



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

GEF ID:	<b>4570</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Togo</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Adapting Agriculture Production in Togo (ADAPT)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>IFAD</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$5,354,546</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$13,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$18,354,546</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Bonizella Biagini</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Naoufel Telahigue</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Togo is an LDC party to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. The letter of endorsement, signed by the GEF Operational Focal Point in Togo and dated 2011-06-28, is enclosed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. IFAD has a clear comparative advantage in agricultural and rural development.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. IFAD has an important portfolio of agricultural and rural development projects in Togo and the present LDCF project is fully aligned with the IFAD-supported baseline investment, Projet d'Appui au Developpement Agricole au Togo (PADAT). The project is aligned with the Agency's country strategy, Climate change strategy, and targeting policy.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The requested grant is within the resources available from the LDCF under the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The project is fully aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	YES. The project contributes towards objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2 and, particularly, outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	YES. The project responds to Togo's urgent and immediate adaptation needs as identified in the NAPA. In particular, the proposal is aligned with NAPA priorities in enhancing agricultural productivity and integrating agro-	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>meteorological information in agricultural production systems. The project is also aligned with Togo's commitments under the Rio Conventions, the Togo Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, UNDAF, and the country's MDG strategy.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The project includes a component on information, education and communication on climate change, under which smallholder farmers and farmers' organizations would benefit from capacity building and training in climate change impacts and adaptation measures. Some of these activities appear to stand alone from the other project components and it is not entirely clear how Component 3 contributes to the sustainability of outcomes under components 1 and 2.</p> <p>Moreover, the sustainability of project outcomes does not hinge exclusively on the awareness and skills of smallholder farmers. Access to markets and credit, access to land and natural resources, and access to adequate extension services will largely determine the extent to which project beneficiaries can sustain and scale up the technologies, practices and production systems introduced through the project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Kindly clarify the linkages between capacity building under Component 3 and the sustainability of outcomes under</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>components 1 and 2.</p> <p>08/25/2011 -- YES. The revised proposal specifies the nature and scope of the capacity building activities under Component 3 and demonstrates that these are essential to enhancing the adoption of climate-resilient technologies and production systems as well as to ensuring the commitment of local stakeholders to the objective of the project. Moreover, the component is well placed to enhance the overall quality of implementation under components 1 and 2.</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposal describes briefly the baseline project (PADAT). The project supports agricultural production and productivity as well as value-added marketing at the national level. Still, the PIF does not sufficiently describe the baseline problem that PADAT seeks to address. On the one hand, PADAT supports market access and value chain development. On the other hand, the project targets food-insecure small farmers. The underlying issues to which the project responds and the targeting principles it adopts should be further elaborated.</p> <p>Moreover, given that the baseline project is consistent with IFAD's Climate change strategy, it strikes as contradictory that PADAT would not consider that agricultural production is expected to be affected by increased</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>climate variability. Indeed, the introduction of improved seeds and soil and water conservation techniques, proposed under PADAT, suggest an understanding of the vulnerability of current production systems, including to climate change. As IFAD would implement both the baseline project and the LDCF project, the PIF should clarify the extent to which PADAT is in fact able to take into account expected climate change impacts and where additional resources are required.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: (i) Kindly describe the baseline problem that PADAT seeks to address and clarify the targeting principles the baseline project adopts. (ii) Please elaborate on the baseline scenario considering the extent to which expected climate change impacts have been identified in line with IFAD's Climate change strategy and activities planned under Component 1 of PADAT.</p> <p>(see also recommendation under Section 13 below)</p> <p>08/25/2011 -- YES. The revised proposal elaborates on the baseline project and scenario, demonstrating that PADAT aims to enhance agricultural productivity and to increase income among smallholder farmers. PADAT targets the poorest and the most food insecure farmers. It adopts a value chain</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>approach, focusing on key crops ‘such as rice, maize and cassava’ rather than integrated production systems.</p> <p>Consequently, the baseline project does not systematically assess nor address the vulnerability of smallholder farmers to climate change, including variability. Moreover, with a focus on crops and their associated value chains, PADAT does not consider the effects of climate change on production systems.</p> <p>IFAD's Climate change strategy notwithstanding, the scope and the targeting of the baseline project do not permit a comprehensive and coherent response to the effects of climate change on smallholder farmers and their livelihoods.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposal notes that, according to an external evaluation of the global framework for intervention in the agricultural sector (PNIASA) in Togo, climate change and sustainable land management calls for stronger consideration. The proposed project is aligned with the national program for investment in the environment and natural resources (PNIERN), which</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>seeks to fill the gaps in PNIASA. In particular, the LDCF project would increase the scope of baseline activities; integrate and disseminate knowledge on climate change; mainstream adaptation tools in selected agricultural systems; contribute towards economic diversification; climate-proof PADAT investments through thematic studies and vulnerability mapping; and provide agro-meteorological information for decision support.</p> <p>While PNIASA is based on insufficient consideration of climate change impacts on agriculture, it is not clear to what extent such shortcomings apply to PADAT (see also recommendation ii under Section 11 above).</p> <p>As for mainstreaming adaptation tools in selected agricultural systems, it is not clear how the proposed LDCF project builds on PADAT investments in agricultural production and productivity, including technical support; the introduction of improved seeds; and soil and water conservation techniques. Similarly, with respect to economic diversification, the synergies between PADAT and the LDCF proposal could be described in the PIF.</p> <p>The notion of climate-proofing PADAT investments is not entirely clear. If this activity is limited to thematic studies and vulnerability mapping, how will it</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>affect PADAT investments?</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: (i) Clarify how activities under components 1 and 2 build on PADAT investments and (ii) elaborate on the concept of climate-proofing.</p> <p>08/25/2011 -- YES. The revised PIF elaborates on the linkages between PADAT and the additional adaptation measures financed under components 1 and 2. As for Component 1, the activities proposed will strengthen the knowledge base as well as the monitoring system required to systematically address the effects of climate change across key crops and their associated value chains. Component 2, in turn, will directly enhance the climate resilience of the value chains targeted by PADAT. The baseline project, on the other hand, facilitates the entry of new, climate resilient products to markets.</p> <p>Climate proofing, in the context of the proposed project, entails the introduction of information and technologies to improve the adaptive capacity of smallholder farmers and to enhance the resilience of their agricultural production systems. The proposed LDCF project provides information and decision support that enables farmers, local authorities and policy-makers to better address climate</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>change risks. The project also undertakes targeted investments to enhance the resilience of crops and production systems. Finally, through income diversification, the project reduces the reliance of smallholder farmers on the key crops targeted by PADAT.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement the project should further elaborate on the linkages between the baseline project and the proposed LDCF project with respect to geographical scale and targeted beneficiaries as well as shared delivery mechanisms.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The project framework could be streamlined with fewer outcomes. Also, outputs could be more clearly distinguished from inputs (e.g. number of weather stations equipped with modern technology rather than equipment procured). Moreover, it is unclear how outcome 2.1 (climate change impacts on food production is reduced) can be attributed to the activities proposed under Component 1.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: (i) Kindly streamline the project framework; (ii) clarify outputs; and (iii) revisit outcome 2.1.</p> <p>08/25/2011 -- YES. The revised proposal includes an improved project framework with clear outputs. Outcome 2.1 has been removed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>By CEO Endorsement, as outcomes and outputs are linked to indicators, the project results framework could benefit from further streamlining with fewer outcomes associated with core adaptation indicators. This would allow project monitoring to better distinguish between progress towards adaptation objectives vs. implementation progress.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The adaptation benefits are described based on a broad understanding of the impacts of climate change, including variability, on agricultural production systems in Togo and current best practice in responding to such impacts. Still, the PIF should seek describe the adaptation benefits also with respect to the vulnerability of project beneficiaries based on available vulnerability assessments and studies. Where such resources are unavailable, the PIF should explain how this information gap will be filled during project preparation.</p> <p>Moreover, during project preparation, additional detail is required as to the adaptation benefits, sustainability and feasibility of activities under Component 2 given the specific climate change impacts in targeted regions and complementarities with the baseline project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe the adaptation benefits with</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>respect to the vulnerability of project beneficiaries based on available vulnerability assessments.</p> <p>(see also recommendations under Section 13 above)</p> <p>08/25/2011 -- YES. The revised PIF clarifies the additional cost reasoning on which the proposed activities are based, demonstrating that the baseline project does not adequately address the vulnerability of targeted smallholder farmers and their production systems to climate change, including variability. The PIF does not, however, cite any relevant assessments of the present vulnerability of the intended beneficiaries or targeted areas. Such information should be provided by CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF describes a range of expected socio-economic benefits for food security, poverty reduction, income diversification and livelihood resilience. The project is fully aligned with the robust gender strategy adopted for PADAT. The delivery of socio-economic benefits is also fully integrated into the adaptation objective of the project.</p> <p>Still, the targeting strategy should be clarified to indicate whether and to what extent the project will benefit the highly vulnerable and the food insecure as opposed to farmers with the necessary</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>assets to benefit most from the introduction of improved agricultural technologies and new production systems. (See also recommendation under Section 11 above with regard to PADAT)</p> <p>Also, it is not clear how the numbers of beneficiaries cited in Section B.5 relate to the different adaptation and socio-economic benefits the project generates.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b> (i) Kindly clarify the targeting strategy adopted by the project and (ii) provide further information on the extent to which different benefits are expected to affect the estimated total number of direct beneficiaries.</p> <p>08/25/2011 -- YES. The revised proposal clarifies the targeting principles of PADAT, noting that the project targets the most food insecure smallholder farmers as well as specific vulnerable groups, such as women, widow heads of families, and HIV youth and families. The LDCF project, in turn, will further target the beneficiaries that are the most vulnerable to the effects of climate change, including vulnerability.</p> <p>The revised PIF also clarifies the adaptation benefits associated with the project. These benefits will, to various degrees, 25,000 direct beneficiaries through 1,500 farmer-based</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>organizations.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, the project should provide a more clear description of the extent to which different activities, especially those associated with climate-resilient agricultural production and livelihood diversification, are expected to affect the estimated total number of direct beneficiaries.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project is geared towards farmers' organizations and local communities and it recognizes the role of indigenous knowledge in adaptation. Thanks to the gender strategy developed for PADAT, the project also encourages the participation of women and youth. Still, by CEO Endorsement, the modalities of public participation and the role of CSOs should be described in greater detail.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>YES. The PIF identifies relevant risks and mitigation measures pertaining to the complexity of institutional arrangements, low participation among project beneficiaries, and the limited capacity at the national and local level to understand and assess climate change impacts.</p> <p>Still, given that the proposed investments serve a demonstration purpose, by CEO Endorsement the project should consider the barriers to adoption of the technologies and production systems introduced. Access</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>to markets and credit, access to land and natural resources, and access to adequate extension services may constrain the uptake of integrated crop-livestock systems and aquaculture.</p> <p>(see also recommendations under Section 10 above)</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposal is consistent with priorities identified in the NAPA, with PNIASA and with UNDAF. Through PADAT, coordination is ensured with the West African Development Bank (BOAD), ECOWAS, GAFSP and the World Bank. The proposed project will build on lessons from relevant projects financed by the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa (BADEA) and the European Commission.</p> <p>While coordination with the above programs and projects is described sufficiently for this stage of project development, the PIF should also consider coordination with country-specific activities under the 'Sahel and West Africa Program in Support of the Great Green Wall Initiative'. Under this programmatic approach, Togo will access resources from the LDCF for activities in response to NAPA priorities in agricultural production.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please consider coordination with country-specific</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>activities financed through the LDCF under the 'Sahel and West Africa Program in Support of the Great Green Wall Initiative'.</p> <p>08/25/2011 -- YES. According to the revised PIF, the project will ensure close coordination with the activities that will be financed under the Sahel and West Africa Program in Support of the Great Green Wall Initiative. Practical synergies and linkages will be explored during project preparation.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	YES.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>NO. As per recent guidance to GEF Agencies (2011-06-17), the level of funding for project management cost should be adjusted or further justified.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please adjust the funding level for project management cost so that it does not exceed 5% of the requested LDCF grant or please provide justification for the requested amount.</p> <p>08/25/2011 -- YES. In the revised PIF the LDCF funding level for project</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		management cost has been brought down to \$267,000 or less than 5 per cent of the total project cost.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. At \$13 million, the level of co-financing is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs. Still, in Table C, the PIF should provide some indication of the level of co-financing from others than the Agency itself.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Kindly provide an indication of the level of co-financing brought by others than the Agency itself.</p> <p>08/25/2011 -- YES. According to the revised PIF, the Government will contribute 795,000 in co-financing; beneficiaries will provide \$424,000; and others will provide \$1,781,000. The type of co-financing is yet to be defined, but government and beneficiary contributions are indicated as in-kind at this stage.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	(see recommendation under Section 24 above)	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. In line with its role, IFAD is bringing in \$10 million in co-financing.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	N/A	
	• Convention Secretariat?	N/A	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	N/A	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 23 and 24.  08/25/2011 -- YES. All recommendations have been adequately addressed for this stage of project development and the PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 15, 17, 18 and 24.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 18, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 25, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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

**REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL**

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

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