



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



OFFICE OF EVALUATION

Project evaluation series

Final Evaluation of the Project "Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural Production for Food Security in Rural Areas of Mali"

ANNEXES

February 2018

PROJECT EVALUATION SERIES

**Final Evaluation of the Project
"Integrating Climate Resilience into
Agricultural Production for Food
Security in Rural Areas of Mali"
(GCP/MLI/033/LDF)**

ANNEXES

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
OFFICE OF EVALUATION
February 2018**

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO 2018

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, Office of Evaluation (OED)
Food and Agriculture Organization
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153 Rome
Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

Cover photo credits: ©FAO/Peter Ton

Contents

Annex 1. Terms of Reference	1
Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix	4
Annex 3. Summary of logical framework (2011-2015) and project results (2012-2016)..	9
Annex 4. Evaluation according to GEF criteria	11
Annex 5. Gender dimension in the Malian agricultural sector	13

Annex 1. Terms of Reference¹

Purpose of the Evaluation

1. This evaluation was planned at the time of the design of the project, as shown in the Project Document, in Section 6.² The final evaluation will review the impact of the project, will analyse the sustainability of results and whether the project has achieved its adaptation and benchmark objectives. The evaluation will provide further recommendations for follow-up action. The final evaluation is intended to provide an assessment to the Government and to national authorities, donors of funds, as well as to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) itself of the results achieved by the project, including the desired impacts and those not intended. The evaluation could also contribute to an assessment of the implementation of the recommendations made by the Steering Committee on a new phase of the project. The final evaluation had the double objective of responsibility and reporting to all stakeholders, and contributing to organizational learning.
2. The results of this exercise will help define the strengths of the project as well as the aspects which could be improved; the conclusions, recommendations and lessons from the evaluation can thus be taken into account in the design and implementation of future similar programmes in the country.
3. The project team and the Government of Mali are the main audience for most of the lessons and recommendations of this evaluation. Other important users of the evaluation will be FAO as a whole, with its divisions at head office and other decentralized offices, as well as the lessor (Global Environment Facility - GEF). FAO partners who belong to the broader development community will also benefit from it and draw upon the lessons learned and best practices identified. In addition, the evaluation also responds to a duty to account for resources used on behalf of the Government and the donor.

Scope of the evaluation

4. The final evaluation covers all aspects related to the implementation of the project since its inception in 2012 until its conclusion in December 2016. Special attention will be paid to the analysis of efforts made since the Mid-term Evaluation to increase the capacity of adaptation to climate change in the agricultural sector in Mali.
5. The evaluation identified and analysed progress made and the results of the project in the intervention zones, covering all the main activities undertaken within its framework and those described in the project documents, as well as the causes of success and failure. The evaluation will consult with key informants of the project, according to their availability after the end of the project, the Working Group of

¹ Excerpt from the Terms of Reference of the Final Evaluation of project GCP/MLI/033/LDF – a document totaling 24 pages.

² "An independent final evaluation will take place three months prior to the terminal review meeting of the project partners and will focus on the same issues as the Mid-term Review. In addition, the Final Evaluation will review project impact, analyse the sustainability of results and whether the project has achieved its adaptation objectives and benchmarks. The evaluation will furthermore provide recommendations for follow-up actions" (p. 44, project document).

the project at head office, the national and regional offices of FAO, as well as all categories of beneficiaries and stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project, including government officials at national and provincial level.

6. The overall evaluation will see if the project in its design and implementation has contributed to the following aspects:
 - Promotion of the understanding of a wide range of knowledge on climate change and its effects on the environment, agriculture and food security for male and female farmers and producers in Mali.
 - Demonstration of sustainable production alternatives in economic and ecological terms. The project contributes to the increase in the ability to adapt and respond to the impacts of climate change as a result of the support it receives in strengthening the capacities of stakeholders at the base, namely officers providing technical support services and also producers in respect of resilient practices, while also supporting local climate change adaptation (CCA) initiatives.
 - Improving the skills of national policymakers to improve national documents through the integration of CCA approaches and practices in policy and the national strategic programmes.
 - Promotion of adaptation Farmer Field School (FFS). Indeed, FFS are an effective tool for educating people on climate-intelligent agriculture and adaptation and the local co-construction of agricultural innovations with the main users, who are the male and female producers in the rural environment. It also supports institutions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) involved in these areas.

Objectives and evaluation questions

7. The evaluation will look at the work of FAO on the integration of climate resilience in agricultural production for food security in rural areas in Mali, in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and its impact compared to the objectives of the project.
8. The objective of the evaluation is to evaluate the changes that have occurred following the intervention of FAO both at a micro and macro level, including all planned and unintentional effects. The final evaluation will try to determine to what extent the project was able to achieve its objectives and identifies any design and implementation issues that need to be improved to guide future actions in this area.
9. The evaluation will be structured around the following areas of analysis: i) the relevance of the concept and approach of the project; ii) the achievements and contributions of the project to its objectives; iii) the application of the common principles of the United Nations with regard to country programming and cross-cutting themes; and iv) sustainability. By referring to the above objectives, the evaluation will be guided by the following evaluation questions:
 - To what extent does the design of the project and its activities meet the needs of Mali and the Malian population in terms of climate change adaptation?

- To what extent are the partnerships encouraged by FAO (with the government, civil society and the donors) complementary and synergistic?
 - To what extent have the actions of FAO, within the context of this project, contributed to reaching the overall objective of "strengthening the capacity of the agricultural sector to successfully respond to climate change through the integration of concerns and strategies into ongoing agricultural initiatives, as well as adaptation issues in agricultural programmes and policies"?
 - To what extent has FAO contributed to the integration of CCA agricultural practices in farming production systems?
 - To what extent are the Farmer Field Schools effective in disseminating improved agricultural practices and developing the capacities of communities in resilient livelihoods in the face of climate?
 - To what extent has the project integrated climate change aspects and/or issues into national agricultural programmes and policies?
 - To what extent has the project put in place the necessary mechanisms for inter-sectoral coordination and awareness raising on climate resilient production and food security?
 - To what extent has the project strengthened the capacities of policymakers and other stakeholders to improve policies, strategies and CCA programmes?
 - To what extent have women and indigenous peoples, as well as vulnerable and marginalized groups, participated in the project?
 - To what extent did the project integrate gender mainstreaming for equality between men and women during its various stages (project design, identification of beneficiaries, implementation and results)?
 - How have the needs of vulnerable groups been factored into the design and implementation of the programme at different levels?
10. The evaluation matrix, indicating the sub-questions and/or the information needs for each evaluation question, as well as methods of data collection, will be finalized by the evaluation team during the preparatory phase of the evaluation.
11. On the basis of this analysis, the evaluation draws specific conclusions and makes recommendations for a follow-up project run by the Government, FAO and/or other parties to ensure sustainable development, including monitoring and expansion activities if necessary. The evaluation will draw attention to good practices and specific lessons that may interest similar activities. Any further aid proposal should specify the objectives and major products as well as the indicative contributions required. The findings are based on evidence. The documented practices and lessons will be presented in the form of recommendations based on the findings in a narrative format that will integrate, but also will fill, the traditional criteria of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/ Development Assistance Committee (DAC): relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix

Questions		Judging criteria/indicators	Documentary review	Interviews with management	Participant interviews	Community interviews
Objective 1: Assess the relevance of the intervention and the project approach						
Q1: To what extent does the design of the project and its activities meet the needs of Mali and the Malian population in terms of climate change adaptation?						
1.1	To what extent did the design of the project and its activities seem relevant and appropriate for meeting the needs identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the situation before the project • Analysis of the needs identified • Analysis of the project's process design and formulation 	x	x	x	x
1.2	To what extent did the design of the project and its activities seem relevant and appropriate for meeting the needs identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the logical framework • Analysis of the institutional mechanisms of management and implementation • Analysis of procedures of implementation of training and FFS • Analysis of the planned system of monitoring and evaluation 	x	x		
1.3	Has the project adapted adequately to the changes in context that occurred during its implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory of the major changes of context having favoured the implementation of the project • Inventory of the major changes of context having complicated the implementation of the project • Analysis of the adaptation of the project to context changes 	x	x	x	x
1.4	To what extent are the partnerships encouraged by FAO (with the Government, civil society and the donors) complementary and synergistic?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the situation before the project • Number of partnerships developed – by type of structure, (co-)funding, and the number of staff trained and involved in the project • Analysis of co-financing 	x	x		

Questions		Judging criteria/indicators	Documentary review	Interviews with management	Participant interviews	Community interviews
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of the situation at the end of the project 				
Objective 2: Evaluate the effectiveness of the project in relation to its objectives and expected results						
Q2: To what extent have the actions of FAO, within the context of this project, contributed to reaching the overall objective of "enhance the capacity of Mali's agricultural sector to successfully cope with climate change, by incorporating climate change adaptation concerns and strategies into ongoing agricultural development initiatives and mainstreaming CCA issues into agricultural policies and programming"?						
2.1	To what extent has the project contributed to the identification and management of agricultural practices adapted to climate change in the areas and systems targeted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of the situation before the project Process begun by the project Activities developed Materials produced Analysis of the situation at the end of the project 	x	x	x	x
2.2	To what extent has the project contributed to capacity building in agricultural practices adapted to climate change?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of training of trainer sessions by master-trainers – by topic Number of trainers trained – by topic/culture, area and gender Number of training sessions of facilitators – by topic/culture and area Number of facilitators trained – by topic/culture, area and gender Assessment of the training and activities by the facilitators – by gender Other (non-FFS) activities for capacity building in CCA practices 	x	x	x	x
2.3	To what extent have FFS been effective at contributing to capacity building in agricultural practices adapted to climate change?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of the curricula of training of trainers, facilitators and FFS in terms of CCA practices 	x	x	x	x

Questions		Judging criteria/indicators	Documentary review	Interviews with management	Participant interviews	Community interviews
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Farmer Field Schools held in the first and second year – per topic/culture and area • Number of Farmer Field School participants trained in the first and second year – per topic/culture and area • Other activities for capacity building in CCA practices • Assessment of Farmer Field Schools by the producers – by gender • Adoption of CCA practices by producers in their own field 				
Objective 3: Evaluate the impact of the project on agricultural programmes and policies						
Q3: To what extent has the project integrated climate change aspects and/or issues into national agricultural programmes and policies?						
3.1	How has the project contributed to the integration of climate change in agricultural programmes and policies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-project analysis of the situation • Process begun by the project • Activities developed • Analysis of the situation at the end of the project 	x	x		
3.2	To what extent were communication and advocacy efforts initiated by the project adequate and responded to the expectations of the stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the communication plan • Number and grade of the manuals and technical data sheets • Number and quality of videos/documentaries • Number of radio programmes • Number of Open Door Days organized - by area and culture • Number of other communication activities 	x	x	x	x

Questions		Judging criteria/indicators	Documentary review	Interviews with management	Participant interviews	Community interviews
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciation of the equipment by the partners • Appreciation of the equipment by the facilitators • Appreciation of the equipment by the producers 				
Objective 4: Evaluate the impact of the project on gender (in the broad sense)						
Q4: To what extent have women and indigenous peoples, as well as vulnerable and marginalized groups, participated in the project?						
4.1	To what extent has the design of the project and its activities integrated gender issues (in a broad sense)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of key elements related to gender in agricultural production • Analysis of key elements related to gender in agricultural extension • Analysis of taking into account gender in the logical framework and the activities 	x	x	x	x
4.2	To what extent have women and indigenous peoples, as well as vulnerable and marginalized groups, participated in the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of trainers trained - by crop, gender and area • No. of facilitators trained - by culture, gender and area • Number of Farmer Field School participants trained in the first and second year – per topic/culture and area • Degree of participation of vulnerable and marginalized groups 	x	x		
Objective 5: Evaluate other impacts and sustainability of the interventions of the project						
Q5: What other impact has the project had, and what is the sustainability of project interventions?						

Questions		Judging criteria/indicators	Documentary review	Interviews with management	Participant interviews	Community interviews
5.1	To what extent has the project had other impacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts at field level – for producers and their communities • Impacts at field level – for trainers and their communities • Impact at institutional level • Any other impact (social, economic, environmental, etc.) 	x	x	x	x
5.2	To what extent are the interventions of the project sustainable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability in terms of agricultural practices • Sustainability in terms of gender • Economic sustainability • Social sustainability • Sustainability at political level • Sustainability at institutional level 	x	x	x	x
5.3	What are the prospects for the project in the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs and opportunities for scaling • Prospects for continuation with the Malian Fund • Prospects for continuation with GEF funds • Prospects for continuation with other funds 	x	x		

Annex 3. Summary of logical framework (2011-2015) and project results (2012-2016)³

Objectives	Activities	Expected results (Project Document; 2011-2015)	Results of the project (2012-2016)	OBSERVATIONS
1. Steering of agricultural practices improved in terms of climate resilience	<p>1.1 Partnerships in place with at least four projects and/or government programmes involved in the steering of improved soil and crop management practices in three different ecosystems identified in the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) and at least three production systems (dry grains, cotton/rice, "market gardening")</p> <p>1.2 At least 10 percent of the total growing areas supported by partner programmes have improved their CCA practices and strategies and integrated genetic material, resulting in more resilient production systems.</p>	<p>1.1 Two partnerships established with major projects in one ecosystem, over two production systems (including dry grains) at the end of the second year.</p> <p>1.2 Four partnerships in three ecosystems over four systems of production at the end of the project.</p> <p>1.3 10 percent of areas (400 000 ha) supported by the partner projects by the second year, and 30 percent at the end of the project.</p>	<p>1.1 See 1.2</p> <p>1.2 Partnerships established in three ecosystems and four production systems (cotton-maize, rice, millet and sorghum and market gardening); with eight projects, namely: IESA, Cotton EU, GIZ/Resilience and Nutrition, IFDC, PAFICOT, APROCA, BCI and FAO/GEF Agro-pastoral.</p> <p>1.3 Multiplication of sowing seed and improved CCA. Use of 31 adapted varieties, application of CES/DRS measures, etc. over 123 168 ha (out of a total of 400 000 ha); or 31 percent of the areas supported by the partners.</p>	<p>1.1 Reached</p> <p>1.2 Reached (200 percent)</p> <p>1.3 Reached (103 percent)</p>
2. Capacity-building and promotion of agricultural practices	2.1 800 Farmer Field Schools that perfectly integrate CCA strategies and practices by supporting the farming adaptation process	2.1 200 Farmer Field Schools (including 125 existing and 75 new ones) incorporating CCA components by the end of the second year.	<p>2.1 See 2.2</p> <p>2.2 1 335 FFS set-up (two years through FFS); in addition, 374 FFS through partners; i.e. a total</p>	<p>2.1 Reached</p> <p>2.2 Reached (213 percent)</p> <p>2.3 Reached (funds</p>

³ See: FAO (2017), Final Report for Project GCP/MLI/033/LDF. February 2017, p. 31.

<p>through Farmer Field Schools</p>	<p>2.2 At least 100 CCA Farmer Field Schools were supported by the Adaptation Fund for Climate Change.</p>	<p>2.2 800 Farmer Field Schools (including 400 existing and 400 new ones) to be achieved before the end of the project. 2.3 A pilot support fund for CCA applications was put in place at the end of the second year and has supported 20 field school initiatives and CCA by using GEF funding. 2.4 The fund was fully operational at the end of the project, mobilizing additional funding to the amount of at least USD 20 000 from partners in four years and it has supported at least 100 Farmer Field Schools and CCA initiatives.</p>	<p>of 1 709 FFS have incorporated CCA. 2.3 A support fund was created to support FFS with materials and CCA equipment. 2.4 Altogether, 34 local initiatives were supported to the tune of USD 41 082 (i.e. CFA 28 551 825), with a return of CFA 3 250 680 (10 percent of the total)</p>	<p>achieved on the project budget) 2.4 Number of initiatives not reached; volume of the fund reached (206 percent)</p>
<p>3. Constitution of strong urge based around considerations of climate change in agricultural sector policies and programmes</p>	<p>3.1 Mechanisms established for cross-sectoral coordination and increased awareness of resilient production and food security. 3.2 Institutional capacity strengthened at national levels to develop policies, strategies and programmes, moving from a reactive attitude to a proactive and informed approach.</p>	<p>3.1 Mechanisms were defined before the end of year two of the project to involve agencies, decentralized territorial administration and the departments concerned, including an inter-sectoral working group. Recurring mechanisms were in place before year four and the Steering Committee and the inter-sectoral working group were taken on permanently and budgeted for so that they could coordinate CCA in the agricultural sector. 3.2 20 percent of agricultural policies incorporate climate change considerations before the end of year two; 10 percent of the operational projects in sectoral programmes have incorporated a budget for CCA components. 3.3 50 percent and 30 percent respectively by the end of year four.</p>	<p>3.1 The Steering Committee and the Working Group on Information and Knowledge in CCA (WG/CCA) were cross-sectoral and fully functional. The National Assembly and the High Council of the Territorial Authorities became involved in the project. Municipalities were involved at a local level. 3.2 All policies, projects and programmes take into account CCA. The FFS approach is seen as the best approach to agricultural extension. 3.3 See 3.2.</p>	<p>3.1 Reached (100 percent) 3.2 Reached (100 percent for CCA; partial for FFS approach) 3.3 See 3.2</p>

Annex 4. Evaluation according to GEF criteria

12. In order to facilitate a comparison of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with the routine reports and to contribute to the learning programme, the final evaluation commented as follows on the success of the project on the six-point scale of the GEF: Very Satisfactory (VS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Very Unsatisfactory (VU). Each of the items listed below is evaluated separately:

Evaluation criteria	Rating	Comments
Achievement of the objectives	S	Climate change adaptation (CCA) is well integrated into the policies and agricultural programmes. The Farmer Field School (FFS) approach has gained a lot of ground but is still not the preferred approach for control of the project – National Board of Agriculture.
Achievement of results and activities	VS	The number of facilitators and producers trained in FFS/CCA exceeds the expected results. The realization of Components 1 and 2 is Very Satisfactory; Component 3 is Satisfactory.
Progress towards the achievement of GEF-4 areas of intervention priorities/objectives	VS	The strategic objective of the GEF-4 is part of the "Climate Change" intervention area, which supports the pilot projects and CCA testimonies.
Cost-efficiency	MS	The team failed to exploit the financial reports. The situation of co-financing is not well understood. Otherwise, the expected results of the project have been exceeded.
Risks and risk management	S	After a difficult start, the project was performed satisfactorily.
Sustainability	VS	Training will be used in the medium- and long-term. The large number of partnerships established is due to CCA and CEP being integrated today in several structures, programmes and projects.
Participation of stakeholders	VS/MS	The project has followed a good participatory approach at all levels. The joint implementation of activities with the Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development (AEDD) and Institute of Rural Economy (IER) has not been as fluid – mainly for administrative reasons.
Country-led ownership	VS/MS	Integrated Production and Pest Management (IPPM), FFS and CCA approaches are solid as are all relationships with the many partners. The capacity of CCA, FFS and IPPM in Mali has increased significantly. The co-financing aspect is not well understood.
Approach to implementation	S	The project has followed a very participatory and inter-sectoral approach at all levels. The National Board of Agriculture has appropriated CCA. The FFS approach is still not preferred.

Evaluation criteria	Rating	Comments
Financial planning	MU	Planning and financial reporting was not clear in the medium-term and final assessment to the evaluation teams. The co-financing aspect is not well understood.
Reproducibility	S	CCA, FFS and IPPM approaches may well be scaled up. Many of the organizations, programmes and projects are interested in them and adopt them. The financing of costs related to the facilitation of FFS and the maintenance of quality requires a sustainable solution.
Follow-up and evaluation	MS	The monitoring and evaluation system has been satisfactory with regard to the follow-up and documentation of activities, and the reporting of results. Monitoring of the impact of field training for producers was not well covered.

Annex 5. Gender dimension in the Malian agricultural sector

Context

13. In sociological terms, Malian society is composed of different ethnic, nomadic or sedentary groups spread throughout the country. All these groups evolve in four systems of production, namely agriculture, fisheries, livestock and pastoralism, through which there are crafts, trade and services. These ethnic groups are traditionally characterized by a strong social hierarchy in which the woman, as a mother and wife, takes on a diverse spread of roles and situations.
14. Customary and religious practices still remain the main references for the management of the relationship between women and men in the family. They often result in behaviours and practices in which women are victims in economic, social and/or political terms. This limits their access to economic opportunities to grow and gain more independence.
15. With the social division of labour, women's roles are essentially recognized at the level of social reproduction and men in the areas of productive activities. These inequalities and disparities in the sexual division of labour cause more work for women than men, for girls than boys and have negative impacts on their health, their productivity and their condition of existence. Also, sociocultural factors weigh heavily on the status of women in the family and in society, limit their ability to make decisions and participate in the life of the community with equal opportunities as those of men. Thus, Mali ranks 150th out of 155 countries in the index of gender inequality.
16. However, since 2010 a national gender policy has been developed and adopted in order to reduce gender inequalities, but its implementation is still slow. This policy in theory offers a conceptual and operational framework that will ensure coherence, harmonization and a better impact of the actions related to equality between women and men through national reforms and sectoral policies in Mali.

Women and agriculture

17. Women represent more than 70 percent of the agricultural workforce in Mali and they are present at all levels (production, processing and marketing). However, they face many constraints (illiteracy, lack of access to land, credit, agricultural equipment, technology and the weakness of their financial base), which hamper their empowerment and development within the sector.
18. The access conditions to land according to the land and dominical code are equal for both sexes (men and women), but in reality it is customary law that prevails, giving great privileges to men. The proportion of women with access to land was around 20 percent in 2009.⁴ In urban areas there is no discriminatory measure in terms of plots for residential use; the only handicap is the financial ability of women which is generally lower than that of men. In rural areas, the current customs and tradition consider men to be the head of the household and prioritizes them in the allocation of plots, in terms of accommodating the household and agriculture to meet the consumption needs of

⁴ See: MEF (2010), Rapport 2009 de mise en œuvre du Cadre Stratégique pour la Croissance et la Réduction de la pauvreté (CSCR). Summary document. Ministry of Economy and Finance, Bamako.

the household. Women usually accesses crop lands through the conjugal family channel or if she they are members of a cooperative.

19. According to the 2007 agricultural census data, inequalities still exist regarding access to land because less than 20 percent of women are responsible for agricultural plots and less than 20 percent of rural women have access to farm equipment. However, in some areas like Niéna certain types of land, including the paddy fields in undefined lowlands, are exclusively operated by women. The latter customarily enjoy the management of these plains, handing them down from generation to generation between mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law. This opportunity allows women to supplement the food needs of the family, especially in times of drought. In other areas, as in Kidal, where there are large areas to exploit, the land belongs to those who want to work it. In these areas, there is no difficulty in getting the plots to cultivate and women as well as men have access to the land, because few people are engaged in agriculture. Once acquired, however, it is passed from family to family.
20. Women are usually active on most agricultural sectors (such as sesame) and, with obvious professionalism, they drive forward transformation, even on the small-scale of agricultural products and they remain in a good position between the various different currents of trade on agricultural products, both inside and outside the country. This is no small thing when it comes to generation of wealth in rural areas and in the formation of the country's gross domestic product (GDP).
21. Unfortunately, as reported earlier, in the exercise of their production activities women, and especially rural women, nowadays face those fundamental constraints which are, essentially: illiteracy, lack of access to land, credit, agricultural equipment, technology and the weakness of their financial base. This reality has led the Ministry of Agriculture to put in place strategies and actions to promote the development of rural women. Today, it is admitted that all research and development projects and programmes being executed should ensure 30 to 40 percent of women are included as beneficiaries and that 10 to 20 percent of managed land is awarded to women and young people.

Project GCP/MLI/033/LDF and gender approach

22. In accordance with the recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation, the project undertook a number of actions for the empowerment of women and to increase their capacity for resilience in the face of climate change:
 - 15 437 women out of 41 117 producers trained on climate change adaptation techniques;
 - training of 2 343 women beneficiaries on specific themes (marketing and quality, nutrition, livestock feed, agroforestry, calabash, seed production sector);
 - support equipment (wire for securing PPM, platform-mill, carts, wheelbarrows, garden wells, ploughs, donkeys, oxen for ploughing, rain gauges) that benefited 2 626 women;
 - the project managed to hire some local officials to issue ten administrative titles of plots attributed to the use of market gardening, to women;
 - support in breeding units for small stocks (sheep) for ten female beneficiaries;

- training a very limited number of facilitator-producers (413 new facilitators including 40 women) because of significant levels of illiteracy among women and the non-consideration of the specificities of this when they present the necessary intellectual skills;
 - the implementation of a gender strategy has, among other things, enabled the creation of a monitoring and evaluation system that takes into account gender-disaggregated data and the intensification of actions specific to women;
 - the participation of 700 women out of 1 685 people in experience exchange visits and 452 women out of 1 300 people involved in the Open Door Days;
 - the inclusion of the Minister for Women and Family in the Steering Committee to ensure gender integration in the actions of the project.
23. These achievements in terms of project assets, which may seem modest, are actually significant, especially if you know the sociocultural context in which the project takes place. The above actions have helped lighten housework for women and therefore support their involvement in development activities, increases their income through active participation in family spending (schooling, nutrition and health of children) and strengthen social cohesion. Inter-village visits and Open Door Days also helped women to see other realities and exchange their experiences.
24. The obstacles to increasing women's resilience to climate change include:
- under-representation of women at the level of: the project coordination, the training team, technician-facilitators, facilitator-producers, the focal points and the structures established by the project such as the Steering Committee or the Working Group with regard to endogenous knowledge and information;
 - low number of women participating at the level of the FFS/CCA, especially dry crop FFS;
 - direction of the FFS/CCA towards the reproduction of the traditional division of roles and responsibilities bestowed on women and men (men – grain and cotton crops; women – gardening and sesame) while they are dominant in all the same crops even if they are not owners or managers;
 - low land security and the smallness of the areas at the level of grain crops. They are often exposed to land set-aside arrangements in the case of conflict;
 - lack of resources: women do not have their own tools and equipment to work with on their collective field or individual piece of land. They must therefore wait for men to complete their work before having access to the tools and equipment;
 - increased crowding of line of production where the project works with women (gardening and sesame) through men. The project should ensure that it does not have a negative impact;
 - lack of training for facilitators on gender issues. They must not only have technical skills, but skills in advocacy to assist the integration of women in development.



**Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations**

OFFICE OF EVALUATION
www.fao.org/evaluation