM, DNAT, DNA, DNPIA, CPS IER DNEF	PGDTE	Device responds to user needs National actors take ownership of the system

sustainable updating, maintained by MES with minimum external assistance). These tools will enable lessons to be learned from ongoing experiences and increase the effectiveness of investments in the field.				APCAM SECO NGO		
Activity n°3: Support the publication by the MEEA (starting in year 4 of the project) of an annual environmental bulletin on agro-ecosystems.	09/20 Idem		AEDD	CPS DNEF DNA	PGDTE	Data can be generated annually National actors have the capacity to collect agro-ecosystem data\$.
Product Cost 2.1						

SDG/Targets: MDG7/Target 1; and SDG 2/Target 4						
National Priorities: GPRSP-Axis 1 /Objective: Food security and improvement of incomes of rural producers						
UNDP Strategic Results: Key Output 1.3, and Flagship Programme № 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020						
GEF Programs: OS1/ SP1: Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management, SP2: Supporting sustainable forest management in production areas						
United Nations System Program: Outcome 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali 2013-2015; and UNDAF Outcome № 1 (2008-2014)						
CPAP: Outcome CPAP: Framework agreements on the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters are operational, and Output CPAP: Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local communities is strengthened.						
Immediate Objective: To increase the use of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) practices in targeted production systems in order to halt/reduce/reverse the trend of land degradation in Mali's agro-ecosystems.						
Component 2: Sector Monitoring and Evaluation						
Outcome 2 / Outcome 2 or UNDP-GEF Result 2: A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems is in place and functional.						
❖ Output 2.2: Support for coordination and monitoring and evaluation at the AHS program level is provided.						
Main activities	Period of realization	Costs US	Implementation structure	Partner structures	Structure responsible	Risks and assumptions
Activity 1: Ensure the operating costs of the project implementation coordination unit	04/2015 A		AEDD	Regional and local Focal	UNDP	Operationalization of the implementation

	31/12/2019			Points of DREFs and DRAs		That the PTBAs be carried out
Activity #2: Support the organization of annual audits and other studies related to project coordination, supervision and M&E	12/2016 A 12/2019		AEDD	PGDTE	UNDP	Audit recommendations are implemented

Main activities	Period of realization	Costs US	Implementation structure	Partner structures	Structure responsible	Risks and assumptions
Activity 3: Supporting the maintenance and use of acquired goods and equipment	08/2019 to 31/12/2019		AEDD	PGDTE	UNDP	Goods be tagged
Product Cost 2.2						
Total Cost of Outcome 2 / Outcome 2 or UNDP-GEF Outcome 2		700,000				

Appendix 18: Project Alignment to Frameworks (Global and National)

Reference frames	Programmatic linkages (Targets, Strategic Directions, Outcomes, Results...)
MDG7 Preserving the Environment	Target 1: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs and reverse the loss of natural resources
SDG2 Eradicate hunger, ensure food security, improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture	Target 4: By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, contribute to the conservation of ecosystems, enhance resilience to climate change, extreme weather events, drought, floods and other disasters, and progressively improve land and soil quality.
PRSC	Axis 1 /Objective: Food security and improvement of the incomes of rural producers
UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2017)	Key Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and wastes. Flagship Programme No 1 of the UNDP Global Framework for Biodiversity and Ecosystems 2012-2020: Integrating biodiversity and ecosystem management into sectoral planning, development and production activities should safeguard biodiversity and provide ecosystem services that support human well-being.
GEF Strategic Objectives and Programs	OS1/ SP1: Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management, SP2: Supporting sustainable forest management in production areas
SNU Program	Effect 2.4 of the UN Joint Transition Support Framework for Mali 2013-2015: The means of production and subsistence of vulnerable populations in rural, peri-urban and urban areas are strengthened and diversified for better food and nutritional security; UNDAF Outcome No 1 (extended from 2008 to 2014): The most vulnerable rural areas benefit from improved food security, sustainable development, sustainable renewable energy services and job creation.
CPAP	CPAP Result: Framework agreements relating to the environment, biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters, are operational. CPAP Output: Environmental management by the public and private sectors and in particular local authorities is strengthened.

Annex 19: Resource Mobilization/Financial Execution

A)-Reminder of the GEF and UNDP Results and Contributions Table

PAPAM Components	AHS Sub-Components	GEF Contribution \$ US	UNDP Contribution \$ US	Total \$ U.S.
1. Technology transfer provision of services	Capacity building of FOs and service providers UNDP-GEF Outcome 1: <i>SLM technologies are disseminated and adopted and the availability of public and private advisory services for the benefit of producers is increased.</i> UNDP-GEF Products : 1.1 Training resources on SLM are dynamically developed, tested and improved based on user feedback, and then deployed at project sites, disseminating the AHSMP capacity building approach 1.2 Knowledge is disseminated, innovation infused, and technological breakthroughs adopted by beneficiaries as part of the AHS On-Farm Approach to Strengthening FOs' Capacity for SLM			
Cost Outcome UNDP-GEF 1 :		1, 200,000		1, 200,000
3. Comprehensive programmatic approach and sector monitoring	Monitoring and evaluation of the sector UNDP-GEF Result 2: <i>A comprehensive system for monitoring agricultural impacts on natural resources and ecosystems is in place and functional.</i> UNDP-GEF Product : 2.1 A geo-referenced system for monitoring and planning the management of agro-ecosystems is developed and adopted as part of the M&E framework of the AHS On-Farm Program and the agricultural sector.	500,000	50,000	550,000
	Project Coordination and M&E UNDP-GEF Product : 2.2 Support for coordination and monitoring and evaluation at the AHS program level is provided	100,000	50,000	150,000
Cost Outcome UNDP-GEF 2 :		600,000	100,000	700,000
Project Management Costs :		100,000	200,000	300,000
Total budget		1.900.000	300.000	2.200.000

B)-Resource Mobilization Table

Years	Allowances introduced at the beginning of the year (ASL)		Effective dates of the first transfers of funds
	UNDP	GEF Total	
2014	49,000	-	-
2015	80,000	150,000	TRANSFER OF 34,910,000 ON MAY 28, 2015/ VOUCHER 66067
2016	240,038	212,646	TRANSFER OF 90,850,000 ON MAY 12, 2016/ VOUCHER 72369
2017	68,045	343,336	TRANSFER OF 92,500,000 ON FEBRUARY 21, 2017/ VOUCHER 77100
2018	150,000	587,774	TRANSFER OF 158,630,000 ON APRIL 10, 2018/ VOUCHER 85084
2019	170,000	723,063	TRANSFER OF 224,762,200 ON MARCH 5, 2019/ VOUCHER 89861
2020	100,000	1, 227,761	-
Total	857,083	3, 244,580	

In view of the dates of the first annual transfers, it is clear that, each year, operating activities were not developed until the second quarter.

C)-Table of financial execution by result

(Amounts in US\$)

	Approved budget (project document)			Actual expenditures (CDRs at 30/6/2020)			Implementation rate		
	UNDP	GEF	Total	UNDP	GEF	Total	UNDP	GEF	Total

Result n° 1	-	1, 200,000	1, 200,000		788,620	788,620	-	65,72 %	65,72 %
Result n° 2	100, 000	600, 000	700, 000	643,521	705,271	1, 348,792	644 %	117,55 %	192,68 %
Management costs of the project	200, 000	100,000	300,000	171,060	181,163	352,223	85,53 %	181,16 %	117,41 %
Total	300, 000	1, 900,000	2, 200,000	814,581	1, 675,054	2, 489,635	271, 53 %	88,16 %	113,17 %

NB :

- ⇒ The UNDP contribution increased by US\$ 514,581, or 171.53%, without a formal budget review;
- ⇒ **The** GEF contribution reflects a balance of US\$224,946 for which consecutive activities have not been defined.

Appendix 20: Strengths and Weaknesses of the WDMP

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p><u>Capacity Building</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PGDTE trained the trainers in good practices in all the project sites. The trainers are therefore a pool of expertise and competence on good WDM practices. - More than 2,000 people from producer organizations have been trained on Good Practices and have conducted pilot tests in their fields with encouraging and edifying results. - Of the 35 good practices listed in the catalog, 15 have been targeted for dissemination in local languages in the project area. <p><u>Networking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PGDTE has facilitated the networking of service providers. This networking tool is an important lever for sustainability insofar as it is called upon to follow and continue good practices in WDM after the project. <p><u>Development of tools</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The innovative approach of the PGDTE. The project has developed the catalog of good practices which is a tool whose impact on WDM practices will go beyond the geographical boundaries of the project sites to reach the whole of Mali and beyond. <p>Communication through the production of adapted radio supports. Translating SLM messages into local languages is also a tool whose impact on the targets (the beneficiary populations) will go beyond the borders to reach the North of Burkina Faso, and contribute to a greater mobilization in favor of Good Practices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insecurity is a factor that has greatly hampered project implementation in the field. - Insufficient application of results-based management in the design of the results framework - Limited project resources in relation to the vision of SLM

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p><u>At the institutional level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project enjoys remarkable political support. This support is perceptible at the level of the central services (in Bamako) and in the field with the administrative authorities who have a good 	

<p>knowledge of the project and are constantly renewing their willingness to support the interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Never before seen in the history of projects in Mali, the Minister of the Environment, Sanitation and Sustainable Development in person made three field trips to see the project's achievements and encourage stakeholders to become more involved and adhere to the project's interventions. This action has left its mark on the minds of the actors who are talking about it at all levels. Even the beneficiaries make it a source of pride. <p><u>At the operational level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project in its operational approach aims at changing behaviors within the target populations that are producers and producer organizations. - The PGDTE is an innovative reference through its approach of involving all the actors and developing synergies at all levels of its action. - The project's interventions and inclusive approach can be scaled up and replicated in other sites. 	
--	--

Constraints	Opportunities
<p>The sustainability of what has been achieved, and therefore the scaling up of best practices, risks being annihilated by insecurity, and the simultaneous and continuous non-functioning of the three "wickets": Training wickets developed by the project with a large volume of training sessions, Support/Consultancy wickets run by SLM providers; Financing wickets provided by the project to support producers (small materials, inputs, etc.).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The implementation process has resulted in equivalent positive changes in lessons learned that constitute best practices in SLM that need to be scaled up: GDTE's innovative approach, with the development of a catalog of best practices (improved fireplace in banco; use of stone cord through contour-based landscaping; wood production planting; assisted natural regeneration); the establishment of consultation and reflection frameworks involving women leaders of women's organizations, mayors and traditional chiefs in the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to combat gender inequalities; the use of local radio stations, which has facilitated access by producers in areas affected

	<p>by the security crisis to messages on GDTE best practices.</p> <p>- It should be emphasized that the actions that led to the changes in behavior are part of an integral rural development approach characterized by transformations that take time to produce their effects. They are part of a programmatic approach to sustainable human development (SHD) based on Research and Development linking the fight against poverty and the preservation of the environment.</p> <p>In this context, the management of experiments towards sustainable results requires a time step that is not far from a decade! Partnerships will have to be established according to this time step. An interesting alternative would be to initiate a pilot program for the development of eco-villages/eco-rural communities by the GDTE. This partnership should also support the development of a national strategy for the creation of eco-villages by the WDM with an action plan over a 30-year horizon.</p> <p>-</p>
--	--

APPENDIX 21: ABSTRACT

RECALLING THE CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The project is designed as an integral part of the major development Programme "Promoting Agricultural Production in Mali - PAPAM", which is structured around three components: (1) Technology transfer and provision service; (2) Irrigation infrastructure and, (3) Programmatic approach to sectoral monitoring. The financing of the said major Programme reflects a total budget estimated at US\$160 million structured around: (i) a World Bank-led agricultural investment, including a mix of loans from IDA and IFAD; (ii) EC grants; (iii) government investments in the agricultural sector; and (iv) WEF funding from the World Bank and UNDP and focused on promoting Sustainable Land and Water Management (GDTE), as well as improving and monitoring the sustainability of agricultural systems. For a period of 5 years and 1/2, with a total cost of 2,200,000 \$US, the project is funded by the Global Environment Fund (GEF) for 1,900,000 \$US and UNDP for 300,000 \$US. The government of Mali's in-kind contribution amounts to 300,000 \$US. The co-financing of the other partners is US\$5,500,000. The project pursues two results: [1] Strengthening the capacity of producer organizations and service providers, and [2] ensuring sectoral monitoring and evaluation.

PLANNED MISSION

This mission involves the final evaluation of the UNDP-FEM project "Sustainable Land and Water Management and Environmental Support for PAPAM. Organized at the request of the Government of Mali, UNDP and the WEF, the final evaluation aims to provide partners with feedback on: the state of expected results, lessons learned lessons and relevant recommendations in the way of consolidating and valuing achievements for the purposes of extending GDTE's best practices to other geographical areas. Specifically, the final evaluation should pursue the following objectives: (1) Assessing overall performance against objectives as defined in the project document (PRODOC) and other related documents; (2) Assess the relevance of the project's actions to national priorities,

as well as the strategic objectives of UNDP and the WEF; (3) Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the project; (4) Conduct a critical analysis of project implementation and management measures and the constraints associated with the implementation of GDTE best practices; (5) Assess the sustainability of the project's interventions and consider the impact of the project, especially of each good practice, on the lives of the communities benefiting from the intervention; (6) Document lessons learned and best practices related to project design, implementation and management, which could be useful to other projects in the country and around the world.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The organization of the mission was dictated by the suspension of air flights, given the current pandemic. Thus, the international consultant carried out the mission remotely, with the support of a national consultant.

In this context, the exchanges were facilitated by the establishment of a mailing group "Mailing Group Evaluation PAPAM". The work was carried out following the following steps: The establishment of the "PAPAM Evaluation Group Mailing Group" cf. Appendix 2; Documentary review; Elaboration and submission of the draft of the initial report indicating, among other things, the methodological approach, the draft of the evaluation matrix, the chronogram for the completion of the evaluation; Exchanges with the Mission Reference Group/Monitoring Group (stakeholders including UNDP, the project team, the Environment and Sustainable Development Agency (AEDD) to review/validate the initial report; Finalization of the Initial Report; Data collection and information/Interviews with local stakeholders by a national consultant; Elaboration of the synoptic implementation table; Development of the draft evaluation report; Exchanges with the Technical Review and Validation Committee of the Interim Assessment Report /Review of Observations and Amendments; Writing the final report of the evaluation.

KEY FINDINGS OF EVALUATION/TEACHINGS/BEST PRACTICES OF GDTE

The analysis of the process of project implementation and implementation led to the following conclusions: **(1)** the risk of "insecure" had been identified, but its management was not properly managed to minimize its negative effects; **(2)** the formulation/approval process was too long, and this led to a certain inconsistency between the PIF and the signed project document; **(3)** the report of the project launch workshop does not, as it should have been, a fundamental reference developed and shared with all stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to implementation; **(4)** The design of the strategic framework for results as outlined in the project document has suffered from inadequate application of results-based management and quality control; **(5)** the project's alignment with the frameworks for sustainable development at the global and national. Level justifies its satisfactory relevance (4/6). However, the chain of results was defined incompletely leading to moderately satisfactory consistency (3/6); **(6)** from a design perspective, the chain of results does not incorporate the relevant elements and reflects gender consideration. However, on the ground, women's responsibilities in implementation have imposed their positioning as leading leaders and actors in certain key sectors (good practices regarding the training/spreading and extension of improved homes, woodlands,

(7) The immediate objective is based on two levers: **(i)** a strategic lever determined by UNDP-FEM 2 with an unsatisfactory level of achievement, and **(ii)** an operational lever determined by UNDP-FEM 1, which is satisfactory and effective.

Overall, progress towards the immediate goal is moderately satisfactory (3/6); **(8)** The review of implementation has noted positive changes equivalent to lessons learned that constitute GDTE's best practices, which must be promoted to scale: GDTE's innovative approach, with the development of a catalogue of best practices(improved banco focus; use of the stony cord through level curves; plantation of wood production; ; Assisted natural regeneration); setting up frameworks for consultation and reflection involving women leaders of women's organizations, mayors and traditional leaders on the path of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to combat gender inequalities; the use of local radio stations, which has facilitated access to messages on good practice for GDTE for producers in crisis-hit areas.

However, the sustainability of the achievements and hence the scaling of best practices, risk being annihilated by insecurity, and the simultaneous and continuous non-operation of the three "Box Offices": Training Box Office developed by the project with a large volume of training sessions, Support/Council Box-based by GDTE providers; Funding box office provided by the project to support producers (small equipment, inputs,...); **(9)** The main factors that influenced progress were: the long delay between the approval of the project identification sheet (PIF) and the launch workshop; the "insecure" risk that had been identified, but the management has not been

properly managed to minimize its negative effects; the lack of application of results-based management and quality control in the design of the strategic framework of results; the lack of a local financing mechanism to support communities in the development of sustainable livelihoods (access to equipment, input equipment..); the delay that has always been recorded at the beginning of the year, in the transfer of cash advances; **(10)** In total, the implementation of the project is moderately satisfactory (3/6).

Recommendations

Government, UNDP, and the WEF:

1. Quickly implement a partnership focused on scaling up GDTE's best practices in a program approach through a **GDTE pilot program of eco-villages/eco-rural communities**. The partnership will also support the development of a national strategy for the creation of eco-villages by the GDTE with an action plan over a thirty-year period.
2. Limit the formulation/approval process over a period of no more than 20 months.

Government and UNDP:

1. Arrange for the effective participation of key partners in LPAC, or formally receive (in case of absence) their fact sheets and notices regarding their recommendation for project approval. A sheet format is proposed in Appendix 13.
2. Organize the project launch workshop no later than two months after operational start-up, so that the report is a fundamental reference developed and shared with all stakeholders in order to formalize the various agreements and protocols related to implementation (agreement on the Global Indicative Planning of the project -PIG proposed in Appendix 7A; understanding the roles, support services and responsibilities of UNDP country office, UNDP/EMF unit vis-à-vis the project team; finalization of the first annual action plan on the basis of the framework of the project results by highlighting indicators, targets, verification methods, as well as assumptions and risks to date)
3. Organize joint field visits to other partners.

Government:

1. To do everything possible to stimulate the political, economic, cultural, and social dialogue that the State must lead in accordance with its enduring mission of public service under which human security, and the preservation of the integrity of the Malian territory.
2. Encourage and facilitate the establishment of frameworks for consultation and reflection involving women leaders of grassroots women's organizations, mayors and traditional leaders in the direction of effective advocacy/lobbying for women's access to land and the strategy to combat gender inequality. In the context of decentralization, the aim is to promote a local governance body for land.

UNDP and the UNDP/FEM Regional Unit:

1. Ensure continuous strategic monitoring to ensure consistency between the project identification form (PIF) and the project document.
2. Establish and implement a close-up follow-up by field visits.

UNDP:

1. Make sure to eliminate the delay that has always been recorded at the beginning of the year, in the transfer of cash advances.
2. Provide regular training on the NIM modality for the benefit of the national party. This training will also have to focus on national ownership of UNDP's Atlas management platform.

Annex 22: Co-financing Status

In the financial package, two co-financing arrangements were foreseen for a total amount of USD 5,300,000:

- (1)**- the contribution of the Government of Mali, estimated at USD 300,000 in kind. This co-financing was carried out through : (i) the support of the 8 regional and local Focal Points, and the civil servants assigned to the project (mainly civil servants from the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture, as well as their decentralized services); (ii) the renting of the project offices by the AEDD;
- (2)**- certain investments that are part of the co-financing to the GEF AHSMP program, and which are financed by the EC, IFAD and the WB for an amount of 5,000,000 USD.

The analysis shows that co-financing was not the subject of co-financing letters or coordination agreements. This failure does not make it possible to assess the validity of the investments made which could be accounted for under the second co-financing. Only the UNDP co-financing was effective, even exceeding the forecasts (US\$814,581 against US\$300,000).

The co-financing matrix is as follows:

CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ALL PROJECTS AT MTR AND TE STAGES

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form (please add rows as necessary)

[illegible]