



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: LDCF

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Mainstreaming ecosystem-based approaches to climate-resilient rural livelihoods in vulnerable rural areas through the Farmer Field School methodology			
Country(ies):	Senegal	GEF Project ID:¹	5503
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	625461
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministère Agriculture et Equipement Rural (MAER); Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable (MEDD); Agence Nationale de l'Aviation Civile et de la Météorologie du Sénégal (ANACIM) ; Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE)	Submission Date:	28/08/2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration(Months)	50
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	591,755

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCA – 1	Outcome 1.1	Output 1.1.1	LDCF	900,000	3,555,000
CCA – 2	Outcome 2.1	Output 2.1.2	LDCF	898,377	3,555,000
CCA – 2	Outcome 2.2	Output 2.2.1	LDCF	1,500,000	5,925,000
CCA – 2	Outcome 2.2	Output 2.2.2	LDCF	1,400,000	5,530,000
CCA – 3	Outcome 3.1	Output 3.1.1	LDCF	534,000	2,109,300
CCA – 3	Outcome 3.2	Output 3.2.2	LDCF	700,000	3,933,085
		Subtotal		5,932,377	24,607,385
		Project Management Cost		296,618	
Total project costs				6,228,995	24,607,385

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To enhance the capacity of Senegal's agro-pastoral sector to develop more climate-resilient production systems and mainstream integrated Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) strategies into on-going agro-pastoral and agricultural development policies and programmes.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Developing /fine-tuning of CCA strategies and tools based on improved knowledge and information management of CCA practices in agro-sylvo-pastoral systems.	TA	1.1: Increased understanding and capacities to systematically gather and disseminate agro-climatic data to identify and improve best CCA practices and innovations in targeted agro-ecological zones.	1.1.1: ANACIM and CSE have analyzed CC related threats, opportunities and constraints and proposed an integrated strategy for CCA by specific project area. 1.1.2: Information management systems and tools used by the national GTP are strengthened and updated to include information related to climate change and, local GTPs are established and participate in the agro-climate advisory system.	LDCF	923,750	3,905,696
2. Capacity building and upscaling of CCA strategies, technologies, and best practices for small agro-sylvo-pastoral producers through a growing network of Farmer Field Schools.	INV	2.1: The agro-climatic information is disseminated and improved CCA practices and innovations are adopted by agro-pastoralists.	2.1.1: Specific curricula for FFS/APFS is revised in light of CCA , resilience of ecosystems and the integration between agricultural production systems, sylvo-pastoral systems and other cross-cutting themes such as nutrition and gender. 2.1.2: Master Trainers are qualified on CCA practices and strategies, on gender issues and nutrition. 2.1.3: FFS are implemented or	LDCF	1,947,425	8,695,357

			<p>strengthened to integrate CCA practices in production systems and producers are trained.</p> <p>2.1.4: Dimitra Listeners' Clubs (CLC) are established and strengthened and integrated within the Farmer Field school network.</p> <p>2.1.5: Good practices and lessons learned for better adaptation to climate risk are capitalized on and disseminated locally.</p>			
		<p>2.2: Household incomes and agricultural and livestock productivity of FFS/AFPS participants have increased through the use of CCA practices, agro-meteorological information and improved crop and beef production value chains.</p>	<p>2.2.1: Agro-sylvo-pastoral producer's organizations are strengthened through the adoption of new technologies and innovations for CCA, improved production and the enhancement of value chains.</p> <p>2.2.2: At least one producer per FFS multiplies and marketing CC adapted seeds with high nutritional values</p> <p>2.2.3: New adapted varieties of cereals, fruits and vegetables and fodder species are introduced into target areas to improve the food and nutritional security of the population.</p> <p>2.2.4: The Land use plan and allocation of land uses (POAS) and plans for the management of</p>	LDCF	1,843,825	8,595,357

			pastures and livestock grazing areas are reinforced with the participation of farmers' associations, livestock producers and local authorities				
3. Mainstreaming CCA strategies in a coordinated manner into agricultural and livestock related policies, development framework programs and projects at the national level and in selected vulnerable areas.	TA	3.1: CCA is mainstreamed into policies, strategies and national programs, shifting from a reactive response to a proactive preparedness approach.	3.1.1: Awareness-raising modules for policy makers are developed and institutional capacities are strengthened to mainstream CCA in policies, programs and projects 3.1.2: The establishment of a high-level inter sectoral group to define and adopt the agenda of CCA activities and resilience to integrate into policies, programs and projects	LDCF	146,625	1,802,327	
		3.2: A "national CC resilience fund" is in place within an existing funding mechanism to support local CCA activities.	3.2.1: A "National Resilience Fund" is created through an open window at the level of existing funds.	LDCF	755,625	788,648	
4. Project monitoring and evaluation	TA	4.1: Project implementation based on results based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated	4.1.1: System for systematic collection of field-based data to monitor project outcome indicators made operational 4.1.2: Midterm and final evaluation conducted 4.1.3: Communications strategy developed	LDCF	315,127	820,000	
Subtotal						5,932,377	24,607,385
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				LDCF	296,618		
Total project costs						6,228,995	24,607,385

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	200,000
Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment (MAER) through the Agricultural Value Chain Support Project – Extension (PAFA-E) financed by IFAD	Grant	3,321,254
Government	The Ministry for livestock and animal industries (MEPA) and MAER through the Project to support Food Security in the regions of Louga, Matam and Kaffrine (PASALouMaKaf)	Grant	9,769,939
Government	The Ministry for the Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) and MAER through the Project to Support Local Small-Scale Irrigation in the areas of Fatick, Kédougou, Kolda et Tambacounda. (PAPIL)	Grant	4,225,390
Government	MAER through the Program for support to Agricultural Development and Rural Entrepreneurship (PADAER) financed by IFAD	Grant	4,022,146
Government	Agency for the Great Green Wall (AGMV) / MEDD through the Great Green Wall initiative	Grant	3,068,656
Total Co-financing			24,607,385

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Funds	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	Grant Amount (\$ (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b) ²	Total (\$) c=a+b
FAO	LDCF	Climate Change	Senegal	6,228,995	591,755	6,820,750
Total Grant Resources				6,228,995	591,755	6,820,750

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	188,000	540,000	728,000
National/Local Consultants	880,200	3,000,000	3,880,200
Total	1,068,200	3,540,000	4,608,200

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

The project design is fully aligned with the PIF. Minor changes to the structure of outcomes have been made and outputs were further detailed. Changes have been explained under section A.5 below. In addition, the project duration was extended to 5 years to exploit an additional full growing season, maximizing the return from project activities in terms of environmental, social and economic benefits.

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

The PIF provides an accurate description of the Project's alignment to national strategies and plans. More detailed information is provided in the Project Document in Sections 1.4 and 1.10.

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

The PIF provides an accurate description of the Project's alignment to GEF focal areas and strategies. More detailed information is provided in the Project Document in Section 1.10 c).

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage

The PIF provides an accurate description of the FAO's comparative advantage to implement this Project. More detailed Information is provided in the Project Document in Section 1.7.

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

The PIF provided a description of the problem to be addressed. The Project Document has further elaborated the relevance and background of the LDCF project, including a more detailed description of the problem to be addressed. Notably, Sections 1.1 and 1.2 of the Project Document provide a detailed overview of the relevant rural sectors in the project areas in Senegal, climate change and climate variability impacts, and related threats to farmers and herders. Section 1.2 also provides an analysis of the barriers to adapting to climate change and increasing climate resilience of the agro-sylvo-pastoral communities in the project area. These are fully in line with the analysis made in the PIF and can be summarized as follows:

- Poor access to accurate agro-climatic information;
- Weak consideration of traditional knowledge and CC local adaptation practices
- Insufficient knowledge and limited local capacity to cope with CC threats;
- Lack of coordination between CCA practices in projects and programs and the relevance of sectoral approaches as opposed to integrated and holistic approaches;
- Lack of clear and consistent display of policies, projects and budget line programs for financing CCA activities

The PIF also provided a tentative description of baseline projects. During project preparation a thorough analysis of baseline projects was undertaken and further partnership were explored. The following table lists 5 projects that form the baseline (adapted from Table 1 in Project Document).

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

Title	Lead Agency	Funding and period	Co-financing amount (USD)
Agricultural Value Chain Support Project – Extension (PAFA-E)	Executed by MAER	IFAD financing: USD 34.7M Duration: 2013 – 2021	3,321,254
Project to support food security in the regions of Louga, Matam and Kaffrine (PASALouMaKaf)	Executed by MEPA and MAER	BAD/GAFSA financing: USD 49.6M Duration: 2013-2018	9,769,939
Program for support to Agricultural Development and Rural Entrepreneurship (PADAER)	Executed by MAER	IFAD financing: USD 51,7M Duration: 2011-217	4,022,146
Project to Support Local Small-Scale Irrigation in the areas of Fatick, Kédougou, Kolda et Tambacounda. (PAPIL) This project will be extended to become: the National Development Project of smallholder irrigation (PNDPIL)	Executed by MEDD MH MAER	BAD and BID: USD 14,5M Duration: 2003-2015 BAD and BID: USD 94M Duration: 2016-2022	4,225,390
The Great Green Wall Initiative (GGWI)	Executed by Senegalese Great Green Wall National Agency AGMV/MEDD	Multi-donor (FAO, UNCCD, GEF, EC, World Bank, and others)	3, 068,656

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

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

Partner	Co-financing as stated in PIF (USD)	Actual Co-Financing (USD)
MAER/IFAD - <i>PAFA-E</i>	5,000,000 (including financing for MAER – <i>PADAER</i>)	3,321,254
MAER/IFAD - <i>PADAER</i>	See row above	4,022,146
MEPA/MAER - <i>PASA LouMaKaf</i>	2,000,000	9,769,939
MEDD/MAER/MH – <i>PAPIL</i>	7,895,000	4,225,390
AGMV - <i>GMV</i>	-	3,068,656
Presidency of the Government of Senegal - USA Millennium Challenge Compact	5,000,000	-
FAO	1,000,000	200,000
Totals	20,895,000	24,607,385

The total co-financing has increased from the level anticipated in the PIF.

- The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MAER) direct contribution is higher than anticipated, increasing from about USD 5 M to USD 7.3 M. This illustrates MAER’s commitment to the Project, its increased understanding of climate change, and openness to using Farmer Field School and Agro-Pastoral Field School approaches as a means to increase resilience of the related rural sectors.
- The Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) co-financing has remained mostly unchanged from the level anticipated in the PIF.
- The Ministry of Livestock and Animal Production (MEPA) has increased its commitment to the project mobilising additional resources through its flagship project PASA LouMaKaf.
- The level of co-financing from FAO is less than anticipated. This is because the projects identified at PIF stage are still under negotiation with donors.
- Finally, the Project has mobilized additional co-financing from the National Agency of the Great Green Wall towards the improvement of knowledge and information management of CCA practices in agro-sylvo-pastoral areas along the Great Green Wall trajectory mainly in northern Senegal.

Project Framework

The PIF provided a description of the outcomes, outputs, activities and strategies to be supported by the Project. The problem analysis that was undertaken during the PPG validated the overall strategy and approach of the PIF. It further defined and elaborated on the outcomes and outputs in order to better address remaining barriers to sustainable climate adaptation and maximise opportunities offered through the baseline initiatives and other projects, programmes, policies and strategies. Modifications made to the project framework are listed in the following tables. A detailed description of the activities is provided in the Project Document, [Section 2.4](#), and in [Appendix 1 \(Results Matrix\)](#).

Table of modifications to former PIF Outcome/Outputs

Former PIF Outcome/Output (only those with modifications are listed)	Comment
Outcome 1.2 Fine-tuned and piloted agroecosystems-specific strategies for increasing CC resilience developed to be scaled up	This Outcome and related Outputs (1.2.1 and 1.2.2) have been integrated within the redefined Outcome 2, with new Outputs 2.1.5 and 2.2.1.
Output 2.1.1 A core of national program managers have the potential for mainstreaming CCA in rural development, using the FFS/APFS approaches, through field and institutional visits to neighboring countries where upscaling is already taking place	The expected output is now integrated within Outcome 3, particularly Output 3.1.1
Outcome 2.3 Use of climate information reinforced at provincial/local levels and in FFS networks for forecasting agricultural production and to increase production and to increase production, thus reducing food insecurity during climate shocks	This has been incorporated in Outcome 2.1.

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

The risk analysis has been further detailed during project preparation and mitigation measures have been included in the project design as follows:

Risks	Rating (High, Substantial, Moderate, Low)	Mitigation Measures
Probability of increased occurrence of more severe droughts, especially in the South, which may affect crop and livestock cycles and increase food/nutritional insecurity	M	The risk will be addressed through the implementation of policies and programmes to reinforce pro-active and coordinated responses and developing plans for rangelands management and by fostering community capacities to anticipate CC related threats. In addition, the project will prioritize the selection of drought-resilient crops to cope with climate change.
Farmers / herders conflict	M	Reinforcing protocols on Chartes and management arrangements, ensuring that the rights of each stakeholder are preserved and duties defined, will be the mitigation measure to cope with this risk.
Reluctance to endorse and participate in the project activities from communities and stakeholders	L	An approach strictly based on local farmers / herder's participation, specifically through FFS and APFS, and which takes into strong consideration socio-cultural aspects of local communities, reduces risks.

		In addition, demonstrative events such as achievements on the ground that bring benefits to local producers and show loose reduction from adaptation activities, will contribute to mitigating the risk and overcoming scepticism.
Seed shortages due to extreme weather events, prolonged droughts, or pests and diseases outbreaks with risk of crop/grassland failure	M	The project will address by systematically linking the adoption of CCA measures and fostering of community-level field observation capacity to reduce seed multiplication failures, particularly with specialized seed multiplying farmers.
Limited capacity and reluctance/slowness by local and national institutions to actively participate	L	By mobilizing and articulating the capacity of different actors, projects and programs to work intensively with Government and gradually transfer skills to government institutions, and through capacity building of national program managers and awareness-raising activities addressed to policy-makers, the risk will be strongly reduced.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

Section 4.1 of the Project Document provides a detailed and updated description of the approach to coordination with other initiatives in the GEF portfolio.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

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

Key government stakeholders involved in agro-sylvo-pastoral development and food and nutrition security are the following:

- Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment (MAER), through its Department of Agriculture, its Seeds Division, the Senegalese Institute of Agricultural Research (ISRA) and the National Agency for Agricultural and Rural Council (ANCAR)
- Ministry of Livestock and Animal Production (MEPA) through its Directorate of Livestock (DIREL);
- Ministry of Higher Education and Research (MESR)
- Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) and its Directorate of Environment and Classified Establishment (DEEC) which monitors the implementation of NAPA; and
- Ministry of the Economy, Finance and Planning (MEFP)
- The regional directorates of technical ministries

- The regional directorates of development agencies
- Local authorities (administrative authorities) and local elected officials (city and district councillors).

On aspects relating to climate change, key stakeholders include:

- The National Agency of Civil Aviation and Meteorology (ANACIM) through its Department of Climate and Application, plays an important role at the national level, particularly in government policy in the areas of early warning for food security and meteorological assistance for farmers. With the drought of the 1970s and 1980s and the drop in performance observed in agriculture, national authorities and donors have drawn more attention to ANACIM for many projects: (i) to demonstrate to farmers the importance of taking into account technical advice on the weather in the planning and execution of the agricultural calendar; (ii) to develop effective tools to prevent food crises due to weather information for the Sahel countries—it is the logical continuation of project Early warning and agricultural production forecast (AP3A); (iii) to demonstrate the impact of the application of seasonal forecasting of rainfall in planning strategies and implementing the agricultural calendar; and (iv) to bring promising innovations in climate risk management to bear on the challenge of protecting and enhancing food security and rural livelihoods in the face of a variable and changing climate.
- The Ecological Monitoring Centre (CSE) that is responsible for climate studies and CCA and was the first national implementing entity accredited under the Adaptation Fund for approving, monitoring, and managing projects in Senegal and regional neighbourhoods. The CSE climatic database and the crop production monitoring and evaluation system form a very valuable information and methodology baseline.

Project Document Section 4.2 provides detailed information on their mandate related to the project and their role in the project implementation.

A vast number of NGOs and CSOs are active in activities related to extension and providing capacity building to local communities across Senegal, and many are active in remote and rural areas. These organizations are to be directly involved in the development of the Field School approach and the training of farmers and facilitators. A detailed list of CSOs and NGOs providing agricultural/pastoral extension services and operating in the proposed project areas is provided in Table 2, Section 1.8 of the Project Document.

Beneficiaries:

The project will directly target agro-pastoral communities through direct and participatory targeting. The project will ensure the inclusion of the most vulnerable households, women and youth. It will directly support 25,000 farmers-herders (15,000 farmers and 10,000 herders). Indirectly, the project will impact all households in the project intervention areas, through synergy and pooling resources with partner projects.. The target sites have not yet been identified; they will be identified and selected through a participatory process based on agreed criteria during the implementation of the Project.

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):

The project aims to directly provide socio-economic benefits to poor and marginalized individuals and communities in Senegal. The project approach is based on the active participation of local populations through field schools, community radios, POs and on the promotion of local know-how which will guarantee social sustainability. Social groups sharing common interests and language, faced with the same threats from Climate Change (CC), will be put in contact to share their experiences and their worries. The pertinence of the recommended actions to respond to the issues posed within the organisations is a key element to the social sustainability of the project since by being pertinent to the people; the groups' cohesion is strengthened (collective actions around an integrated, integral approach). Dialogue on the collaborative management of natural resources will ensure exchanges between the populations using the resources and the institutions involved, thus increasing the social sustainability of the actions (reduction of conflicts, improvement in access to information, local dialogue and participation, etc.).

Gender focus:

The project has a strong gender focus. Project activities under each Output have a gender focus. The awareness raising, the preparation of training material and the training of Master Trainers and Facilitators all have modules focused on women and women's role. Outputs 2.2.1 – 2.2.3 cover the provision of technologies, and the market inclusion for various community activities with the aim of increasing revenue and increasing food security, notably for women.

Environmental sustainability

Since a majority of the target population relies directly on natural resources for their livelihoods, the main problem that the project will try to resolve will be that of the degradation of natural resources, whether that be pastures, water resources, or the impoverished agricultural land due to poor soil fertility management. The project aims, through its actions, to increase environmental sustainability for those using the resources, by strengthening the natural capital of people's livelihoods and the resilience of the ecosystems to the harmful effects of Climate Change.

- The field school approach (FFS) promoted in this project is based on an integral and systematic intervention, which considers production systems to be interrelated and complementary. In this way, the practices and innovations tested and adopted will be chosen based on their potential to strengthen the resilience of ecosystems to CC in the mid-long term. Promoting the use of inputs will take into account aspects relating to contamination through the tested integrated management of production and pests (IPM) already used in Senegal;
- The majority of the intervention areas chosen by the Project present advanced levels of land degradation (see selection criteria for zones) either due to human or climate causes. In these areas, the objective is to improve the management of the agro-sylvo-pastoral resources by introducing techniques which take into consideration the harmful actions of man and which provide an adapted response to CC; and
- The training sessions developed by the Project will take into account the practices of sustainable production intensification, the use of organic material and green fertilizers, and the introduction of plant varieties adapted to the agricultural, soil and climate conditions of each zone, etc.

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

Cost-effectiveness is a concept that is built into the LDCF/GEF programming strategy. LDCF/GEF funds the "additional costs" of achieving adaptation to climate change, meaning that activities of the partners' in the baseline cover most of the basic development and agro-sylvo-pastoral, gender, nutrition and IGA issues. For this project, this means that FAO/LDCF/GEF project builds on top of a large baseline of natural resources management, food security, livestock, and pastoralism and agro-forestry projects. With a baseline and co-financing of approximately USD 24,607,385, the FAO/LDCF/GEF costs represent about 20% of the entire project costs. This means that for every dollar invested, FAO/LDCF/GEF gains almost four dollars of impact.

Cost-effectiveness is also at the heart of the FAO strategy to support rural development (SO2) and strengthen the resilience of vulnerable populations (SO5) in Sub-Saharan African countries such as Senegal. The design of the proposed project is expected to be highly cost-effective as it relies on the existing structures of the FFS already operational in Senegal, and on ongoing activities with similar goals and synergies with existing programs. The proposed project also builds directly on previous collaborations between FAO and Senegal on FFS (1366 FFS established through the IPPM program). FAO has conducted FFS activities in Senegal since 2001, supporting the government's priority of improving agricultural productivity and competitiveness. On this basis and through the IPPM program, FAO has created core capacity of technical expertise and experience. This includes legal and technical capacities within government structures as well as the FFS national experts who have worked on previous FAO projects and on which the project will capitalize.

In addition, the FFS approach itself has demonstrated its cost effectiveness in many contexts, including Senegal. It is a way to provide high quality technical advice to a large number of Communities. Under the Outcome 2 of this project, about USD 4M of FAO/LDCF/GEF funds, direct benefits will reach a minimum of 25,000 agro-pastoralists. This is about USD156 per farmer-herder.

To achieving this cost-effectiveness with FFS, it is crucial to work with local partners. FAO will channel the project funds to local authorities and NGOs already active in similar activities in the same project intervention area. Therefore, there will be little start-up costs and few costs to mobilize expertise outside the region or country. Several alternative methodologies and approaches have been considered for cost effectiveness during project design. These alternatives included focusing on providing more equipment (e.g. beekeeping support) and inputs (e.g. improved seeds), or concentrating all capacity development efforts on state services, development agencies and country extension services, or installing an adequate number of rain gauges, or by FAO directly providing extension services to farmer-herders.

The project also intends to limit the role of international consultants, using them only if there is a lack of availability of national expertise. This will lower both travel costs and the cost of consultancy fees. However, when international expertise is unique or exceptionally credible, it will be utilized.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The FAO Project Document provides a detailed description of the monitoring, reporting and evaluation to be undertaken during the Project (Sections 4.6). Full details of indicators, baseline values and targets are presented in Annex 1 (Results Framework).

Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow the FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. Monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and indicators established in the project Results Framework (Annex 1). The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been budgeted at \$228,000 (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.

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

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Estimate of costs
Inception Workshop (IW)	PCU, supported by the LTO, BH, and PCU	Within three months of project start up	10,000
Surveys to determine AMAT baseline values	PCU and service providers	Within three months of project start up	Covered under costs of Outcomes 1.1, 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1
Project Inception Report	PCU, LTO, BH, and PCU	No later than one month post IW.	3,000
Field based impact monitoring	PCU, MoA and other relevant agencies – including regional and provincial – to participate.	Periodically – to be determined at inception workshop.	70,000
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	LTO, other participating units and PCU	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 Technical Experts will be paid from the project travel budget.
Project Progress Reports	PCU, with inputs from MoA, PSC members and other partners	Mid-Term	Paid by GEF agency fee
Project Implementation Review report	PCU supported by the LTO and cleared and submitted by the PCU to the GEF Secretariat	Annual	Covered by NPC and National Technical Experts salaries
AMAT	PCU supported by the LTO	Project start-up, mid-Term and project end.	

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Estimate of costs
Co-financing Reports	PCU, FAO Senegal	Annual	Covered by NPC and National Technical Experts salaries
Technical reports	PCU, LTO & Participating Units	As appropriate	-
Mid-term Evaluation & Review	External Consultant, FAO Office for Evaluation in consultation with the project team including the PCU and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 40,000 for independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Final Evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team including the PCU and other partners	At the end of project implementation	USD 40,000 for external, independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Terminal Report	NPC, LTO, TCSR Report Unit	At least two months before the end date of the Execution Agreement	Covered by NPC and National Technical Experts salaries. LTO's involvement is covered by the fee.
Best practices publication	PCU, LTO & Participating Units	Between the second and last year	USD 20,000 for publication preparation and printing
Auditing	External Unit, PCU	Annual	USD 15,000
Impact Assessment	External Consultant and PCU	At the beginning and the end of the project	USD 30,000 for external consultant assessment
Total Budget			USD 228,000

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 form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#))

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/DD/YYYY)
Mariline Diara	La directrice	Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable	15-02-2013

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 (MM/DD/YYYY)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Mr Guy Evers Deputy Director Officer-in-Charge Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla (00153) Rome, Italy TCI-Director@fao.org		08/28/2015	William Settle, Project Manager, Plant Production and Protection Division, FAO, Rome	+39.06.570 56039	William.Settle@fao. org
Jeffrey Griffin FAO Senior Coordinator Email: Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org Tel: +3906 57055680					

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).

Please see Appendix 1 of the FAO GEF 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 from Council

Comments by Germany on PIF Senegal:

Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal: Germany commends the PIF and its objective of enhancing the capacity of Senegal's agro-pastoral sector to develop more climate-resilient production systems, as well as to mainstream integrated adaptation strategies into on-going agro-pastoral/agricultural policies and programmes. We are particularly pleased to see the strong focus on capacity building activities targeting farmers and agro-pastoralists.

Regarding gender related issues, the PIF states that poor rural women are among the most affected by climate change (p. 16). Further, it is noted that over 70 per cent of women are active in the agriculture sector while they only own 13.4 per cent of land (p.7). Against this backdrop, we appreciate that the proposed project aims to incorporate inclusive, community-based efforts to ensure mutual participation of both women and men. However, to be able to track the project benefits for both women and men, it would also be essential to include gender aspects in the project framework. In the final project document, we therefore recommend disaggregating by gender all the expected outputs (2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.3 and 2.3.1 in the PIF) which include objectives in terms of number of persons benefiting from the respective project activities.

GEF Agency response to comments by Germany on PIF Senegal:

The project preparation phase was designed in such a way that gender issues be comprehensively represented in the project framework. Key activities of the project preparation phase that particularly focused on gender mainstreaming include:

- *Concept on the inclusion of gender sensitive CCA strategies into existing FFS/APFS curricula* focusing on i) ecosystem resilience, ii) food and nutritional security, and iii) social acceptance by farmers and agro-pastoralists. The activity involved the initial identification of opportunities and constraints when selecting relevant topics for CCA/FFS-APFS curricula and modules, as well as gender awareness and demand-driven CCA/ FFS-APFS frameworks. The activity further included the development of a methodological approach based on the Social Learning Process/Place-Based Learning Communities.
- *Gender sensitive analysis of social/indigenous acceptance of new CC adapted cereal varieties* for increased quality of forage and its resilience to CC and increased food security.

For this purpose, a national Gender Dimension Expert was recruited as part of the project preparation team, with the specific task to i) develop a proposal on gender approaches to be used for the implementation of the project and in particular of component 2 of the project; and ii) support the Farmer Field School expert in including gender into technical studies. The Gender Dimension Expert worked with the project preparation coordinator, the project preparation team, FAO and partners throughout the preparation phase and met with and interviewed national and grassroots stakeholders, in particular CSOs, NGOs and POs. The expert furthermore participated in the inception and validation workshops, providing further reason and evidence for properly embedding gender and youth into project activities in order to achieve integrated, equitable and sustainable project results.

As a consequence, the results matrix that can be found in Annex I of the Project Document includes a high number of gender sensitive indicators and targets, particularly but not exclusively under Component 2.

Comments from GEF Secretariat

GEF Secretariat recommended actions for project improvement during PPG:

(10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?) - Please highlight the plan for the inclusion of the CSOs, indigenous people, gender groups and/or any other, as appropriate, in the preparation stage of the project.

GEF Agency response to comments by GEF Secretariat:

A key activity of the project preparation phase was the *Stakeholders' analysis and consultations*. A Policy and Institutions Expert was specifically taken on board to cover the tasks related to this activity.

The activity foresaw a PPG inception workshop during which a stakeholder mapping was done in order identify primary and secondary stakeholders, their influences and interests, potential roles in the project and links and relations amongst them and with the project objectives.

A series of stakeholder meetings and consultations with policy-makers, researchers, technicians and community representatives took place during the following period with particular attention to women and grassroots communities. These included focus group discussions with agro-pastoralists, producers organizations and local institutions at the field level, bilateral consultations with governmental and ministerial technical bodies, academic and research institutions and multi-stakeholder workshops to introduce, discuss and readjust the project proposal and specific activities. These meetings also increased the ownership of the consulted stakeholders of the project and its planned activities.

A validation workshop concluded the consultations, involving all relevant partners, government actors and other stakeholders mentioned earlier.

Identification of Stakeholder(s)	Date	Participants	Location
PPG Inception Workshop: Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment (MAER), through its Department of Agriculture, its Seeds Division, the Senegalese Institute of Agricultural Research (ISRA) and the National Agency for Agricultural and Rural Council (ANCAR); National Agency of Civil Aviation and Meteorology (ANACIM); Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE); IFAD Senegal; Agence Nationale de Conseil Agricole et Rural (ANCAR) ; Ministère de l'Élevage et des Productions Animales (MEPA); Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable (MEDD)	June 2014	15 (5 women)	Saly
Meeting of PPG National Team of Consultants with Stakeholders: Field consultations in Matam : Projet de Développement Agricole de Matam (PRODAM), Société d'Aménagement des terres du Delta (SAED), USAID YAAJEENDE et la Direction Régionale du Développement Rural (DRDR). Field consultations in Louga : Direction Régionale du Développement Rural, Direction de Zone Sylvo-pastorale de l'Agence Nationale de Conseil Agricole et Rural ANCAR, Projet des Villages du Millénaire, Directoire Régionale des Femmes en Elevage (DRFEL), Réseau des Facilitateurs GIPD (Gestion Intégrée des Déprédateurs et de la Production), Antenne PASALOUMAKAF/Volet Eaux Souterraines ; Field consultations in Thiès : Direction Régionale du Développement Rural DRDR, Association des Unions Maraichères AUMN, RESOPP (Réseau des Organisations Paysannes et Pastorales du Sénégal du Sénégal) ; Fédération des ONG du Sénégal (FONGS), Direction Zone Niayes ANCAR	July 2014	Average 5 representatives of key stakeholders per meeting during field visits (20% women)	Matam Louga Thiès
Field visit : Direction régionale du Développement Rural (DRDR) ; BAMTAARE/SODEFITEX ; Projet d'Appui aux Filières Agricoles (PAFA) ; Projet d'Appui au Développement Agricole et de l'Entreprenariat Rural (PADAER) ; PASA LouMaKaf	Septembre 2014	5 to 8 per meeting (20% women)	Tambacounda, Kaffrine, Kaolack
Field visit: Direction régionale du Développement Rural (DRDR) and PASA LouMaKaf	Octobre 2014	6 (2 women)	Louga, Matam, Tambacounda, Kaffrine and Kaolack

<p>PPG Validation Workshop: Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment (MAER), through its Department of Agriculture, its Seeds Division, the Senegalese Institute of Agricultural Research (ISRA) and the National Agency for Agricultural and Rural Council (ANCAR); National Agency of Civil Aviation and Meteorology (ANACIM); Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE); IFAD Senegal; Agence Nationale du Conseil Agricole et Rural (ANCAR) ; Ministère de l’Elevage et des Productions Animales (MEPA); Ministère de l’Environnement et du Développement Durable (MEDD) ; Ministère de l’Elevage et des Productions Animales (MEPA) ; Société de Développement et des Fibres Textiles (Sodefitec) ; Comité National de Changement Climatique (COMNACC) ; Direction de l’Environnement et des Etablissements Classés (DEEC) ; Programme d’Appui au Développement agricole et à l’Entrepreneuriat Rural (PADAER) ; Projet d’Appui aux Filières Agricoles (PAFA) ; Projet d’Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire dans les régions de Louga, Matam et Kaffrine (PASALouMAKAF) ; Base d’Appui aux Méthodes et Techniques pour l’Agriculture, les autres Activités Rurales et l’Environnement de la SODEFITEX (BAAMTARE) ; Programme de Développement Agricole et Nutritionnel pour la sécurité Alimentaire au Sénégal (YAJEENDE)</p>	April 2015	34 (14 women)	Dakar
<p>Separate meetings of PPG national and international team with relevant key stakeholders and partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The National Agency of Civil Aviation and Meteorology (ANACIM) - The Ecological Monitoring Centre (CSE) - The Senegal Agency of the Great Green Wall (ANGMV) - Projet d’Appui aux Filières Agricoles (PAFA) - Projet d’Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire dans les régions de Louga, Matam et Kaffrine (PASALouMAKAF) - DGA/MAER 	April 2015	<p>6 (2 women)</p> <p>6 (2 women)</p> <p>5 (1 women)</p> <p>5 (1 women)</p> <p>5 (2 women)</p> <p>4 (2 women)</p>	Dakar

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000			
<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>
Activity 1: Assessment of data availability, institutional options and technology needs for development of an inter-institutional Information System, including the identification of pilot sites	23,000	28,448	
Activity 2: Technical studies and approaches for the design of FFS and APFS' programmes and to develop proposals and strategies for the introduction of CC adapted cereal varieties and livestock production value chains	37,000	41,627	
Activity 3: Policy and institutional analysis and improved investment strategies for mainstreaming CCA into agricultural sector policies and development programs	18,000	16,387	
Activity 4: Stakeholder consultations	25,000	10,955	
Activity 5: Analysis of execution options and assessment of fiduciary standards	7,000	11,814	
Activity 6: Information Synthesis, Project Design & Budgeting	40,000	16,583	24,186
Total	150,000	125,814	24,186

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue 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.

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

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

N/A