



REQUEST FOR: CEO Endorsement

Project Type: Full sized Project

Type of Trust Fund: LDCF Trust Fund

PART I PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Integrating climate resilience into agricultural and pastoral production for food security in vulnerable rural areas through the Farmers Field School approach.			
Country(ies)	Burkina Faso	GEF Project ID	5014
GEF Agency (ies)	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	617677
Other Executing Partners	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA), Ministry of Aquatic and Animal Resources (MRAH), and Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD).	Submission Date	July 22, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s)	Climate Change	Project Duration (Months)	48
Name of Parent Program	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$)	381,000

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-Financing (\$)
CCA-1	Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Output 1.1.1: Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks	LDCF	500,000	3,540,000
CCA-2	Outcome 2.1: Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced threats at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Output 2.1.2: Systems in place to disseminate timely risk information	LDCF	700,000	7,450,000
CCA-2	Outcome 2.2: Strengthened	Output 2.2.1: Adaptive capacity	LDCF	510,000	3,260,000

	adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses	of national and regional centers and networks strengthened to respond rapidly to extreme weather events Output 2.2.1: Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction measures, disaggregated by gender (Score)			
CCA-3 (Select).	Outcome 3.1: Successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas	Output 3.1.1: Relevant adaptation technology transferred to targeted groups	LDCF	1,885,996	4,995,000
Sub-Total				3,595,996	19,245,000
Project management cost ¹				214,004	190,000
Total project costs				3,810,000	19,435,000

B. Project Framework

Project Objective: To enhance the capacity of Burkina Faso's agricultural and pastoral sectors to cope with climate change, by mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) practices and strategies into on-going agricultural development initiatives and agricultural policies and programming and upscaling of farmers adoption of CCA technologies and practices through a network of already established farmer field schools.					
Project Component	Grant type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1: Introduction of improved climate-resilient agro-pastoral practices in the framework of the National Adaptation Programme (PNA) and the National Rural Sector Programme (PNSR)	TA	Outcome 1: Awareness and knowledge on climate-resilient agro-pastoral practices (including adoption of new varieties and cultivars, and adapted soil and water and animal management) established at national and regional levels. <i>Indicator:</i> 50% of partner	1.1 Core group of 60 senior managers (national/regional) with knowledge of improved climate-resilient agro-pastoral practices. 1.2: a) Map of best practices, of climate resilient cultivars/varieties, and of institutional support	600,000	4,550,000

¹ GEF will finance management cost that is solely linked to GEF financing of the project.

		<p><i>programmes have a written commitment to supporting implementation of FFS/DFP Strategy.</i></p>	<p>mechanisms collected from across the sub-Region.</p> <p>b) An agreed series of best practices and of appropriate varieties/cultivars to be used in BKF.</p> <p>1.3 A strategy for the adaptation of the FFS approach and the introduction of DFF.</p>		
<p>2: Improving agro-pastoral practices through Field Schools (FS) in the framework of on-going FAO-supported projects and other MRAH, MASA and MEDD's "projets sous tutelle"</p>	TA	<p>Outcome 2: Broad adoption by agro-pastoralists of, financially sustainable, gender sensitive climate-resilient agro-pastoral practices and technologies.</p> <p><i>LDCF AMAT Indicator 3.1.1: 100% of targeted groups (26,000 pastoralist/farmers) are adopting adaptation technologies.</i></p> <p><i>LDCF AMAT Indicator 3.1.1.1: 16 types of adaptation technologies transferred to targeted groups</i></p>	<p>2.1 Intervention zones and 500 partners and partner-communities identified.</p> <p>2.2 20 Master Trainers (at least 30% women) for APFS and FFS selected and trained.</p> <p>2.3 CCA and other best practices integrated into APFS and FFS curricula/training.</p> <p>2.4 500 APFS and FFS facilitators (40% women) trained in integrated crop/livestock/tree systems.</p> <p>2.5 26,000 Pastoralist/farmers trained and implementing new practices.</p> <p>2.6 Dissemination of climate-resilient APFS and FFS approaches.</p> <p>2.7 Improved availability of information on weather for local agro-pastoral communities (100 FFS).</p> <p>2.8 Secured land assets (50 land delineation packages approved).</p> <p>2.9 Local Adaption Investment Fund</p>	2,330,996	12,470,000

			(operational and financially sustainable) benefitting at least 50 APFS/FFS.		
Component 3: Mainstreaming climate change resilient agro-pastoral and agricultural systems into sectoral policies and into local development plans - in conformity with the PNA and the PNSR	TA	<p>Outcome 3: Implementation of sectoral plans and local development plans that contribute to climate change resilience for agro-pastoral and agricultural communities.</p> <p><i>LDCF AMAT Indicator 1.1.1 Two national livestock related policy initiatives (SNVACA and one other) are implementing adaptation activities.</i></p> <p><i>LDCF AMAT Indicator 1.1.1.1: 50 Commune Development Plans have budget allocation to climate adaptation.</i></p> <p><i>LDCF AMAT Indicator 2.2.1: In at least 2 regions, 2 provinces and 10 communes, technical departments are applying climate change knowledge in their work related to livestock raising</i></p> <p><i>LDCF AMAT Indicator 2.2.1.1 At least one staff member in 4 Regional governments, 4 provincial governments and 20 communal governments have received training related to climate change and integrated crop/animal/tree management systems.</i></p>	<p>3.1 A five-Ministry CC-A coordination mechanism for extension to integrated livestock and cropping systems.</p> <p>3.2 Strengthened National Extension System (SNVACA) – incorporating APFS approach and strengthening approach to climate change.</p> <p>3.3 50 Commune Development Plans updated to account for climate resilience across agro-pastoral activities.</p>	500,000	2,050,000
Component 4: Project monitoring and evaluation	TA	<p>Outcome 4: Project implementation based on results-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated</p>	<p>4.1 System for systematic collection of field-based data to monitor project outcome indicators operational.</p> <p>4.2 Midterm and final evaluation conducted.</p> <p>4.3 Project-related</p>	165,000	175,000

			“best-practices” and “lessons-learned” for enhanced adaptation to climate risk of the agricultural sector are disseminated via publications, project website and others		
			Subtotal	3,595,996	19,245,000
			Project Management Costs (PMC)	214,004	190,000
			Total Project Costs	3,810,000	19,435,000

C. Sources of Confirmed Cofinancing for the Project by Source and by Name (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of co-financing	Amount of co-financing (\$)
Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA),	Grant	2,075,000
Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA),	In-kind	2,000,000
Government	Ministry of Aquatic and Animal Resources (MRAH)	Grant	600,000
Government	Ministry of Aquatic and Animal Resources (MRAH)	In-Kind	700,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	5,450,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-Kind	8,550,000
Other	Bioversity	In-Kind	60,000
Total Co-financing			19,435,000

D. Trust fund Resources Requested by agency, Focal Area and country

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country Name/Global	Grant amount (\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b)	Total (\$) (a + b)
FAO	LDCF	Climate Change	Burkina Faso	3,810,000	381,000	4,191,000
Total Grant Resources				3,810,000	381,000	4,191,000

In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

E. Consultants working for technical assistance components (\$):

Component	Grant Amount	Co-Financing	Project Total
International Consultants	605,800	888,000	1,493,800
National/Local Consultants	785,600	349,000	1,134,600

PART II PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. Describe Any Changes in Alignment With The Project Design Of The Original PIF

1. The project design is overall fully aligned with the PIF. There are some changes to the structure of Outcomes and the details of some Outputs. These are explained in section A.5 below.
2. The indicative Project Management Costs (PIF) were elaborated on in detail during the project preparation phase. They now reflect the project's PMC needs based on an analysis of the project's duration and the current (and anticipated) situation in Burkina Faso, in view of activities needed to be carried out. It is foreseen that the administrative expenditures are higher due to more complex procurement requirements in view of Burkina Faso's infrastructural and institutional set-up. This should ensure the timely acquisition of all required goods, works and services, avoiding delays in the project's overall implementation. Additionally, the project will support the harmonization of the FFS/PFS curricula with the national extension system (SNVACA) which implies a higher management effort. For these reasons the Management Costs have been raised from 5% to 6%.

A.1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports etc.

3. The PIF provides an accurate description of the Project's alignment to national strategies and plans.
4. More detailed information is provided in the Project Document in Sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.6.

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities

5. The PIF provides an accurate description of the Project's alignment to GEF focal areas and strategies.
6. More detailed information is provided in the Project Document in Section 1.6.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage

7. The PIF provides an accurate description of the FAO's comparative advantage to implement this Project.
8. More detailed information is provided in the Project Document in Section 1.3.

A. 4 The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address

9. The PIF provides a description of the problem to be addressed. This description is valid. However, the Project Document provides a much more detailed description of the problem to be addressed. Notably, Sections 1.1 and 1.2 of the Project Document provide details of the situation with regards to agro-pastoralists in Burkina Faso, and of climate change and climate variability impacts, and of the related threats to agro-pastoralists. Section 1.2 also provides an analysis of the barriers to adapting to climate change and increasing climate resilience. These can be summarized as:

- Local capacity to implement projects is very limited
- The prevalence of sectoral approaches as opposed to cross-sectoral or holistic approaches
- Limited experience with integrated tools
- Inadequate access to micro-credit
- Insecure land tenure
- Lack of agro-meteorological information

10. These are fully in line with the analysis in the PIF.

11. The PIF also provided an initial description of baseline projects. Generally, this list and description is valid. However, through the PPG, a thorough analysis of baseline projects was undertaken. This analysis revealed that certain projects have now terminated and others have commenced. As a result, the following Table lists 8 programmes and projects that form the baseline and provide co-financing to the proposed project.

Title	Description	Lead Agency	Funding and planned implementation period
Agriculture			
National Extension System (SNVACA) and Annual Programmes (PNVACA)	The System has five main components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase production and agricultural productivity; • Strengthen the capacity of stakeholders (staff of extension services and public and private support organizations); • Promote adequate and appropriate technologies from research and disseminate; • Encourage partnerships between actors; • M&E. 	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA)	\$4 million annually, starting 2013 (and subject to annual revisions). Confirmed co-financing \$ 2,000,000 (Component 1, 2, 3 and 4)
National Food Security and Nutrition Programme in Burkina Faso (PSAN-BF)	The PSAN-BF aims to contribute to improving food and nutrition security in Burkina Faso and to achieving the MDGs by 2015, as part of the SCADD ² . More specifically, the Programme contributes to the achievement of MDGs 4 and 5 "reduce mortality in children under five years" and "improve maternal health"; and to strengthening institutional arrangements and food security policy.	National Food Security Council (CNSA) and MASA (funding from the European Development Fund).	€25 million for 2013–2018 (provisionally) Confirmed co-financing \$ 2,075,000 (Component 1 and 2)
Livestock			
National Bio Digester Program – Phase 2 (PNB 2)	The overall objective of the PNB is to contribute to the improvement of socio-economic and environmental living conditions of rural and peri-urban populations through the introduction of biogas digesters. The goal is to stimulate the emergence and development of a viable bio-digester construction sector and market. The first phase (2009-2013) supported the	Ministry of Aquatic and Animal Resources (MRAH)	2014 – 2017, €15.845.153 Confirmed co-financing \$ 400,000 (Component 1 and 2)

² The Accelerated Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy – described later in this document

Title	Description	Lead Agency	Funding and planned implementation period
	construction of over 4,000 digesters and established the foundations of a market. Phase 2 has the same overall objective and aims to increase the results numerically.		
Ouagadougou Peri-Urban Dairy Sector Development Project	The Project Objective is to enhance the dairy value chain through improving production and productivity. The project will cover genetic improvement, improved health services, animal feeding, milk collection and processing.	MRAH	2013 – 2017, \$27 million. Confirmed co-financing \$ 350,000. (Component 2)
Improving Zebu Azawak Raising and Sustainable Pasture Land Management Project	The objective is to improve the genetic material of the zebu Fulani, to improve the zebu selection procedure, to reinforce the breeders, and to improve market capability.	MRAH	USD 8 million, initially planned to end in 2016. Confirmed co-financing \$ 550,000 (Component 1, 3 and 4)
Multi Sectoral			
Food and Nutrition Security Programme in Burkina Faso (PSANBF)	<p>This FAO support, with funding from the European Union, contributes to the PSAN-BF. It aims to contribute to improving food and nutrition security in Burkina Faso and the achievement of MDG 1 by 2015, as part of the SCADD.</p> <p>It aims to improve food and nutrition security to develop people's resilience and incomes, and increase the availability of food access for poor rural people (especially women and youth). The two operational components are: (i) access to non-timber forest and agro-pastoral production means increased, and (ii) marketing and accessibility of agricultural production increased.</p>	FAO	\$20 million. 2013 – 2016 ³ . Confirmed co-financing \$ 13,000,000 (Component 1 and 2)
Helping Households Vulnerable to Malnutrition and Climate Change Through NTFP Value Chain Development in Burkina Faso	<p>The project has the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase household incomes through the production, processing and marketing of NTFPs – notably enhancing the economic position, role and work of women in the household; • Improve food and nutrition 	FAO	\$5 million. 2012 – 2016 ⁴ Confirmed co-financing \$ 1,000,000 (Component 1 and 2)

³ As a food security project, there is a strong chance there will be a follow-up project of a similar nature.

⁴ Latest implementation status reports indicated that this project will probably be extended beyond the initial closing date into 2017.

Title	Description	Lead Agency	Funding and planned implementation period
	security of beneficiaries through the consumption of quality NTFPs; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribute to the fight against the degradation of natural resources through protection, restoration and natural regeneration. 		
Bioversity International	Bioversity International is implementing several projects, mostly covering several West African countries, aiming generally, to improve the availability and use of diverse seeds and other planting materials to reduce vulnerability and improve food security for smallholders in vulnerable ecosystems.	Several, notably the National Institute for Environment and Agricultural Research (INERA).	There are several related ongoing initiatives. Notably: “Diversity Field Fora, with the objective of reducing the risk of crop failure for poor farmers through enhancing traditional seed systems in Sahelian West Africa’ financed by IFAD Confirmed co-financing \$ 60,000 (Component 2)

A. 5 Incremental/Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project

Additional cost reasoning and Cofinancing

12. Based on the PPG assessment of the baseline projects and related consultations, the co-financing to the project has been confirmed. This is detailed in the following table.

Partner	Co-financing as stated in PIF	Actual Co-Financing
MASA	\$15.9 million	\$4,075 million
MRAH	\$370,000	\$1.3 million
MEDD	\$850,000	0
FAO (including bilateral through FAO)	\$2.35 million	\$14 million
Bioversity International	0	\$60,000
Totals	\$19.47 million	\$19.435 million

13. The total co-financing is almost unchanged from the level anticipated PIF.

14. The direct contribution of MASA appears significantly reduced compared to the level anticipated in the PIF. However, the co-financing listed above as ‘FAO’ is mostly in cooperation with MASA – and MASA have confirmed their support to this situation. Hence, the commitment by MASA to the project is not significantly changed.

15. The contribution from MRAH is higher than anticipated, increasing from \$370,000 to \$1.3 million. This illustrates MRAH commitment to the Project, their increased understanding of climate change, and their openness to using Field Schools and working with MASA.

16. The MEDD direct co-financing is less than anticipated. This is because in the meantime MEDD has agreed to co-finance other GEF initiatives. However, MEDD’s commitment to this project is in no way diminished, as illustrated through its strong participation in the PPG phase – both

institutionally and technically. The project aims to develop working linkages with MEDD and to conclude partnership arrangements.

17. The level of co-financing from FAO has greatly increased above the level anticipated in the PIF. This is because the FAO, working closely with MASA and local stakeholders, has mobilized considerable resources to support pastoralist communities in the concerned regions. This support is largely undertaken with MASA, as mentioned above.

18. Finally, the Project has mobilized co-financing from 'Bioversity' (a member of the CGIAR Consortium) towards the development of Diversity Field Flora, and to the utilization/conservation of local seeds and varieties.

19. Based on the detailed analysis undertaken during the PPG, the allocation of co-financing across the components has been modified a little. The details are provided in the following Table.

Component	PIF Cofinancing	Actual Cofinancing	Note
Component 1	3,064,000	4,550,000	The increased co-financing is in order to exploit opportunities to connect with NAP process and to establish partnerships with a large range of partner projects.
Component 2	9,920,000	12,470,000	The increase in co-financing is due to the increased partnerships with large-scale national projects and programmes. This will facilitate sustainability and dissemination.
Component 3	5,762,000	2,050,000	Since the preparation of the PIF, the national institutional framework has evolved, particularly with regards to the PCD and the SNVACA, hence less co-financing is required for Component 3.
Component 4	362,000	175,000	The monitoring activities have not changed. However, the costs of undertaking the monitoring activities had been overestimated in the PIF.

Logical framework

20. The PIF provided a description of the outcomes, outputs, activities and strategies to be supported by the Project. The thorough problem analysis that was undertaken during the PPG validated the overall strategy and approach of the PIF. It also led to a restructuring of some of the outcomes and outputs in order to better reflect the problem to be addressed and how the opportunities will be exploited. In addition, parallel developments led to a small number of the former outputs being no longer necessary, and led to a small number of new outputs in order to exploit opportunities. These modifications are listed in the following tables. Full details of the activities are provided in the Project Document, Section 2.4, and in Appendix 1 (Results Framework).

Table of modifications to former PIF Outcome/Outputs	
Former PIF Outcome/Output (only those with modifications are listed)	Comment
Outcome 1.1. Increased resilience of dry crop cereal and livestock production systems through the adoption....	As stated in the PIF, this is a very broad aim and is covered through new Outcomes 2 and 3.
Outcome 2.1. 26,000 farmers and agropastoralists have adopted improved climate resilient....	This is included as part of new Outcome 2, through new Output 2.5.
Outcome 2.2. 200 FFS-based CCA initiatives supported by a CCA Local Adaptation Investment Fund	This is covered through new Outcome 3.
Outcome 3.1. CCA strategies mainstreamed into 50% of agricultural sector policies, planning and programmes for targeted vulnerable areas of the following regions: Sahel, East, Center-north and Center-west	Recent developments in policy and related work to be undertaken by UNDP means this is no longer necessary as stated. However the problem analysis revealed other policy/institutional weaknesses and entry points, which are addressed through the new Outcome 3.
1.1.4. A diverse set of soil and water management	This will take place but not as a formal 'piloting'

practices and crop varieties chosen from existing climate stress tolerant cultivars/species of cereals and legumes and piloted in three agro-ecological zones...	exercise. Instead, previous experience from the region will be collected (new Outcome 1) and tested through the FFS learning and decision-making processes (new Outcome 2).
2.1.3. Appropriately adapted CC impact monitoring and tested weather forecast decision support tools for farmers....	This has been modified and replaced by new Output 2.7 (<i>Improved availability of information on weather for local agro-pastoral communities (100 FFS)</i>).
3.1.3 Draft investment plan available in support to CCA mainstreaming and up-scaling in the agricultural sector in complement to existing agricultural investment plans...	As stated in the PIF, this is being covered through a parallel UNDP/LDCF project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new Output 2.3 will lead to (inter alia) FS community action plans, the equivalent of local level investment plans; • new Output 2.9 is mobilizing resources through the local adaptation funds, and • new Output 3.3 leads to modified commune development plans which can mobilize resources to adaptation and to support FFS investment plans.

Table of 'new' Outputs'	
'New' output	Comment
2.1 Intervention zones and 500 partners and partner-communities identified.	This was already understood to be part of the Project process, but was not previously stated as an Output.
2.8 Secured land assets (50 land delineation packages approved).	This issue was raised by the Ministry of Environment and identified through the PPG studies as a critical issue at some sites.
3.2 Strengthened National Extension System (SNVACA) – incorporating APFS approach and strengthening approach to climate change.	This was identified as a key strategy for mainstreaming and so contributes to former Outcome 3.1

Additional reasoning

21. In the baseline, the ongoing implementation of many large scale rural development and pastoral support projects and programmes, and the previous adoption of the FFS approach in Burkina Faso (through the SNVACA), provide entry points for addressing climate change considerations when supporting agro-pastoralist communities. This constitutes a cost-effective opportunity to finance the additional costs of adaptation using the LDCF funds. `

22. With the additional financing from the LDCF, the proposed intervention will (i) develop the basic foundations for mainstreaming climate change adaptation across activities in the agro-pastoralists sectors; (ii) develop the tools and capacities for actually delivering in a cost-effective manner climate change support to agro-pastoralist communities; (iii) directly deliver support to a sizeable number agro-pastoralist communities; (iv) mainstream climate change support into a number of large scale initiatives that deliver rural development support to agro-pastoralist communities and; (v) ensure sustainability by integrating into key policy initiatives and ensuring lessons are learnt and disseminated.

23. Section 1.2.3 in the project document provides an overview of activities that are covered by the baseline projects and how additional finances from the LDCF will be used to reach the project's objective.

Adaptation benefits

24. The additional costs financed by the LDCF will support at least 26,000 herder-farmers to develop and implement new approaches, practices and technologies that increase climate resilience. The Project will also contribute directly to organizational strengthening in the targeted communities – leading indirectly to improvements in terms of gender, land tenure, access to and use of agro-meteorological information and access to credit. Moreover, the Project will contribute to improved

natural resource management over: at least 5000 hectares of extensively grazed rangelands; at least 5000 hectares of semi-intensively grazed rangelands; and at least 5000 hectares of agricultural land.

25. Directly, the project will also:

- Support naturally assisted regeneration of 8005 hectares of currently highly degraded rangelands. This regeneration will decrease the pressure on land (thereby contributing to globally significant sustainable land management) and increase the supporting environment for biodiversity;
- Support protection and sustainable use of the genetic resources in selected local crop and pasture species through the use of Diversity Field Flora (see Box 1 in project document). Through this, globally significant species and varieties will be protected. Activities may lead to increased productivity and competitiveness of local food staple crops (sorghum, millet, fonio, cowpea, and bambara groundnut) through participatory plant breeding for low heritability. Also, selected dual usage varieties of maize, soya, and andropogon will be used. Wild species selection might also be tested. Finally, at least one community gene bank will be established in the Sahel region based on the experiences developed by the DFF in other part of the country.

26. Indirectly, it is expected that the project will have the following replication and multiplier effects:

- By supporting a revision of the SNVACA, the project will indirectly influence the extension system in use across Burkina Faso. Notably, it is expected that, as a result of these interventions, the SNVACA will (i) better integrate climate change adaptation, thereby contributing greatly to overall adaptation across the agriculture sector (ii) adopt more integrated ecosystem approach, as opposed to focussing on individual crops. This will lead to improved land management, reduced land degradation and likely to the conservation of some species and unique varieties.
- By empowering Field School groups, and by supporting diffusion to neighbouring communities, the project will indirectly influence the implementation of many rural development projects, particularly in the agriculture sector (see list in Table 1). This should have a strong multiplier effect in terms of increasing resilience to climate change and climate variability. Although no specific indicators in terms of people/hectares impacted are available, these processes will be monitored.

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

27. The PIF provided an initial risk assessment. The Risk Analysis was validated during the PPG process. The PIF assessment was considered largely valid; however some clarifications and modifications were recorded. The revised risk assessment is provided in the following Table.

Risk	Risk level	Description and Management Measure
Limited partnership-building constrains project implementation	M	Partnerships are required to ensure project success. This includes partnerships across the government agencies responsible for agriculture, livestock, water and environment. It also includes partnerships between NGOs and government and between local and national organizations. The Project includes many activities to develop partnerships, including workshops, consultations, awareness raising (Outcome 1) and joint work on Project follow-up (Outcome 3). Under Outcome 2, most activities take place

⁵ Included in the 5,000 hectares listed above.

		at local level, with involvement of provincial and communal agencies, where it is known that partnerships are more straightforward and this risk should not apply at this level.
Seed shortages owing to climate variability shock, prolonged droughts, and/ or pest and disease outbreaks with risk of project crop/grassland failure	M	<p>Pest and disease outbreaks owing to climate variability may cause risk of crop/grassland failure during the project.</p> <p>The project will address this risk by systematically linking the adoption of CCA measures as well as fostering community-level field observation capacities to reduce seed multiplication failures, particularly with specialized seed multiplying farmers.</p>
Security crisis in Mali and northern Niger leads to insecurity in Burkina Faso and/or to a greater influx of migratory herds.	M	<p>Increased influx of migratory herds may increase pressures on rangelands and lead to conflicts in some of the project areas.</p> <p>Conflict sensitive programming will be mainstreamed into the APFS to address resource management and sharing. Efforts will be made with all stakeholders to establish secure mobility corridors and pasture belts and so reduce the impact on natural resources on protected areas.</p> <p>The situation will be monitored. If necessary, emergency/security plans will be developed by the project stakeholders including the FAO and the responsible ministries. Collaboration will be established from the outset with similar projects in Mali and Niger to facilitate communications.</p>
Limited capacity of local and institutions	L	<p>Burkina Faso is undergoing a decentralization process, and limited capacity (in provincial and regional technical services) is known to be a constraint.</p> <p>Government capacity is not likely to represent a high risk for the project because the capacity for FFS activities and the projects is already in place. However, the risk of lack of capacities will be mitigated by mobilizing and articulating the capacity of different actors, projects, programmes and bilateral agencies to work intensively with government and gradually transfer skills to government counterparts.</p>
Reluctance to participate in the project activities by agriculturalists and/or by pastoralists.	L	<p>Farmer and herder stakeholders may be hesitant to participate.</p> <p>The risk of reluctance of stakeholders is considered low, as FFS are widely distributed and well known in the country. Nevertheless, this situation will be monitored, and if there are signs that it will lead to challenges, the project strategy will be revised to ensure more focus on awareness raising and communication with local farmers and herders.</p>
Certain project interventions (e.g. provision of agro-meteorological information) are not implemented on a financially sustainable basis.	L	<p>Accurate agro-meteorological information is expensive to produce. Moreover, it is often prepared in a top-down, supply driven manner and not adapted to needs of farmer-herders.</p> <p>Overall, this only threatens one Output (2.8) and so the overall risk is considered low. However the situation will be monitored. The Project will introduce, at a policy debate level, the idea of demand driven meteorological information that farmer-herders are willing to pay for.</p>
High costs and difficulties in intervening in remote locations undermine project impact.	L	<p>The Project intervention area (the four regions) is very large and transport infrastructure is very limited. Hence it may be costly, impractical to intervene across the area.</p> <p>This is considered low risk. First, the nature of this project is to deal largely with livestock-raisers, many of whom are semi-transhumant, hence difficulties in reach project stake-holders are integral to the project and overcoming these is part of the project design. Moreover, this only applies to a small percentage of project site. Finally, the project will often work with/through locally active organizations and this will increase outreach and lower costs.</p>
Local institutions are slow to agree on project activities.	L/VL	<p>Local departments may hesitate to participate due to the innovative nature of the project and/or the need to cooperate with a broad range of partners. However, based on recent experience in Burkina Faso, this risk is considered very low.</p> <p>The situation will be monitored and a strategy developed if needed.</p>

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

28. In line with recent development in the GEF portfolio in Burkina Faso and West Africa, the Project Document (Section 4.1) provides a detailed and updated description of the approach to coordination with other initiatives in the GEF portfolio.

29. Notably, appropriate coordination will be assured with the following:

- Strengthening Adaptation Capacities and Reducing the Vulnerability to Climate Change in Burkina Faso (UNDP/LDCF);
- Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Africa for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change: Burkina Faso (UNDP/LDCF);
- Reducing vulnerability of natural resource dependent livelihoods in two landscapes at risk of the effects of climate change in Burkina Faso: Boucles du Mouhoun Forest Corridor and Mare d'Oursi Wetlands Basin (UNDP/LDCF).
- Integrating climate resilience into agricultural production for food security in rural areas of Mali (FAO/LDCF);
- Strengthening resilience to climate change through integrated agricultural and pastoral management in the Sahelian zone in the framework of the Sustainable Land Management approach (FAO/LDCF, in Mali);
- Land rehabilitation and rangelands management in smallholders agro-pastoral production systems in south western Angola (FAO/LDCF); and,
- Integrating Climate Resilience Into Agricultural and Pastoral Production for Food Security in Vulnerable Rural Areas Through the Farmers Field School Approach (FAO/LDCF, in Niger).

B. Additional information not addressed at PIF Stage

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation:

30. A study of stakeholders was undertaken as part of the preparation of this Project. The findings are presented in the FAO Project Document (Appendix 7). The analysis looked at governmental (national and local), non-governmental, academic, community and international stakeholders and partners, and it identified potential collaboration activities/mechanisms.

31. The key government stakeholders are:

- Ministry of the Economy and Finance (MEF), responsible notably for the coordination of internationally supported projects;
- Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA), notably responsible for providing policy and technical support to rural areas on agriculture, including through the national extension system. MASA also implements many programmes and projects and is responsible for food security and nutrition;
- Ministry of Fishery and Animal Resources (MRAH), notably responsible for providing policy and technical support to rural areas on livestock raising. MRAH also implements many programmes and projects;
- Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD), notably responsible for implementing the UNFCCC and coordinating adaptation to climate change, including through the provision of technical support to rural areas;
- Ministry of Scientific Research and Innovation (MRSI), notably responsible for assessing, identifying and promoting new approaches and technology;
- Ministry of Water Supply and Sanitation (MEAHEA), responsible for water infrastructure in rural areas;
- General Department for Meteorology (DGM), responsible for the collection of meteorological data and the provision of forecasts. It has also taken a lead on climate change forecasting and modelling, working with regional partners such as ACMAD and AGRYMET;

- Regional Governments, responsible for sustainable development in the concerned Region, including the coordination/implementation of support projects and the provision of policy and technical support;
- Regional and Provincial technical departments of national line ministries, provide technical support to rural populations.

32. Appendix 7 provides information on their mandate related to the project and their role in the project implementation.

33. A vast number of NGOs and CSOs are active in activities related to extension and providing capacity building to local communities across Burkina Faso, and many are active in remote and rural areas. In general, these have a base in the regional capital, as well as possibly in the nation's capital. An initial capacity assessment has been undertaken and the findings are provided in Appendix 7 (part B). These organizations are to be directly involved in the development of the Field School approach and the training of farmers and facilitators.

Beneficiaries

34. The main project beneficiaries are herder-farmer families. The Project will bring benefits to at least 26,000 such families across the following four Regions; Sahel, Eastern, West Central and North Central. The Project will focus activities on a selected group of communities and sites across these four regions. The target sites have not yet been identified; they will be identified and selected through a participatory process based on agreed criteria during the implementation of the Project (Output 2.1). However, general information on the age structure, socio-economic situation, main economic situation, religion, ethnic groups and languages in the four Regions is provided in Appendix 10 of the Project Document.

35. In general, three types of farmer/herder communities will benefit: (i) communities based around transhumant livestock-raising systems. These are predominantly in the Sahel and Eastern Regions; (ii) communities based around semi-intensive, non-transhumant, livestock-raising systems. These are predominantly in the West Central and North Central Regions and; (iii) communities based on agriculture having existing farmer field schools. These communities are in more fertile areas with more reliable climates.

36. The FAO has developed a series of tools to ensure the full participation of vulnerable and indigenous groups and these will be used in the Project. Likewise, the full participation of women and the addressing of gender inequality will be core aspects of the Project, for example through the use of socio-economic and gender analysis (SEAGA) tools.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

37. The project aims to directly provide socio-economic benefits to poor and marginalized individuals and communities in Burkina Faso. The Project introduces and adopts a predominantly 'bottom up' approach, empowering local communities and increasing their ability to participate in economic activities and to take ownership over their natural resources. Moreover, the participatory and didactic approach adopted is conducive to avoiding elite capture and to minimizing any marginalization at the community level. Further, the Project strengthens existing decision-making processes at all levels. These aspects should ensure that, although the Project introduces new approaches and technologies, they do not lead to social dis-function or to negative social impacts.

38. As a result of these interventions, at least 26,000 herder-farmers - approximately 150,000 people - will benefit from new approaches, practices and varieties/cultivar that not only increase climate resilience but support socio-economic development. Further, the Project will also contribute directly to organizational strengthening in these communities – leading indirectly to improvements in

terms of gender, land tenure and access to credit. These benefits are mostly delivered under Outcome 2.

39. The Project utilizes new tools to ensure participation in: TOP-SECAC (a tool kit with 11 tools to be used in the analysis of vulnerability; Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience of farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP), and; Participatory and Negotiated Territorial Development;

40. At the national level, the Project will build the capacity of planners and technical decision makers (Output 1.1). It will develop materials that can be used for training, awareness raising and dissemination (Outputs 1.2 and 2.3), and which should continue to be used after the Project. The Project also builds capacity of regional and provincial governmental and non-governmental agencies on supporting extension systems (Outputs 2.1 and 2.7). Finally, under Outcome 3, the project will work to strengthening institutional capacity (notably coordination mechanisms) and to mainstream changes into the national extension system (the SNVACA).

Attention to gender issues

41. The project has a strong gender focus. In Output 2.1 the project will apply the Improving Gender Equality in Territorial Issues (IGETI) tool that allows for a gender sensitive, stakeholder priorities' analysis. The analysis is based on a Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) approach that places great emphasis on the importance of linkages between economic, environmental, social and institutional patterns. The approach also analyses the influence exerted on economic and social opportunities by factors such as age, ethnicity, religion, etc. all of which are fundamental in understanding livelihood strategies.

42. Several other activities under the other Outputs have a gender focus. The awareness raising, the preparation of training material and the training of Master Trainers and Facilitators all have modules focused on women and women's role. Outputs 2.5 – 2.7 cover the provision of technologies, and the market inclusion for various community activities with the aim of increasing revenue and increasing food security, notably for women. The community based action plans to be prepared under Output 2.5 will have women components and will have gender issues mainstreamed throughout. Output 2.8, focusing on strengthening land security, and the use of PNTD, also with a strong focus on women.

B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

43. Cost effectiveness is a concept that is built-in to the programmatic strategy of the GEF/LDCF. In projects like this, GEF/LDCF finances the 'additional costs' of achieving climate change adaptation, meaning the activities of the partners in the baseline cover most of the basic development and agro-pastoral issues. For this Project, this means that the FAO/GEF/LDCF project builds on top of a large baseline of agriculture, food security and livestock-raising projects. With a baseline and co-financing of approximately \$20 million, the FAO/GEF/LDCF costs are approximately 15% of the entire Project costs. That means, for every \$1 invested, FAO/GEF/LDCF gains almost \$6 of impact.

44. Cost-effectiveness is also at the heart of the FAO's strategy to supporting rural development in sub-Saharan African countries, including Burkina Faso. The proposed project design is expected to be highly cost-effective since it builds on existing Farmers Field Schools' structures that are already operational across Burkina Faso, and on ongoing activities with similar objectives and synergies with existing programmes.

45. The proposed Project also builds directly on from previous collaboration between FAO and Burkina Faso on FFS. Since 1996, the FAO has been supporting FFS in Burkina Faso, and has created a core capacity of technical expertise and experience. This includes legal and technical capacity in the government as well as the cadre of FFS experts that have worked on previous FAO projects. By building on these past initiatives, the project capitalizes upon this previous FAO work.

46. Moreover, the FFS approach in itself has demonstrated its cost-effectiveness in many contexts, including in Burkina Faso. It is a demonstrated cost-effective manner to deliver high quality

technical advice to a large number of communities. Notably, under Outcome 2 of this Project, for approximately \$2 million of FAO/GEF/LDCF funds, direct benefits will reach a minimum of 26,000 farmer-herders. This is less than \$77 per farmer-herder.

47. In the preparation of a similar project in Mali⁶, a comparison of costs for FFS and standard training approaches for extension was undertaken. Although not directly transferable to this project, the finding was that “*building upon 400 existing FFS and 233 experienced facilitators (for crops such as rice, cotton and “maraichage”)* will save 251 540 USD in training costs alone and 220 000 USD in FFS operation over the project cycle”. Although not a solid economic analysis, this does strongly indicate the cost-effectiveness of the FFS approach.

48. A critical way to achieving this cost-effectiveness with FFS is through collaboration with local partners. The FAO will channel funds from the project to local authorities and NGOs that are already active in similar activities in the project intervention area. Hence there will be few start-up costs and few costs related to the mobilization of expertise from outside the region or country.

49. Several alternative designs and approaches were considered for cost-effectiveness during project design. These alternatives included focusing on providing more hardware, or on focusing all capacity development efforts on national government agencies, or by the FAO directly providing extension services to farmer-herders. Ultimately, it was decided that these approaches would not have as much impact per input, hence the selected focus of transforming agriculture and livestock-raising through the FFS approach was selected. This approach underlies Outcome 2.

50. The Project also intends to minimize the use of international consultants where national expertise is available. This will reduce the travel costs and the costs of consultancy fees. Notwithstanding, where international expertise is unique or exceptionally credible, it will be utilized. For example, given the innovative nature of the project related to agro-pastoral field schools, expertise on this will be sought from the East Africa and Chief Technical Adviser position established. However, this key position will be shared with a similar FAO/GEF/LDCF project starting up in Mali – thereby making significant savings to this Project’s budget.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN

51. The FAO Project Document provides a detailed description of the monitoring, reporting and evaluation to be undertaken during the Project (Sections 4.5).

52. Full details of indicators, baseline values and targets are presented in Annex 1 (Results Framework).

53. Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow the FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. Monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and indicators established in the project Results Framework (RF) (Annex 1). The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been budgeted at USD 165,000 (see Table below). Integrated into all Outcomes, the Project monitoring and evaluation approach will also facilitate learning and mainstreaming of project outcomes and lessons learned into international good practice as well as national and local policies, plans and practices.

54. A summary of the envisaged M&E activities is provided in the following table.

⁶ See Project document: *Integrating climate resilience into agricultural production for food security in rural areas of Mali*

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Estimate of costs
Inception Workshop (IW)	NCU, supported by the LTO, BH, and GEF Coordination Unit (GCU)	Within three months of project start up	Workshop costs combined with costs of 2.1 Workshop preparation: staff time USD 3,500 (completed by NPC and IPTA)
Surveys to determine AMAT baseline values	NCU and service providers	Within three months of project start up	Covered under costs of 2.1
Project Inception Report	NCU, LTO, BH, and GCU	No later than one month post IW.	USD 2,500 (completed by NPC and IPTA)
Field based impact monitoring	NCU, MASA and other relevant agencies – including regional and provincial - to participate.	Periodically - to be determined at inception workshop.	USD 45,800
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	LTU/LTO, other participating units and GCU	Annual or as required	The visits of the LTO and the GCU will be paid by GEF agency fee. The visits of the NPC and IPTA will be paid from the project travel budget
Project Progress Reports	NCU, with inputs from MASA, PSC members and other partners	Semi-annual	USD 13,000 (completed by NPC and IPTA)
Project Implementation Review report	NCU supported by the LTO and cleared and submitted by the GCU to the GEF Secretariat	Annual	Paid by GEF agency fee
AMAT	NCU supported by the LTO	Project start-up, mid-Term and project end.	0 Data is collected by the NCU.
Co-financing Reports	NCU, FAO Burkina Faso	Annual	USD 3,000 (completed by NPC and IPTA)
Technical reports	NCU, LTO & Participating Units	As appropriate	USD 9,200 best practices publication and technical data available to the public
Mid-term Evaluation	External Consultant, FAO Office for Evaluation in consultation with the project team including the GCU and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 40,000 for independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Final evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team including the GCU and other partners	At the end of project implementation	USD 40,000 for external, independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Terminal Report	NPC, LTO, TCSR Report Unit	At least two months before the end date of the Execution Agreement	USD 8,000 (completed by NPC and IPTA)

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Estimate of costs
Total Budget			USD 165,000

Part III **APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
HONADJA Mamadou	Secrétaire Permanent du Conseil National pour l'Environnement et le Développement Durable	Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable	1 MARCH, 2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla (00153) Rome, Italy TCI-Director@fao.org		July 22, 2014	Caterina Batello, Team leader AGPME, FAO Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection Rome, ITALY	+3906 5705 3643	Caterina.Batello@fao.org
Jeff Griffin Environment Officer and Officer-in-Charge, daily matters GEF Coordination Unit Email: GEF- Coordination- Unit@fao.org Tel: +3906 5705 55680					

Annexes

Annex A: Project Results Framework

Please see Appendix 1 of the FAO GEF Project Document

Annex B – Response to Project Reviews.

Response to GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD) / Work Program Inclusion

Commenter	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
GEFSec PIF Review Sheet of 24/7/2012 (point 11)	By CEO Endorsement, please clarify the interface between the proposed LDCF project and the baseline projects on which it builds, demonstrating adequate linkages that allow successful adaptation measures and technologies to be adopted and scaled up through ongoing and planned projects and programs on rural and agricultural development.	<p>One of the project’s strategies is to support Farmer Field Schools (APFS and FFS) so that they can engage with and influence large-scale rural development programmes projects – i.e. engage with the baseline projects. Hence, through the APFS and FFS, the Project will empower communities to engage with, and ultimately influence, the large-scale rural development projects that are implemented in their vicinity. This will lead to multiplier effect: the targeted rural development projects will then contribute to increasing climate resilience and supporting integrated crop/livestock/tree systems.</p> <p>See notably Section 1.2.3 and Output 2.6. A comprehensive list of on-going programmes and projects that will either provide co-financing for, or cooperate with the current project is provided in Table 3 in the project document.</p>
GEFSec PIF Review Sheet of 24/7/2012 (point 13)	By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information to justify the proposed grant request for Component 3.	<p>Component 3 is <i>the mainstreaming climate change resilient agro-pastoral and agricultural systems into sectoral policies and into local development plans - in conformity with the PNA and the PNSR</i>. This leads to the institutionalization of the successes achieved and lessons learnt through Component 2 - through national/sub-national policy, programmes, institutions, budgets, and coordination mechanisms. Component 3 focusses in particular on the sustainability of project impacts.</p> <p>\$500,000 of GEF and \$2.05 million of Cofinancing are allocated to this. This is a reasonable amount.</p>
US Council Member (email of	We ask the Agency to provide more information regarding the effectiveness of the current FFS program and how the	The effectiveness of the FFS model as a bottom up people centred learning approach has been highlighted in various

Commenter	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
21/August 2012)	<p>additional activities funded by the LDCF will increase its effectiveness. The PIF notes that “climatic variability has always been considered in rural development policies, programs and field activities” though farmers and agro-pastoralists now face increased risk (page 6). Given that, what climate-change-adaptation-oriented techniques are already included in the existing FFS? If there are some of those techniques in place, how effective has the delivery of those techniques or technology been?</p>	<p>publications including: <i>Farmer Field Schools in Rural Kenya: A Transformative Learning Experience</i> (Duveskog et al., 2010), <i>The Empowerment Route to Well-Being: An Analysis of Farmers Field Schools in East Africa</i> (Friis-Hansen et al., 2012), and <i>Supporting Communities in Building Resilience Through APFS</i> (Okoth et al., 2013). Climate-change-adaptation-oriented techniques are already included in the FFS curricula of Mali and have demonstrated to be effective. The main techniques used in Mali include; crop calendars and the use of climate resilient varieties, community variety selection, crops/trees/livestock integration, legume crops (annual and perennial), anti-erosion and water saving measures (half moon, contour line, ridges, etc.), temporary reduction of stocking density, agro-meteorological information, no tillage, fertilizer management and the application of micro-doses.</p> <p>The FFS model was introduced in Burkina Faso by the FAO in the mid 1990’s, strengthening the technical capacities of at least 180,000 producers in 600 communities per year throughout the country. A clear sign of the FFS’s effectiveness can be observed by the increase in yields of rice, cotton and vegetable crops (by between 10% and 200%, depending on the crop and location). Further, there has been a reduction in usage of imported chemical, particularly chemical pesticides.</p> <p>Today the FFSs in Burkina Faso are recognised as one of the official farmers' training methods. However, although the current SNVACA training modules include climate change, they primarily focus on single crops (on a plot scale). Present FFS do not take the specific adaptation needs of agro-pastoral activities nor crops/trees/livestock systems into account.</p> <p>Moreover it is true, as noted in the PIF, that “climatic variability has always been considered in rural development</p>

Commenter	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
		<p>policies”. It is mentioned in the design of most projects and programmes. However, in most cases, although the programme/project design documents do identify climate change as a threat, they do not include a thorough analysis of climate change nor of its specific impacts. Moreover, they do not identify specific measures to adapt to climate change or to increase climate resilience.</p>
<p>US Council Member (email of 21/August 2012)</p>	<p>We request that the Agency expand on what plans are in place to ensure the continuation of the climate adaptation education beyond the time line of the proposal, particularly if private capital proves difficult to leverage. We also request more clarity on the sustainability of the baseline programs.</p>	<p><u>Policy:</u> Most training is through the Field Schools, and, as the Field School approach has been adopted as official policy in Burkina Faso (through SNVACA), this increases the chance of sustainability.</p> <p><u>Capacity:</u> The Project will develop capacity at many levels that will contribute to the overall body of capacity related to Field Schools and extension systems in Burkina Faso. The project will support capacity to operationalize and implement the approach, hence this capacity will respond to a proven need and will provide capacity that has proven useful and effective in the past.</p> <p>This capacity will be integrated into existing organizations, both governmental and non-government, and so will have a sustained use after the Project. The project will <u>not</u> support new structures, or support organizations on issues for which they do not currently have a mandate.</p> <p>The Project will build the capacity of planners and technical decision makers on climate resilient approaches to agro-pastoralism. It will develop training, and awareness raising materials that will (based on past experience) continue to be used post-Project.</p> <p><u>Mainstreaming into investment baselines & local development planning:</u> This LDCF investment project is designed to complement the baseline investment projects in agricultural and rural development. These baseline projects will incorporate the adaptation benefits generated by the project in the form of</p>

Commenter	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
		<p>farmer field school modules. The Local Adaptation Investment Fund (LAIF) which shall be established as a revolving fund by the project in each of the four targeted regions will also help to ensure the continuation of adaption activities beyond the duration of the baseline projects.</p> <p>The development of community action plans and their integration into existing communal (and regional) development planning is part of the mainstreaming element contributing to the project's overall sustainability.</p>
<p>US Council Member (email of 21/August 2012)</p>	<p>We note the importance of building understanding of the value of changing practices to incorporate adaptation strategies. Engaging users in the development of the program can be critical for achieving this objective. What plans are in place to ensure that farmers are engaged in shaping the program and how will the Agency additionally work with the farmers to ensure they successfully implement the practices learned through FFS?</p>	<p>The FFS approach in itself is the main guarantee that farmers will implement the practices learned. The Project introduces and adopts a predominantly 'bottom up' approach, empowering local communities and increasing their ability to participate in economic activities and to take ownership over their natural resources. The participatory and didactic approach adopted at the grass-roots is conducive to avoiding elite capture and to minimizing any marginalization at the community level. Further, the Project respects and strengthens existing decision-making processes at all levels.</p> <p>The Field School approach is basically farmer driven, by definition. However M&E (of both project and FFS) will ensure that the situation is monitored, and, if needed, corrected.</p> <p>Evaluative evidence (e.g. the recent SCCF evaluation done by the GEF Evaluation Office) very strongly shows that systems that lend reiterative support to the implementation of continuously evolving CCA practices are among the most powerful approaches to building long-term adaptive capacity. In decades to come, the single biggest challenge for CCA activities will be the dealing with uncertainties and an ever-changing information base. Structures facilitating continuous adaptive actions based on real time context-specific information, such as FFS, with its integration of CC with simultaneous implementation and</p>

Commenter	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
		<p>continuous improvement (i.e. the “grassroots lab”) are among the very few existing and well-established systems that can provide this added value, thus giving the FAO a unique advantage.</p> <p>The use of a resilient self-assessment tool, as outlined in project Output 1.2, will further strengthen farmers’ engagement in program shaping and successful implementation of learned practices. The SHARP (Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience of farmers and Pastoralists) tool will be employed throughout the entire project, in particular as an early diagnostic sample to establish baselines and track system change over time. This will act as a participatory tool for use during the course of a season-long FFS training to help guide training content along lines of participant priorities, and to help participant households determine priorities for longer-term actions and investments.</p> <p>See details of activities in Outcome 2 and explanation in Section 5.1.</p>
<p>US Council Member (email of 21/August 2012)</p>	<p>We request that the Agency provide more information about how women will be included in the benefits of this project, beyond the statements that women are affected by climate change. This could include what efforts are already in place to ensure that women participate in FFS programs and what will be added to ensure that their needs are reflected in the new curriculum and that they have access to the expanded FFS resources.</p>	<p>The project has a strong gender focus. In Output 2.1 the project will apply the Improving Gender Equality in Territorial Issues (IGETI) tool that allows for a gender sensitive, stakeholder priorities’ analysis. The analysis is based on a Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) approach that places great emphasis on the importance of linkages between economic, environmental, social and institutional patterns. The approach also analyses the influence exerted on economic and social opportunities by factors such as age, ethnicity, religion, etc. all of which are fundamental in understanding livelihood strategies.</p> <p>Several other activities under the other Outputs have a gender focus. The awareness raising, the preparation of training material and the training of Master Trainers and Facilitators all have modules focused on women and women’s role. Outputs 2.5 – 2.7 cover the provision of technologies, and the market inclusion for various community</p>

Commenter	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
		<p>activities with the aim of increasing revenue and increasing food security, notably for women. The community based action plans to be prepared under Output 2.5 will have women components and have gender issues mainstreamed throughout. Output 2. 8, focusing on strengthening on land security, and the use of PNTD, also has a strong focus on women. Finally, specific gender-disaggregated indicators for monitoring women’s involvement and benefits have been included in the project.</p>
<p>US Council Member of (email of 21/August 2012)</p>	<p>We ask that the Agency describe how it will work with organizations like ACMAD and AGRHYMET to characterize climate risks to inform when adaptation strategies should be applied.</p>	<p>The project Output 2.7 is entirely devoted to this issue.</p> <p>The proposed project will build on the work of ACMAD and AGRYMET on meteorology and on climate modelling, forecasting, and prediction. The national meteorological service (DGM) and other national stakeholders will continue collaborating with ACMAD and AGRYMET throughout the project in order to facilitate the flow of accurate information for developing the project Output 2.4: “Improved availability of information on weather for local agro-pastoral communities”.</p> <p>This output will improve the quality of agro-meteorological information available to farmers and pastoralists at various scales in time and space. The agro-meteorological data will be tailored to agro-pastoralists’ local needs to enable better understanding of climate variability and climate change in their region, and highlight risk levels thereby improving their decision-making ability in terms of agricultural risk management.</p> <p>With the support of the national meteorological service (DGM - climate information’s producers) and agricultural (DGPV/INERA -agricultural extension staff) services, relevant weather and climate information will be introduced in the FFS learning-by-doing training. The activity will start with the identification of agro-meteorological information needs in FFS/APFS. Further to that, the DGM/DGPV/INERA staff will be</p>

Commenter	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
		<p>trained in order to respond to farmer's needs in FFS/APFS. Finally, under the supervision of facilitators, the FFS/APFS will receive agro-meteorological information and determine ways to use the forecast. Specific training sessions will be organized before the start of the planting season, during cultivation and before the harvesting season. Agro-meteorological data collection, archiving, processing and analysis capacity will be achieved mainly by DGM that strictly collaborate with ACMAD and AGHYMET.</p>
<p>US Council Member (email of 21/August 2012)</p>	<p>We request that the Agency clarify the reasoning behind the models chosen for predicting climate impacts and revisit the numbers in this PIF to check for accuracy and consistency.</p>	<p>The latest information and models regarding climate change have been utilised (see Section 1.1), although these still have some uncertainties.</p>
<p>US Council Member (email of 21/August 2012)</p>	<p>We recommend that the Agency expand on how it will engage other donors and civil society organizations and consider how this project will fit into the recently-formed AGIR Sahel partnership.</p>	<p>Engagement with partners, notably donors and civil society, is a key strategy of the project. Potential donors, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) that will be involved in project activities were identified during the PPG phase. However during PY1, a diagnostic of ongoing projects/activities implemented in the project area will be conducted and partnership agreements will be signed with project coordinators, authorities, NGOs, CBOs and joint work-plans, roles and responsibilities will be defined. In addition, the project will achieve a number of key outputs through letters of agreements (LoAs) to be established between the FAO and collaborating partners (service providers). An assessment of civil society organizations was undertaken (see Appendix 7, Part B), and many have been identified to be implementation partners for Outcome 2.</p> <p>The proposed project will support the Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative (AGIR), with particular focus on its third and fourth pillars; a) sustainable agricultural food productivity and incomes of vulnerable households, and improve their access to food, and b)</p>

Commenter	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
		strengthening governance for food and nutritional security. It is not a partnership at the operational level, as such. Information exchange and coordination will be maintained. Also, the project will form part of the partnership once approved.

Annex 3 – Status of Implementation of Project Preparation Activities and the Use of Funds

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: \$100,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NCIF/ Amount (\$) <i>100,000</i>		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
1. Stakeholder analysis, capacities needs assessments, and selection of practices, varieties and areas for the piloting of climate-resilient agricultural practices through the FFS process (Component 1)	13,760	13,760	
2. Technical studies for the analysis and design of the CCA FFS and DFF programme activities (Component 2)	20,330	20,330	
3. Policy and institutional analysis for mainstreaming CCA into agricultural sector policies and development programs (Component 3)	13,760	13,760	
4. Stakeholder consultations	15,600	15,600	
5. Analysis of execution options and assessment of fiduciary standards	3,000	0	
6. Detailed design of project components, additional reasoning, expected adaptation benefits, Results Framework, financial plan and detailed budget.	33,550	18,244	18,306
Total	100,000	81,694	18,306