REQUEST FOR: CEO Endorsement

Project Type: Full sized Project

Type of Trust Fund: LDCF Trust Fund

PART I PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening capacities of agricultural producers to cope with climate change for increased food security through the Farmers Field School approach			
Country(ies)	Mozambique	**GEF Project ID**	5433
GEF Agency (ies)	FAO	**GEF Agency Project ID:**	622616
Other Executing Partners	Ministry of Agriculture and Food security (MASA) and Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development (MITADER)	**Submission Date**	03.19.2015
GEF Focal Area (s)	CCA	**Project Duration (Months)**	48
Name of Parent Program	N/A	**Project Agency Fee ($)**	855,000

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-Financing ($)
CCA-1 Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.	LDCF	1,100,000	5,000,000
CCA-2 Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.	LDCF	3,800,000	11,000,000
CCA-3 Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology.	LDCF	4,100,000	11,344,657
Total project costs		9,000,000	27,344,657

B. Project Framework

Project Objective: To enhance the capacity of Mozambique's agricultural and pastoral sectors to cope with climate change, by upscaling farmers adoption of Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) technologies and practices through a network of already established Farmers Field Schools (FFS), and by mainstreaming CCA concerns and strategies into on-going agricultural development initiatives, policies and programming.

Project Component	Grant Type[1]	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
1. Inclusion of improved climate resilient	INV	1. Awarness and knowledge of national,	1.1 A multi-stakeholders FFS-based knowledge building strategy is formulated and applied to foster	LDCF	3,695,776	12,255,000

[1] TA includes capacity building and research and development.

agricultural practices in the framework of the Strategic Plan for the Agricultural Sector (PEDSA) and its investment plan (PNISA) with an emphasis on provinces and districts assisted by FAO MDG1c and Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza projects.		provincial and district-level managers and farmers increased to include CCA best practices and measures into on-going rural development programmes *Outcome Indicator 1.1: (AMAT Indicator 2.2.1) Number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability* *Outcome Indicator 1.2: Number of targeted rural development programmes that include CCA measures*	CCA strategies and practices. 1.2 National, provincial and district-level managers of agricultural and pastoral programs are trained in strategies and processes to include CCA in rural development through FFS and other extension approaches. 1.3 Integrated local adaptation options, measures and practices, specifically suited to support the CCA strategies promoted by the FFS network under Component 2, are participatively identified. 1.4 Improved soil, water and crop management practices piloted in selected areas of the targeted districts. 1.5 Seeds of a more diverse set of crop/pastures varieties chosen from existing climate stress tolerant cultivars/varieties made available in local seed systems and piloted in different ecosystems and production systems in the targeted districts.			
2. Promotion of climate resilient agricultural practices and technologies through Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and other extension approaches in the framework of the PSP, MDG1c and Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza projects, and other initiatives.	TA	2. Adoption of improved CCA strategies, practices and a broader choice of adapted genetic material, in up to 15 districts covering at least three production systems (staple crops, vegetables, mixed tree/crop/animal production systems) through the FFS network that are assisted by FAO MDG1c and Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza projects and other partner programs *Outcome Indicator 2.1: (AMAT Indicator 2.2.1.1) Number of staff trained on technical adaptation themes (disaggregated by gender)*	2.1 Training material on CCA best practices developed and integrated into extension curricula, including FFS curricula. 2.2 At least 1500 FFS facilitators (30% women) trained in CCA and ecosystem resilience strategies and practices in 3,200 FFS. 2.3 At least 200 non-FFS extensionists (government, NGOs, private providers, etc.) (30% of women) are trained in climate change adaptation and ecosystem resilience strategies and practices and support 10,000 additional farmers (30% women). 2.4 Methods developed and MITADER's CDS (Centros de Desenvolvimento Sustentavel) and INGC's CERUM (Centers of Resources and Multiple Use) officers trained to monitor progress towards more sustainable and climate-proof production systems. 2.5 Agro-meteorological decision support tools for farmers, developed in coordination with Instituto Nacional de Meteorología, PPCR and other partners, are tested with 20% of participating FFS and other beneficiary groups in 3	LDCF	3,475,488	8,949,657

		Outcome Indicator 2.2: (AMAT Indicator 3.1.1) Percent of targeted groups adopting CCA strategies, practices and adapted genetic material (disaggregated by gender) *Outcome Indicator 2.3: Level of use of agro-meteorological information by targeted agro-pastoralists*	provinces and 8 districts.			
3. Climate change adaptation strategies mainstreamed into agricultural sector policies and programs with emphasis on rural extension/outreach strategies and plans	TA	3. Increased institutional capacity and cross-sector coordination for designing and implementing efficient extension/outreach approaches, strategies and mechanisms in support of mainstreaming CCA in the agricultural and animal production sector. *Outcome Indicator 3.1: Number of annual meetings held of the institutional inter-sectorial task force established* *Outcome Indicator 3.2: (AMAT Indicator 1.1.1.1) Number of development framework that include specific budgets for adaptation actions*	3.1. Manual of Environmental Educator (PECODA) revised and updated and MASA staff trained. 3.2 Agricultural policy and current capacities assessed to identify strengths and weaknesses for mainstreaming CCA aspects into the rural development sector and land planning policies. 3.3 Joint MASA/MITADER coordination mechanisms strengthened in support of the implementation and monitoring of extension/ outreach strategies for CCA. 3.4 Comparative assessments of the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of FFS and non FFS-based extension approaches for up-scaling CCA, carried out in selected districts. 3.5 Good operational technologies and approaches for enhanced adaptation to climate risk of the agricultural sector are developed, disseminated and replicated at national level in support of sound CCA policy making and programming. 3.6 Draft investment proposals formulated for the financing of more effective extension strategies for mainstreaming and up-scaling CCA in the agricultural and pastoral sectors.	LDCF	900,000	4,480,000
4. Project monitoring and dissemination of results	TA	4 Project implementation based on results based management and application of project lessons	4.1 Project monitoring system operational and providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcome and output targets. 4.2 Timely biannual project	LDCF	500,000	710,000

		learned in future operations facilitated *Outcome Indicator 4: Fulfilment of planned M&E activities including establishing baseline values for all project indicators, yearly updating of indicators, a mid-term evaluation/review and a final project evaluation*	progress reports available for adaptive and results based management. 4.3 Midterm evaluation/review and final evaluation conducted.			
Sub-Total					**8,571,264**	**26,394,657**
Project management Cost				LDCF	428,736	950,000
Total project costs					**9,000,000**	**27,344,657**

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**	**Co-financing Amount** ($)
GEF agency	FAO (MDG1c and Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza project)	Cash	24,900,000
Government of Mozambique	MASA (In kind and PSP)	Cash	1,274,657
Government of Mozambique	MASA (In kind and PSP)	In-kind	770,000
Government of Mozambique	MITADER	In-kind	400,000
Total Co-financing			**27,344,657**

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	Mozambique	9,000,000	855,000	9,855,000
Total Grant Resources				9,000,000	855,000	9,855,000

[1] 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 ($)**
Local consultants	1 479 000		1 479 000
International consultants	1 182 500		1 182 500

PART II PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. Describe any changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF

1. No significant changes have been made with regards to the project design of the original PIF. However, although the project's overall outcomes are well in line with the PIF, some changes were made during the PPG phase to the arrangement of outcomes and outputs in order to better reflect the problem that needs to be addressed and how opportunities will be exploited during the project implementation. The modifications are explained in details in Section A.5 below.

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.

2. The PIF provides an accurate description of the Project's alignment to national strategies and plans.

3. More detailed information is provided in the project document in Sections 1.2 and 1.6.

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

4. The PIF provides an accurate description of the Project's alignment to GEF focal areas and strategies.

5. More detailed information is provided in the Project Document in Section 1.6.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage

6. The PIF provides an accurate description of FAO's comparative advantage to implement this Project.

7. 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

8. 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, Sections1.1 and 1.2 of the Project Document provide details of the situation with regards to agriculture in Mozambique in terms of climate change and climate variability impacts and related threats. Section 1.2 also provides an analysis of the barriers to adapting to climate change and increasing climate resilience.

9. Based on the thorough analysis undertaken during the PPG, the Project Document describes in more detail the three baseline projects mentioned in the PIF. The following table lists the 3 projects that form the baseline and provide co-financing to the proposed project.

Table: Introduction to related baseline and co-financing projects and programmes implemented in Mozambique

Title and Project Objective/Description	Lead Agency	Duration and co-financing amount
Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza project The overall objective is to improve the food security and nutrition of vulnerable households in the six selected districts of intervention in Gaza Province. This should be done through the achievement of the three following outcomes: (i) increased production and productivity of agriculture and livestock; (ii) improved community based natural resources management; and (iii) Improved nutrition and dietary intake as a result of nutrition education.	FAO	Co-financing : 2.5 million USD2013-2017
Accelerate Progress towards MDG1c in Mozambique The goal is to accelerate progress towards MDG1c in Mozambique by reaching the following objectives: (i) enhance agricultural and fisheries production; (ii) improve access to food, and; (iii) improve nutritional status of vulnerable groups, in particular women and children.	FAO	Co-financing: 22.4 million USD 2013-2017
PRONEA Support Project (PSP) The overall objective is to contribute to absolute poverty reduction and an improvement in the quality of life of the rural poor. The purpose of the PSP consists in increasing returns and improving household food security for male and female subsistence farmers, including female-headed and disadvantaged households, through a steady uplift in production efficiency and market orientation	Government	Co-financing: 1,274,657 USD 2015-2017

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 co-financing

10. Based on the PPG assessment of the baseline projects and related consultations, the co-financing to the project has been confirmed and will be as follows:

    - FAO will provide US$ 24,900,000 in cash co-financing (US$ 22,400,000 from the MDG1c project and US$ 2,500,000 from the Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza project)
    - MASA will provide US$ 770,000 in-kind co-financing consisting mainly of staff time, office space and utilities, and support for local travel; and US$ 1,274,657 in cash co-financing through the PSP.
    - MITADER will provide US$ 400,000 in-kind co-financing consisting mainly of staff time, office space and utilities.

11. The total amount of confirmed co-financing (US$ 27,344,657) is almost identical as what was estimated in the PIF (US$ 30,000,000). This is mainly due to the fact that the amount considered as cofinancing under the PSP is only the governmental contribution and does therefore not include all other funding sources for the PSP (amounting for more than USD 20 million in total).

12. The details of cofinancing amounts per components are provided in the following table.

Table 1: Detailed co-financing per component

Project Objective		
	GEF Financing	**Co-Financing**
Project Components	($) a	($) b

Component 1	3,695,776	12,255,000
Component 2	3,475,488	8,949,657
Component 3	900,000	4,480,000
Component 4	500,000	710,000
Project management	428,736	950,000
Total Project Costs	9,000,000	27,344,657

Budget

13. The GEF grant allocations between Component 1 and 2 have been slightly adjusted in order to better balance the budget between investments (Component 1) and technical assistance (Component 2). Indeed, most of investments in terms of promoting and disseminating CCA and resilient farming practices including small-scale soil, water and crop management practices are planned under Component 1. Component 2 focuses on capacity building and training activities, except for the agro-meteorological decision support tools output.

Logical Framework

14. The PIF provides a description of the outcomes, outputs and strategies to be supported by the project. The thorough problem analysis that was undertaken during the PPG phase validated the overall strategy and approach of the PIF. It also led to minor restructuring of some of the outcomes and outputs:

    - The wording of Component 1 and Outcome 1 has been slightly modified to include the Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza project;
    - The wording of Component 2 has been slightly changed to include the Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza project and the PSP;
    - The wording of outputs 1.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5 has been slightly changed to avoid repetitions and include additional information collected during the PPG;
    - Output 1.3 from the PIF has been removed since the budgeted CCA plans are now integrated in activity 3.2.2 regarding the development of the Local Adaptation Plans (LAPs);
    - The targeted number of FFS and facilitators in Output 2.2 has been increased since it also includes now the FFS put in place through the Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza project.

15. The detailed outcomes, outputs and activities are provided in the Project Document in Section 2.3 and 2.4, and in Appendix 1 (Results Matrix).

Additional Reasoning

16. In the baseline, the three on-going co-financing projects PSP, MDG1c and Food Nutrition and Security for Gaza, the existing public extension network of MASA, and MITADER's LAP development methodology, provide entry points for addressing climate change considerations when supporting rural communities. This constitutes a cost-effective opportunity to finance the additional costs of adaptation using LDCF funds.

17. With additional financing from LDCF, the proposed intervention will: (i) develop the basic foundations to include CCA into rural development and agriculture policies and strategies; (ii) develop the tools and capacities for delivering in a cost-effective manner climate change support and advice to vulnerable rural communities; (iii) provide and disseminate resilient agro-pastoral practices and measures to a sizeable number of rural communities; and (iv) ensure sustainability

by integrating CCA into key policy initiatives and ensuring lessons are learnt and disseminated.

18. Section 1.2.3 in the project document explains in more details the additionality and complementarity of each component of the proposed project with regards to baseline projects.

Global environmental and adaptation benefits

19. The LDCF project is expected to increase resilience to climate change in the intervention areas through an integrated ecosystem-wide and agro-ecological approach. The project will generate both direct and indirect adaptation benefits for smallholder farmers in the project's intervention areas. By doing so, the project will directly support at least 80,000 farmers, including at least 30% of women, through 3200 FFS to develop and implement CCA technologies and approaches that increase climate resilience. Further, the project will train 1500 FFS facilitators and at least 200 non-FFS extentionists in providing climate resilient strategies and practices. The project will build institutional capacity and cross-sector coordination for implementing approaches to mainstream CCA in the rural development sector.

20. The project will increase the resilience of at least three production systems (staple crops, vegetables, mixed tree/crop/animal production systems), through the adoption of improved CCA strategies, practices, in up to 15 districts assisted by the PSP, MDG1c and Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza projects and other partner programs. The project will more specifically produce the following outputs:

    - A multi-stakeholder FFS-based knowledge building strategy is formulated and applied to foster CCA strategies and practices;
    - National, provincial and district-level managers of agricultural programs are trained in strategies and processes for mainstreaming CCA in rural development through FFS and other extension approaches;
    - Smallholder and emergent farmers benefit from more climate-resilient production systems, specifically suited to support the CCA strategies and practices promoted by the FFS network under Component 2;
    - Improved soil, water and crop management practices piloted in selected areas of the targeted districts; and
    - Seeds of a more diverse set of crop/pastures varieties chosen from existing climate stress tolerant cultivars/varieties made available in local seed systems and piloted in different ecosystems and production systems in the targeted districts.

21. The project will assist farmers in adopting improved climate resilient technologies and approaches, mostly through FFS facilitating experimental learning on CCA strategies and practices and will more specifically produce the following outputs:

    - Training material on CCA best practices developed and integrated into extension curricula, including FFS curricula;
    - At least 1500 FFS facilitators (30% women) trained in CCA and ecosystem resilience strategies and practices in 3,200 FFS;
    - At least 200 non-FFS extensionists (NGOs, private providers, etc.) (30% women) trained in CCA and ecosystem resilience strategies and practices and support 10,000 additional farmers;
    - Methods developed and MITADER's CDS (Centros de Desenvolvimento Sustentavel) and INGC's CERUM (Centers of Resources and Multiple Use) officers trained to monitor progress towards more sustainable and climate-proof production systems; and

- Agro-meteorological decision support tools for farmers, developed in coordination with the Instituto Nacional de Meteorología, PPCR and other partners, tested with 20% of participating FFS and other beneficiary groups.

22. The project will increase institutional capacity and cross-sector coordination for designing and implementing efficient extension/outreach approaches, strategies and mechanisms in support of mainstreaming CCA in the rural development sector:

- Increased human and institutional capacity through a better knowledge and understanding of climate change - induced threats and impacts in the agricultural sector for a better sectorial and sub-sectorial planning;
- Agricultural policy / capacity assessment undertaken to identify gaps and opportunities for mainstreaming CCA into the rural development sector policies;
- Joint MASA/MITADER coordination mechanisms strengthened in support of the implementation and monitoring of extension/ outreach strategies for CCA;
- Comparative assessments of the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of FFS and non FFS-based extension approaches for up-scaling CCA, carried out in selected districts;
- Good operational measure and technologies for enhanced adaptation to climate risk of the agricultural sector developed, disseminated and replicated at national level in support of sound CCA policy making and programming; and
- Draft investment proposals formulated for the financing of more effective extension strategies for mainstreaming and up-scaling CCA in the agricultural and pastoral sectors.

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:

23. 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.

Table 2: Risk Matrix

Risk	Risk Level	Mitigation Measure
High-probability of increased occurrence of extreme weather events which may affect crop and livestock cycles and increase food/nutritional insecurity.	H	Mitigated by supporting the implementation of CCA policies and measures to strengthen pro-active and coordinated responses. Developing adaptation plans for rural development and by linking with on-going emergency/post-emergency initiatives that are implemented by the government. Community-level field observation capacities will be fostered to anticipate climate-change-related disruptions. Finally, the project will support the access and use of climate data which allow better planning.
The limited experience in project coordination between MITADER and MASA may constitute a challenge.	M	MITADER and MASA will benefit from several trainings and an inter-sectoral task force including both ministries and the civil society will be set up under Component 3 in order to ensure good project coordination.
Partnership-building capacities to ensure mainstreaming into on-going initiatives may constitute a challenge.	L	Since the LDCF-funded activities and management will be closely linked to the MDG1c, PSP and Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza projects, this risk is considered to be low. The project is also expected to build additional partnerships with other agricultural development and agricultural services

		provision projects country-wide
Climate change shocks and/or pest and diseases outbreaks may cause seeds shortages that may negatively influence new varieties distribution.	M	The project will address this risk by fostering community-level field observation capacities to reduce seed multiplication failures, and by closely linking with the MDG1c project and other initiatives working on seed production and inputs distribution schemes.
Reluctance to endorse and participate in the project activities by stakeholders and reluctance/ slowness of local institutions to agree on project activities	L	The risk of reluctance of stakeholders is low. Nevertheless it will be addressed through local participation in project implementation. Achievements on the ground that bring benefits to local producers will be demonstrated during the project to overcome skepticism. Regarding local institutions, common objectives will be established by giving emphasis on local ownership of the process as well as building capacity.
Risk of management change in local institution	M	A medium risk of ongoing modification within the framework of the local institutional settings is present. The risk will be addressed by strongly involving local institution at all level, and building appropriate programmes for the involvement of relevant officers and institutional sectors.
Lack of adequate human and material resources for the implementation of this project could disturb the implementation of the various activities.	L	Government capacity is not likely to represent a high risk for the project because the capacity for climate resilient development exists in the country (but is not systematically geared towards explicit and specific CCA goals). However the risk of lack of capacities will be mitigated by mobilizing and articulating the capacity of different actors, projects, programs and bilateral agencies to work intensively with government and gradually transfer skills to government counterparts.
Local populations do not see the benefit of resilient practices.	L	The project will ensure a high level of ownership from the population through the participative FFS approach. This model encourages farmers to actively get involved in order to try out and adopt CCA practices and technologies, and gain experience through a learning-by-doing process. Trainings are given by local facilitators in order to ensure the continuity and appropriation of the learning process by the local population.
Difficulty to perpetuate the equipment provided for the functioning of the soil analysis laboratories because of a lack of long-term financing and involvement from the IIAM and Instituto Superior Politecnico de Manica.	H	The project will conduct an intermediation process with these 2 institutions incentivizing them to include in their respective budget equipment maintenance, staff remuneration and supply of necessary soil analysis input.

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

24. In line with recent development in the GEF portfolio across Africa, the Project Document (Section 4.1.2) provides a detailed and updated description of the approach to ensure efficient coordination with other initiatives.

25. Notably, appropriate coordination will be assured with the following initiatives in the GEF portfolio:

- Strengthening resilience to climate change through integrated agricultural and pastoral management in the Sahelian zone in the framework of the Sustainable Land Management approach in Mali (FAO/LDCF under FAO Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP));
- Strengthening the Resilience of Women Producer Groups and Vulnerable Communities in Mali (UNDP/LDCF);

- Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production for Food Security in Vulnerable Rural Areas in Burkina Faso through the Farmer Field School Approach (FAO/LDCF under FAO Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP)); and
- Land Rehabilitation and Rangeland Management in Smallholder's Agro-pastoral Production Systems in Southwestern Angola (FAO/LD under FAO Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP)).

B. Additional information not addressed at PIF Stage

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

26. FAO will be the GEF Agency responsible for supervision and provision of technical guidance during the project implementation. In addition, FAO will act as executing agency and will deliver procurement and contracting services to the project using FAO's rules and procedures, as well as financial services to manage GEF-LDCF resources. The technical execution of the project will be supported by the Government of Mozambique represented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA). The key partners that will be involved in the project are:

At the national level:

27. The institutions involved in the project's implementation will be:

    - The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA);
    - The National Directorate for Agricultural Extension (DNEA);
    - The National Directorate for Agrarian Services (DNSA);
    - The Mozambique Agriculture Research Institute (IIAM);
    - The Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development (MITADER);
    - The Direction of Cooperation (DC);
    - The National Institute of Meteorology (INAM).

28. MASA will be the lead government counterpart and the project implementing partner. FAO will execute the project as requested by the Mozambique Government in close cooperation with MASA and the other project partners. MASA will be responsible for coordinating project activities and undertaking any activity aimed at supporting the implementation or integration of climate change into local or national policies.

29. Overall responsibility for project implementation and management remains with MASA, National Directorate for Agriculture Extension Services (DNEA), while responsibility for National Climate Change Policy Coordination remains with MITADER and its National Directorate for Environmental Promotion (DNPA), who will designate a focal point to follow-up the implementation of project activities and ensure that the policy and strategic priorities are followed.

At the provincial level

30. At the provincial level, the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture (DPA) will be involved in the implementation of Component 1 and 2 in the respective provinces. The Provincial Services for Agrarian Extension (SPER) will operate through a network of extensions officers in order to implement project's activities. At the district level, extension services will be guided by the District Service for Economic Activities (SDEA), and the team of extentionists.

Non-Governmental Organizations

31. The following civil society organisations will be involved in project activities, as project beneficiaries, contributors to providing extension services, or providing technical support for agro-meteorological information: National Farmers Union (UNAC), District Farmers Unions

(UDAC), and IKURU (farmer apex association), and Radio Mozambique.

Project Coordination

32. The responsibility for the daily project management and implementation will be done by a National Coordination Unit (NCU), based at MASA/DNEA and actuating at district level through the district governmental service for economic activities (SDAE) which includes the local agriculture extension services. At MASA-DNEA, the NCU will remain responsible for the implementation of all project's components, while the SDAE will assume the responsibility for the implementation of components 1 and 2. The DPA will be involved in technical oversight, planning and monitoring and evaluation of the project activities in the respective provinces. For this purpose a provincial facilitator for the project implementation will be recruited and based in the respective DPA.

33. FAO will sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with MITADER, MASA, the DPA and the SDAE (which host the extension services at district level). The MoU will establish the main responsibilities of the partner institutions for the project implementation.

34. The project will achieve a number of key outputs through letters of agreements (LoAs). These letters will be elaborated and signed between FAO and collaborating partners (including service providers). The service provider will then be administratively managed by FAO Mozambique. Funds received by the service provider under a LoA will be used to execute the project activities in conformity with FAO's rules and procedures.

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):

35. The proposed project has a fundamental participatory approach. The involvement of national, provincial and local institutions and partners as well as local communities will be sought throughout the intervention of the project. The participatory and didactic approach adopted at the grass-root level in the project through the FFS system will contribute to avoiding elite capture and to minimizing marginalization at the community level.

36. In order to ensure that communities' perceptions are well represented in project, the FAO SHARP tool will be used and promoted in the project. One of the aims of the tool consists of empowering farmers and rural communities to self-assess their resilience to climate change. SHARP can also be used following a gender disaggregated approach in order to specifically promote self-assessment of women resilience to climate change. The tool can be used for instance to assess the baseline situation and the effects of the project intervention on production, livelihoods, and environmental conservation. SHARP also analyses local level policy frameworks regarding climate resilience. It will be used in the project, to conduct climate risk analysis at FFS level, and to carry out an adaptation needs assessment at district level for the development process of the LAP.

37. The FFS curricula that will be developed under the proposed project will be demand driven and the input of rural communities, including women, will be sought during their development. The identification of integrated local adaptation options at FFS level will be done in a participatory manner in order to take into account and build upon local habits and the available indigenous knowledge. This participatory process will also be gender sensitive ensuring women's perceptions are well represented.

38. Throughout the project, several demonstration sites will be implemented to show the effects and

impacts of different techniques such as the plantation of legume trees, resilient soil and water management practices, plots with improved climate resilient varieties, etc. This demonstration sites will allow farmers to experience the benefits of these new techniques, get familiar with them and use their own judgment to adopt them or not. These techniques will therefore not be forced onto the farmers but rather proposed and promoted as a sustainable alternative. Specific techniques will be promoted to women.

39. The project will support better access to agro-meteorological and resilient seed varieties for farmers. Farmers will also be involved in the identification, collection and preservation of local seed varieties. This will empower local communities in their agricultural practices and will ensure farmer's knowledge and perception are included in project's outputs.

40. Any document and outputs produced through the project intervention such as the FFS-based knowledge building strategy or the LAP will be shared at the provincial and district level after their development. This will ensure the documents are well adapted and understood, which will foster people's ownership over the different outputs.

41. Since the project respects and strengthens existing decision-making processes and institutions at all levels, it should ensure that, although new approaches and technologies will be introduced, they do not lead to social dysfunction or negative social impacts. On the contrary, the project is designed to strengthen social capital, providing a good basis for social sustainability.

42. By making smallholder farmers more resilient to climate change in the provinces of intervention, the project will strengthen their economic development. The project will enable its beneficiaries to better cope with climate change and adapt their agricultural practices. This will minimize the negative impacts of climate change on their crops and income in the long term, therefore contributing to the economic sustainability of the regions of intervention. In addition, farmers will have better access to improved and resilient seed varieties, which will help them increase their yields and therefore their income in the long term. The project will also support local seed production with farmers, mostly for community use at the beginning but with a possibility to enter into formal market later on, which would be an opportunity for additional income.

43. The changes introduced by the project will be developed in a participatory manner and will respect local needs, local resources and local capacity. Hence, the local communities will be able to sustain the economic improvements after the project. Moreover, by strengthening the existing extension system and the capacity of technical agencies (both governmental and non-governmental), the project creates an institutional capacity that can continue support local communities after the project has been completed.

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

44. Cost-effectiveness is at the heart of FAO's Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection's strategy for incorporating CCA concerns into its regular institutional support to sustainable agricultural development in LDCs such as Mozambique. The proposed project design is expected to be highly cost-effective since it builds upon and expand the scope of an existing FFS network that is already operational in several provinces. The project will seek synergies and complementarities with on-going initiatives and programs having similar objectives while avoiding overlaps. All interventions will be coordinated with other GEF projects implemented in the country.

45. Throughout the project, capacities will be strengthened – mainly in CCA, FFS and agro-meteorological products - in different institutions at national, provincial and local level. The staff with strengthened capacity while staying in the country after the end of the project will be able to upscale awareness on CCA and FFS, which will allow the project to limit the use of international experts in a cost-effective manner. Notwithstanding, where national expertise is not available,

making international expertise unique or exceptionally credible, international expert could be used.

46. The proposed project will not establish new FFS but builds directly upon an existing FFS network, built through support from the PSP, MDG1c and Food Security and Nutrition for Gaza projects, which will allow for a significant reduction in costs. These projects have created a core capacity of technical expertise and experience on FFS in Mozambique that will be used by the proposed project. This includes political and technical capacity in the government and extension services as well as technical expertise for FFS master trainers and facilitators that have previously worked in FFS. By building on these past initiatives, the project capitalizes upon previous work to include CCA aspects into the existing FFS curricula and trainings. The project will therefore not have to bear the cost of establishing new FFS. Beyond providing trainings, the project intends to support the agro-meteorological sector by providing equipment such as rain gauges, AWS and GSM. This kind of equipment is not overly expensive and has the potential to introduce a tremendous change in farmers' adaptive capacities regarding their agricultural practices. National staff will also be trained in the use and maintenance of this equipment which will ensure its durability. These investments are therefore deemed cost-effective.

47. The project will support the seed sector and the operations of soil analysis laboratories. The support provided to the seed sector will be cost-effective since it will build upon existing seed producers and providers while being in synergy with the intervention of the PSP and MDG1c projects. The project will support existing systems such as CGIAR's and will strengthen existing entities such as IIAM, the National Seed Dialogue and existing local seed enterprises. This will be done by working with international research centres established in the country such as ICRISAT. By focusing on these well-established entities, the project will ensure that funds will be used in a cost-effective manner since the project will not have to establish new structures. The same can be said for the soil analysis laboratories that are already functional within existing institutions (IIAM and Instituto Superior Politecnico de Manica) with basic equipment and staff available. The project will therefore complement and strengthen the existing structure by providing missing equipment and training staff. The project will not bear the costs of building a lab from scratch. In addition, the investments are deemed cost effective since the project will incentivize the two institutions, through an intermediation process, to include staff remuneration and supply of necessary soil analysis inputs in their respective budget to cover staff costs and equipment maintenance.

48. Cost-effectiveness will also be achieved through knowledge management, synergies and complementarities. Precious knowledge on climate change threats and mitigation practices and strategies does exist both at grass-roots and institutional levels, but it is poorly systematized, shared and disseminated. Good operational lessons learned and practices for enhanced adaptation to climate risk of the agricultural sector will be developed and disseminated by the project. While the cost of producing a report on the matter is not high, the impacts of the application of such lessons learned could have in the agricultural sector is tremendous. The project also encompasses close cooperation with the on-going GEF projects, as well as with a series of other externally funded initiatives.

49. The project intends to develop investment proposals for the financing of more effective extension strategies for mainstreaming and upscaling CCA in the agricultural sector. While drafting such proposal has a limited cost, their effectiveness and impacts is particularly important since it will allow future investments to mainstream CCA in other initiatives, even after the end of the project.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN

1. The project document provides a detailed description of the monitoring, reporting and evaluation to be undertaken during the project (Section 4.5).

2. Full details of indicators, baseline values and targets are presented in Appendix 1 (Results Matrix).

3. Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow 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 Matrix presented in Appendix 1 of the project document. The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been budgeted at US$ 110,000 (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.

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

Table 3: Summary of M&E related costs

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 two months of project start up	Covered by output 1.1
Surveys to determine AMAT baseline values	NCU and service providers	Within three months of project start up	USD 0 - data is collected by the NCU.
Project Inception Report	NCU, cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH, and the GCU	No later than one month post IW.	USD 0 - project inception report is developed by the NCU.
Field based impact monitoring	NCU, MASA and other relevant agencies – including regional and provincial - to participate.	Periodically - to be determined at inception workshop.	USD 20,000
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 CTA will be paid from the project travel budget
Project Progress Reports	NCU, with inputs from MASA, PSC members and other partners	Semi-annual	USD 0 (as completed by CTA and NCU)
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.	USD 0 - data is collected by the NCU.
Co-financing Reports	NCU, FAO Mozambique	Annual	Completed by NPC and CTA
Technical reports	NCU, LTO & Participating Units	As appropriate	USD 10,000 (Report on best practices and lessons learned)
Mid-term Evaluation/Review	External Consultant, in case of MTE: 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	Under the responsibility of FAO Office of Evaluation in consultation with the	At the end of project implementation	USD 40,000 for external, independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee

	project team including the GCU and other partners		will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Terminal Report	NCU, LTO, TCSR Report Unit	At least two months before the end date of the Execution Agreement	USD 0 (as completed by CTA and NPC)
		Total Budget	USD 110,000

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)*
Marilia Telma Antonio Manjate	Director or Cooperation and UNFCCC and GEF national Focal Point	Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development (MITADER)	03.11.2013

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		03.19.2015	Caterina Batello, Team leader AGPME, FAO Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection Rome, ITALY	+3906 5705 3643	Caterina.Batello@fao.org
Jeff Griffin Senior Coordinator Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department GEF Unit Email: Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org Tel: +3906 5705 55680					

Appendices

Appendix A: Project Results Framework

Please see Appendix 1 of FAO GEF Project Document

Appendix B– Response to comments received at PIF approval.

	Comments received from GEF Sec	**Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)**
1	By CEO Endorsement, the role of local and national CSOs could be further explored.	Section 1.4 presents the key stakeholders who will be involved in the project, including those at the provincial and district levels. Civil Society Organizations that have been identified as potential implementation partners during the inception workshop in Maputo have also been listed here.

	Comments received from US Government	**Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)**
1	With a view toward further strengthening this PIF, we would like to request FAO, as it prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, to provide more information regarding the effectiveness of the current FFS program and how the additional activities funded by the LDCF will increase its effectiveness. In other words, how effective has the delivery of agricultural techniques or technology been thus far?	The overall approach to FFS is discussed in Section 2.1.1, which integrates a section specifically on FFS in Mozambique. Section 1.5 on lessons learned also describes the effectiveness of the FFS approach, based on scientific literature. Furthermore, the additionality section clearly demonstrates how the activities funded by the LDCF will be a cost-effective measure to integrate CCA in current FFS projects in Mozambique. Further explanations on the FFS approach and its effectiveness are provided for Comment # 2 (below) and in particular for the STAP Comment # 6.
2	Clarify how users will be involved in program design. 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 FAO additionally work with the farmers to ensure they successfully implement the practices learned through FFS?	During the PPG, 2 workshops were organized in Maputo, gathering the views and input from a large variety of stakeholders including direct beneficiaries. These initial consultation meetings should ensure that users are (i) aware of the project's overall objective, and (ii) that their views were comprehensively covered in the initial project design. Various provincial and district level workshops and trainings are planned through Component 1 and Component 2 to make sure that all stakeholders are engaged all along the project implementation.

		Moreover, the project design recognizes that cultural values (e.g. linked to food preparation/preferences) and traditions (such as agricultural production methods) in a rural set-ups hardly change unless farmers see an intermediate need for a change. In order to ensure social acceptance by targeted groups, and eventual wide-scale sustainable adoption of improved crops, as well as climate change adapted tools and practices, the project will use participatory approaches such as the FFS and SHARP. These approaches will make sure that farmers firstly receive all necessary information based on their own knowledge and experience (e.g. changing climate and expected impact on crops and livelihood), and secondly that all the interventions will meet, not only the norm of the social system, but also the different needs of women and men. In this way it will be the farmers having a direct impact on the detailed project design along the process of implementation according to their priorities and needs.
3	Provide more information on 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	The involvement and inclusion of women is discussed in Section 1.2.3: *Additionality*. At present, FFS are tailored for men and women needs. Different FFS curricula are designed for different farming systems and crops. These different FFS modules allow for a distinct set of activities focusing on crops that are traditionally grown by men and women. However, no FFS in place takes into consideration CC. More specifically, in the present project Component 2 aims at securing a high participation of women in the FFS training provided by the updated curricula with clear targets (30%, see Outcome indicators 2.1 and 2.2). Technologies and approaches will be tailored for men and women's needs and traditions throughout the implementation of the project. Also, gender tools such as

		Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA) will be applied.
4	Describe how it will work with organizations like ACMAD and AGRYHMET to characterize climate risks to inform when adaptation strategies should be applied	INAM will be the service provider for the dissemination of agro-meteorological data. The proposed project will build on the work of ACMAD and AGRYHMET on meteorology and on climate modelling, forecasting, and prediction. INAM and other national stakeholders will continue collaborating with ACMAD and AGRYHMET (although AGRYHMET does not directly work in Mozambique) throughout the project's lifetime in order to facilitate the flow of accurate information. This will improve the quality of agro-meteorological data available to farmers and pastoralists. The agro-meteorological information will be tailored to suit the needs of agro-pastoralists to enable a 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. Furthermore, some training will be organised at ACMAD, as discussed in Section 2.4, under Component 2, focusing on training opportunities in agro-meteorology.
5	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 there is a lack of capital investment and positive incentives for sustainable rural development (pg. 6)	The efficiency and sustainability of the FFS approach is explained in more details in Section 1.5 on lessons learned and Section 5 on sustainability. As discussed in the FFS approach section, the bottom-up approach of FFS is aimed at ensuring sustainability of the project, by providing training opportunities and training of trainers. The FFS is based on a network of local facilitators that will ensure sustainability of climate change adaptation education. Furthermore, Component 3 of the project aims at integrating CCA strategies (which include the FFS as effective extension system) in policies as a means to ensure sustainability..

	Comments received from UK Government	**Action/reference (references**

		refer to FAO Project Document)
1	The proposal needs to be clearer on how this will support implementation of the new national climate change strategy (this is mentioned but then not discussed as a key policy document) and in particular how indicators can be aligned with the national M&E framework for the strategy (currently under discussion between ministries - and with support of WB, DFID and GIZ)	The new Gender, Environment, and Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan is presented in Section 1.2.1 as part of the baseline information required in the project document. Several project activities will be linked to this strategy and action plan as described in the project strategy, especially under Output 1.2 and 1.3.
2	Mention should also be made that the World Bank's Development Policy Operation (DPO) includes a policy action series to support the scale-up of climate resilient agriculture. It is important that FAO coordinates closely with World Bank on this issue.	See comment below
3	The discussion of the SPCR and PPCR are inaccurate in places, this also points a need for much closer coordination with World Bank e.g. the PPCR is not 'sponsored' by the World Bank - it is a multi-donor TF that is administered by WB, the names of PPCR-supported pilots are also wrong.	The project will closely collaborate with the World Bank SPCR and PPCR as elaborated on in Section 4.1.2 on coordination and collaborations with other projects and as a result of Output 2.5.
4	The Ministry of Agriculture's department of extension services do not appear to be aware of this document (perhaps they were involved in initial discussions but not since?) and we would therefore urge the proponents to share this document and provide sufficient time for their review and inputs before this proceeds further. Their inputs will be crucial for ensuring that this support is harmonised with Government policy and emerging efforts to scale-up climate resilient agriculture.	Indeed, the role of MASA has been altered since the PIF and is now playing the lead role on the implementation of the project. MASA and the National Directorate for Agriculture Extension (DNEA) are presented in the Stakeholder Analysis Section, as well as the section on Institutional Arrangements. DNEA will be a lead department in the implementation of the project. MASA officers were consulted and were involved in planning meetings, and co-organised the project validation workshop held in November 2014.
5	Overall though, we are very pleased to see FAO coming in behind climate resilient agriculture but better coordination should be strongly encouraged	Since the PIF, the roles and responsibilities of all key stakeholders have been discussed and more clearly defined. An organizational chart is presented in Section 4.2.4 which demonstrates the institutional arrangements for the implementation of the project among all the key stakeholders.

	Comments received from German Government	**Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)**
1	Germany welcomes the proposed project and its integration into	The results, experiences, best

	activities and efforts of several national programmes and interventions by other donors. Germany would like to recommend that experiences made within the mainstreaming activities of component 1 and 3, as well as the knowledge resulting from the best practices research and piloting climate resilient crops and varieties, are managed in order to make them accessible to others. This will serve upscaling activities and could also feed in the revision of the 'Strategic Plan for Development of the Agricultural Sector' (PEDSA) and the 'National Investment Program for the Agricultural Sector' (PNISA).	practices, and lessons learned of the project will be available and discussed through a variety of forums, such as publications and presentations for all to benefit. Component 3 of the project is solely based on mainstreaming CCA strategies into agricultural sector policies and programs with emphasis on rural-extension/outreach strategies and plans. Therefore, knowledge and experiences gained through the implementation of the project will indeed feed into the revision of the PEDSA and the PNISA. Output 1.5 focuses on producing and disseminating climate resilient crops and seeds. The knowledge resulting from the best practices research and piloting climate resilient crop and varieties will be accessible to a wide range of stakeholders, since it will be developed in direct collaboration with IIAM, local smallholder farmers, extension officers and local seed companies.
2	In addition, Germany suggests that the proposed project considers experiences currently being made in the project 'Adaptation to climate change in rural and urban areas of Mozambique' (ACC RUA) financed by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). This project implements early warning systems on a demonstration basis and raises awareness at the local level in rural areas as well as in informal settlements in the city of Beira. It further strengthens the capacity of provincial and district administrations, committees, cooperatives and non-governmental organizations to enable them to implement adaptation measures with target groups. At the national level ACC RUA supports the 'National Disaster Reduction Institute' (INGC) in integrating gender issues and using the monitoring of adaptation activities to manage interventions strategically. It further supports the 'Ministry of Environment' in its adaptation mainstreaming activities and the climate proofing of land use planning.	Meetings were held during PPG with the GIZ coordinator in Maputo and linkages were discussed. The GIZ coordinator was also invited to the validation workshop. The vast majority of activities, which will be implemented through this LDCF projects, complement the ones implemented by ACC RUA. CCA capacities and awareness of district and provincial administration, especially extension services, will be strengthened. Support will also be provided to INGC CERUM to build their capacities in CCA monitoring and to provide support to monitor progress towards more climate-proof production systems. MITADER will also be supported in developing Local Adaptation Plans for the 15 targeted districts based on its own existing methodology.

	Comments received from STAP	**Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)**

1	It would be useful to express more succinctly the project objective, so the adaptation objectives are explicit. Currently, the objectives are not clearly worded.	The objectives have been revised accordingly.
2	STAP recommends specifying further the expected outputs and outcomes by identifying indicators on what will be measured (example: percentage of soil, water, and crop management practices adopted by farmers (sub-activity 1.1.5)). Doing so, will help measure the intended effect of each intervention. Also, it appears as if some outputs are outcomes, and vice-versa. The project developers may wish to review the project framework in this regard.	The project aims to build capacity, thus most measurable indicators are with regards to the number of participants trained, the percentage of women benefiting from the trainings, the percentage of targeted groups adopting adaptation technologies and the percentage of target groups that have access to agro-meteorological techniques (see outcome indicators 1.2, 2.1 and 2.2). These indicators relate to GEF/LDCF AMAT indicators. The project framework has been revised and updated to make it more consistent.
3	Although the concept of farmer field schools is widely known in the agricultural field, STAP suggests defining what is meant by the "farmer field schools methodology", and how it has proven (or intends) to increase agricultural productivity and improve farmers' livelihoods. The concept appears not to be defined in the proposal, and the evidence of farmer field schools could be detailed further by drawing from sources (example: unpublished rigorous studies, published documents). More importantly, the proposal needs to assess the farmer field schools approach with regards to climate change adaptation and climate resilience. This information appears absent in the proposal.	Section 2.1.1 presents the FFS approach, as well as its weakness and benefits, while also discussing how CCA has been integrated. This is followed by a description of the FFS approach in Mozambique and its current successes in the training of farmers and the application of new agricultural approaches. The project will also use the SHARP tool for the establishment of FFS as participatory community analysis of climate resilience. Additional elements responding to this comment are also provided in the answer to STAP Comment #6 below.
4	Component 1, 2 and 3 seek to involve different individuals (and institution) potentially with distinct preferences and needs on mainstreaming climate resilience and development strategies across different levels at the community, district, and national levels. Understanding the inter-linkages between how farmers perceive and address climate resilience amidst other on-going adaptation efforts stemming from baseline projects, district and national attempts, is imperative to formulating appropriate adaptation responses and policies. This notion is detailed further in the following paper that provides a useful framework for working across multiple institutional scales on climate change adaptation in Mozambique. FAO may wish to draw upon this literature to strengthen the role of multiple engagements (institutions) across the components, given the number of stakeholders involved and the intended outcomes: Osbahr, H. et al "Effective livelihood adaptation to climate change disturbance: Scale dimensions of practice in Mozambique". Geoforum 39, page 1951-1964. 2008.	The article is referenced in Section 4.2.1 in a footnote. It has been read and taken into consideration in the development of the institutional arrangements in the project document.
5	In component 2, STAP recommends defining	The climate-resilient agricultural practices are detailed

	further the climate-resilient agricultural practices the project will strengthen. Currently, agricultural practices are only broadly defined in the proposal in component 2. Additionally, it appears the proposal does not identify the livestock management practices for example, will these include mixed crop-livestock approaches? It also would be valuable to detail further how climate vulnerability is expected to influence the agro-ecological conditions in each of the target areas, and how each proposed practice/technology intends to reduce farmers and pastoralists vulnerability to climate change. The project developers may wish to refer to the following paper that analyzes the determinants of adaptation measures in agricultural, and livestock systems: Bryan, E. et al. "Adapting agriculture to climate change in Kenya: Household strategies and determinants". Journal of Environmental Management. (2013). Pages, 26-35.	under Activity 1.3.2 and 2.1.1 as follows: Use of soil analysis, conservation agriculture practices, use of compost, IPPM, erosion control measures, reforestation, integration of crop-livestock productions, use of fodder and forages into crop rotation, use of adapted seeds of major crops and seeds adapted to animal use, introduction of perennial crops and agroforestry, agro-ecology use of cover crops with nitrogen fixing species, and mitigation options for pesticides-induced risks. The potential list of practices does include mixed crop-livestock production practices. The project will not analyze climate vulnerability as such. However, appropriate agro-meteorological decision support tools will help farmers to take informed decisions on the technologies to be applied. Also, the project will analyze initial farmers' and herders' resilience to climate change through the use of SHARP. Although not focusing in climate vulnerability, the tool allows analyzing the pros and cons of the present agricultural techniques, and will help farmers and herders to rank their priority interventions for climate resilience. As stated in the article Bryan, E. et al. "Adapting agriculture to climate change in Kenya: Household strategies and determinants", even though few households were able to make productive investment in their farming operation to adapt to climate change, effective policy lever exists to support the adoption of adaptation strategies. Access to extension services and climate information is for instance deemed effective to incentivize farmers to adopt adaptation practices. Participants in the study also considered that off-farm investments, such as increasing human and organizational capacity and technical trainings could play an important role in the adoption of new technologies. It can therefore be foreseen that the proposed project will introduce significant changes, since it will provide many of the above mentioned determinants to change. Collective work and raising awareness on the efficiency of the practices promoted is also considered as an important means of creating change in farming practices, which is at the heart of the FFS approach and the proposed project.
6	As noted above, STAP is pleased that FAO will draw upon its experiences on farmer field schools, including FAO/GEF projects relying on the methodology. Thus, STAP suggests for FAO to draw-upon its recommendations on GEF project #4270 (Angola). These recommendations include the following: i. Based on experiences from East Africa, the literature suggests the evidence base for success in using the farmer field schools (FFS) model is somewhat limited, particularly on the impact on agricultural production and income (see Davis, K. et al "Impact of Farmer Field Schools on Agricultural Productivity and Poverty in East Africa". World Development,	(i) The article that was mentioned, proposes measurements that are mostly related to farm participation, as well as crop and livestock production. As a result, the article demonstrates the effectiveness of farmer groups in enhancing access to rural services, and improved income and productivity. However, at the same time there are significant differences in effectiveness due to country, poverty, gender, fertility, and literacy rate levels. FAO East Africa is adopting an M&E scheme depicting a wider spectrum of livelihood indicators that are not taken into consideration by the article. We consider FFS to be an experimental and learning-centered approach that bases its own success on community involvement through validation, adaptation and adoption of

	40, 402-413. 2012). STAP urges the proponents to adopt a more experimental and learning-centered approach to FFS to identify the model that best suits Mozambique's socio-economic and agricultural/livestock systems. ii. FAO also may wish to consider building experimental design into the proposal, given their significant experience with farmer field schools in Africa. By doing so, FAO would help strengthen evidence on the impact of farmer field schools on agricultural and rangeland management, and the socioeconomic conditions of small-herders and farmers. For further consultation on how to include experimental design in GEF projects, FAO may wish to consult STAP's advisory document "Experimental Project Designs in the Global Environment Facility: Designing projects to create evidence and catalyze investments to secure global environmental benefits, 2011".	technologies and approaches. The disagreement in monitoring processes depends on the great differences existing between FFS approaches. For this we thank STAP for highlighting the importance of a more centered learning approach. Findings from the article "Farmer Field Schools in rural Kenya: A transformative learning experience" (Duveskog et al., 2010) revealed significant impacts demonstrated by a personal transformation; changes in gender roles and relations, customs and traditions, community relations, and an increase in the economic development of households. Friis-Hansen et al., 2012, also suggested that the most significant impact of FFS could be viewed in terms of building the capacity of local people to make choices and make decisions that ultimately lead to an increased uptake of agricultural innovations, access to services and market access, as well as collective action. A major conclusion of the study is that agricultural development programs should focus more on the processes of empowering farmers as opposed to technical solutions that characterize most programs, in order to create an appropriate mix of technological and social advancements for a development process that is sustainable in the nature. The recent publication, "Supporting communities in building resilience through APFS" (http://www.fao.org/docrep/019/i3512e/i3512e.pdf), explores potentials for Uganda's success story to be converted to a framework for policy recommendations. Tola (Ethiopia) reports that, the APFS became a community managed learning platform that shows a remarkable achievement from the pilot stage. With the aim of discussing the impacts of FFS at a global arena and to confront opinions in future development of FFS, FAO organized a FFS global review (https://dgroups.org/fao/ffs-eforum2). The results will soon be published, reflecting a global consensus on the FFS success stories. The focus was not on "production" as the forum widely discussed the shift in the FFS's concept to other expected impacts. One central comment describes that "A field school lies in the methodology of delivery for which there might be certain uniformity despite the subject in focus. This is characterizing the ongoing shift that FFS have taken from IPM/IPPM FFS, to poultry FFS, forestry FFS, climate change FFS, CMDRR FFS, pastoral FS. [...] Integration and holistic planning is the issue here". That is to deal with the success of ecosystem management, that can only be achieved through involving a wide range of stakeholders. In fact, while certain actions can only be handled by the communities, others require the government, local leaders and indigenous groups to be actively involved in the process to realize success and achieve wider impacts. Also, certain actions may require specialized institutions to tap into the cohesive strength of the FFS. For this, the method also has to build the capacities of different stakeholders to support certain

		activities. The kind of information/training passed on to the different levels of stakeholders is different. What is appropriate and relevant to the farmer will differ from what is appropriate and relevant to government officials. With this expanded APFS concept, a forum member from Kenya reported that "livelihood improvement for the beneficiaries is enormous and sustainability aspects have been ensured while commercialization of most activities was achieved as farmers understood the science associated with each technology". A comment from a post-socialist country, Kyrgyzstan, explains that the "FFS served the goal of facilitating the change from collectivity-based to private farming. However, when visiting FFS training programmes at that time, one got the distinct impression that they were of considerable value to farmers in increasing their self-confidence and self-reliance in coping with the new challenges". This expanded FFS system is based on endogenous farmers' and herders' knowledge. It supports expanded community and decision makers' capacity building, and harmonizes various approaches into a single tool and will be the foundation leading to the success of the present project. (ii) It would be valuable to strengthen the evidence of the impact that FFSs have on agriculture and rangeland. Nonetheless, we think there is not the possibility to apply an experimental design in view of the various M&E suggestions which are present in many of the STAP comments (see Comment 7). During the development of similar GEF projects, FAO was requested to decrease the quantity of knowledge related activities, as well as to reduce the amount of GEF funds for soft activities. FAO was also requested to assign more resources to activities on the ground. In this framework, the use of an elaborate monitoring scheme diverts resources and risks going against GEF reviewer requests. As the project intervention will cover a wide area, an experimental monitoring scheme would be very costly. On the other hand, by using a typical M&E scheme those expenses are reduced and more resources could address CCA in agricultural production and improve livelihoods. Finally, we are doubtful regarding the cost-effectiveness of such an experimental scheme. A usual time frame to evaluate a large-scale intervention is defined as 10 years (i.e. as defined by the LADA Project). Will it really be significant to design an experimental method to cover a 4 year intervention?
7	It appears that a significant proportion of small-holder farmers are women in Mozambique (http://www.wfp.org/purchase-progress/blog/mozambique-%E2%80%93-un-agencies-combine-efforts-help-farmers) If the same gender distribution characterizes the agricultural, or livestock, sector in the target areas, STAP highly encourages FAO to further	Promoted technologies will be specifically targeting both men and women, as explained in the project strategy. Most indicators set-out for monitoring results are gender disaggregated and will contribute to measure the impact of FFS on female headed household

	delineate the proposed farmer field schools by gender. The reference cited above (Davis, K et al), also provides compelling evidence on the impact of farmer field schools on female-headed households ("At the project level, per capita agricultural (crop and livestock) income of female headed households increased by 187 % while the equivalent income for male-headed households did not change significantly at 10% level".)	incomes. 30% of direct beneficiaries will target specifically women.
8	In the full proposal, STAP recommends defining more explicitly the adaptation benefits, and identifying indicators for each one. This will help estimate and monitor the adaptation outcomes, and strengthen the additional cost reasoning.	Adaptation benefits have been defined in the project strategy (outcomes and outputs) and specific monitoring indicators have been developed to measure adaptation outcomes. This is detailed in Section 2.3.

Appendix C– Status of Implementation of Project Preparation Activities and the Use of Funds

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: $200,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	**GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NCIF/ *Amount ($) 100,000***		
	Budgeted Amount	***Amount Spent To date***	***Amount Committed***
1. Elaborate Component 1. Stakeholder analysis, capacity needs assessment, and selection of practices, varieties and areas for the piloting of climate-resilient agricultural practices through the FFS process	17,552	17,552	
2. Elaborate Component 2. Technical studies for the analysis and design of the CCA FFS programme activities	77,966	77,966	
3. Elaborate Component 3. Planning of activities to mainstream climate change adaptation strategies into agricultural sector policies and programs, with emphasis on rural development sector policies	19,352	19,352	
4. Stakeholder consultations	43,252	43,252	
5. Analysis of execution options and assessment of fiduciary standards	10,778	0	
6. Information Synthesis, Project Design & Budgeting	31,100	32,100	9,778
Total	200,000	190,222	9,778[2]

[2] The remaining budget has been allocated for the translation of the project document into Portuguese.