



# Program to strengthen smallholder resilience to climate change (RESI-2P)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11365

**Countries**

Burkina Faso

**Project Name**

Program to strengthen smallholder resilience to climate change (RESI-2P)

**Agencies**

IFAD

**Date received by PM**

10/17/2023

**Review completed by PM**

11/20/2023

**Program Manager**

Aloke Barnwal

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

## **GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET**

### **1. General Project Information / Eligibility**

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

### **2. Project Summary**

**Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?**

Secretariat's Comments

In the summary, please add a sentence or two summarizing the alignment of the project with GEF 8 adaptation strategy. e.g. aligns with the food security and agriculture theme and will support one or more of the three strategic priorities (scaled up finance for adaptation, tech transfer, innovation, and whole society approach). Please refer to the strategy.

November 13, 2023

Thanks. It's fine now.

Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

Addressed.

### **3 Indicative Project Overview**

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

### Secretariat's Comments

a) Please avoid mention of target beneficiaries in the objective statement. Also, the objective reads very generic and reads more like an indicator target, rather than a project objective. Please revise. I suggest including reference to smallholders' resilience, resilient agri value chain and improved food security. It will be good to clearly articulate adaptation also in the objective statement. I see a lot of innovation elements also in the PIF which you may also consider to add in the objective.

b)

Component 2, reads like an outcome with the word "increased". This may be revised to e.g. "Enhancing market access...".

Please streamline Output 1.1.3. It is not very clear.

Output 1.1.4 refers to local capacity. Is it different than the capacity of small holders referred in Output 1.1.2? It will be useful to add a word or so to make 1.1.4 a bit more specific.

2.1.3- please specify the output. it reads like an activity currently.

November 13, 2023

Thanks. This comment is cleared.

### Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

a) Addressed, objective was edited accordingly.

b) The outcome was revised. Output 1.1.3 simplified and Output 1.1.4 and 2.1.3 reformulated.

Well noted, gender will be further articulated during the project design.

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

### Secretariat's Comments

Knowledge management and M&E is fine. Gender dimensions are recommended to be articulated in the project outcomes or in outputs to make it more integrated and explicit.

GEFSEC November 13

Please address the following comment from PPO:

3. Gender: Please incorporate gender dimensions in Outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.3, Outcome 3.1. Please ensure that the Gender Action Plan to be developed is budgeted, monitored, and reported on.

GEFSEC November 20

Thanks. Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

20/11/2023

Outputs 2.1.2 and Outcome 3.1 have been revised, and now address gender in their wording ? specific reference to the gender dimension was added to paragraphs 44,45,48 and 49. The GAP is now specifically mentioned within the M&E budget.

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

a) yes

b) yes. Co financing PMC is 13% , which is more than 5% PM of the GEF budget.

c) yes.

#### Agency's Comments

#### **4 Project Outline**

##### **A. Project Rationale**

##### **4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS**

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

Secretariat's Comments

a) Yes

b) Please briefly summarize key barriers and enablers, and link them with the justification text already provided.

GEFSEC Nov 13:

Thanks for adding the barriers. Please provide some additional information in the justification para making specific links with these barriers and the enablers will the project build on.

GEFSEC Nov 20

Thanks. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

b) Text added under paragraph 18.

20/11/2023

Links to the enablers were added in paragraph 18.

#### **4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT**

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

Please provide more details for c) and d).

GEFSEC Nov 13:

Thanks. This is fine.

Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

c) Text added in paragraph 22

d) Text was added in paragraph 23

## 5 B. Project Description

### 5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Theory of Change is missing in the project. There is some description. Please include a diagram showing the change path from the current context. Please refer to STAP guidance on developing a TOC.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks. The TOC is fine now.**

Please provide rationale behind 20% increase in resilience. Also, is 70% population equivalent to the target beneficiaries? If yes, what is the basis for assuming that increasing 20% of resilience capacity can lead to their adaptation. In a scale of 1-100, 20% is quite on the lower side to assert that their adaptation will be supported through the project.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks for the clarification below. It is well noted. At the CEO ER stage, please provide more details of this tool and its potential application more broadly in climate change adaptation benefits assessment.**

Output 1.1.1 is very strategic for this project. However, it needs to be locally-led rather than just ensuring a participatory approach. This output also has the potential to align with the whole of society approach of GEF 8 strategy, which emphasizes on multi-level and multi-stakeholder involvement in developing and implementing adaptation solutions. It will be useful to articulate this aspect in the PIF.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks. Looks fine now.**

A number of abbreviations are used in the document e.g. PCD, LWC, SPR, FO, etc.  
Please provide the full forms.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks.**

Please specify what is meant by Hydraulic Infrastructure in this project's context.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks. These are defined as infrastructure that store or move water.** Thanks for the examples. Please include an activity to support identification of these infrastructure while considering climate and weather data in the target region. A systematic adaptation infrastructure planning will lead to better identification and design. Please consider adding this under para 12 of this output.

Sustainable and Resilient Production intensification: This refers to inclusive digital agriculture. Please elaborate if this will be a focus. It is strongly recommended as it can be an innovative solution for small holder framers linking production with market access and other services also.

Output 1.1.4- improved organizational capacity: It will be useful to include strategic CSOs as part of this. This activity aligns with GEF 8 strategic priority of whole-of society and locally led adaptation approach. Please make a link and highlight this.

The Environmental Education activity is also strongly linked with the knowledge management component. it will be useful to establish this link in the PIF.

Component 2: The component may explore the option of cold storage facilities for crops, if feasible. This can help address the market fluctuation or respond to the market situation. Will the road improvement work proposed be funded by the LDCF? Are infrastructure and displacement related risks identified associated with this?

Across the three components, it is not clear how climate data or information services will be provided to FOs or smallholders directly to inform their crop planning and marketing. Is there an existing system in the target region or can the project support this activity ?

**GEFSEC 13 November: The above comments have been addressed well.**

**GEFSEC November 20- Comments cleared.**

Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

TOC diagram included

On the resilience targets: the project will be applying the Resilience Design and Monitoring Tool (RDMT) to measure resilience. When applying the tool households do not usually start from a baseline score of 0. Please note that the RDMT is not a measure of absolute resilience but rather of context-specific resilience capacities linked to the project Theory Of Change. The 20% is relative to the increase in the baseline resilience score due to the project interventions. At project completion overall average score might be something around 50-80%, depending on each household baseline situation, the accuracy of the resilience TOC and the success of the project. The reason why we chose 20% is because we have seen from previous applications that this is on average what the projects contribute to. The more we apply the RDMT the better we will be able to determine that benchmark goal.

Yes the 70% refers to the target beneficiaries (households).

For Output 1.1.1:some additional text was added to make the envisaged inclusive planning process clearer.

Full forms of abbreviations provided, apologies for inconvenience.

A description of what is meant by Hydraulic infrastructure was added.

Additional text was added on sustainable and resilient production intensification

Reference to CSO?s such as CNABIO, and Farmer Organizations was added to Output 1.1.4.

On the Environmental Education, a link was added to Component 3 activities.



For cold storage, because of current limitations in supply for energy efficient cold storage option in BF, this is not the preferred option. However, the project is considering substantial investment in post-harvest infrastructure. Some of these infrastructures could be cold storage facilities for vegetables, but the right technologies that are cost-effective and susceptible to have a group modality to adopt such technologies still have to be defined. This could be an option should a more detailed analysis be done at PPG stage.

The road improvement work will not be funded by the LDCF and is following all IFAD safeguards measures. This was clarified in the output description.

For climate data: the added data on digital work addresses the question on crop planning. For the Marketing part, the project will be supporting digital promotion as well: helping facilitators, production and marketing extension agents, producers, women processors and young people to learn about and adopt digital technology.

20/11/2023

Thanks for the suggestion. The text was added to para 36 as suggested.

## 5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

### Secretariat's Comments

Yes. However, please provide more details on the baseline projects and other investments which this project will complement. Currently, only the following is included which is not sufficient. Thanks.

The LDCF contribution will be fully embedded in the larger RESI-2P program giving to the program a stronger resilience building angle through both supporting resilient production and improving market access for resilient products.

**GEFSEC 13 November: The above comments has been addressed well.**

### Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

Addressed, please see additional info reflected in paragraph 50

### 5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

**d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

Please provide this information under the section " Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project." in the PIF.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks. Comment cleared.**

#### Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

Please see additions in Paragraph 51

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

Why does the project aim to benefit only 40% women, given that more than 50% of the population are women? For CI 4, 40% can be understood, but for beneficiaries, there should be a better distribution, ideally more.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks for the clarification. Comment cleared.**

#### Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

Target was revised to 45%:

? Please consider that first and foremost, the 45% isn't a ceiling, it's just a minimum target for ourselves; projects can and often do over-shoot these.

? While 45% is obviously under-representing women's share of the overall population, we are indeed disproportionately targeting them in terms of their current participation in these livelihoods activities. The 40% recognises the structural disadvantages they face in access to land, inputs, training, capital, and, not least time allocation to paid work given their domestic workloads. Even at 40% of direct beneficiaries, this is no small achievement.

? Important to note that even if 55% of direct beneficiaries are men, this does not in any way mean that women don't benefit; women in those households often do also benefit from overall increased household income and improved food security, particularly in combination with the GALS methodologies to tackle social norms which underpin unequal distribution within households and behaviour change communication around nutrition practices.

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

**5.6 RISKS**

**a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?**

**b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?**

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**5.7 Qualitative assessment**

**a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**

**b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**

**c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

Please elaborate this under C. ALIGNMENT WITH GEF-8 PROGRAMMING STRATEGIES AND COUNTRY/REGIONAL PRIORITIES of the PIF.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks. Comment cleared.**

#### Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

Additional text added.

#### **6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

YES. However, the alignment is just stated and not briefly described. The below needs a bit more expansion:

The proposed LDCF proposal is aligned to the LDCF/SCCF strategy document (2023-2026). In particular, the RESI-2P strongly aligns with LDCF Priority Area 1 (Scaling Up Finance) and Priority Area 2 (Strengthening Innovation and Private Sector Engagement) within the priority Theme 1: Agriculture, Food Security, and Health. The project also has relevance with priority Area 3 (Fostering Partnership for Inclusion and Whole-of-Society Approach) of the new Adaptation programming strategy for GEF-8].

**GEFSEC 13 November: Yes. Comment cleared.**

#### Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

Additional text added.

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)**

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

#### Agency's Comments

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments

No. Please provide the list of stakeholders consulted for the PIF development.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks. Comment cleared.**

Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

The list of consultations held is provided as a separate excel document in the GEF Portal.

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

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

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

## Secretariat's Comments

### Agency's Comments

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

## Secretariat's Comments

The Indicative Focal Area Elements is tagged only to CCA 1-1. Please see the codes details below:

The PIF has a strong aspect of scaling up finance and whole of society approach also. Please distribute the LDCF resources across other codes also. This is important for the LDCF to respond to the strategy approved by the Council.

**GEFSEC 13 November:** The intention of sharing all the codes was not to recommend equal distribution of the resources across all of these. Please review again based on your own judgement if you would like to distribute the resources uniformly, or differently, or only across a few main priority coded areas. For example, if CCA 1.4 is more of an embedded approach and not dedicated resources are set aside to support this (e.g. a set aside funding for local government or CSOs), you may like to reduce or remove this.

**GEFSEC 20 November: Thanks. Comment cleared.**

CCA 1.1	Supporting implementation of Climate change adaptation solutions in priority themes
CCA 1.2	Scaling up finance for adaptation
CCA 1.3	Strengthening innovation and private sector engagement
CCA 1.4	Fostering partnership for inclusion and whole of society approach

### Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

Done.

20/11/2023

On further reflections, the resources split was adjusted to better reflect the project focus.

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments

Please provide more details of the co-financing by IFAD. Also, the recipient government financing is classified as investment mobilized but in-kind, which is not very intuitive.

**GEFSEC 13 November: Thanks. Comment cleared.**

Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

Information on IFAD investment was added. Contribution for the Government was changed from INV Mobilized to Recurrent Expenditures.

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

Please address the following comments from PPO on the Endorsement Letter

1. Letter of Endorsement: the template utilized for this project removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate". Also, the focal



are source is not identified. Per the attached email back in March when we were aiming to constitute June 2023 Work Program, Agencies were informed that LoEs ?with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned?. While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE ? also in the email the OFP needs to identify the focal area source (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

2. The LoE presents the project?s title in French and the executing Agency in English ? in Portal, the project?s title in English and the executing Agency in French. Using the same email above, please request the OFP to present the title in English (which has to match that in French) ? please modify the executing Agency in Portal to match the English version in LoE.

**GEFSEC November 20- For PPO's final clearance.**

Agency's Comments

20/11/2023

1. Well noted, the OFP will send an email as suggested.

2. Well noted and addressed.

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project?s intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

#### **Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

#### **Annex E: Rio Markers**

**8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. It is unclear how this project will deliver significant Biodiversity objective. Either remove it or elaborate the benefit from this project.

The project proposes 4 million tons of GHG reduction as CCM benefits. This is quite significant. Please provide the calculation basis for this. It is not intuitive from the project description that this much of emission reduction can be achieved through this project.

GEFSEC Nov 13: Thanks. Comments are cleared now.

Agency's Comments

8/11/2023

The BD objective was removed.

For the GHG reduction estimates, the EXACT calculation is now uploaded in the Portal and will be revised during PPG.

#### **Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

The PIF is returned to the Agency to address technical comments.

The PIF is returned to the agency to address additional technical and policy related comments.

The PIF is cleared for PPO's final clearance and CEO's approval.

Agency's Comments

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>10/24/2023</b>	<b>11/8/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/13/2023</b>	<b>11/20/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/20/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		