



# GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: Least Developed Countries Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Enhancing the adaptation capacities and resilience to climate change in rural communities in Analamanga, Atsinanana, Androy, Anosy, and Atsimo Andrefana			
Country(ies):	Madagascar	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5632
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5228
Other Executing Partner(s):	Bureau National de coordination du Changement Climatique - BNCC (National Climate Change Coordination Office)	Submission Date: Re-submission Date:	8 Oct 2015 9 Dec 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration (Months)	60 months
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of Parent Program		Agency Fee (\$)	558,353

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
CCA-2	Outcome 2	LDCF	1,600,000	12,600,000
CCA-3	Outcome 3	LDCF	4,277,397	48,761,670
<b>Total project costs</b>			<b>5,877,397</b>	<b>61,361,670</b>

### B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

<b>Project Objective: Strengthen the capacities of vulnerable communities of Androy, Anosy, Atsinanana, Analamanga and Atsimo Andrefana to cope with the additional risks posed by climate change and variability on livelihood opportunities</b>						
Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
Component 1: Strengthening of the adaptation capacities of rural development institutions	TA	Outcome 1: The institutional and technical climate risk management capacities of ministries responsible for agriculture, the environment, forests, livestock, fishing, water and sanitation, and meteorology and their decentralized directorates, the community organizations and	Output 1.1: Technical authorities and services, i.e. 30 representatives from the Sectoral Regional Directorates (BNCC, DGM, DGAgri, DGE, SNGF), 30 representatives per Regional Directorate (DREAH, DRDR, DREEF, DRRHP, DIREL), 10 local administrators per commune, and 20 representatives per	LDCF	552,397	12,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#).

<sup>3</sup> Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		<p>people of Androy, Anosy, Atsimo-Andrefana, Analamanga and Atsinanana, have been strengthened</p>	<p>commune from professional and community organizations and NGOs that support rural development, will receive training and information on climate risk management</p> <p>Output 1.2: The local development plans of the 11 target communes and their related budgetary frameworks have been reviewed to incorporate climate risks and incentive measures fostering CCA</p> <p>Output 1.3: The Water and Sanitation Blueprints (SDEA) of Madagascar's Southwestern, Midwestern and Southeastern watersheds have been revised with a view to including climate risks and relevant adaptation options and their dissemination; and the Water and Sanitation Communal Development Plans (WSCDP) and related budgets have been developed in the 11 target communes with a view to identifying, prioritizing and planning water and sanitation-related adaptation measures which include a climate change component at the communal level.</p> <p>Output 1.4: The National Climate Change Strategy - Agricultural, Livestock and Fishing Sector (SN-CC-AEP) has been operationalized, and a climate change perspective has been</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			included in the implementation decrees of the revised Water and Sanitation Code			
Component 2: Production and dissemination of agro-meteorological and hydraulic information for appropriate decision-making in the area of rural development	INV	Outcome 2: Agro-meteorological and hydraulic information has been structured and disseminated to effectively support the decision-making of relevant players and responsible ministries and communities in the Androy, Anosy, Atsimo Andrefana, Analamanga and Atsinanana regions	<p>Output 2.1: Two agro-meteorological stations in Ampanihy and Amboasary-Sud, two synoptic stations in Betroka and Faux-Cap, three climatology stations in Behara, Beroroha and Sakaraha, and 10 hydrometric stations for the watersheds of the Mandrare, Menarandra, Linta, Onilay and Fiherenana rivers have been set up, and the interregional meteorology service in Toliara, strengthened</p> <p>Output 2.2: A service dedicated to conducting downscaled climate change modelling and sector impacts analysis has been created within the DGM and its technical and human capacities have been strengthened.</p> <p>Output 2.3: DGM and user capacities to analyze agro-meteorological and hydrological data have been strengthened</p> <p>Output 2.4: A system to produce and disseminate agro-meteorological information has been designed and put into service</p>	LDCF	1,000,000	15,000,000
Component 3: Introduction of communal adaptation strategies to the Androy, Anosy, Atsimo Andrefana, Analamanga, and Atsinanana regions	INV	Outcome 3: Adaptation measures and technologies have been transferred to, and implemented in, the 11 target communes of the Androy, Anosy, Atsimo Andrefana, Analamanga, and	Output 3.1: Climate-resilient agro-sylvo-pastoral, fishery and water management technologies, and advisory support services for resilient agricultural practices have been disseminated to 3,000 producers from	LDCF	4,042,760	32,731,670

		Atsinanana regions	<p>the most vulnerable communities (of which 40% are women) in 11 pilot communes of the Androy, Anosy, Atsimo Andrefana, Analamanga and Atsinanana regions</p> <p>Output 3.2: An input supply chain promoting sustainable, climate-resilient agriculture, supported by seed multiplier groups, NGOs and community organizations, has been established</p> <p>Output 3.3: The resilience of priority water and sanitation services in the 11 target communes of Androy, Anosy, Atsimo-Andrefana, Analamanga and Atsinanana has been strengthened and these communities have been made aware of basic sanitation measures and hydro-agricultural and drinking water conveyance facilities with a view to reducing their vulnerability to the expected impacts of climate change</p> <p>Output 3.4: The target vulnerable communities have appropriated the agro-meteorological products and services created and provided through Output 2.4, and have made them part of their agricultural and water management practices thanks to the support and advice provided by the FFS on resilient agriculture and water management practices.</p> <p>Output 3.5: Access to adapted forms of credit from active</p>			
--	--	--------------------	---	--	--	--

			<p>microfinance institutions and access to markets by the target communities have been strengthened with a view to developing climate-resilient IGA alternatives for local producers</p> <p>Output 3.6: A Public-Private Partnership (PPP) has been established to foster and promote the joint contributions of the public and private sectors in regards to CCA, in the areas of agriculture, meteorology, and water and sanitation in Madagascar.</p> <p>Output 3.7: An effective Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) system and the dissemination of best practices and lessons learned have been provided through the implementation of the project</p>			
Subtotal					5,595,157	59,731,670
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>				(select)	282,240	1,630,000
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>5,877,397</b>	<b>61,361,670</b>

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

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	5,000,000
Others	UNICEF	Grant	2,365,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Environment Ecology, Sea and Forests	In-kind	1,017,170
Recipient Government	Ministry of Transport and Meteorology	Grant	1,770,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Transport and Meteorology	In-kind	200,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Agriculture	Grant	47,009,500
Recipient Government	Ministry of Livestock	Grant	4,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>61,361,670</b>

<sup>4</sup> For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

#### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee <sup>a)</sup> (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	LDCF	Madagascar	Climate Change	(select as applicable)	5,877,397	558,353	6,435,750
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>					5,877,397	558,353	6,435,750

a ) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](#)

#### E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS<sup>5</sup>

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	<i>hectares</i>
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	<i>hectares</i>
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	<i>Number of freshwater basins:</i>
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	<i>Percent of fisheries, by volume</i>
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	<i>metric tons</i>
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	<i>metric tons</i>
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	<i>metric tons</i>
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	<i>ODP tons</i>
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i>
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i>

<sup>5</sup> Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

## F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund) in Annex D.

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

### A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>6</sup>

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area<sup>7</sup> strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

A detailed description of the project, including the global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed, the baseline scenario, proposed alternative scenario and detailed project strategy can be found in the full Project Document.

No significant changes have been made with regards to the project design of the original PIF.

A.2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.3. *Stakeholders*. Elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement, particularly with regard to [civil society](#) and [indigenous people](#), is factored in the preparation and implementation of the project.

Stakeholders which will be involved in the project implementation were identified following a consultative and participatory process. This involved:

- Semi structured interviews at the national level with institutional partners, TFP and potential co-financing – these interviews allowed the identification and analysis of stakeholders and of their role in project implementation.
- Discussions and focus groups at regional, communal and local levels. During the PPG phase, field missions were organised and conducted with the BNCC in the 5 intervention regions. All selected pilot communes were visited. Focus groups were organized at the local level in each commune visited to analyze the communities’ level of vulnerability and to identify local organisations, their mandate and activities. Specific focus groups with women were organized to address gender specificities;
- Implementation arrangements and roles of stakeholders were discussed and validated during a validation workshop.

The stakeholders involved in the project and their respective roles are presented in the table below.

*Stakeholders involved in the project*

Stakeholder	Role in the Project
<b>Government</b>	
<b>National Climate Change Coordination Office (BNCC)</b>	- National project execution agency - Steering committee member

<sup>6</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

<sup>7</sup> For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project’s consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsible for achieving Output 1.1</li> <li>- Responsible for coordinating Output 3.3</li> </ul>
<b>General Directorate of Meteorology (DGM)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsible for executing Component 2 and Output 3.4</li> <li>- Steering committee member</li> </ul>
<b>General Directorate of Agriculture (DGAgr)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsible for coordinating Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 in collaboration with the Regional Directorates involved</li> <li>- Responsible for the Agriculture Component of Output 1.4</li> <li>- Involved in Output 3.4 in collaboration with the DGM</li> <li>- Steering committee member</li> </ul>
<b>General Directorate for Livestock</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supervision of activity 3.2.2</li> <li>- Supervision of the livestock component of output 1.4</li> <li>- Steering committee member</li> </ul>
<b>General Directorate of Water (DGE)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsible for the water Component of Output 1.4</li> <li>- Steering committee member</li> </ul>
<b>National Tree Seed Centre (SNGF) Directorate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contributes to Activity 1.1.1</li> <li>- Contributes to Output 3.1 in collaboration with the Regional Directorates involved</li> </ul>
<b>Decentralized Services</b>	
<b>Regional Directorates of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (DREAH)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsible for achieving Output 1.3 and 3.3 in collaboration with UNICEF</li> <li>- Contribute to Output 3.1 in collaboration with the Regional Directorates involved</li> </ul>
<b>Regional Directorates of Rural Development (DRDR)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contribute to Output 1.2 with the DTU</li> <li>- Responsible for coordinating Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 with the General Directorate of Agriculture</li> <li>- Contribute to Output 3.4 in partnership with the DGM and the DREEF</li> </ul>
<b>Regional Directorates Environment, Ecology and Forests (DREEF)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Logistical support on Output 1.1</li> <li>- Responsible for achieving Output 1.2</li> <li>- Involved in the awareness campaign component of Output 3.1</li> <li>- Contribute to Output 3.4 in partnership with the DGM and the DRDR</li> </ul>
<b>Regional Directorates of Fishery Resources and Fishing (DRRHP)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contribute to Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 in collaboration with the other Regional Directorates involved</li> </ul>
<b>Regional Directorates of Livestock (DIREL)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contribute to Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 in collaboration with the other Regional Directorates involved</li> </ul>
<b>Interregional meteorology service in Toliara</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contributes to Output 2.1</li> </ul>
<b>Decentralized Territorial Units (DTU)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participate in Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 3.3, 3.4 et 3.5</li> </ul>
<b>Associations, NGOs and development partners</b>	
<b>UNICEF</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Labour for Outputs 1.3 and 3.3 in collaboration with the DREAH.</li> </ul>
<b>NGOs, POs and local associations (MDP, GRET, CTAS, CSA, CARE, etc.)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Involved in setting up FFS (Output 3.1)</li> <li>- Involved in achieving Output 3.2 in partnership with the General Directorate of Agriculture and the DRDR.</li> </ul>
<b>Microfinance institutions</b>	
<b>FIVORY, Microcred, etc.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Involved in achieving Output 3.5</li> </ul>
<b>Local communities</b>	
<b>Local producers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Involved in Component 3</li> <li>- Main project recipients</li> </ul>

A.4. *Gender Considerations*. Elaborate on how gender considerations were mainstreamed into the project preparation, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of men and women.

In Madagascar, like in most countries, women generally earn less than men and have fewer opportunities than men. Despite their innovation and leadership skills, women have historically been kept away from local and national decision-making processes. In order to improve local climate change resilience and adaptation capacities, it is therefore essential that gender-specific strategies be identified to ensure that women are included in identified initiatives.

Women in the project intervention regions have limited decision-making power and have a limited ability to own or accumulate assets. This trend is perpetuated by estate mechanisms which prevent women and children from inheriting substantial assets. The same holds true for matrimonial systems which allow polygamy but which often result in separation. It is estimated that more than half of all marriages result in separation, leaving many women as the sole



providers of their households. Female heads of households generally lose most of their resources and rarely own irrigated land.

In recent years, women's workloads have increased as they have become more involved in livelihood activities. They now perform agricultural tasks alongside men, in addition to fulfilling their household duties and working on other IGA.

Despite their crop work, women rarely have a say in how their household's farming activities are run or how their household revenues are spent. While they can choose how to manage their own IGA, they do not necessarily have a say in how the money they earn is spent.

Women's participation in community forums is extremely limited. Women say they aren't invited to meetings or are too intimidated to speak. There are also very few women who work in local administration groups or governments. Illiteracy is another factor that keeps women from being involved in social and community groups.

Women are even more vulnerable to climate change due to their key role at home and within the community. They must obtain water and fuel wood and take care of their vegetable gardens and children's health.

The proposed project activities will not only address differences between sexes, but will strive to reduce gender inequality by making women more autonomous and encouraging them to become more involved. Gender equality will be considered throughout the project period. The training provided through Component 1 will put a special focus on women working in recipient institutions. All participatory processes organized through the project will seek to integrate women in order to support and increase their participation in local decision-making processes.

Women will be an integral part of the target groups during the production of agro-meteorological products and services to ensure these best meet their needs.

Component 3 of the project will seek to integrate a significant percentage of women in activities related to transferring CCA measures and technologies to local communities. For example, at least 1,200 women (40% of participants) will take part in FFS training modules and at least 32 women (40% of participants) will be trained as FFS facilitators. Some of the techniques and measures disseminated through the FFS will specifically target women, such as improved seeds and techniques for small-scale market gardens and livestock farms, etc. Women will especially benefit from measures to strengthen the resilience of water and sanitation services, as they are typically the ones who are responsible for obtaining drinking water for their households. This duty will be facilitated by the availability of reliable water and sanitation facilities that can meet their household's drinking water needs, even in the context of climate change. There will also be a special focus on women during processes to identify IGA, where they will represent at least 30% of the participants, and during activities to help communities access new financial products adapted to climate change.

To ensure that gender is considered, gender-specific (AMAT GEF-6) indicators will be used to monitor the entire project.

*A.5 Risk.* Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

A complete Risk Matrix is presented in **Appendix 1 of the project document**. It presents risks identified in the PIF, as well as those identified during the PPG phase. Additional barriers are presented in the previous "Barriers to Overcome" section. Most of the risks are of a political, organizational or strategic nature, and relate to the weak institutional and individual capacities of public structures in regards to adaptation. A summary of the key risks identified appears below.

- The resurgence of a socio-political crisis in Madagascar;
- A potential reorganization and recurring institutional instability;
- A lack of community involvement in some of the project intervention sites;
- The non-adopted or weak adoption of IGA alternatives and climate change-resilient technologies;
- Inconsistent political will at communal and regional levels during the project period;

- Unforeseen climate disasters disrupting the implementation of the project; and
- CCA capacities are lacking in the key institutions involved in the project.

*A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.* Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Section 6 (p.71) of the project document details all the institutional arrangements of the project.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

*A.7 Benefits.* Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The benefits of the project are described above in *Section A2 - paragraph 4) Global environment benefits* of this document (pp. 21-22).

*A.8 Knowledge Management.* Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

The project will work in close collaboration, and share its best practices and lessons learned, with all co-financing projects, as well as other GEF financed initiatives and other projects implemented in the region of intervention. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Activity 3.7.3 of the proposed project is specifically dedicated to the collection, publication and dissemination of project-related best practices and lessons learned. There will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

## **B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:**

*B.1 Consistency with National Priorities.* Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:

Madagascar's NAPA identified seven priority sectors, including infrastructures, water resource management, agriculture and livestock, which were considered and respectively classified as priority one, priority two, and priority three of the project:

- *Infrastructures:* The project will help increase the climate change resilience of sanitation and drinking water services and conveyance facilities in the Androy, Anosy, Atsimo Andrefana, Analamanga and Atsinanana regions.
- *Water resource management:* The project will help increase the resilience of water supply services by strengthening the water supply infrastructure network and the adaptation capacities of organizations and people

involved in managing drinking water supply services. To protect water sources and boost groundwater reserves, the proposed project will also address deforestation issues using an ecosystemic approach.

- *Agriculture and livestock:* The project will help increase the adaptation capacities of agricultural and pastoral communities and support the development, demonstration and transfer of climate change-resilient strategies, including the use of climate change-resilient agro-meteorological tools and agricultural products and technologies. The project will also consider forestry, an essential ecological sector that goes hand in hand with agriculture, to prevent soil erosion and increase cattle feed.

This project meets urgent and immediate adaptation needs. It goes beyond a traditional sectoral approach and offers an integrated approach which includes various sectors (agriculture, livestock, forestry, water resources, etc.) in order to achieve overall climate change resilience in the five intervention regions. It is designed to meet the additional costs of priority adaptation measures identified in the NAPA, and will increase the capacities needed to pursue activities once the project is completed.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:**

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP/GEF procedures and will be led by the PMU and the UNDP Country Office.

Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) will be carried out following the activities and the budget presented in the table below. The M&E framework presented in the logistical framework in Component 3 is consistent with the AMAT tool and UNDP's M&E framework. The project document, AMAT, logical framework and associated indicators and targets, will form the basis on which the project's Monitoring and Evaluation system will be built, as part of the project implementation plan to be developed at the project's inception workshop.

Key project executing organisations will be directly involved in monitoring and evaluating activities, outputs and outcomes, and all beneficiary and stakeholder groups will be consulted, using a gender sensitive approach. The monitoring process itself will serve as a learning and capacity building platform for the project's main executing agencies. The project will also train key implementing partners in monitoring and evaluation tools and techniques including for social and environmental impact assessment. Principles of adaptive management will be applied in undertaking six monthly and annual reviews of the effectiveness of project implementation mechanisms. Two key external independent evaluations will be commissioned, one at the mid term of the project, the other at the end of the project. Establishment of the project's monitoring and evaluation process will involve the following steps. Project monitoring and evaluations steps, roles and responsibilities and costs are summarised in the table below.

#### **Project start:**

A Project Inception Workshop will be held during the first two months of project start. It will be conducted with the full project team, key agencies involved in implementation at national and regional levels, representatives of relevant government, NGO and community based organisations, co-financing partners, UNDP-CO and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, as appropriate. It is important that all key local stakeholder agencies take part in the Inception Workshop to enable establishment of a common vision and ownership of the project execution strategy. This should include all NGOs, farmers associations and baseline projects at proposed project sites. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop will provide an opportunity for all parties to understand and clarify their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making and implementation structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The project's decision-making and implementation structures and the Terms of Reference for project staff and the Project Board will be discussed, in order to clarify the responsibilities of each during the project's implementation phase.

A key task of the Inception Workshop will be the preparation of the project's first Annual Work Plan on the basis of the project's logframe matrix and the Project Document. Specific targets and progress indicators for the first year of implementation, together with their means of verification, will be developed and will form part of the Annual Work Plan. These should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timebound (SMART) and should help the

project team and partners to assess whether project implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction to meet logframe targets and indicators. Targets and indicators for subsequent years will be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team in consultation with all key project stakeholders.

The logical framework (logframe) will also be reviewed at the Inception Workshop. Progress and performance indicators will be fine tuned in consultation with key stakeholders and with support from UNDP-CO and assisted by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit. All indicators must adhere to the SMART criteria. The inception workshop report will clearly outline any changes made and why these have been proposed. An Output and Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan will also be developed at the Inception Workshop.

The Inception Workshop will also: (i) enable discussion between project staff and all key project stakeholders (including organisations and baseline projects); (ii) detail the support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team; (iii) provide the opportunity for a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, with particular emphasis on the annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the Annual Project Report (APR), Tripartite Review Meetings, mid-term and terminal project evaluations and the GEF LDCF Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT). The Inception Workshop will also provide an opportunity for UNDP to inform the project team and national counterparts and partners of project related budget reviews, planning and mandatory budget re-phasing. It will provide the basis on which the project team will develop an operational plan.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

### **Monitoring responsibilities and events**

A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project management team, in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives. This will be incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Such a schedule will include: (i) tentative time frames for Tripartite Reviews, and Project Board Meetings, and (ii) project related Monitoring and Evaluation activities.

Day to day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the National Coordinator based on the project's Annual Work Plan and its indicators, and the project document and logical framework. The national coordinator will inform UNDP CO and UNDP RCU of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion. He will also inform UNDP CO and RCU of any significant change of circumstance which impacts upon project rationale or approach. Measurement of Outcome indicators may require specific studies to be undertaken.

### Quarterly Monitoring:

Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.

- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

### Annual monitoring:

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative). This progress assessment could follow Randomized Control Trial (RCT) principles for outputs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, measuring project effectiveness by comparing outcomes of those (individuals and communities) who received the project against those who did not<sup>8</sup>.
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Annual review of project budget and expenditures will also be undertaken by the Project Coordinator, with support from UNDP CO and the chief technical advisor. These will assess levels of project expenditure and co-financing contributions over the year to make sure that these are on track.

Tripartite Review (TPR) is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. It will be held with the Project Board (PB). The project will be subject to Tripartite Review at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve months of the start of project implementation. The Project Coordinator will prepare an Annual Project Report (APR), with support from the Chief Technical Advisor and will submit it to UNDP-CO, UNDP-GEF RCU and subsequently to the PB at least two weeks prior to the TPR for review and comments. APR/PIR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the TPR meeting. The project coordinator will present the APR/PIR to the TPR, highlighting policy issues and recommendations. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary. The TPR has the authority to suspend disbursement of funds if project performance benchmarks are not met. Benchmarks will be developed at the Inception Workshop, based on the logframe, project implementation plan, proposed delivery rates, and processes for assessing achievement of outputs.

#### **Periodic Monitoring through site visits:**

UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

#### **Mid-term:**

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

#### **End of Project:**

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the

---

<sup>8</sup> For more info on RCT, please visit: <http://www.povertyactionlab.org/methodology>

achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation will use RCT principles for assessing impact achievements. A Randomized Evaluation is a type of Impact Evaluation that uses random assignment to allocate resources, run programs, or apply policies as part of the study design. Like all impact evaluations, the main purpose of randomized evaluations is to determine whether a program has an impact, and more specifically, to quantify how large that impact is.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). The relevant AMAT will also be completed during the final evaluation.

The terminal tripartite review (TTR) is held in the last month of project operations. The project coordinator is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report (TR) with support from the Chief Technical Advisor. The TR will be submitted to UNDP-CO, UNDP GEF's Regional Coordinating Unit and subsequently to the Project Board (PB). It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the TTR meeting in order to allow for full review of the document, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the TTR. The terminal tripartite review considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the LDCF GEF project has achieved its stated Objective, Outcomes and Outputs and has contributed to the broader development goal. The TTR meeting decides whether any actions are still necessary to achieve the project Objective, particularly in relation to the sustainability of project results. It acts as a vehicle through which lessons learnt can be captured to feed into other projects under implementation or formulation.

### **Project Monitoring Reports**

The Project Coordinator, with the support of the Chief Technical Advisor, and in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF CO and RCU will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process. Items (a) through (f) are mandatory and strictly related to monitoring, while (g) through (h) have a broader function and the frequency and nature of these reports is to be defined and agreed throughout implementation.

#### **a) Inception Report**

A Project Inception Report will be prepared immediately following the Inception Workshop, to be submitted within 3 months of the project start-up date. It will include a detailed First Year/ Annual Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames, detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. Alongside key activities, this Work Plan will include the dates of specific field visits by the UNDP-CO and/or the Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU), as well as time-frames for meetings of the project's decision making structures. The Report will also include a detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the Annual Work Plan. This will include monitoring and evaluation activities to enable effective measurement of project performance during the targeted 12 months time-frame.

The Inception Report will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners, as agreed in the Inception Workshop. It will outline progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities. It will also include an update of any changed external conditions that may effect (positive or negative) project implementation or that change the project baseline. It will highlight any new opportunities for project partnership / co-financing and propose an approach to ensure that the project works to maximise partnership opportunities. It will also confirm the status of risks and assumptions. As an annex to the Inception Report, the project manager will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. When finalized, the Inception Report will be circulated to UNDP Country Office and to the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, who will review it, and provide comments within two weeks. The report will then be circulated to all key project executing and stakeholder organisations who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries.

#### **b) Annual Project Report (APR)**

The Annual Project Report (APR) is a UNDP requirement and part of central oversight, monitoring and project management. It is a self-assessment report by project management to UNDP CO and provides input to the country office reporting process, as well as forming a key input to the Tripartite Project Review (TPR). An APR will be

prepared by the project coordinator supported by the Chief technical advisor, on an annual basis, to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project's Annual Work Plan. The APR also assesses overall project performance towards achieving Outcomes through Outputs, to achieve intended GEF LDCF project 'additionality' to the baseline, supporting climate change adaptation in the agriculture sector. The APR will be submitted to PB / TPR members at least two weeks prior to the TPR meeting.

The format of the APR is flexible but should include the following:

- An analysis of project performance over the reporting period, including activities undertaken, results achieved and information on the status of progress towards achieving Outputs and Outcomes.
- The stakeholder groups involved in the project during the year and how they were involved.
- Identification of key beneficiary groups and how they benefited, as well as assessment of any unintentional negative impacts of the project.
- The constraints experienced in progress towards results and the reasons for these. Identification of the three major constraints to achievement of results. Remedial action proposed to overcome these constraints in the next year's work plan.
- The status of risks and assumptions identified in the Project Document and identification of any new risks or assumptions.
- Analysis of any change of circumstance / change to the project baseline that may affect (positive or negative) project implementation.
- The identification of new opportunities for project partnership or co-financing and a proposed approach to ensure that the project works to maximise partnership opportunities.
- An overall assessment of the levels and types of expenditure in relation to that outlined in the Project Document / budget and in the Annual Work Plan / budget and the reasons for any derivations from budget levels and types planned. Remedial action proposed in the next year's work plan. AWP, CAE and other expenditure reports (ERP generated).
- As assessment of the level of co-financing committed to the project during the year, indicating levels of co-financing and agency / organisation and comparison with levels committed to the project.
- Lessons learnt. How the project will build on successes and learn from failures.
- An assessment of the likelihood of sustainability of project results and how the project implementation approach is working to achieve sustainable results. Any changes proposed to the project approach, to increase the likelihood of sustainable impact.
- Clear recommendations for future project orientation.

#### c) Project Implementation Review (PIR)

The Project Implementation Review (PIR) is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. It is an important management and monitoring tool for project managers. Once the project has been under implementation for a year, a Project Implementation Review report must be completed by the UNDP CO together with the project management team. The PIR should however be agreed upon by the project management team, the executing agency (BNCC), UNDP CO, UNDP RCU and the PB. It should be discussed at the PB / Tripartite Review TPR meeting.

PIRs are collected, reviewed and analyzed by the RCU who provide comments and ensures that they have been filled in correctly. They are then sent to the focal area clusters at the UNDP/GEF headquarters. The focal area clusters supported by the UNDP/GEF M&E Unit analyse the PIRs by focal area, theme and region for common issues/results and lessons. The focal area PIRs are then discussed in the GEF Interagency Focal Area Task Forces in or around November each year and consolidated reports by focal area are collated by the GEF Independent M&E Unit based on the Task Force findings. In light of the similarities in content of both APR and PIR, UNDP/GEF has prepared a harmonized format for reference.

#### d) Quarterly Progress Reports

Short reports outlining main updates in project progress and key issues/constraints encountered will be provided quarterly by the project coordinator, in consultation with the CTA and relevant stakeholders. It will then be sent to the

local UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF RCU. Quarterly reports form the basis for discussions with UNDP CO.

#### e) Periodic Thematic Reports

As and when called for by UNDP, UNDP-GEF RCU, the Project Board, the project team will prepare Specific Thematic Reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNDP and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learnt exercise, for specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered. UNDP is requested to minimize its requests for Thematic Reports, and when such are necessary will allow reasonable timeframes for their preparation by the project team.

#### f) Project Terminal Report

During the last three months of the project, prior to the Terminal Evaluation (TE) the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will:

- Summarize all activity areas and associated Outputs implemented by the Project, the results achieved, or not achieved, in relation to those intended in the Project Document (reporting against Output and Outcome statements, targets and indicators);
- Any changes made to project implementation following the mid term evaluation, why these changes were made and whether proposed results were achieved;
- The implementing agencies, key project stakeholders and the project beneficiaries - how they were involved and what impact the project has had for them;
- How the project worked in synergy with associated baseline activities;
- Lessons learnt;
- Project implementation approach structures and systems;
- The likelihood of sustainable impact from project impacts and analysis of any potential risks to sustainability;
- An assessment of project expenditure per Output and per Outcome over the life of the project, based on the annual audits prepared as part of annual project reports (APR). Any changes in levels and types of expenditure in comparison to those proposed in the Project Document and in associated Annual work plans will be fully explained;
- An assessment of the level of co-financing committed to the project, over the life of the project, indicating levels of co-financing and agency / organisation; and
- Any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of Project results prior to the end of the project, and by national partners, following the end of the Project.

#### g) Technical Reports (project specific)

Technical Reports are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis within the project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports planned during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. Technical Reports are often prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive, specialized analyses of clearly defined areas of research or analysis within the framework of the project. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to the information and knowledge base, and may be an important part of the project's overall contribution to developing tools, approaches, best practice and lessons learnt at local, national and international levels.

#### h) Project Publications (project specific)

Project Publications whether written or visual can form an important mechanism through which the project disseminates results and achieves impact. 'Publications' may be scientific, technical or informational documents, journalistic articles, multimedia publications, training or documentary films, and radio programmes. Publications may be summaries or compilations. The project management team will determine the most appropriate mechanisms for publication and dissemination, based on the Project Document, intended impact and stakeholder consultations. Key considerations will



be intended beneficiaries/audience, their levels of literacy, their information needs and the likely impact of publications in meeting those needs.


*Project Monitoring and Evaluation*

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Party	Budget excluding staffing costs (USD)	Calendar
Inception workshop and report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National coordinator</li> <li>PMU</li> <li>UNDP CO, UNDP GEF</li> </ul>	Estimated cost: 10,000	During the first 2 months of implementation
Development of an M&E framework and procedural manual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU</li> <li>UNDP GEF RTA/Project coordinator</li> </ul>	Estimated cost: 15,000	
Analysis of means to verify the achievement of outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP GEF RTA/Project coordinator</li> <li>PMU, responsible for M&amp;E</li> </ul>	To be defined during the inception workshop Estimated cost: 20,000	Launch, midterm and end-of-project
Analysis of progress made in terms of the project outputs and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU</li> <li>External consultants (evaluation team)</li> </ul>	To be determined in the annual Work Plans  Estimated cost 25,000	Annually, before the ARP/PIR and in the annual work plans
APR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP RTA</li> <li>UNDP EEG</li> </ul>	0	Annually
Progress report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project coordinator</li> </ul>	0	Quarterly
Midterm evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP RCU</li> <li>External consultants (evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Estimated cost: 30,000	Midterm
Final evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP RCU</li> <li>External consultants (evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Estimated cost: 45,000	3 months before the end of the project
End-of-project report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> </ul>	0	3 months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> </ul>	Estimated annual cost: 3,000 (15,000 in all)	Annually
Site visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP RCU</li> <li>Government representatives</li> </ul>	Paid on UNDP fees and management costs Estimated cost: 15,000	Annually
<b>Total estimated cost</b> Excluding project personnel and UNDP agent costs and travel expenses		175,000 USD (+/- 2% of the total GEF budget)	

### **PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)**

#### **A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

**This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies<sup>9</sup> and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.**

<b>Agency Coordinator , Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (MM/dd/yyyy )</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Adriana Dinu Executive Coordinator, UNDP/GEF		12/09/2015	Henry Rene Diouf, RTS, GLECRDS , Africa	+251115170 770	<a href="mailto:henry.rene.diouf@undp.org">henry.rene.diouf@undp.org</a>

---

<sup>9</sup> GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF  
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-April2015

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

The project logical framework is provided in Section 3 p.53 of the project document.

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

	Comments received from GEF SEC	Initial Response
1	<p>By CEO endorsement (11/18/2013):</p> <p>Please provide more information on the 'additional' adaptation aspects of activities mentioned in Component 3.2. Dredging, de-silting etc., are not adaptation measures in and of themselves. The PIF does provide further relevant information on climate resilience aspects of these activities but only later in the document. Please ensure that the additional adaptation elements are clear also in Table B.</p>	<p>Activities in output 3.3 are mostly focused on rehabilitation of already existing water supply infrastructures. When it comes to de-silting or dredging canals or ponds, the idea is to reduce the risk of flooding by ensuring a better flow of water during intense rainfall. Reducing the risk of flooding contributes to increasing the resilience capacities of vulnerable communities.</p> <p>Regarding the irrigation canal in Miary, dredging the canal will contribute to ensure a better water management by local communities. Since the irrigation potential of this canal is huge (600 ha), its rehabilitation through dredging will allow local communities to grow vegetables and cotton in the irrigated area, which will reduce their vulnerability to climate change and extreme climate events such as droughts and floods.</p> <p>Output 3.3 has been re-worded to better show the link between rehabilitation and reduced vulnerability to climate change.</p>
2	<p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide details on 2-way engagement with communities (e.g., drawing on community advice and traditional knowledge to guide project design; building capacity at community level so that they can ensure sustainability of project activities and outcomes in the long term, etc.).</p>	<p>The two-way engagement with communities is clearly mentioned in the project document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local communities have been consulted and gave advice on the project design through the VRA and interviews conducted during the PPG. As part of the PPG, focus groups were conducted in all targeted communes.</li> <li>Communities will be highly involved and will benefit from the FFS approach which will strengthen their capacities in terms of adaptation to climate change. The project will directly train at least 80 facilitators and 3,000 farmers through the FFSs. In each case the training will be designed in a participatory manner to respond to the needs and resources of the beneficiaries, it will be a focused, demand-driven, needs-driven training. The FFS approach is based on a learning-by-doing process and the recipients of the training are well placed to immediately apply the contents of the training to their work. By making the training useful, there is strong reason to believe it will be used after the project is finalized. FFS are “grass-root labs” that, through using participatory monitoring, will increase local leadership and strengthen long-term farmers’ capacities in the adaptive management of their land.</li> <li>Communities’ advice and knowledge will also be taken into account while assessing the needs for climate and meteorological data and information.</li> </ul>
3	<p>Recommended action by CEO</p>	<p>Seven projects will be cofinancing the project (MSD, AROPA, FORMAPROD, UNICEF WASH, Zebu industry and Emergency</p>

	<p>endorsement (11/18/2013):</p> <p>The project includes several sub-components, encompassing 7 baseline projects. Please discuss risks pertaining to execution/coordination across the project.</p>	<p>projects). The cooperation between these different initiatives and their respective executing agencies will be facilitated through regular meetings between implementation partners and sharing lessons learned and best practices between cofinancing projects and the LDCF project.</p>
4	<p>Sustainability: The project contains many elements/sub-components spanning several baseline projects, and many proposed activities are community-based. More information is needed by CEO Endorsement stage on how project activities will be coordinated, maintained, and communities kept engaged.</p>	<p>It is proposed that a project coordinator is recruited at national level. He will be supported by 5 regional facilitators based in each of the 5 Regions of interventions to ensure the coordination of activities at local level. Furthermore, the number of targeted communes has been limited to 11 in order to reduce the risk of dispersion. In every region, the geographic proximity of the targeted communes was also one of the selection criteria.</p> <p>Through the FFS approach, local communities will be engaged throughout the project as this is a learning-by-doing process and the recipients of the training are well placed to immediately apply the contents of the training to their work.</p>
5	<p>By CEO endorsement stage (11/18/2013):</p> <p>Please explain more fully the measures that will be taken to ensure sustainability of project actions and outcomes.</p>	<p>The sustainability section of the prodoc provides a more detailed answer to this comment.</p> <p>The sustainability of project actions and outcomes will be ensured by building institutional and technical capacities at national, regional and local level that will remain available after the end of the project. Integrating climate change in existing national and local development policies will ensure that this aspect keeps being taken into account in future initiatives, even after project's end. The implication of relevant stakeholders in the revision of policy documents and development plans will help them build ownership of the revised documents.</p> <p>The restructuring of the DGM will enable the institution to be fit for purpose and deliver quality and demand-driven information for the country to be able to react properly to climate change. The project will also support and advocate for the integration of maintenance costs and quality control of the equipment provided by the project into the DGM budget to ensure the sustainability of the equipment provided. The project will develop a dissemination system to ensure that relevant stakeholders can access and use the data produced by the DGM in the long term.</p> <p>The FFS approach, by training local facilitators on CCA resilient practices, will strengthen local capacities and ensure that knowledge will remain locally available even after the end of the project.</p> <p>By facilitating reliable access seeds and inputs, the project will ensure</p>

	<p>producers keep adopting resilient agricultural practices in the long term.</p> <p>The project will also help producers develop income-generating activities to reduce their vulnerability in the long term by facilitating their access to credit through reliable financial mechanisms.</p> <p>Finally, the public private partnership developed by the project should secure funding from the private sector to continue some of the initiative originally put in place by the project after this one has ended.</p>
--	---

	<b>Comments received from US Government</b>	<b>Initial Response</b>
6	How will UNDP maintain and operate the monitoring equipment that the project will procure and install	<p>Maintenance and operation of all stations are included as key activities in the project design, and will be costed. As maintenance has been a problem even of recently established stations, it has been agreed with DGM to improve the internal/national budgeting allocation for essential maintenance activities in the future. Furthermore, the procurement of this equipment will include training of DGM's staff on how to maintain it. It is realized that there are risks associated with this, as political will beyond DGM may not easily be solicited (e.g. at Finance Ministry), but a dedicated process will be actively pursued through output 2.2 of this project, integrated in the design.</p> <p>The project will develop a public private partnership that should secure the involvement of the private sector in the financing and maintenance of agro-meteorological infrastructures.</p>
7	How the climate and weather monitoring network could contribute to the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) and the Global Framework of Climate Services (GFCS)	<p>Linkages with international service and programs already exist. Data can be accessed routinely and links are to be established through international collaborations. Activity 2.1.1 specifically focus on strengthening international collaboration with GCOS, and activity 2.3.3 aims at setting up a users' platform for climate services in support to GFCS.</p>
8	How it will involve users both in the design of the agro-meteorological and climate information system and in deciding what information is produced from the system as well as how information will be disseminated	<p>Specific outputs relating to this aspect are included both under outcome 2 and outcome 3 (especially 2.3, 2.4 and 3.4). DGM is realizing a new role as information and knowledge product service provider (output 2.2), and aims to reform their approaches to service delivery including through demand articulation and participatory scoping of services and products. Such approaches are now being mainstreamed throughout the project design. The consultations during the design phase already scoped some of the demand in more detail, which led to the updating of the project design since PIF stage.</p> <p>Activity 2.4.1 is specifically dedicated to analyzing the needs in terms of agrometeorological products and services of targeted groups. This</p>

		study will serve as a basis for the conceptualization of the products and services to be developed by DGM in the framework of the project.
--	--	--

	Comments received from Germany	Initial Response
9	With regard to the first outcome (“institutional and technical capacities”) Germany asks to elaborate on the role of existing farmer’s organisations in capacity building. In Atsimo-Andrefana for example, there is a farmer’s organisation (Maison des Paysans - MdP) that engages in the entire region. In this context, Germany also suggests getting in touch with other donors and NGOs who are already working with farmers’ organisations. The French NGO AVSF, for example, has a project with MdP to increase the farmers’ resilience. The environment program implemented by GIZ (Programme German-Malgache pour l’Environnement) supports MdP via two technical assistants that work on the adaptation of agricultural techniques to climate change.	Farmers’ organizations such as MDP will be highly involved in capacity building activities throughout the project. MDP in Tulear was consulted during the PPG field mission. Other NGO such as CARE, GRET were also consulted during the field mission. These organisations will benefit from a climate change awareness-raising programme intended for local governments, NGOs and community-based organizations, implemented under output 1.1. Their capacities will also be strengthened by being involved in the development of the FFS network and the input supply chain for local producers, which will be implemented under component 3 of the project.
10	Possible synergies in implementation should be considered in a perspective of integrating climate change into strategic regional documents. Before the political crisis, GIZ had started supporting the elaboration of a Regional Land Use Plan of Atsimo-Andrefana. It might be opportune for the GEF project to integrate adaptation initiatives (the same would be possible for the national land use plan).	Component 1 of the GEF project will ensure that climate change considerations are integrated into national (code de l’eau), regional (SDEA) and local (PCD, PCDEA) strategies and development plans. To do so, it will collaborate and create synergies with on-going initiatives such as the MSD project.
11	Finally, for the third outcome (“adaptation measures”), there seem to be possible synergies with the GIZ project “Developing value chains in the South East of Madagascar”. The project is working on agricultural income generation activities in the regions Androy, Anosy and Atsimo Atsinanana	<p>The GIZ project will not co-finance the GEF project but both project will benefit from each other by sharing best practices and lessons learned.</p> <p>The developing value chain projects supports the honey, castor oil plant, goat and bean sectors. The LDCF project will create synergies with this project by supporting in priority the same sectors in the FFS that will be implemented in the regions Anosy, Androy and Atsimo Andrefana.</p> <p>This project coordination unit was consulted in Fort Dauphin during the PPG field mission.</p>

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>10</sup>**

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Elaboration document de projet	150,000	118,210	31,790
<b>Total</b>	150,000	118,210	31,790

<sup>10</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.



**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS** (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)