



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5014		
Country/Region:	Burkina Faso		
Project Title:	Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production for Food Security in Vulnerable Rural Areas Through the Farmers Field School Approach.		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,810,000
Co-financing:	\$19,470,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,280,000
PIF Approval:	July 24, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Caterina Batello

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Burkina Faso is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated March 1, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. FAO has a clear comparative advantage in capacity building, policy support and technical analysis for agricultural development. FAO also has a strong track record in applying and developing the farmer field school (FFS) approach.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	

	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. The proposed project is closely aligned with FAO's strategic objectives, and the Agency's mandate under Burkina Faso's UNDAF 2010-2015. The proposed project would build directly on several FAO interventions in Burkina Faso, and it would benefit from a well-staffed FAO representation in the country.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is fully aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 and, specifically, CCA-1.1 on mainstreaming adaptation in broader development frameworks; CCA-2.1 on increased knowledge and understanding of climate change-induced threats; CCA-2.2 on strengthened adaptive capacity; and CCA-3.1 on the demonstration and deployment of relevant adaptation technology. More	

		allocated towards CCA-3.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	YES. The proposed project is very clearly aligned with Burkina Faso's National Program for the Rural Sector (PNSR), the Accelerated Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy (CSLP), the National Plan for the Environment and Sustainable Development (PNEDD), and the National Action Plan on the Environment (PANE). Moreover, the project would contribute towards the implementation of several of Burkina Faso's NAPA priorities, notably those on early-warning systems, agricultural water use, as well as livestock and crop production.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	YES. The proposed project strikes a sound balance between concrete investments and capacity building. The project is fully geared towards enhancing the capacity of smallholder farmers to adopt and to scale up climate-resilient crop and livestock production technologies. The project would pilot and demonstrate tangible adaptation measures in the context of several baseline projects and programs. In parallel, 1,300 FFS would allow 26,000 farmers to apply climate-resilient practices and technologies on 15,000 ha of agricultural land.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on a range of baseline initiatives implemented by FAO, the Ministry of Agriculture and Hydrology (MAH), the Ministry of Animal Resources (MRA), and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable	

Project Design

a wide range of bilateral and multilateral donors, including the Government of Luxemburg, the Government of Italy, the Government of France, the World Bank, the Islamic Development Bank, and the West-African Development Bank.

Overall, the baseline initiatives and their associated co-financing are very clearly and consistently presented. The baseline initiatives are mostly relevant and present important opportunities for introducing and scaling up climate-resilient practices and technologies in crop and livestock production. Still, some of the proposed baseline projects are not clearly linked to the activities proposed for LDCF financing, notably the National forest inventory, managed by MEDD, and the Program on biodigesters, managed by MRA.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please justify the inclusion of the National forest inventory project and the Program on biodigesters as baseline initiatives and, if necessary, remove the projects from the baseline along with their associated co-financing.

07/19/2012 -- YES. The National forest inventory project and the program on biodigesters have been removed from the baseline in the re-submission. The two projects are instead presented in Section B.6 among other relevant initiatives.

By CEO Endorsement, please clarify the

		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.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Overall, the additional cost reasoning is clear and well presented. The proposed project would pilot climate-resilient technologies and practices in crop and livestock production across the three agro-ecological zones of Burkina Faso, in the context of relevant baseline projects; build the capacity of farmers to adopt such technologies and practices; and mainstream adaptation strategies across agriculture sector policies and programs.</p> <p>Still, the proposed project includes activities that are not clearly based on additional cost reasoning. In particular, the relevance and added value of Output 1.1.3 on multi-stakeholder knowledge building is not well understood. It is also not clear who the FFS leaders targeted under Output 2.1.3 are and how the output differs from Output 2.1.2. Component 3 could be streamlined and scaled down, as there appears to be duplication between outputs 3.1.1, 3.1.4 and 4.1.3, as well as between 3.1.2 and 3.1.5.</p>	

		<p>Moreover, the outputs 2.1.1 through 2.1.4 do not correspond clearly to Outcome 2.1 and it remains unclear how this ambitious outcome would be achieved through the proposed project. (see also section 14 below)</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify outputs 1.1.3 and 2.1.3; (ii) consider streamlining and scaling down Component 3; and (iii) clarify how the activities proposed under Component 2 would achieve Outcome 2.1.</p> <p>07/19/2012 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies and justifies output 1.1.3 and excludes output 2.1.3. Component 3 has been streamlined and clarified, and duplication with components 2 and 4 has been eliminated. Outcome 2.1 has been clarified to better correspond to the associated outputs.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information to justify the proposed grant request for Component 3.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to the recommendations under Section 13 above.</p> <p>The proposed project appears to have two investment outputs, namely 1.1.4 and 2.1.4. Outcome 2.1 suggests considerable investments in climate-resilient agricultural practices and technologies, benefiting 26,000 farmers on 15,000 ha. Yet, the outputs corresponding to this outcome focus on technical assistance. It is, therefore, not</p>	

		<p>defined as INV.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13 above, please consider restructuring the project with a separate component clearly focusing on concrete investments.</p> <p>07/19/2012 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies that Component 2 integrates technical assistance and concrete investments. This is justified as all outputs relate to FFS.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13 above, please revisit the description of the expected adaptation benefits.</p> <p>07/19/2012 -- YES. The adaptation benefits are well described in the re-submission.</p>	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	<p>YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>YES. By virtue of the FFS approach, the proposed project will have a strong interface with farmers' organizations, women's groups and the civil society in general. A detailed analysis of stakeholders and mechanisms for public participation will be provided by CEO</p>	

	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	YES. The PIF identifies relevant risks and describes adequate mitigation measures.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. The PIF identifies other relevant initiatives, with which the proposed project will be coordinated and from which it will draw lessons. However, other initiatives may be developed in parallel. Please ensure continued coordination.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	YES. The project would primarily be executed by MAH, in close collaboration with MEDD, MRA and the National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development (CONEDD).	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$181,000, or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 14 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11, 13 and 14, please adjust the proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly if	

		07/19/2012 -- YES.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendation under Sections 11, please adjust the indicative co-financing figures accordingly if needed. 07/19/2012 -- The indicative co-financing figures have been revised as recommended, with total co-financing now amounting to \$19.47 million, and resulting in a co-financing ratio of 1: 5.1.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. FAO would bring \$2.35 million to the proposed project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 11, 13, 14, 15, 24 and 25. Please consider comment in section 19 as appropriate.	

		07/19/2012 -- YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	07/19/2012 -- Please refer to sections 11 and 13.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 08, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.