

**NAME OF PROGRAM:  
FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY  
Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Fostering Participatory Natural Resource Management Project
Country(ies):	Burkina Faso
GEF Agency(ies):	Lead Agency: IFAD
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2  Component 1 of the project corresponding to component 2 of the IAP-FS (Scaling up of integrated approaches)	GEFTF	4,361,668	23,730,286
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4  Component 1 and 2 corresponding to components 1, 2 and 3 of the IAP: scaling up, Institutional frameworks and monitoring and assessment)	GEFTF	2,035,447	11,074,132
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5  Mainly under component 3 of the project corresponding to components 1, 2 and 3 of the IAP: scaling up, Institutional frameworks and monitoring and assessment)	GEFTF	872,333	4,746,056
Total Project Cost		7,269,448	39,550,474

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

Project Objective: Promote sustainable ecosystem services management to ensure food security and increase stallholder farmer's resilience.				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
Scaling up integrated approaches  (Village-level smallholdings and development of the productive potential)	INV	<b>Outcome 1.2 Functionality and cover of ecosystems maintained</b>  - Proven and innovative water harvesting technologies scaled-up over 17,000 ha  - Agroforestry systems developed and promoted over 6000 ha of land and Sustainable management of non-timber forest products is promoted in favor of women (5000	4,725,141	26,933,304

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

		women) - Use of renewable energy for irrigation at market garden perimeters is promoted. And the promotion of the use of biodigesters (150 units of the flexible system).		
Strengthen institutional frameworks	INV	<p><b>Outcome 3.1 Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established</b></p> <p>- Strengthening the advisory support services (research and extension) is strengthened.</p> <p>- Innovations are introduced and good practices are scaled up for improved soil fertility/ sustainability of production systems in the lowlands</p> <p><b>Outcome 3.2 Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities</b></p> <p>- Farmer groups are supported to collectively promote sustainability The enabling environment is promoted for the dissemination of good practices resilience (institutional support to existing frameworks)</p>	1,453,889	8,287,170
Monitoring and assessment of ecosystem services, global environmental benefits resilience	TA	<p><b>Outcome 4.1 SLM mainstreamed in development investments and value chains across multiple scales</b></p> <p>- Training is provided to farmers to use and disseminate sustainable production systems and better monitoring of sustainability and resilience</p> <p><b>Outcome 4.2 Innovative mechanisms for multiple-stakeholder planning and investments in SLM at scale</b></p> <p>- Support to improved M&amp;E and M&amp;A at all levels</p> <p>- Institutions and frameworks (i.e. CPP, CSIF etc.) are supported to</p>	745,418	2,150,000

		contribute to the M&A framework and to incorporate resilience into project design and implementation, and for monitoring of GEBs. - A framework for monitoring resilience is established		
		Subtotal	6,924,448	37,370,474
		Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup> GEFTF	345,000	2,180,000
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>7,269,448</b>	<b>39,550,474</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	IFAD	(select)	34,780,474
Recipient Government	Government of Burkina Faso	(select)	3,450,000
Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries	(select)	1,320,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>39,550,474</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security Incentive (set-aside)	LD	STAR allocation	3,599,724	323,975	3,923,699
IFAD	GEFTG	IAP-Food Security Incentive (set-aside)	IAP Set-aside	IAP Food Security	3,669,724	330,275	3,999,999
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7,269,448</b>	<b>654,250</b>	<b>7,923,698</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )

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

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### Project Overview

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*  
*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting;*

The project area covers part of the Sahel and the Sudanese area from Burkina Faso characterized by low rainfall (400 to 500mm / year) and a sharp change in the spatial and temporal variability. These regions (North, Centre-North and East regions of Burkina Faso) are still highly vulnerable. They face relatively difficult ecological conditions associated with both the semi-arid climate of the Sahel and growing pressures by human development. A major portion of their land is being degraded by disappearing plant cover, fragile and impoverished soil, erosion and falling water tables. Rain is generally scarce, irregular and poorly distributed. Rural people rely mainly on land, water, and pastoral and forestry resources for their economic and social development. Agricultural activities remain highly dependent on the variability of agro-climatic conditions. Moreover, rigid and unstable traditional land tenure systems pose a major obstacle to investment in crop and livestock activities. Investing in safeguarding ecosystem services to ensure sustainability of production systems, improved food security and income is often marginalized and rather targeted through fragmented projects. There is a need to build on the successful elements of the CPP and the CSIF in Burkina Faso to: (i) further mainstream good practices and strengthen the enabling environment for their dissemination (transformative elements), bring the good practices to a larger scale of implementation and impact and (iii) better monitor the impact (notably in terms of ecosystem services and food security and their linkages with GEBs). This project will respond to the three main components of the IAP on Food Security by promoting an enabling environment (at all levels) to drive the upscaling efforts (under the investment component) and provide the tools and skills to better measure the impact of the proposed package.

### *Context and baseline scenario;*

The GEF financing will be mainly linked to the IFAD - Participatory Natural Resource Management and Rural Development Project in the North, Centre-North and East Regions “Neer-tamba Project“. It will however establish linkages with initiatives at the national and local scales to address the enabling environment bottlenecks and to promote a supporting ground for scaling up.

The Neer- Tamba Project aims to improve food and nutrition security of poor smallholders farmers and increase their income through the development and enhancement of Inland valley swamps (lowlands areas) and small village market garden perimeters, sustainable forest management, capacity building, stakeholder organization and networking with a focus on women's associations. Neer-Tamba is also designed to support the efforts of producers in the protection and soil restoration and improvement of soil fertility in the intervention villages. It aims to increase crop yields, recover degraded land for agricultural, forestry and pastoral purposes and replenish soil fertility and highly degraded vegetation cover, to promote the sustainable exploitation of non-timber forest products. The total co-financing is estimated at 39,55 million USD. The missing elements in the baseline scenario are : (i) a wider approach to promote the dissemination of good practices (enabling environment, incentives etc.) and the need to further support farmers to innovate and scale up activities that can improve the sustainable use of natural resources (such activities are sustainable rural energy like biogas, efficient water use technologies for irrigation etc.). There is also an increasing need to better monitor the environmental impacts in terms of ecosystem services and linkages with food security and resilience.

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework and 4) Global Environmental Benefits;*

The project reflects the priorities of Burkina Faso and it will focus on investment and development of good practices that will achieve a real and lasting impact on the rural population and threatened ecosystems. For this

purpose, the activities to be proposed in the framework of the GEF funding will be mainly integrated with the components of the Neer-tamba Project but they will ensure a wider approach to enable good practices to emerge and be unscaled. The GEF funding will be channeled through the Neer-tamba but will establish linkages to respond to the three pillars of the IAP-food security programmer. The focus of the project will be on investment and on promoting best practices (documented and proven already) but it will also strive to promote innovations that can gain scale (example biogas etc.). The project will build on the CPP and CSIF and other relevant frameworks to further support the government of Burkina Faso in its efforts to promote the sustainable management of ecosystem services. The project will give particular importance to gender aspects by implementing specific activities for women. It will also invest in improving the M&E and reporting systems (local and global environmental benefits). The following activities will be expected by component (to be further refined and verified during the design phase). The proposed project will build on the government existing mechanisms for scaling up and mainstreaming of best practices (SLM) in particular. In Burkina Faso these are the CPP and the CSIF (SIP framework). The intervention of the IAP will further strengthen the two aspects of (i) Food security and (ii) resilience in the mentioned frameworks. To do so the project will support the implementation of tools that will help integrate and monitor the results in terms of mainstreaming food security and resilience objectives in these overarching planning tools. The project will also establish the linkages in terms of impact and results monitoring from the field. The detailed assessment of the entry points of for the IAP work under the existing framework will be conducted during the PPG phase.

**Component 1: Village-level smallholdings and productive potential development:** This component will focus on upscaling and promoting proven sustainable practices while encouraging innovation to further support the sustainability agenda. In this respect the project will promote sustainable water management and water harvesting by establishing 2 pilot sites (testing innovative water harvesting schemes), disseminating the use of existing water harvesting techniques to at least an area of 12000 ha and helping the rural communities by establishing water reservoirs and 5 seuils d'épandage that will contribute to the reduction of vulnerability to climate shocks. The project will support the promotion of agro-forestry over 6000 ha and disseminate adequate soil management techniques that will contribute to better soil fertility over 5000 ha of land. The project will also promote the efficient use of energy for irrigation while also promoting flexible biogas systems as an innovative and sustainable /clean alternative for rural energy (reducing pressure on natural vegetation). The promotion of sustainable management of non-timber forest products will favor of women (5000 women). The project will support the implementation of nutritional gardens schemes for the production of leaves and fruits of Moringa \Oleifera and Adansonia digitata (Baobab). This activity will simultaneously contribute to food security and improving ecosystem services.

*Component 2: Intensification of smallholdings and development of their production*

The project interventions under this component will seek to strengthen the advisory support services (research and extension) to scale up good practice but also to introduce innovations that will: (i) improve soil fertility and profitability/sustainability of production systems in the lowlands (ii) fight against erosion and land degradation, and (iii) collection and conservation of water resources to reduce post-harvest losses.

Work under this component will contribute to the definition and implementation of adequate incentive mechanisms that will help farmers that shift towards sustainable production systems. This will be coupled with demonstration and sensitization of farmers on the need to adopt sustainable production systems. This component will also aim at improving food security by increasing the efficiency and reducing post-harvest losses. Project design will provide more detailed description of activities and their scale under this component.

*Component 3: Stakeholder organization and networking*

This component will drive the mainstreaming efforts and it will come to support the SLM, food security and sustainability agendas and frameworks in Burkina Faso. The objective is to engage all stakeholders at all levels and contribute to the development of an enabling environment for the promotion of sustainable and resilient agriculture production practices. To this end, the project will interact with the PPC (The National Partnership Program for SLM) which has a 15-year horizon and its intervention will be aligned with the country goals of SLM/ CSI. The support will be for national level (precise targets will be identified during the formulation of the project) but also in the area of intervention of the Neer-tamba project. This component will complement the actions funded by the

investment project to promote an enabling environment and contribute to the dissemination of good practices resilience by: (i) Supporting the creation of groups by production and/ or exploitation sector; with the final purpose to establish inter-regional groups by sector; (ii) Specific training for agroforestry, water harvesting techniques, fight against erosion, installation and management of bio-digesters, renewable energy for irrigation etc. and (iii) Promoting innovation in tandem with the activities of Component 2 (identification and support of innovative farmers etc.). It will pay particular attention to improving and harmonizing M&E systems (local impacts and GEBs) and the establishment of an effective M&A framework.

*Global environmental benefits;*

The project will generate global environmental benefits by: (i) driving the agenda and supporting mechanisms that will foster the shift towards sustainable practices (sustainable land and water management, carbon sequestration, agro-biodiversity conservation etc.) and (ii) directly investing in activities that will lead to a scaling up of sustainable agricultural production practices (wider dissemination of RNA, half-moons, zai, agro-forestry etc.). All these will contribute to the reduction of erosion and the increase of carbon pool in soils. The regeneration of the vegetation cover and the improvement of the soil quality is likely to improve biodiversity in the targeted locations. The project will also support the promotion of clean energy and flexible biogas systems in particular which will lead to less emissions and positive impact on vegetation. All global environmental benefits will be assessed and quantified during design and throughout project implementation.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The project preparation phase will involve all stakeholders throughout the design phase. The key national partners would be The Ministry of Agriculture and water resources with strong involvement from the Ministry of Environment. It will engage directly with the potential beneficiaries, existing projects for synergies and it will involve decentralized Institutions, Research Institution (e.g. TNERA) and civil society organizations, private sector etc. IFAD will ensure and will demonstrate that the project design is participatory and inclusive.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

Transferring responsibility to non-governmental stakeholders and instituting partnership-based rural development management breaks with deeply rooted practices whereby planning and implementing rural development is the exclusive purview of State agents. This new framework, that will give professional organizations, CAs and other local stakeholders a major role, is consistent with the general institutional trajectory of the country, which has adopted decentralization to the communal and regional level. However, it calls for new kinds of relationships (less top-down and more partnership-based) among the different stakeholders and a redefinition and clarification of the roles, prerogatives and responsibilities of each. As the example of decentralization shows, this is a gradual process that takes place over the medium to long term. The project will follow the mitigation measures of Neer-Tamba by supporting this transition by clearly embracing the rationale for this new institutional structure from the outset, and by: (i) assisting emerging stakeholders and giving them responsibilities (by building their capacities and awareness); (ii) introducing and strengthening the kinds of partnership arrangements at the regional and provincial level that are already found between stakeholders and the Government at the national level; and (iii) helping traditional stakeholders grow in their new functions and develop partnerships with new stakeholders. In view of the risk posed by traditional land tenure practices and their ability to block and/or act as a brake on rural investments particularly those, whose bargaining power is weak within the traditional system – the project will seek to promote and manage the medium- and long-term transition (Risk being mitigated by Nee-Tamba). To this end, the GEF would support this effort by encouraging broad dissemination, understanding and ownership of the legislative and regulatory texts (on

environment in particular) and the dissemination of any incentives that will be defined at national level to promote the sustainability agenda for stallholder farming.

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

The project will use its support to the institutional frameworks to also ensure alignment with planned and ongoing GEF projects in the country (this will ensure alignment at national and local/investment levels). In this respect, this project will strongly link with the work of the CPP and the CSIF frameworks and interventions. Specific linkages will be explored with the following projects (further possible synergies will be explored during design):

MSP3884: CPP: National Subprogram for Coordination and Institutional Development on Sustainable Land Management

FP4233: CPP: Sub-Program for Sustainable Land Management in Boucle de Mouhoun region.

FP4301: CPP: SLM subprogram for the Centre-West Region

MSP4767: Capacity Development: Generating Global Environmental Benefits from Improved Local Planning and Decision-making Systems in Burkina Faso

FP5014: Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production for Food Security in Vulnerable Rural Areas Through the Farmers Field School Approach

FP5187: GGW: Community based Rural Development Project 3rd Phase with Sustainable Land and Forestry Management

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 IS THE PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH THE NATIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANS OR REPORTS AND ASSESSEMENTS UNDER RELEVANT CONVENTIONS? (YES /NO ). IF YES, WHICH ONES AND HOW: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCS, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, ETC.:*

The Project is aligned with the following national policies and strategies:

- The Burkina Faso Strategy for Accelerated Growth and Sustainable Development (SCADD). The objective of this strategy is to achieve economic growth inducing a significant increase in real household income and an increase in goods and services that economic agents can have without cutting national heritage for future generations
- National Policy for Sustainable Development
- The Environmental Plan for Sustainable Development
- Strategic directions for national food security and nutrition policy
- National Sustainable Development Policy for irrigated agriculture
- The National Strategy and the National Action Plan for the promotion and valorization of Non-Timber Forest Products;
- National Adaptation Programme of Action to variability and climate change in Burkina Faso.
- The National Rural Sector Programme

**NAME OF PROGRAM:**  
**FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY**  
**Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Support for sustainable food production and enhancement of Food security and Climate Resilience in Burundi's Highlands
Country:	Burundi
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Water, Environment, Territorial and Urban Planning and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock.
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	Amount (in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Cofinancing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2	GEFTF	3,415,554	21,900,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4	GEFTF	1,696,103	12,900,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5	GEFTF	151,5173	8,900,000
IAP-Food Security, BD-4, Program 9	GEFTF	769,500	3,000,000
		7,396,330	46,700,000

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

Project Objective: To Improve diversified production systems for sustainable food security and nutrition through integrated sustainable landscape management and establishment of sustainable food value chains.				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
1. Strengthened institutional framework and support mechanisms	TA LD-3, P-4 (0.3 m) LD-4, P-5 (0.2m) BD-4, P-9 (0.2m) IAP (1.2 m)	1.1. Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms in support of policy and institutional reform and upscaling of integrated natural resources /landscape management in place.  <i>Indicators and targets:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Functioning multi-stakeholder knowledge and outreach platforms in place at national and local/landscape level</li> </ul> 1.2. Supportive policies, extension structures	1,900,000	12,550,000

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

		<p>and incentives in place to support sustainable smallholder agricultural systems and food value-chains.</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>FFS approach institutionalized in nation-wide extension system</i></li> <li>• <i>SLM best practice (tools/guidelines) and agro-ecological approaches linked to selected food value chains and mainstreamed into gender sensitive policy frameworks</i></li> <li>• <i>Network of (pre) cooperatives/producer organizations established based on existing FFS structure</i></li> </ul>		
2. Improved livelihoods and food security through integrated water-shed management.	<p><b>INV</b></p> <p>LD-3, P-4 (0.4 m)</p> <p>LD-1, P-1 (0.1m)</p> <p>BD-3, P-7 (0.55 m)</p> <p>CM (1,6 m)</p> <p>IAP (1 m)</p>	<p>2.1. Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources /landscape management and SLM practices.</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>X thousand ha under integrated natural resources/landscape management based on SLM best-practices (technologies and approaches)</i></li> <li>• <i>X thousand ha under diversified production systems linked to value chains (incl. high value fruit trees, potatoes, maize, peas, wheat, banana, pineapple) as well as forage grasses and leguminous crops/trees)</i></li> <li>• <i>X thousand ha with improved soil and water conservation and management</i></li> <li>• <i>% farmers with increased food access, availability and use</i></li> </ul> <p>(Baselines and targets to be refined during the PPG phase)</p> <p>2.2 Increase in investment flows to integrated natural resources/landscape management.</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Effective partnerships between FFS groups / producer organization, public and private sector and civil society organizations and markets strengthened or established to increase investment flow and to foster sustainable food value chains.</i></li> </ul>	3,650,000	21,950,000
3. Monitoring and assessment of global environmental benefits and socio-economic impacts.	<p><b>TA</b></p> <p>LD-3, P-4 (0,02m)</p> <p>LD-1, P-1 (0,04m)</p> <p>BD-3, P-7 (0.06m)</p> <p>CM (0,1)</p> <p>IAP (1,3)</p>	<p>3.1. Strengthened capacity of relevant institutions to incorporate resilience (climate variability, natural disasters and market fluctuations) into project design and implementation, and for monitoring of GEBs, including tools and systems for monitoring of SLM impacts on food and livelihood security and ecosystem services (resilience to land degradation, drought and other natural disasters, conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity and GHG emission reductions/ carbon sequestration and food security benefits).</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p>	1,494,124	10,200,000

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable monitoring tools and approaches identified (based on criteria), linked to project interventions and relevant partners trained in their use and service provider successfully applying the tools.</li> </ul> <p>3.2. Framework in place for M&amp;A of resilience and socio-economic benefits including food and livelihood security.</p> <p>Indicators and targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participatory M&amp;A tools developed and institutionalized within established extension and support services (Outcome 1.2)</li> </ul>		
		Subtotal	7,044,124	44,700,000
		Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>	352,206	2,000,000
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>7,396,330</b>	<b>46,700,000</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	Government of Burundi through IFAD loan portfolio (PRODEFI tbd)	Cash	46,300,000
GEF Agency	FAO (FMM/GLO/112/MUL)	In kind	400,000
Beneficiaries	Targeted Agro-pastoralists	In kind	tbd
Other	Tbd	tbd	tbd
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>46,700,000</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total (c)=a+b
FAO	GEFTF	Country	LD	IAP food security	1,144,312	102,988	1,247,300
FAO	GEFTF	Country	BD	IAP food security	893,431	80,409	973,840
FAO	GEFTF	Country	CCM	IAP food security	1,784,862	160,638	1,945,500
FAO	GEFTF	Country	IAP	IAP food security	3,573,725	321,635	3,895,360
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7,396,330</b>	<b>665,670</b>	<b>8,062,000</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here (LD 54,491, BD 42,544, CCM 84,993, IAP 170,178)

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

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **Project Overview**

*A.1. Project Description.* Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits

#### **1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:**

The targeted agro-ecological zone in Burundi (highland perennial) comprising the provinces of Bururi, Gitega, Mwaro, Muramvya, Kayanza and Ngozi, is facing increased pressures as a result of rapid population growth, agricultural and livestock intensification characterised by progressive reduction in farm sizes, and unsustainable land use and management practices. In this region, land and freshwater resource base, associated biodiversity and populations whose livelihoods and food security depend on those resources, are threatened by land degradation, declining productive capacity of croplands and pasturelands, deforestation and expansion of agriculture into wetlands through encroachment and irrigation development. More than 96% of the energy production derives from fuelwood and biomass products such as charcoal, leading to serious deforestation. Climate change and high variability, including flood intensity and the dry season length, aggravate these threats, further challenging the resilience of food production systems and food security. The accumulative effects of these trends and degradation of resources and ecosystems is to compromise the delivery of ecosystem services and increase food insecurity and vulnerability of the population to climate change and other shocks.

#### **2) Context and baseline scenario:**

To address the abovementioned threats, the Government of Burundi (GoB) has in recent years set up several relevant national platforms and institutional structures. Moreover, Burundi has just adopted a law in support of pre-cooperative groups, which will facilitate extension from FFS groups to pre cooperatives to strengthen marketing and value addition. However, still lacking is cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder outreach platforms at different scales combining finances, agriculture and environmental concerns in order to increase institutional capacity to out-scale the wider adoption of demonstrated best practices and territorial management efforts.

The FAO and other international partners, such as IFAD, have supported the GoB in land rehabilitation and biodiversity conservation, supporting a shift from a reactive to a more proactive approach linking food security, land rehabilitation, and CC adaptation and mitigation. Through the GEF/FAO Kagera TAMP project the GoB has effectively supported capacity building and planning for the wide adoption of proven SLM practices in target catchments in 5 provinces. The project supported the evaluation and mapping of land degradation (type, extent severity) and the extent and effectiveness of various SLM practices at national level. The improved adapted practices in the five target districts were evaluated and documented and are available in the global WOCAT database for larger-scale adoption. Moreover, FAO/GoB crossborder food security and horticulture projects have generated complementary experiences and successes in farmer organisation for enhanced marketing, value addition through processing and off farm employment. Co-financing from FAO is of USD\$ 400,000.

The current and future efforts of the FAO led-baselines will be effectively linked to PRODEFI projects supported by IFAD. Led by the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, PRODEFI uses a similar approach as the FAO/GoB baseline but with a stronger focus on supporting selected food value chains. A second phase of PRODEFI is under design and can will be an opportunity to combine good SLM practices and lessons learned from the FAO intervention with selected food value chains targeted by PRODEFI in order to increase food security and resilience under the IAP through integrated investment on the ground. Co-financing from PRODEFI is of US\$ 46,300,000.

### 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:

The project's objective is to improve diversified production systems for sustainable food security and nutrition through an integrated sustainable landscape management approach (catchment wide) which includes strengthening or establishing sustainable food value chains and the conservation and sustainable use of agro-biodiversity at species and agro ecosystem level. The approach will largely benefit from well documented lessons learned from previous and on-going SLM-interventions in the target region which will be: (i) captured and disseminated at multi-scale through the multi-stakeholder policy and knowledge platforms, (ii) adopted by the target group through the FFS extension system, and (iii) linked to existing and newly established sustainable food value chains.

#### Institutional frameworks:

GEF financing will support an effective cross-sectoral coordination at different scales through the establishment of multi-stakeholder policy and knowledge sharing and management platforms for SLM including integrated landscape management and sustainable food and agricultural systems (to strengthen effectiveness of existing national platforms and institutional structures described in Section 2). A dialogue between different actors will be facilitated to develop and implement a framework to institutionalize effective cross-sectoral and ecologically sound extension services and capacity development approaches. SLM best practices (tools/guidelines) and agro-ecological approaches successfully tested in the targeted agro-ecological zones will be aligned with selected food value chains and mainstreamed into policy frameworks and/or action plans. The establishment of farmer field schools (FFS) and their transformation towards pre-cooperatives and/or producer organizations will be supported and linked to the existing or newly created sustainable food value chains. The interventions will take advantage of existing regulatory frameworks (such as the Burundi pre-cooperative law) and will ensure gender sensitive policies and SLM approaches that recognize the importance of women and youth in agriculture.

#### Scaling up:

The proposed project intends to expand already tested approaches and methods that lead to substantially increased coverage of sustainable and viable food production systems (80,000 ha) under a range of adapted management practices at farm and catchment or wider landscape level in order to enhance food security and climate resilience. The planned interventions will enhance agro-biodiversity (genetic resources, harvested and associated species and habitats), increase resilience to extreme climate events and variability, increase household income by livelihood diversification and alternative income generation, improve access to markets and inputs, and enhance C sequestration/reduce GHG emissions through land use systems that increase woody biomass and soil organic matter. For that purpose the project will adopt an integrated catchment management approach (from the ridge to the marsh) employing a well-structured and participatory-based extension structure and paying attention to governance issues (rights of access and use over resources) to ensure that the extension methods and SLM techniques are adapted to the social and cultural context and sustainable. A significant co-financing is targeted in biological and physical investments for sustainable food production intensification which includes soil and water conservation for erosion control, improved water management (pumps, harvesting, microdams) and irrigated cropping in valley bottoms. The IAP proposal will also facilitate the mainstreaming of environment and climate in the decision making and local design process, extending the stakeholders beyond the traditional environment and agriculture sphere.

#### Monitoring and assessment (M&A):

The monitoring and assessment component for the proposed project will assess the capacity of relevant institutions to develop and implement a biophysical and socio-economic monitoring framework which will include monitoring of eco-system resilience. For that purpose the suitability of existing tools and approaches for multiscale and multistakeholder use will be assessed according to a set of criteria (sustainability, participatory, country ownership etc...) which will be based on a country driven needs assessment. The anticipated impacts will be assessed on site and offsite and documented using the multi-stakeholder platforms created under Component 1. A specific attention will be paid to key global environmental benefits targeted under the IAP.

## 4) Global environmental benefits

By applying an integrated natural resources and landscape management approach at catchment scale, the project will reduce land degradation (soil, water, biodiversity) in the targeted area while improving agricultural productivity, sustaining ecosystem services and enhancing resilience to climate change. By using a well adopted extension approach, the project will support the wider uptake of locally adapted SLM-best practices and agro-ecological approaches, that will restore healthy soils and make better use of water resources and agro-biodiversity on farm and at landscape level. The project will thereby contribute to several GEBs including: area under sustainable land management, increase in land productivity (crop, pasture and forest) and the conservation and sustainable use of agro-biodiversity (genetic resources and habitat). The baseline indicators and targets as well as appropriate tracking tools will be developed during the PPG phase.

A.2. *Stakeholders.* Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:

The project which will be prepared and executed by FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock MINAGRIE, the Ministry of Water, Environment, Land Management and Urban Planning (MoWELMU). Project implementing partners include: (i) Government: the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development Planning will be involved all throughout the project formulation phase; the Ministry of Municipal Development through its Provincial Directorates and Municipal Administrations. (ii) Civil Society: local NGOs involved in activities aimed at enhancing integrated management of agro-ecosystems and food security will be actively involved in project design and throughout project implementation. Likewise, local and grassroots community based organization will play a key role in project planning, these include among others: the Peasant Support Organization (APO), the Integral Development Community Association (ADIC), CAPAD, Concern, etc. (iii) Research institutions notably the Geographical Institute of Burundi (IGEUBU) and the Institute of Agricultural Sciences of Burundi (ISABU). (iv) Private sector: including seeds multipliers and breeders and food processing companies. All the stakeholders and implementing partners will be engaged in project planning which will include: (i) Stakeholder mapping, needs assessment and workshops; (ii) Baseline data acquisition; (iii) A participatory decision making process to clarify roles, responsibilities and respective financial contribution to the project; (iv) The civil society members of the project will directly engage local communities as mobilizers for this project.

A.3 *Risk.* Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Mitigation measure</b>
Drought- may be so severe that it threatens crop and livestock survival thus curtailing the basis for development of value chains appropriate for food security.	H	The project will mitigate this risk by implementing SLM activities, watershed management and CCA&M policies and measures to strengthen pro-active and coordinated responses, as well as by initiating multi-stakeholder, community-based capacity-building initiatives (i.e FFS). Appropriate partnerships and collaborations with on-going emergency/post-emergency initiatives and with governmental programs regularly supporting crop health will improve responses to those risks.
Lack of social acceptance of introduced INRM/SLM tools and practices by the target groups will threaten the project's impact and sustainability.	M	Cultural values (e.g. linked to food preparation/preferences) and traditions (such as agricultural production methods) in a rural set-up hardly change. In order to ensure social acceptance by target groups and eventual wide-scale adoption of improved crops and INRM/SLM tools and practices, the project uses participatory approaches such as the FFS and SHARP to ensure

		that interventions meet, not only the norm of the social system, but also the different needs of women and men.
Limited involvement and weak cross- ministerial cooperation between the two involved ministries.	M	Introducing greater resilience and sustainability into food production systems will require stronger links between the environment and the agriculture sectors at all levels. The project is therefore designed with the view of strengthening cross-sectoral collaborations by establishing multi-sectoral policy and knowledge platforms, such as the Agriculture and Rural Development Group <sup>4</sup> . Here the stakeholders' common interests, the project's multi-scale benefits (evidence based) and appropriate incentive mechanisms for each party's involvement will be identified and elaborated on. Activities will hence be designed and implemented in a win-win manner for all parties involved.

*A.4. Coordination.* Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:

The project will seek to coordinate with the projects mentioned below. The coordination will focus on exchanging lessons learned and sharing technical expertise and will be established through partnership agreements and joint work plans:

*Enhancing Climate Risk Management and Adaptation in Burundi.* An AfDB- GEF project (2013-2017) that aims at integrating relevant information on climate change, including variability, into national and sub-national decision-making processes for better awareness, preparedness and adaptation, through enhanced capacity of the population to adapt to climate change and reduce vulnerability.

The structures, mechanisms and recommendations emanating from the FAO- GEF regional project *Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin* (Kagera TAMP) (2010-June 2015) that is supporting adaptive management and the adoption of an integrated ecosystems approach for the management of land resources in the Kagera Basin to generate local, national and global benefits and contribute to improved agricultural production, food security and rural livelihoods.

*Community Disaster Risk Management in Burundi.* An UNDP-GEF project (2014-2018) that seeks to capacitate provincial, communal services and local communities on disaster risks preparedness and responses management to ensure long term and sustainable emergency and reconstruction phase in Bugasera, Mumirwa and Imbo Lowland regions.

B.1 Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes  /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:

The proposed project is firmly in line with and will directly contribute to the following national policies and strategies: the National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation (NAPA), the National Environment Strategy and Action Plan (SNEB/PAE); the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (SNPA –DB); the National Action Programme to Combat Desertification (NAP/LCDT); and links to key priorities indentified in The Strategic Framework for the Fight against Poverty II (CSLPII); the Agriculture National Strategy (SAN) and the National Agricultural Investment Programme (NAIP).

**NAME OF PROGRAM:  
FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY  
Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience
Country(ies):	Ethiopia
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment and Forest
GEF Focal Area(s):	IAP-Food Security, LD and BD

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
LD-1, Program 1, Program 2 <b>Outcome 1.1</b> Improved agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management <b>Outcome 1.2</b> Functionality and cover of ecosystems maintained <b>Outcome 1.3</b> Increased investments in SLM	GEFTF	2,494,000	45,000,000
LD-3, Program 4 <b>Outcome 3.1</b> Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established <b>Outcome 3.2</b> Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities <b>Outcome 3.3</b> Increased investments in integrated landscape management	GEFTF	5,069,545	45,000,000
LD-4, Program 5 <b>Outcome 4.1</b> SLM mainstreamed in development investments and value chains across multiple scales <b>Outcome 4.2</b> Innovative mechanisms for multiple-stakeholder planning and investments in SLM at scale	GEFTF	1,075,450	7,845,500
BD-4, Program 9 <b>Outcome 9.1</b> Increased area of production landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into their management <b>Outcome 9.2</b> Sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations	GEFTF	1,600,455	14,854,500
<b>Total Project Cost</b>		10,239,450	112,700,000

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

Project Objective: To Enhance Long-Term Sustainability and Resilience of the Food Production Systems by addressing the environmental drivers of Food Insecurity in Ethiopia				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
Institutional Frameworks for enhancing Food Security	TA	1.1 Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms in support of policy and institutional reform	1,321,320	16,795,620

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

		<p>and upscaling of integrated natural resources management in place.</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Functioning multi-stakeholder platforms in place in the project sites – at national and local/landscape scale (such as the Rural Economic Development and Food Security Sector Working Group; water user associations, local land committees, etc.)</i></li> <li>• <i>At least one Gender/age sensitive decision-support tool and participatory processes applied</i></li> </ul> <p>1.2 Supportive policies and incentives in place at national and local level to support smallholder agriculture and food value-chains</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Value chain approaches integrated with sustainable production systems approaches, including consideration of post-harvest losses</i></li> <li>• <i>Select value-chains strengthened</i></li> </ul> <p>Baselines to be determined during PPG</p>		
Scaling up the Integrated Approach	TA	<p>2.1 Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources management and SLM <i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>X million ha with improved soil and water management</i></li> <li>• <i>X million ha under diversified production</i></li> <li>• <i>X million of ha of agro-pastoral systems under integrated management</i></li> <li>• <i># of farmers with increased access to food</i></li> </ul> <p>2.2 Increase in investment flows to integrated natural resources management</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>X million in increase from the local and international private</i></li> </ul>	7,069,545	89,447,690

		<p>sector; (building on the existing efforts by the G8 Alliance for Food security and Nutrition)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• X number of innovative funding mechanisms/ schemes in place – such as weather index insurance and others</li> </ul> <p>(Baselines to be determined during the PPG)</p>		
Monitoring and Assessment	TA	<p>3.1 Capacity and institutions in place to incorporate resilience into project design and implementation, and for monitoring of GEBs, <i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Multi-scale monitoring of ecosystem services and global environmental benefits established at national and landscape level</i></li> </ul> <p>3.2 Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscapes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Framework for monitoring of resilience established at national and landscape level</i></li> <li>• <i>Key Program socio-economic and gender indicators mainstreamed</i></li> </ul> <p>(Baselines to be determined during the PPG)</p>	1,360,992	821,690
Subtotal			9,751,857	107,065,000
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>			487,593	5,635,000
<b>Total Project Cost</b>			<b>10,239,450</b>	<b>112,700,000</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
SLM Funding by Multiple Development Partners <sup>5</sup>	DFID, Finland, JICA, Netherlands, USAID	Cash	22,000,000
SLM Programme Phase II	World Bank, SLM Trust Fund	In Kind	85,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	5,700,000
Government of Ethiopia	PSNP et al	In kind	TBD
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>112,700,000</b>

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

<sup>5</sup> SLM Budget allocation to Ethiopia; Source: Development Assistance Group – Ethiopia - <http://www.moa-redfs.gov.et/node/254>

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS**<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b <sup>6</sup>
UNDP	GEFTF	Country	LD	IAP food security	4,734,863	426,138	5,161,000.
UNDP	GEFTF	Country	BD	IAP food security	1,834,863	165,137	2,000,000.
UNDP	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security incentive (set-aside)		IAP food security	3,669,725	330,275	4,000,000.
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					10,239,450	921,550	11,161,000

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )

<sup>6</sup> Excludes Project Preparation Grant of 150,000 USD including fees

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **PROJECT OVERVIEW**

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:*

The project will target the Highland areas of Tigray, North Shoa, and East Hararege, and the Lowland areas of West Harerege, Somali (Hadow area) and Rift Valley Lakes. Historically, the cereal dominated livelihood zones/areas, particularly the northern and central highlands have suffered from persistent food crises and famine due to relatively lower rainfall distribution and a single season. More recently, the formerly resilient southern highlands of Tigray have become vulnerable to persistent food crises, hunger and famine after a single season of rain failure or drought. These areas also exhibit high levels of land degradation and unsustainable land use practices.

*Context and baseline scenario:*

With 80 percent of its population dependent on rain-fed agriculture, Ethiopia is particularly vulnerable to weather-related shocks. Rain varies greatly by region and is particularly unpredictable. Over the past six decades, Ethiopia has been particularly susceptible to drought, with a drought occurring every three to five years. Serious droughts and often famine, either widespread or localized, have occurred several times and affected millions of people. Poor natural resource management, together with a reduction in size of average landholdings due to high population growth, conflict, and institutional capacity constraints have exacerbated the impacts of these droughts. Land degradation is a major cause of the country's low and declining natural resource and agricultural productivity, persistent food insecurity, and rural poverty. The minimum annual cost of land degradation in Ethiopia is estimated at the range of 2 - 3 percent of agricultural GDP.

The Government of Ethiopia has demonstrated a strong commitment to addressing food insecurity by balancing investment in the chronically food insecure areas with an increased focus on higher potential areas of the country, exemplified by the development of its Agricultural Growth Program. The Government adopted the Agricultural Development-Led Industrialization (ADLI) strategy, focusing first on output growth in agriculture through technologies such as fertilizer, seeds, and infrastructure. The multi-year (2009-2023) Ethiopia Strategic Investment Framework for Sustainable Land Management (ESIF) and the (2010-2020) Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) aim to improve the livelihoods and economic well-being of the country's farmers, herders and forest resource users by scaling up sustainable land management practices with proven potential to restore, sustain and enhance the productivity of Ethiopia's land resources. The Rural Development Strategy, the Water Resources Management Policy and the Water Sector Policy aim to enhance the efficient, equitable and optimal utilization of water resources for sustainable agricultural and socioeconomic development, and place small-scale irrigation as a key priority.

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:*

Environmental degradation remains a major driver of food insecurity in Ethiopia. Existing baseline investments, while substantial, do not fully address sustainability and resilience for food security. GEF funding is sought to address this gap through the following three components:

**Component 1- INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS:** This component will strengthen existing policy and legal frameworks and institutional arrangements that allow stakeholders at national and landscape level to work together towards an approach to land use and management that fosters sustainability and resilience for food security. At the national level, the project will ensure sustainability and resilience issues are integrated into the work of the Rural Economic Development and Food Security Sector Working Group which is the Government Donor coordination platform for agriculture, natural resource management and food security. By doing so, the working group will ensure these issues are mainstreamed into sector level implementation and will coordinate and harmonize efforts of various development partners supporting the sector. Furthermore, the project will support revision of the Watershed Management Policy to strengthen land tenure and community rights. At the landscape level, the project will scale up irrigation schemes to ensure continuous water supply; strengthen the capacity extension workers, water user associations, local land committees; strengthen cooperatives to overcome value chain inefficiencies and help farmers get better access to markets and negotiate better prices for crops. Improved varieties (maize, wheat, teff and barley) have been shown to yield up to three times more production than traditional seeds in some parts of Ethiopia, but availability and cost remain significant obstacles.

**Component 2 - SCALING UP:** - This component will scale up integrated approaches at landscape level including watershed management practices such as soil and water conservation, afforestation/reforestation, conservation agriculture such as agroforestry, climate smart agriculture, and pasture management. Small reservoirs and on-farm water storage ponds support soil and water conservation, drought proofing, and small-scale community irrigation. They also will sustain livestock, fisheries, and allow farmers to grow high- value dry-season crops. Less than 10% of the 3.7 to 4.3 ha of irrigable land is currently irrigated, and the Government has already made a commitment to increase irrigation . During the PPG phase, the project will map areas where there is potential for these interventions, and develop a clear baseline.

Secondly, this component will also support increase in investment flows to SLM by incentivizing the private sector to invest in SLM building on efforts underway by the G8 Alliance for Food security and Nutrition to remove barriers for private sector participation in the sector. Specifically the project will look for opportunities to fund demand driven projects that demonstrate value addition for increased private sector investment.

Last but not least, given the extensive weather risks faced by rural smallholders in Ethiopia, this component will engage the private sector to support smallholder farmers to have access to index insurance. Some of the existing barriers around index insurance that the project will unlock include appropriate design, effective outreach and education, and the appropriate risk layering and distribution channels—including interlinking insurance with financial products.

**Component 3. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT:** - This component will support monitoring and assessment to determine whether integrated approaches to improving food security and natural resource management have a positive impact on resilience of ecosystem services, livelihoods and food security, to understand tradeoffs and synergies among environmental, agricultural and livelihood outcomes, including for food security, using

standardized tools that can be applied across scales, from the local, to national and landscape scales. Support will entail establishing integrated baselines, capacity building of key institutions in charge of monitoring, support to development of tools and systems for monitoring global environmental benefits, such as carbon benefits and GHG emission reductions, as well as for monitoring of resilience, agricultural productivity and socio-economic benefits and gender mainstreaming.

*Global environmental benefits:*

The IAP will generate global environmental benefits in the Ethiopian highlands located in the Eastern Afromontane biodiversity hotspot. The highlands are under severe threat from land degradation and yet small holder farmers depend on them for their fuelwood, food supply, income, and water. The IAP will ensure GEBS are maintained and restored through scaling up integrated approaches to sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes). Project activities will reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape; enhance cross-sectoral coordination in integrated landscape management; support farmers in adopting integrated land management practices, promote and reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change. A more detailed assessment of GEBS will be carried out during the PPG phase.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

Project design will be led by the Federal Ministry of Environment and Forest. The Ministry will closely consult with all key stakeholders including the Ministry of Agriculture, NGOs, Donors, Private Sector and Research institutes. At the regional and local level the regional and local Governments will also be consulted and their inputs will feed into the design and preparation.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk Level</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>
The Integrated Food approach is new and thus there is likely to be limited capacity to implement it at local level – and this could affect how quickly the project gets implemented	Medium	Project’s activities will include extensive engagement with local communities to identify opportunities relating to communities’ needs and local knowledge.
Climate Change could affect the project activities on the ground	Medium	The project will adopt best practices from on-going and past projects on Climate Change adaptation such as “ <i>Coping with Drought</i> ” and the <i>Disaster Risk and Livelihood Recovery Programme</i>
Poor coordination between key institutions implementing the project at the local level – and also between regional and national authorities	Medium	The project will put in place a well designed coordination mechanism during the project PPG. Regular communication channels and/or formal agreements (e.g. Memoranda of Understanding) will enhance cooperation between participating authorities.

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

The project will coordinate with ongoing GEF and other programs/projects such as:

- The Mainstreaming Agro Biodiversity Project provides farming communities with incentives (policies, capacity, markets and knowledge) to mainstream conservation of agro-biodiversity, including crop wild relatives into the farming systems of Ethiopia
- The Promoting Autonomous Adaptation at the Community level project supports local communities and administrations at the lowest level of government to design and implement adaptation actions aimed at reducing vulnerability and building resilience, especially in those communities that are particularly vulnerable in Ethiopia. Grant:
- The Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change project aims to increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

***B.1 IS THE PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH THE NATIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANS OR REPORTS AND ASSESSEMENTS UNDER RELEVANT CONVENTIONS? (YES /NO  ). IF YES, WHICH ONES AND HOW: NAPAS, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURS, ETC.:***

The proposed project is inline with several government policies, strategies and plans as indicated below:

- I. The Growth and Transformation Plan (2011-2015) which focuses on among others enhancing productivity and production of smallholder farmers and pastoralists, strengthening market systems, improving participation and engagement of the private sector, expanding the amount of land under irrigation, and reducing the number of chronically food insecure households.
- II. The Climate-Resilient Green Economy Green economy strategy that aims to achieve middle-income status by 2025 while developing a green economy. The green economy plan is based on four pillars including improving crop and livestock production practices for higher food security and farmer income while reducing emissions; Protecting and re-establishing forests for their economic and ecosystem services; Expanding electricity generation from renewable sources of energy for domestic and regional markets and leapfrogging to modern and energy-efficient technologies in transport, industrial sectors, and buildings.
- III. The Policy of Food Security through better Agricultural Productivity, which aims to develop incentive based Productive Safety Nets Programmes for Farm Regeneration and for voluntary Relocation to better Farmlands for better Agricultural Productivity to tackle the challenges posed by Droughts.

**NAME OF PROGRAM:  
FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY  
Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Sustainable Landscape Management Project in Northern Ghana
Country(ies):	Ghana
GEF Agency(ies):	WB
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI)
GEF Focal Area(s):	LD, BD and CCM

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 2	GEFTF	2,962,042	9,000,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4	GEFTF	2,500,000	10,000,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5	GEFTF	500,000	1,000,000
IAP-Food Security, BD-1, Program 1	GEFTF	2,024,863	500,000
IAP-Food Security, BD-4, Program 9	GEFTF	1,900,000	500,000
IAP-Food Security, CCM-2, Program 4	GEFTF	2,881,927	1,000,000
Total Project Cost		12,768,832	22,000,000

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

Project Objective: To scale-up integrated landscape management practices <sup>3</sup> in selected target communities to maintain ecosystem services.				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>4</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
Strengthened Institutional Frameworks	TA	Multi- stakeholder platforms strengthened to support upscaling of integrated natural resources management across scales and sectors  Supportive policies and incentives in place to support smallholder agriculture and nature-based value-chains	2,000,000	1,400,000
Scaling-up Implementation of Integrated Landscape	Inv	Increased land area and agroecosystems under integrated natural resources management and	8,368,832	18,650,000

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

<sup>3</sup> Integrated landscape management practices include management of soil, water, vegetation and animal resources. It involves a holistic approach that integrates social, economic, physical and biological assets. For the purposes of this proposal, this definition will encompass other approaches such as integrated natural resources management (INRM), integrated water resources management (IWRM), integrated ecosystem management (IEM), eco-agriculture and sustainable forest management (SFM), and many facets of sustainable agriculture, agriculture water management (AWM), biodiversity conservation and climate change adaptation, such as agroforestry.

<sup>4</sup> Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

management practices		sustainable land and water management and integrated crop-livestock systems.  Improved local-level (district and community) watershed management planning  Increased extension capacity for SLWM technologies in target areas.  Increased community awareness about integrated landscapes management.		
Monitoring assessment and Evaluation	TA	Systems and capacity of institutions strengthened for monitoring SLWM, support impact evaluation, PES and GEBs	1,800,000	1,450,000
Subtotal			12168832	21,500,000
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>5</sup>			600,000	500,000
<b>Total Project Cost</b>			<b>12,768,832</b>	<b>22,000,000</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	World Bank (GCAP parallel financing)	Loans	20,000,000
Recipient Government	Government of Ghana	In-kind	2,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>22,000,000</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b <sup>6</sup>
WB	GEFTF	Ghana	Biodiversity	IAP-Food Security	2,924,863	263,238	3,188,101
WB	GEFTF	Ghana	Climate Change	IAP-Food Security	2,212,202	199,098	2,411,300
WB	GEFTF	Ghana	Land Degradation	IAP-Food Security	3,962,042	356,584	4,318,626
WB	GEFTF	Ghana	Incentive	IAP-Food Security	3,669,725	330,275	4,000,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>12,768,832</b>	<b>1,149,195</b>	<b>13,918,027</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )

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

<sup>6</sup> Excludes Project Preparation Grant of 150,000 USD including fees

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### Project Overview

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:*

Within IAP, the proposed Project targets the Sahel region of Ghana - the dry, primarily flat, northern savannah region often referred to as the Northern Savannah Zone (NSZ). This area historically has had the highest rates of poverty and food insecurity and is the least climate resilient. In this area, the target agrosystems are the cereal-root crop mixed and the agro-pastoral millet sorgum farming. Notably, also natural habitat corridors centered along rivers form biodiversity corridors linking Mole National Park and Gbele Resource Reserve (GRR) with protected areas in Burkina Faso. Sustainable land management of the surrounding watersheds is thus key to supporting the continued survival of these riparian corridors, which in turn are critical to the hydrological services provided by the watershed as a whole.

This project would build upon the on-going Sustainable Land and Water Management Project (SLWMP) that aims to reduce land degradation and enhance maintenance of biodiversity in the NSZ. Due to inadequate resources under the available GEF-4 and GEF-5 star allocations, the originally planned SLWMP had to scale back geographic coverage to 6,000 ha. The proposed project would address the identified gaps in the remaining geographical zone and expand sustainable land and water management practices to 10,000 ha. This expansion would improve contiguity of communities along target sub-watershed rivers (Kulpawn, Sisilli, and Red Volta), amplify benefits from rangeland management practices, and optimize project impacts and benefits to communities.

*Context and baseline scenario:*

Ghana's agriculture sector contributed 22% to the country's GDP in 2013 and employs over 41% of the economically active population. About 45% of all Ghanaian householders are engaged in agriculture and together contribute over 90% of the country's food needs. Agriculture is predominantly practiced on smallholder, family-operated farms - typically less than 2 hectares - using rudimentary technology. Only 0.04% of cultivated land was under irrigation in 2013, the remainder being rainfall dependent.

Much of the increased production through expansion of agricultural land, combined and traditional bush-fallow systems, grazing practices and rising demands for water are becoming increasingly unsustainable, and increasingly affecting not only agricultural lands but forests, natural habitats and waterbodies. The causes of land degradation are closely associated with the particular ecological zone and production system and a leading cause appears to be unsustainable agricultural practices. Others include over-harvesting of fuel wood, encroachment of reserves, poaching and uncontrolled bush fires.

Ghana has several national parks and reserves and also serves as an important area for faunal migration owing to the natural habitat corridors linking Mole National Park and Gbele Resource Reserve (GRR). Clearly, agriculture, biodiversity conservation and forestry are interrelated and, this calls for a holistic integrated landscape approach to providing ecosystem services.

The baseline context includes two on-going or planned investments that address problems in the NSZ and are the SLWMP and the Ghana Commercial Agriculture Project (GCAP). For purposes of the incremental reasoning, the SLWMP operation is not considered as baseline financing, but an associated parallel project which serves as an existing model for expanding further work.

The SLWMP, started in 2011, promotes adoption of sustainable land and water management practices with the aim of reducing land degradation and enhancing maintenance of biodiversity in selected micro-watersheds in Ghana's NSZ. Through capacity building for integrated spatial planning, water and land management, and project management and coordination, SLWMP addresses climate resilience, rangeland management, sustainable natural resource management, small scale water harvesting, water resource control techniques, and environmental quality improvements. SLWMP has secured additional financing for three years and would end February 2018 with total GEF funding of USD 16.9million and Ghana government funds of USD 12.3 million equivalent.

The GCAP aims to increase access to land, private sector finance, and input and output markets by smallholder farms from public-private partnerships in commercial agriculture in the Accra Plains and Savannah Accelerated Development Authority zone, or NSZ. An estimated \$20 million of the overall GCAP envelope (\$100 million) is considered as baseline associated financing for this proposed project.

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:*

The design of the project will be developed as preparation proceeds. However, the proposed project priorities in support of the IAP will likely be structured around three key aspects: strengthening institutional frameworks and capacity building; scaling up implementation of integrated landscapes management practices and; monitoring and evaluation. Key priority interventions will be as follows:

- Support to multi-stakeholder platforms, including the existing National SLM committee (NSLMC), which brings together different sectors and stakeholders to promote policy integration and enhanced sharing of experiences and technical knowledge.
- Support to establishment of supportive policy frameworks and incentives at national level to support smallholder agriculture and nature-based value-chains
- Scale up SLWM interventions from the original target of 6,000 ha to an expanded area of 10,000 ha.
- Scale up biodiversity management in the Western Wildlife Corridor by supporting implementation of management plans developed by Community Resource Management Areas in sites two and four.
- Add two districts in Ghana's Northern Region due to proximity to Mole National Park and root crop cultivation to bring number of operating districts under SLWMP from 10 to 12.
- Promote carbon sequestration and increased climate resilience through efficient soil and water management practices in farming systems and by empowering smallholder farmers to diversify their farms through integration of trees, natural regeneration, and high value crops.
- Advance rangeland management, agro-pastoralism with cereals and good animal husbandry to ensure sustainable supply and access to livestock feed and organic manure for achieving food security.
- Support to capacity building of key institutions for monitoring and assessment studies.
- Support to development and implementation of tools and systems for monitoring global environmental benefits, such as carbon benefits, agricultural productivity and socio-economic benefits as relevant.
- Training and capacity building of key national stakeholders in data collection, analysis, results sharing and communication with policy and decision makers

*Global environmental benefits:*

Global Incremental Benefits: Given that SLWM is a key element for the connectivity of the different fragmented habitats in Ghana, a mosaic approach to ecosystem management has been taken for the provision of essential ecosystem services through this proposed GEF operation. As designed the project presents a comprehensive approach to sustainable land and watershed management linking forestry and biodiversity (protection of the key biodiversity in the Gbele Resource Reserve and Wildlife Corridors and Forest Reserves), that combines soft and hard investments at the community level, including in maintenance of ecological infrastructure across the Northern Savannah eco-agricultural zone. This is expected to lead to success in SLWM in the adjacent agricultural land. Notably, SLM activities for crops (conservation agriculture, hedges, agro-forestry, ridges etc), for livestock (fodder banks and sylvo-pastoralism for fodder and shadow, e.g. using acacia) along with improved fire control/management, are expected to improve carbon sequestration in the soil and above, and improve erosion control.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The on-going SLWMP provides a robust and tested institutional arrangement for project implementation. As preparation proceeds the existing platforms and coordination mechanisms will be used to engage with the relevant stakeholders. Below are key stakeholders and brief descriptions of their roles:

- Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI) provides overall management and coordination.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) coordinates micro-watershed planning exercises and leads Payment for Environmental Service and monitoring aspects of SLWM.
- Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) leads watershed planning and implementation of SLWM activities in the agricultural landscape.
- Wildlife and Forestry Service Divisions of the Forestry Commission lead planning and implementation of SLWM related biodiversity management in non-agricultural landscapes and sustainable forest management activities in the forest reserves, respectively.
- National Sustainable Land Management Committee (NSLMC), a multi-stakeholder platform, brings senior technical representatives from relevant land and water related sectors together to act as a Technical Advisory Committee to support project implementation and assist with technical coordination between implementation agencies.
- In addition, as preparation proceeds the consultative discussions will include as relevant, the Water Resources Commission, Ministry of Local government and Rural Development, District Assemblies, Lands Commission and various research and centres of excellence (e.g. the Faculty of Agriculture, the CSIR Soil Research and Water Research Institutes, the Forest Research Institute etc.)

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

Projects risks are low. The IAP addresses climate resilience but does not depend on it per say. Implementation risks are minimized due to the existing, well established institutional implementation structures under SLWMP and SLWMP additional financing.

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

The proposed project will draw synergies with ongoing related initiatives on the ground to avoid duplication. Notably, through NEPAD's TerrAfrica Partnership, the World Bank and others have provided technical support to

the GoG in strengthening programmatic investment in land use management via national coordination and multi-sector dialogue on investment priorities. Following which investment projects are under implementation on the ground including the GEF financed Sustainable Land and Water Management project (SLWMP) under the Sahel and West Africa Program (SAWAP). The project will also ensure coordination with the Social Opportunities Project (SOP) and the Forest Investment Program (FIP). These opportunities will be explored during the preparation stage.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes  /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:*

- Summarize alignment of proposed priorities with relevant national sustainable development policies and strategies
- Summarize alignment of proposed priorities with relevant local sustainable development policies and strategies
- The project priorities identified align closely with Ghana's vision of modernizing its agriculture sector to improve food security in an environmentally sustainable manner with a focus on small scale farmers, particularly in the most fragile ecosystems. Some key national and local policies and strategies include:
- Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (FASDEP II), which directs Ghana's agriculture development strategies and seeks to address issues affecting smallholder farming and food security.
- Ghana's National Climate Change Policy and Environment Policy, which identify agriculture as a priority.
- Government of Ghana Strategic Investment Framework (GSIF) for Sustainable Land Management 2011-2025.
- SADA is Ghana's policy scheme to address the development gap between southern and northern Ghana by modernizing agriculture in the north and orienting it towards a larger market.

**NAME OF PROGRAM:**  
**FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY**  
**Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Establishment of the Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund (UTNWF)
Country(ies):	Kenya
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD
Other Executing Partner(s):	The Nature Conservancy; Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources - Water Resources Management Authority and Kenya Forest Service; Ministry of Agriculture; National Museums of Kenya; UNEP
GEF Focal Area(s):	LD, BD and CCM

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2	GEFTF	1 440 400	11 500 000
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5	GEFTF	2 160 435	27 250 000
IAP-Food Security, BD-3, Program 7	GEFTF	180 050	2 300 000
IAP-Food Security, BD-4, Program 9	GEFTF	1 620 450	11 650 000
IAP-Food Security, CCM-2, Program 4	GEFTF	1 800 500	12 500 000
Total Project Cost		7201835	65 200 000

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

<b>Project Objective:</b> A well conserved Upper Tana River basin with improved water quality and quantity for downstream users (public and private); maintaining regular flows of water throughout the year; enhancing ecosystem services, specifically food security, freshwater and terrestrial biodiversity, and improving human well-being and quality of life for upstream local communities				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
1.Upper Tana Water Fund Management Platform strengthened and operational	Inv	1.1 Multistakeholder and multi-scale platforms in place to support policy and institutional reform and upscaling of INRM (PFD outcome) 1.1.1 Establishment of the UTNFW as a legal Institution and initial endowment 1.1.2 Governance structures for the UTNFW agreed and in line for GoK legal guidelines for public-private partnerships 1.1.3 Governance structures and guidelines for the endowment fund established	2,110,733	7,733,333
	TA	1.2 Supportive policies and incentives in place to support		

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

		<p>smallholder agriculture and food value chains (PFD)</p> <p>1.2.1 Innovative and operational communications strategy ensures the UTNFW is responsive to the needs of its stakeholders (the people, the public and the private sector) (linked to component 3)</p> <p>1.2.2 Payment for Ecosystem Services Mechanism established for delivering incentives to targeted upstream land managers to properly manage land</p>		
<p>2. Improved Upper Tana Catchment ecosystems that support livelihoods and economic development</p>	TA	<p>2.1 Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under INRM and SLM (PFD)</p> <p>2.1.1 Diversified and climate resilient production systems that increase food security and household incomes promoted across 1 700 000 ha</p> <p>2.1.2 Carbon stocks in the Aberdares and Mount Kenya Water Towers enhanced and GHG emission reduced - 10% change over baseline</p> <p>2.1.3 Support mechanisms for sustainable land management, including wetlands, rural roads and quarries, in the wider catchment of the Aberdares and Mount Kenya Water Towers for ecosystem restoration and maintenance</p> <p>2.2 Increase in investment flows to INRM (PFD)</p> <p>2.2.1. Support mechanisms for forest landscape management and restoration established in the wider catchment of the Aberdares and Mount Kenya Water Towers for ecosystem restoration and maintenance</p> <p>2.2.2 Audit mechanisms developed for the water fund endowment and disbursement mechanisms</p> <p>2.2.3 Lessons from UTNFW outscaled to two other water towers in Kenya and business cases as well as pilot interventions developed for Cherangani- Embobut, Mara and/ or Marsabit</p>	3,480,368	51,533,333

3. Robust knowledge management and learning systems implemented to direct UTNWF management and share lessons both nationally and regionally	TA	<p>3.1 Capacity and institutions in place for monitoring of GEBs (PFD)</p> <p>3.1.1 Biophysical monitoring protocols established and integrated across key partners (LDSF/Hydrometry)</p> <p>3.1.2 Communication management tools appropriate to the needs of the UTNWF stakeholders developed and institutionalized (Link to component 1.4)</p> <p>3.2 Framework in place for M&amp;A of resilience and socio-economic benefits (PFD)</p> <p>3.2.1 Socio-Economic monitoring, analytical and reporting tools developed and institutionalised within the UTNFW for livelihoods and resilience assessments</p> <p>3.2.2 Economic monitoring of returns to private sector investments</p>	1,250,733	933,333
Subtotal			6,841,835	60,200,000
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>			360,000	5,000,000
<b>Total Project Cost</b>			<b>7,201,835</b>	<b>65,200,000</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF/Donor Agency	International Fund for Agricultural Development	Grants	12,000,000
GEF Agency	United Nations Environmental Agency	Grants	500,000
Recipient Govt	Government of Kenya through it loans from IFAD	Loans	39,600,00
Recipient Govt	Government of Kenya – Departmental Budgets	In Kind	tba
Other	The Nature Conservancy		3,300,000
Private Sector	Nairobi Water Company, East African Breweries, Kenya Power and Light .....	Equity	10,000,000
Beneficiaries	Farmers and communities in Water Towers	In kind	Tba
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>65,200,000</b>

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

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>**

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b <sup>5</sup>
IFAD	GEFTF	country	LD	IAP food security	1,800,459	162,041	1,962,500
IFAD	GEFTF	country	BD	IAP food security	900,229	81,021	981,250
IFAD	GEFTF	country	CC	IAP food security	900,229	81,021	981,250
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security incentive (set-aside)	IAP Food Security	IAP food security	3,600,917	324,083	3,925,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7,201,835</b>	<b>648,165</b>	<b>7,850,000</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

Project Overview

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:*

The challenges to agro-ecosystem resilience and food security in East Africa are numerous and are related to: (i) the management of land and water; and (ii) agricultural approaches, technologies and practices, including access to markets and inputs. This situation is compounded by factors such as the complementary yet unclear roles of the private sector and public policy, access to timely and appropriate information on climate and markets, and the critical role of community-based resource user associations. Existing initiatives address both challenges, but the GEF can add value in the interface between the two. For example, strengthened institutional arrangements need to be linked to other upscaling processes to have an impact. Market-based approaches to upscaling of good natural resources management practices, in turn, need to be linked to incentive schemes that are pro-poor and support environmental sustainability. Finally, coordinated and sustained monitoring and assessment of environmental and socio-economic and food security impacts need to underpin any successful upscaling process to ensure adaptive learning and implementation.

In Kenya, the integrated approach of the Program will be piloted in the Upper Tana River basin, which covers 17,000 km<sup>2</sup> with 5.3 million inhabitants. This basin includes two of Kenya's five "water towers": the Aberdare Mountains and Mount Kenya. It is home to critical indigenous flora and fauna and sustains important aquatic biodiversity and drives agriculture that feeds millions of Kenyans. The water towers lie largely within protected areas; however downstream, the river is being choked by sediments and dry season flows are depleted due to poor land and water management practices. Millions of people and the iconic wildlife that depend on the river bear the brunt of these impacts. This is amplified by the impacts of climate change that increases sediment load in times of severe rainfall events which are of increased frequency.

<sup>5</sup> Excludes Project Preparation Grant of 150,000 USD including fees

*Context and baseline scenario:*

IFAD and UNEP are working with TNC to build upon both past and current investments programmes that have supported integrated development and food security in the Upper Tana River basin with the GoK including past GEF3 financing (Mount Kenya Environmental Pilot Project). The current investment programmes are the Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resources Management Project (UTaNRMP)" and the Kenya Cereal Enhancement Programme - Climate Resilient Agricultural Livelihoods Window (KCEP-CRAL)". Co-financing from these sources combined is in excess of US\$60,000,000 and jointly target more 300 000 households farming some 1.7 million ha

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:*

The goal for this proposed GEF activity is a well conserved Upper Tana River basin which is improving water quality and water quantity for downstream users (public and private); maintaining regular flows of water throughout the year; enhancing ecosystem services, specifically food security, freshwater and terrestrial biodiversity, and improving human well-being for upstream local communities. The project will have three key components:

**Institutional frameworks:** GEF financing will support a platform to bring together local communities, public and private sector under one umbrella to achieve the goal. In the Tana River basin, the creation of an equitable and sustainable financing mechanism (an endowment fund) within the UTNWF, will enable different actors to invest in upstream watershed conservation activities. Moreover, it will serve as a long-term climate change adaptation tool.

**Scaling up:** GEF support will expand the emerging UTNWF – a public-private partnership – to address the pressing challenges facing the supply of clean water to 4 million inhabitants of Nairobi and the sustainability and food security of 1 million households and farmers in the basin and ensure continued hydropower generation. Sustainable intensification of agriculture and enterprise development initiatives will be implemented.

**Monitoring and assessment (M&A):** This component aims at developing of a M&Ag system within UTNWF to monitor the rivers' water quality and quantity, and ultimately improve water management approach.

*Global environmental benefits:*

The Global Environmental Benefits of project comes from scaling up TNCs tried and tested sustainable and long term payment for ecosystem services (PES) methodology from Latin America developed with GEF support. This an example of facilitating a south-south exchange to advance the Upper Tana-Nairobi Water Fund (UTNWF) and scales out the experiences from the GEF3 - Mount Kenya Environmental Pilot Project that explored community natural resource management initiatives and Green Water Credits to the whole of the Mount Kenya and Aberdare Water Towers. The development of a catchment wide surveillance system using LDSF approaches will help the early identification of land degradation risks and enable mitigation of land use risks. By linking with ongoing development initiatives good land management and water conservation practices will promoted to all communities within hotspot areas and will be supported through a sustainable source of green financing. The scaling up of SLM practices will contribute to carbon sequestration and is expected to lead to increase in biomass and biological diversity. The exact GEBs will be assessed during design but are expected to include improved water quality and water quantity for downstream users (public and private); maintaining regular flows of water throughout the year; enhancing ecosystem services, specifically food security, freshwater and terrestrial biodiversity, and improving human well-being for upstream local communities.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The proposal which will be led by the International Fund for Agricultural Development, with co-implementation and execution support from the United Nations Environmental Programme, and will be prepared and executed by The Nature Conservancy; Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources - Water Resources Management Authority and Kenya Forest Service; Ministry of Agriculture; National Museums of Kenya. Project Collaborators include: (i) Government: State Department of Agriculture, State Department of Energy, Tana & Athi Rivers Development Authority, Kenya Forest Service, Kenya Wildlife Service, Water Resources Management Authority

(ii) Private Sector: Nairobi City Water & Sewerage Company, Kenya Electricity Generating Company, East Africa Breweries, British American Tobacco, Pentair Inc, Coca-Cola, Frigoken (Horticulture) Ltd

(iii) Civil Society: Kenya National Farmers Federation (KENAFF- NGO), Sustainable Agriculture, Community Development & Environment Program (SACDEP- NGO), The Green Belt Movement (GBM- NGO)

All the stakeholders and collaborators will be engaged in project planning which will include : (i) Stakeholders workshops; (ii) Baseline data acquisition; (iii) A participatory decision making process to clarify their roles, responsibilities and their respective financial contribution to the project; (iv) The civil society members of the project will directly engage local communities as mobilizers for this project. It is targeted that at least one million people will be directly involved (60% women, 30% men and 10% being youth and marginalized communities).

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

The water towers of Kenya are subject to both erratic and extreme climatic conditions that oscillate between droughts and floods, impacting upon the livelihoods of rural populations and exacerbate environmental degradation. Environmental and socio-aspects of resilience are monitored for adaptive learning, and "climate-proofing" of investments.

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

The project is building upon the findings of GEF3 project - Mount Kenya Environmental Pilot Project that explored community natural resource management initiatives and Green Water Credits. The proposed IAP Project will apply TNC's tried and tested, sustainable and long term payment for ecosystem services (PES) methodology from Latin America developed with GEF support and is facilitating a south-south exchange to advance the Upper Tana-Nairobi Water Fund (UTNWF).

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes  /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:*

The project address issues at the intersection of the UNCCD, CBD and the UNFCCC and their respective action programmes: Specifically the project will contribute to the National Action Programme to Combat Desertification (NAP); the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP); National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) 2013-2017 and links to key priorities of the Government of Kenya identified in Kenya's Vision 2030 Flagships, MTP II, basic requirements of the Kenya Constitution 2010 to strengthen Environmental Governance, including the rehabilitation and strengthening of water towers.

The establishment of the UTWF will directly contribute to these priorities, while also responding to cross sectoral priority areas, such as food security, energy, vegetation cover and wildlife, forest conservation, agriculture and pastoralism, and soil management

**NAME OF PROGRAM:**  
**FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY**  
**Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Enhancing the resilience of agro-ecological systems
Country(ies):	Malawi
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development; Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Environment; Food and Agriculture Organisation (EPIC team)
GEF Focal Area(s):	LD, BD and CCM

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2	GEFTF	2,057,313	9,300,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4	GEFTF	1,610,100	24,100,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5	GEFTF	536,700	2,000,000
IAP-Food Security, BD-4, Program 9	GEFTF	1,341,750	5,400,000
IAP-Food Security, CCM-2, Program 4	GEFTF	1,610,100	6,200,000
Total Project Cost		7,155,963	47,000,000

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

Project Objective: Enhancing the provision of ecosystem services to improve productivity and resilience of agricultural systems				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
Component 1: Catchment Management/ River Basin Authorities strengthened and functional	TA	1.1 Catchment Management/ River Basin Authorities established and operationalized 1.2 Participatory catchment management plans developed 1.3 Functional community based natural resources management groups and water user associations established	1,236,319	10,150,000
Component 2: Agricultural development and catchment management	Inv	2.1 Wider adoption of climate resilient agriculture practices 2.2 Infrastructure in irrigation schemes made more robust and protected 2.3 Soil fertility management and water conservation improved	4,694,412	27,320,000
Component 3: Knowledge and skill enhancement	Inv	3.1 Livelihoods diversified	867,434	5,300,000
	TA	3.2 A low-cost farmer-to-farmer extension network established Ecosystem resilience measurement and monitoring tools and systems developed		

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

	Subtotal	6,798,165	42,770,000
	Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup> (select)	357,798	4,230,000
	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>7,155,963</b>	<b>47,000,000</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	International Fund for Agricultural Development	Grant	19,500,000
GEF Agency	International Fund for Agricultural Development	Loan	19,500,000
Recipient Government	Government of Malawi	In kind	7,000,000
Beneficiaries		In kind	1,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>47,000,000</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b <sup>5</sup>
IFAD	IAP Food Security Set aside			IAP Food Security (select as applicable)	3,577,982	322,018	3,900,000
IFAD	GEFTF (select)	Malawi	Land Degradation	IAP Food Security (select as applicable)	1,341,743	120,757	1,462,500
IFAD	GEFTF (select)	Malawi	Climate Change	IAP Food Security (select as applicable)	1,341,743	120,757	1,462,500
IFAD	GEFTF	Malawi	Biodiversity	IAP Food Security (select as applicable)	894,495	80,505	975,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7,155,963</b>	<b>644,037</b>	<b>7,800,000</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

### Project Overview

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:*

The IAP will cover catchments mainly in the southern and central regions of Malawi. These are areas with the higher density of the population, who are mainly engaged in maize mixed farming in rain-fed plots. The areas also have

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

<sup>5</sup> Excludes Project Preparation Grant of 150,000 USD including fees

potential for small and medium sized gravity fed irrigation systems. These regions are also more exposed to erosion risks and frequently have degraded catchments.

*Context and baseline scenario:*

The resilience of the agro-ecosystem in Malawi is hindered by soil and land degradation as well as nutrient loss leading to low productivity. The management of natural resources is often at the micro-level in contrast to an integrated landscape approach. Most smallholders focus on maize cultivation with limited crop diversification. The irrigated land area is minimal and agriculture production vulnerable to rainfall variation. Large numbers of smallholders remain food insecure with low incomes. The low productivity leads to persistent high levels of poverty and malnutrition and is exacerbated by lack of enabling institutional frameworks and sustainable financing, poor advisory services and extension and limited youth participation. Agricultural productivity is also adversely affected by the poor quality of farm inputs, declining soil fertility and sub-optimal agricultural practices. These challenges are reinforced by lack of tenure security, dysfunctional land policies and institutions, which hinder efficient land use, investment in agriculture, private sector development, gender equality, and good governance.

Ongoing and planned investments in agricultural development and catchment management include the Sustainable Agricultural Production Programme, the Climate Smart Agriculture pilot project and the Programme for Rural Irrigation Development. The co-financing from these baseline projects amounts to at least USD 47 million.

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:*

**Component 1 Institutional Frameworks:** The IAP will strengthen smaller-scale leadership/social mechanisms, platforms, structures and processes for sharing knowledge and networking to enhance collaboration among different users of natural resources. At the national and regional levels support will be provided for the operationalization of the catchment management/ river basin authorities that are in the process of being established in Malawi. This will strengthen the landscape governance and regulatory structures to harness benefits of an integrated approach in order to achieve large-scale benefits. In addition, the IAP will support the development of participatory catchment management plans to promote benefit sharing in each of the sub-basins. At the local level, the IAP will support establishment or strengthening of existing community based groups and water user associations and build capacity of staff at the district and extension planning area levels.

**Component 2 Scaling-up:** These implementation of the catchment management plans will include tried and tested measures such as natural forest regeneration, vegetated contours, riverbank conservation, training in sustainable water and chemical usage to address the issues of soil erosion, deforestation, water quality and siltation. The IAP will promote the adoption of climate resilient agricultural practices such as crop diversification, improved soil and water management practices, conservation agriculture, agroforestry, integrating the use of climate forecasts into cropping decisions, irrigation and increasing regional farm diversity. This will result in improved climate resilience, sustained or increased productivity, reduced land degradation and enhanced provision of ecosystem services at the watershed level. In addition existing and new sustainable land management programmes within the landscape approach will be strengthened to incorporate climate and environmental issues; evidence-based and pilot tested best practices expanded/replicated to more beneficiaries, and existing development gains climate proofed and a holistic approach to sustainable land management and food security promoted/adopted. The IAP will also promote livelihood diversification as a means of climate change adaptation and also improving household incomes for food security.

**Component 3 Monitoring and assessment:** The IAP will support the development of relevant partnerships and tools for measuring and monitoring resilience including the analysis of biophysical, socio-economic, institutional, climatic and agro-ecosystem elements and indicators.

*Global environmental benefits:*

The global environmental benefits that the IAP will generate include maintenance of the ecosystem goods and services in the watersheds that contain the agricultural productive systems on which the smallholders depend for their livelihoods and food security at local and national levels. The IAP also places emphasis on scaling up of sustainable land management practices in the production systems in the catchments being targeted, which is another environmental benefit. The catchment management/ river basin authorities that will be operationalised and the management plans to be developed will also provide institutional frameworks and investments to contribute to the

sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services. The IAP will also promote resilience to climate change for the smallholder farmers and communities in the targeted catchments. The details of the GEBs will be assessed during design but are expected to include improved climate resilience, sustained or increased productivity, reduced land degradation and enhanced provision of ecosystem services at the watershed level.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

Several Government Agencies and Ministries responsible for Natural Resources Management, Environment and Climate Change, Local Government and Rural Development, Gender, Industry, Trade and Private Sector Development will be involved in the design of the programme by providing both the expertise and the data and information required. Other sources of data including lessons and experience to inform the design and implementation will be Civil Society/Non-Government Organizations such as National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi; Farmers' Union of Malawi and Total Land Care. Academia and Research institutions are also sources of data and potential implementation partners including Chitedze Agricultural Research Station, Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Natural Resources College NRC. Private sector will also provide information and experience to shape the design for example, Micro Finance Institutions and Input suppliers.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

Some of the risks and potential measures to address them are as follows:

- Land tenure issues may result in smallholder farmers not being able to make long term investments such as those required for rehabilitation of degraded lands. This will be addressed through policy dialogue to support Land Bill and working with Traditional Authorities and District Councils to get documented and legally recognised land use agreements for Water User Associations and members
- Farmers are unwilling to diversify from maize-based farming systems. This risk will be minimized by initiating linkages to the value chain to support and linking farmers to markets.
- Low adoption rates of climate resilient agricultural practices. The farmer field schools that use the peer based learning mechanisms and also promote particular practices with evidence of results from early adopters will help to address this risk.
- Irrigation plot holders not willing to participate in catchment activities. This can be minimised through early participation of smallholders in the planning and implementation of an irrigation scheme and catchment area. Sensitization on the interdependence of water users in each catchment will also encourage participation from different water users.

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

Synergies will be established and with the following projects and programmes being managed or implemented by several development partners lessons learnt used to inform the IAP design. The UNDP's policy level mainstreaming climate change in national and district level planning through GEF financed projects. The UK's Department for International Development's Enhancing Community Resilience Programme with Norway and Irish Aid covering four main themes of disaster risk management including an early warning system, conservation agriculture, livelihoods diversification and low carbon technology. The Clinton Development Initiative's promotion of climate smart agriculture among smallholders and integrated soil fertility management. The FAO's Economic and Policy Innovations for Climate Smart Agriculture project which generates an evidence base to capture the interactions at the food security, adaptation and mitigation nexus as well as develop investment plans for financing climate smart agriculture. The African Development Bank 's GEF financed Climate Adaptation for Rural Livelihoods Agricultural project which included activities such as crop diversification, soil and water conservation, and improved inputs.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes  /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:*

The emphasis on agro-ecosystem resilience and food security for the IAP fully aligns it with the Malawi Growth Development Strategy, which includes a focus on increasing food security, diversifying crop production and improving nutrition and incomes amongst the rural population. The focus areas are also in line with the Agriculture Sector Wide Approach, which covers three main areas: 1) Food security and risk management, 2) Agri-business and market development and, 3) Sustainable land and water management. The IAP priorities are also aligned with those identified in the National Adaptation Programmes of Action, which proposed interventions for improved crop varieties and improved crop and livestock management practices. The emerging National Adaptation Plans have climate change and agriculture as central pillars of the planning process. The IAP will also contribute to meeting the objectives of National Climate Change Policy and Investment Plan that are aimed at guiding programming, building resilience and developing capacity of the environment and climate change management; increasing the protection, conservation and productivity of the environment and natural resources. The IAP will contribute to achieving priorities of the National Action Programme to Combat Desertification focusing on increasing smallholder agricultural productivity, as a way to reduce poverty, which is expected to greatly assist in the conservation and protection of natural resources and the environment. The IAP is consistent with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan objectives to enhance agricultural production through active protection and management of agricultural biodiversity, and support coordinated community action to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity. This includes promotion of agro-biodiversity within a gender sensitive framework.

**NAME OF PROGRAM:  
FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY  
Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Smallholder agricultural development programme
Country(ies):	Niger
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture and HCI3N
GEF Focal Area(s):	LD, CC and BD and IAP-set aside

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2 Scaling up of integrated approaches)	GEFTF	4,508,459	36,192,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4 scaling up of integrated approaches and monitoring and assessment)	GEFTF	2,502,371	19,302,400
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5 : Strengthening institutional frameworks and monitoring and assessment	GEFTF	625,592	4,825,600
Total Project Cost		7,636,422	60,320,000

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

Project Objective: Ensure sustainable food security and strengthen smallholder farming resilience				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
C1. Scaling up of integrated approaches through for sustainable family farming	INV&TA	<b>Outcome 1.2 Functionality and cover of ecosystems maintained and outcome 3.2 Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities.</b> (i) soil and water conservation are investments scaled up (40,000 hectares); (ii) improved agro-ecosystem resilience through water mobilisation; (iii) improving food security and smallholder resilience to droughts through the promotion of small-scale irrigation on 7,500 hectares	6,672,022	21,780,000

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

C2. Access to markets	INV	<b>Outcome 3.1 Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established</b> (i) services to producers through 21 (9 new) rural clusters of economic development fully equipped with economical infrastructures being part of « Maison du Paysan » (Farmer House) in 27 communes; (ii) densification of the feeder roads network through the construction and rehabilitation of 850 km of feeder roads.	0	32,300,000
C.3 Institutional support, programme monitoring & evaluation and knowledge management	TA	<b>Outcome 4.2 Innovative mechanisms for multiple-stakeholder planning and investments in SLM at scale</b> An M&A framework promoted at national level (within the HCI3N framework) Monitoring of GEBs Institutional support to HCI3N to drive the integration of priorities that will contribute to safeguarding and maintaining ecosystem services in smallholder agricultural development.	844,400	3,620,000
Subtotal			7,516,422	57,700,000
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup> GEFTF			120,000	1,500,000
<b>Total Project Cost</b>			7,636,422	60,320,000

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	IFAD	Loan and Grant	51,272,000
Recipient Government	Government of Niger	In Kind	6,032,000
Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries	In Kind	3,016,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			60,320,000

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)*	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security	Land Degradation	IAP-Food Security	3,003,395	270,305	3,273,700

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

		(set-aside)					
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security (set-aside)	Biodiversity	IAP-Food Security	458,716	41,284	500,000
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security (set-aside)	Climate change	IAP-Food Security	504,587	45,412	550,000
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security (set-aside)	IAP- Food Security	IAP-Food Security	3,669,724	330,276	4,000,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7,636,422</b>	<b>687,277</b>	<b>8,323,700</b>

- a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.
- b) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](#).
- c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### Project Overview

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting;*

The Programme's target intervention area will be spread over the centre-southern stripe of the Maradi, Tahoua and Zinder regions, that includes the target areas of the currently implemented projects (PASADEM and Ruwanmu). The expansion aims at consolidating in a sustainable way, 22 catchment areas, in which family farming livelihoods will contribute to improve food and nutrition security of rural people within 21 economic development clusters. The coverage will be both national (for institutional support to the 3N initiative) and on ground investments (Tahoua, Zinder and Maradi) covering a total of about: 215,500 ha (including contributions from co-financing notably for 190,000 ha of assisted natural regeneration). Most of the target group is composed of vulnerable and moderately vulnerable family farming households whose access to food security and markets remains uncertain. Women and youth constitute an important groups of the target population. The number of direct beneficiaries of the Programme will reach 290,000 households (2.3 million persons) including the extremely vulnerable households exposed to food, and environmental crisis (12%).

### *Context and baseline scenario;*

Smallholder farming in Niger is structurally vulnerable to climate variability, and its vulnerability is further amplified by the effects of climate change, affecting livelihoods and their sustainability in the long term (productive potential) and the short term (post-crisis capitalization etc.) with a negative impact on food and nutrition security. Projection models indicate important cereal yield loss if nothing is done to improve Nigerien production systems and sustainability, while the areas planted in sorghum and millet, the two main staple crops of the country will decrease as a result of desertification (land degradation). The main baseline for this GEF intervention is PRODAF (the Smallholder Agricultural Development Program). PRODAF will target about 240,000 smallholder farmers. Three types of smallholder activities have been identified and targeted: i) highly vulnerable family farms; ii) intermediate family farms / moderately vulnerable; and iii) less vulnerable family farms. The program will also put a specific emphasis on women and youth. Among youth, special attention will be given to young women. Women and young people will represent at least 30% of the beneficiaries. The overall objective of the baseline program is to contribute to sustainable food and nutrition security and strengthen resilience of rural households in Maradi, Tahoua and Zinder. The development objective is to sustainably increase the income of 240,000 family farms, their resilience to external shocks, including climate change, and their access to local, urban and regional markets in the three regions. The baseline intervention is articulated around three components: i) Strengthening sustainable family farming; ii) improving access to markets; and iii) management and program coordination, monitoring and evaluation (M & E) and knowledge management. The overall cost of the main baseline program over a period of eight years, is estimated at 103.6 billion CFA francs, equivalent to US \$ 207.2 million. It consists of a cost of 22.3 billion FCFA (44.7 million USD) covered by already approved funding and 81.3 billion CFA francs (US \$ 162.5 million) to cover by new financing. About USD 60 million will contribute to the co-financing of the proposed GEF initiative that will be designed to support the baseline intervention in promoting the sustainability and resilience agenda beyond the area of PRODAF, by strengthening existing frameworks like the 3N framework and the CSIF to drive this agenda and to drive the scaling up efforts. GEF intervention will also strengthen the M&A aspects at all levels (particularly at national level within the 3N framework) which will offer an additional important tool for mainstreaming, planning and

evaluation/efficient scaling up of integrated approaches.

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework;*

The proposed initiative will be presented within the IAP framework and would be aligned with the GEF 2020 priorities. The project will work through the PRODAF within the national 3N framework to upscale good land management practices, engage in activities that promote the shift towards transformation of policies and regulatory frameworks; the demonstration of innovative approaches; the strengthening of institutional capacity and decision making processes and support to multi-stakeholder alliances.

To this end, ProDAF serves as a good basis to implement this vision and complement it with investment activities. This will build on thirty years' experience of IFAD's intervention in Niger. ProDAF will thus intervene as a lead program, with a transformational approach that encompasses all the successes drawn from IFAD's and other donors' past projects and programs (regarding the river-basin approach; sustainable land management; farmers field schools and small scale irrigation; nutrition and food security; etc.), up-scaled at national level in Niger's most densely populated regions: Tahoua, Maradi and Zinder.

The line Ministry of the project is the Ministry of Agriculture, and ProDAF will follow-up on the contribution of previous IFAD's interventions to the priority programmes of the President's 3N initiative (5 out of 12 programmes). With this involvement at high political level, ProDAF will build on Niger's strong political ownership and work with regional and national institutions to mainstream its shared vision and facilitate the amplification of learning and scaling-up of good practices. The programme will also closely coordinate with other donors and partners such as CNEDD.

ProDAF will monitor its impact on the environment and benefitting populations also by mainstreaming the use of GIS and remote sensing in its M&E/M&A systems, developed with the support of national research institutes. In this optic, the project aims at developing agreements with Niger's top scientific institutes, through which it will seek to improve access to information and capacity building of key stakeholders; and to improve knowledge management and exchanges / dissemination of experiences also to ensure that results are captured at national scale for wider scaling-up.

The GEF project will achieve its outcomes by: (i) promoting agro-ecosystem resilience through the scaling up of proven technologies (soil and water conservation, etc.). It will do this through the implementation mechanisms of PRODAF at the field level; (ii) promoting and strengthening institutional frameworks and capacity through the support to the 3 N initiative and the use of the existing CSIF tools and mechanisms to support the efforts that will lead to concrete transformational change towards an integrated approach to sustainability, resilience and food security. This will be done through a convention between PRODAF and the 3 N initiative. (iii) The third outcome will be achieved through a structured support to the M&E and M&A systems. The GEF intervention will mainly support the M&A while PRODAF will support M&E. This will be undertaken in a complementary manner and the GEF funding will provide the necessary tools, training etc. to implement a comprehensive and effective M&A system within the 3 N initiative. The work on M&A and the GEBs monitoring will be based on collaboration with other partners such as CI, vital signs and others. Implementation details and modalities will be clearly defined for each GEF activity during the PPG phase.

*Global environmental benefits;*

The Project will generate global environmental benefits through its contribution to the support of transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path. In addition investment in Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture and rangelands) the project will

contribute to efforts to maintain globally significant biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services that it provides. It is estimated that the project investment (with its co-financing) will generate a mitigation potential of about -5.6 T of CO<sub>2</sub>eq / ha over 20 years (i.e. 0.28 T of CO<sub>2</sub>eq per hectare per year).

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The project's design will include all relevant stakeholders, following IFAD's logic of intervention in Niger. At institutional level, the project will work closely with HCI3N and the relevant ministries to ensure the alignment of the project's priorities with PDES and I3N. At local level, the project will be supporting the decentralization efforts both by working with agriculture chambers as a point of entry (and supporting local development plans), and relying on decentralized technical services (agriculture, livestock and environment). The design will also use the experience of ongoing projects, especially by capitalizing on participative approaches around wholesale markets (stakeholder concertation platforms hadin gwiwa – PASADEM & Ruwanmu projects) and participative catchment area management with water users associations (Ruwanmu project).

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

The following risks and preventive measures related to the project's activities have been identified:

Risk	Attenuation	Level		
		H	A	L
<b>Effect 1: The emergence of sustainable family farms enable local producers (women and youth included) to diversify their agricultural production, increase their productivity/yields, and their adaptation capacity to external shocks, more specifically to climate changes</b>				
<i>Political:</i> political and security conditions deteriorate in the Programme area	The programme will develop its implementation strategy by relying on economic stakeholders that are both local (producers ; traders; etc.) and organized (SMEs; FOs; SMCs; etc.), as well as with local communities with the capacities to ensure the sustainability and continuity of the investments, especially in situations or periods of political/institutional crises. The operational framework relies on technical and operational capacities at national and local level.			X
<i>Environmental:</i> Climate hazards	The Programme will contribute: (i) to better forecasting climate change through the production and diffusion of weather information so as to prevent/anticipate crises (GIS/RS); (ii) to supply adapted technologies so as to improve the producers' resilience to the effects of climate change.		X	
<i>Environmental:</i> Reduction of the water table	The Programme will contribute to better following the level of the water table and its evolution thanks to the piezometric network. The information will be shared with the involvement of local technical assistance and water users associations for a better use and management of available water. The programme will also contribute to reloading the water table through a better mobilisation of rain water thanks to land and water management interventions in the catchment areas.		X	
<i>Economic:</i> coverage of renewal	The increased access to bank services (blocked savings		X	

cost for infrastructures and irrigation schemes is decisive for the sustainability of small scale irrigation investments.	accounts and financial education) and improvement of management skills for the entrepreneurs (business plans and technico-economic support) will contribute to the sustainability of investments for smallholder farming businesses.			
<i>Social:</i> The most vulnerable beneficiaries can undergo crises related to climate shocks.	The programme will help forecast, absorb and respond to shocks through an increased resilience of vulnerable households to climate change, and through support to the social safety nets programme (Cash for Work; GFS; nutritional education; reconstitution of cattle; micro projects; etc.)		X	

#### A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:

The project is building on good projects to promote best practices. Many of these were tested and promoted under previous and ongoing GEF projects in Niger and in other regional countries. During design, IFAD will ensure that the project: (i) will build on existing mechanisms and consolidate them for wider impact and (ii) will establish linkages with the relevant ongoing and planned projects. The following GEF projects will offer potential opportunities for synergies (within the 3 N framework as the main national institutional framework for alignment) and they will be particularly explored during design and implementation:

- FP3760: SPWA-BD: Integrating the Sustainable Management of Faunal Corridors into Niger's Protected Area System
- FP3796: SPWA-CC: Integration of Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions in Niger's Rural Energy Service Access Program
- FP3916: Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience and Adaptive Capacity of the Agriculture Sector to Climate Change
- FP4701: Scaling up Community-Based Adaptation (CBA) in Niger
- FP4702: Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production for Food Security in Vulnerable Rural Areas through the Farmers Field School Approach
- FP5252: GGW: Third Phase of the Community Action Program

#### *Description of the consistency of the project with:*

**B.1 IS THE PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH THE NATIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANS OR REPORTS AND ASSESSEMENTS UNDER RELEVANT CONVENTIONS? (YES  /NO  ). IF YES, WHICH ONES AND HOW: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCS, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPS, PRSPs, NPFE, BURS, ETC.:**

The policy framework and national development strategy is governed by the Economic and Social Development Plan (PDES) 2012-2015 and the 3N Initiative (Nigeriens Nourish Nigeriens). The PDES highlights the potentially disastrous effects of environmental degradation and climate change on agriculture, livestock and health sectors and the threat posed by these constraints on efforts to reduce poverty. It refers to the adaptation to climate change as a "compelling need", especially to conserve and sustainably manage environmental resources on which food security and livelihoods of the population depend. The proposed GEF project will contribute largely to priority investments falling within Axis 1 of the I3N, namely the increase and diversification of agro-forestry- pastoral and fish production, including sustainable land and biodiversity management. Also by supporting the 3N initiative and its acceleration plan, and using it as an entry point and a driver for the promotion of resilient and sustainable land management practices, this GEF will directly support government priorities and national strategies and policies. The project would also support the capacity of CNEDD to contribute to better alignment of objectives and linkages between operations and national programming and monitoring frameworks.



**NAME OF PROGRAM:**  
**FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY**  
**Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Nigeria
Country(ies):	NIGERIA
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP
Other Executing Partner(s):	<b>Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</b>
GEF Focal Area(s):	LD and BD

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2	GEFTF	1,520,000	10,000,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4	GEFTF	2,698,000	25,000,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5	GEFTF	1,500,000	11,000,000
IAP-Food Security, BD-4, Program 9	GEFTF	1,421,450	5,000,000
Total Project Cost		7,139,450	51,000,000

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

Project Objective: Enhancing long-term environmental sustainability and resilience of food production systems in order to ensure improved national food security				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
<b>Component 1:</b>  Enhancing the institutional and policy environment for achieving improved food security	TA	<p>1 Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms in support of policy and institutional reform and up scaling of integrated natural resources management in place (based on the country SLM frameworks)</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Functioning multi-stakeholder platforms in place at local/landscape scale (including the Advisory Committee on Agricultural Resilience in Nigeria, and Voices of Food security Coalition)</i></li> <li>• <i>At least one Gender/age sensitive decision-support tool and participatory processes applied</i></li> </ul> <p>1.2 Supportive policies and incentives in place at local level to</p>	1,620,000	10,000,000

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

		<p>support smallholder agriculture and food value-chains</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Value chain approaches integrated with sustainable production systems approaches, including consideration of post-harvest losses</i></li> <li>• <i>Cassava and Rice value-chains strengthened</i></li> </ul>		
<p><b>Component 2:</b></p> <p>Scaling up Integrated Approaches</p>	TA	<p>2.1 Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources management and SLM</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>X million ha with improved soil and water management</i></li> <li>• <i>X million ha with climate resilient agriculture</i></li> <li>• <i>X million of ha of agro-pastoral systems under integrated management</i></li> <li>• <i># of small holder farmers with increased access to food in the target AEZ's</i></li> </ul> <p>2.2 Increase in investment flows to integrated natural resources management</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>X million in increase from the local and international private sector;</i></li> <li>• <i>X number of innovative funding mechanisms/ schemes in place</i></li> </ul> <p>(Baselines to be determined during the PPG)</p>	4,123,000	28,571,429
<p><b>Component 3:</b></p> <p><i>Monitoring and Assessment</i></p>	TA	<p>3.1 Capacity and institutions in place to incorporate resilience into project design and implementation, and for monitoring of GEBs,</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Multi-scale monitoring of ecosystem services and global environmental benefits established at national level (and capacitated)</i></li> </ul> <p>3.2 Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscapes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Framework for monitoring of resilience established at</i></li> </ul>	1,058,450	10,000,000

		<i>national and landscape level (and capacitated)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Program socio-economic and gender indicators mainstreamed</li> </ul> (Baselines to be determined during the PPG)		
Subtotal			6,801,450	48,571,429
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>			338,000	2,428,571
<b>Total Project Cost</b>			<b>7,139,450</b>	<b>51,000,000</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
The Federal Government of Nigeria	Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FADAMA II, NIRSAL and national budget)	Grant	50,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP (AADSP and other sources)	In kind	1,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>51,000,000</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b <sup>5</sup>
UNDP	GEFTF	Country	LD	IAP food security	847,432	76,268.81	923,700
UNDP	GEFTF	Country	BD	IAP food security	2,448,807	220,392.66	2,669,200
UNDP	GEF TF	Country	CCM	IAP food security	173,486	15,613.76	189,100
UNDP	GEFTF	IAP- set-aside		IAP food security	3,669,725	330,275.23	4,000,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7,139,450</b>	<b>642,550.46</b>	<b>7,782,000</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )

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

<sup>5</sup> Excludes Project Preparation Grant of 150,000 USD including fees

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **Project Overview**

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:*

The project will target the middle belt savanna agro-ecological zone, which is characterized by a drier and more seasonal (wet/dry) climate, and the northern Savanna and Sahel ecological zones, which is characterized by low rainfall and a short and variable wet season with low annual rainfall. These zones are considered to be more susceptible to climate variability and exhibit high levels of land degradation.

*Context and baseline scenario:*

Nigeria's agriculture sector is dominated by about 15 million smallholders who account for over 90 percent of the national food production. These smallholders, mostly women, farm an average of 1 to 2 hectares per smallholder, usually with little or limited mechanization, access to fertilizers, and preservation or storage facilities. A few large agro-industrial farming operations with the average size of about fifty hectares (with some attaining over 1,000 hectares) also exist, but their production, combined with the smallholders' output have not been able to meet the national food demand. The average prevalence of food inadequacy in Nigeria between 2000 and 2013 was 12%, while the average domestic food price volatility index was 13% over the same period. Because of this supply and demand gaps, Nigeria has had to resort to importation of food despite its abundance of arable land resources. In 2012, the country's annual food import bill was estimated at \$11 billion. Some of the main drivers of food insecurity in Nigeria are the growing population, shrinking farming workforce and flat crops yields over the past decades. Further compounding the situation are the current conflicts in the northern agro-ecological zones (AEZs), where most of the grains are produced. These are likely to be exacerbated by the changing and uncertain climate. A recent World Bank study projected that global warming-induced temperature increases would result in 50% and 75% of AEZs not being able to meet demand for food with local supply by 2020 and 2050 respectively.

The Government of Nigeria has recognised the need to address food insecurity and has out in place various initiatives that focus on (i) development of small-scale irrigation to increase the productivity of the farming system during the dry and wet seasons; (ii) reducing vulnerability to soil erosion in sub-watersheds, through improved land-use planning, erosion and watershed management; (iii) development and promotion of sustainable land management and agricultural practices to improve crop production in desertification-prone areas; (iv) improving small farmers' access to credit; and (v) removing critical supply chain bottlenecks in the cassava and rice value chains by focusing on improved storage and pre-storage processing.

Project Baseline and Potential Co-financing :- The project will build on and partner with the projects described below are (worth over US\$ 1 billion from various sources including Government)

The National Fadama Development Project (FADAMA III) promotes the development of small-scale irrigation, especially in low lying lands subject to seasonal flooding or water logging along the banks of streams or depressions, to increase the productivity of the farming system during the dry and wet seasons. The project has registered some success such as an increase in the 2012 index for crop yield by 8.59%.

The Nigeria Incentive-Based Risk Sharing System for Agricultural Lending (NIRSAL) was introduced to improve small farmers' access to credit..

The Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project (NEWMAP) is focused on reducing vulnerability to soil erosion in sub-watersheds, through improved land-use planning, erosion and watershed management, all of which have high potential to contribute to the country's food security.

Last but not least, the Government is also participating in the UNDP Agribusiness Supply Chain Development Programme, which focuses on removing critical supply chain bottlenecks in the cassava and rice value chains by focusing on improved storage and pre-storage processing

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:*

The existing baseline investments through substantial are mostly geared towards improving access to food and markets, but less so on the environmental drivers of food insecurity. GEF funding is sought to address this gap through the following components:

**Component 1: Enhancing the institutional and policy environment for achieving improved food security:** This component will support strengthening the capacity of existing policies, and institutions to foster sustainability and resilience for food security. Specific support will be provided to strengthen the capacity of the existing platforms such as Advisory Committee on Agricultural Resilience in Nigeria (ACARN) which is mandated to advise the Government on policies, technologies, and institutions that would ensure resilience of the country's agricultural system to climate change; the Voices of Food Security Coalition which advocates for increased funding for the agriculture sector. By mainstreaming sustainability issues into these platforms, the project will ensure the issues are integrated into policy and institutionalized. The project will also establish other relevant multi-stakeholder platforms (to be determined during PPG) that will advocate for strengthening the capacity of small and large-scale agricultural producers to increase productivity, in the face of growing challenges from multiple environmental stressors and changing climate. Last but not least, the project will strengthen capacity of extension workers to diversify livestock and improve range management; increase access to drought resistant crops and livestock feeds; adopt better soil management practices; and provide early warning/meteorological forecasts and related information, among others.

**Component 2: Scaling up Integrated Approaches:** This component will support up scaling of SLM best practices in the AEZs' most vulnerable communities, particularly where droughts and desertification are most severe. These include: water and land management, soil fertility improvement and maintenance; improved /rangeland management; assisted natural regeneration, improving pastures and fodder production; efficient water use and irrigation systems; increased planting of native vegetation cover and promotion of re-greening efforts; improved drainage; integrated pest management; and sustainable grazing and herd management. More details will be confirmed during the PPG.

Through NIRSAL the Government is already improving access to credit to the agricultural value chain and providing confidence to banks to lend to the farmers by offering them strong incentives and technical assistance. The project will build on this by ensuring environmental priorities are incorporated in the scheme and make the case for even more i flows to projects that are implementing SLM best practices

**Component 3: Monitoring and Assessment of Global Environment Benefits:-** This component will support establishment of a monitoring and assessment framework at the national and local level to determine whether integrated approaches to improving food security and natural resource management have a positive impact on resilience of ecosystem services, livelihoods and food security, to understand tradeoffs and synergies among environmental, agricultural and livelihood outcomes, including for food security, using standardized tools that can be applied across scales, from the local, to national and landscape scales. Support will entail establishing integrated baselines, capacity building of key institutions in charge of monitoring, support to development of tools and systems for monitoring global environmental benefits, such as carbon benefits and GHG emission reductions, as well as for monitoring of resilience, agricultural productivity and socio-economic benefits and gender mainstreaming.

**Global environmental benefits:**

The IAP will generate global environmental benefits through maintaining globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services in agro-ecological zones located in the the Sudano Sahelian and Guinea Savanna

ecoregions. Smallholder farmers heavily depend on these agro-ecological zones for their livelihoods and food security. The GEBs will be ensured through scaling up sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes) and promoting resilience to climate change. Project activities encompass in situ biodiversity conservation, carbon sequestration, land and water conservation, food production, sustainable livelihoods, and developing food value chains and access to markets. A more detailed assessment of GEBs will be carried out during the PPG phase.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The main stakeholders are government, represented by various Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs); Research Institutions; Civil Society Organizations, local user organizations and beneficiary farmers (men, women and youths) etc: The Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development will be the Implementing Agency, supported by the Ministry of Environment, which is the GEF Focal Ministry. The strategic direction of the project will be overseen by a National Steering Committee comprising representatives of: Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (Chair); Federal Ministry of Environment; Federal Ministry of Water Resources; Federal Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development; Federal Ministry of Finance; National Planning Commission; The Agricultural Research Council of Nigeria (ARCN); Other relevant Research Institutes; and a proven NGO.

The Project Implementation Committees (PICs) at Federal, State and Local Government levels will monitor the implementation of the project on regular basis to ensure its timely implementation and delivery on the agreed workplan. The respective technical committees will liaise with the implementing agencies and service providers on daily basis to ensure compliance to technical specifications of the project. As part of the post project implementation sustainability plan, the community members will participate actively in the actual delivery of the technical input, while PICs at the community level will select knowledgeable members of the community to be trained as technical extension agents. The Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee will undertake quarterly monitoring of the project with other technical partners to appraise the progress of the project implementation and impact. They will prepare quarterly monitoring reports.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

Possible risks are summarized in the following table:

Risk Type	Risk Description	Risk Rating	Mitigation Measures
<b>Political</b>	Limited political support for fostering sustainability and resilience in national food production systems for enhanced security and mainstreaming climate change issues in agricultural development.	Low	Ensure proactive interactions with decision makers on different issues on climate change to ensure adequate funding through the NARF
<b>Strategic</b>	Lack of capacity to implement the integrated approaches	Low	Strengthen capacities within the implementation of NARF.
<b>Operational</b>	Potential delays in project approval, fund release and disbursement	Medium	GEF, UNDP and national executing agency will undertake constant dialogue to facilitate project implementation.
<b>Financial</b>	Fluctuation in the exchange rate may affect the available resources for project implementation.	Low	Develop and implement an appropriate workplan with timeline and concrete deliverables to avoid undue prolong project implementation period.

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*  
The project will build and partner with various initiatives including:

- WB/GEF Project: *Nigeria-Scaling up Sustainable Land Management Practice, Knowledge, and Coordination* which focuses on mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in Nigeria's agricultural sector through capacity building and knowledge management
- WB/GEF Project: *Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project* which aims to reduce vulnerability to soil erosion in targeted sub-watersheds towards achieving greater environmental and economic security, as well as contribute to enhancing the resilience to soil erosion and associated climate variability and change, while raising capacities to promote long-term climate resilient, low carbon development.
- WB/GEF Project: *Third National Fadama Development* which aims to prevent and reduce the impact of land degradation on ecosystem services in priority Fadama landscapes of some States; thereby contributing to improved agricultural productivity and food security in a sustainable manner.
- *The Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative (GGWSSI) for Nigeria* – which is rehabilitating thousands of hectares of degraded pastures and introduce/implement sustainable pasture management practices in the desertification-prone areas of Nigeria, and will thereby enhance carbon storage and sequestration, as well as improve rural livelihoods and opportunities for sustainable development among local farmers/animal-breeders in the affected areas that cover about 35% of the country.
- IFAD-assisted *Climate Change Adaptation and Agribusiness Support Programme (CASP)* in the Savannah Belt of Nigeria, designed to mainstream climate change resilience measures in the agricultural practice of Northern Nigeria.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes  /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:*

The project is in line with the following strategies:

i) The Agricultural Transformation Agenda which advocates for among others: (i) main urban areas in the country supplied with food made in Nigeria; (ii) smallholder farmers with long term rights to farm their lands, (iii) Nigerian researchers breeding a cassava varieties that are resistant to climate change; (iv) livestock that is immune to some of the new epidemics caused by extreme weather conditions; and (v) proper extension services supporting small farmers to decide what best to grow on their lands, where extreme rains and droughts are a constant threat.

(ii) The Nigeria Vision 2020, Economic Transformation Blueprint which (among other things) (i) guarantees productivity and wellbeing of the people with a major objective of eradicating extreme hunger and poverty; (ii) fosters sustainable social and economic development with a critical objective of preserving the environment for sustainable socio-economic development.

(iii) The 'National Adaptation Strategy and Plan of Action on Climate Change in Nigeria (NASPA-CCN)': interventions related to this project include \; i) adoption of improved agricultural systems for both crops and livestock; and ii) implementation of strategies for improved resource management; particularly the Sahel in the savanna zones.

(iv) The National Agriculture Resilience Framework (NARF). Related interventions to this project include: i) promotion of changes in agricultural practices; (ii) promotion of changes in agricultural water management; (iii) risk management and agricultural insurance; and (iv) sustainable land management.

**NAME OF PROGRAM:  
FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY  
Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Agricultural Value Chains Support Project
Country(ies):	Senegal
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD, UNIDO
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agricultural and Rural Equipment
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation (LD) Climate Change (CC) IAP-Set aside

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2 (component 1 of the project which corresponds to component 2: Scaling up of integrated approaches)	GEFTF	4,331,670	16,713,233
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4 (component 2 of the project which is contributing to 1, 2 and 3 of the IAP: scaling up, Institutional frameworks and monitoring and assessment)	GEFTF	1,443,890	5,571,078
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5 (component 2 of the project which is contributing to 1 and 2 of the IAP scaling up and Institutional frameworks)	GEFTF	721,945	2,785,539
IAP-Food Security, CCM-2, Program 4 (component 1 of the project which corresponds to component 2: Scaling up of integrated approaches)	GEFTF	721,945	2,785,539
Total Project* Cost		7,219,450	27,855,388

\* The proposed project is in line with the IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2 priorities. It also responds to LD 3 (programme 4) and to LD 4 (programme 5).

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

Project Objective: Increasing sustainability and resilience of agriculture and value chains for an enhanced food security in Senegal				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
Diversification and access to market through Scaling up of integrated approaches	INV	<p><b>Outcome 1.2 functionality and cover of ecosystems maintained.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sustainable production practices are promoted and scaled up over 30000 ha of land</li> <li>- Sustainable rangeland management practices are promoted and water</li> </ul>	3,952.696	12,930.000

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- management improved</li> <li>- The use of renewable energy is promoted and scaled up</li> <li>- Rural storage and processing facilities are climate proofed for better resilience and improved food security</li> <li>- Rural communities' capacity are strengthened to promoted integrated approaches and sustainable value chain practices</li> </ul>		
Structuring and developing value chains through strengthen institutional frameworks	INV	<p><b>Outcome 3.1 Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutional support and capacity building are provided for the integration of sustainable production practices in 100 % of the targeted smallholders business plans</li> <li>- Institutional frameworks support the dissemination of resilient and sustainable land and water management practices through exchange visits</li> <li>- Policy dialogue and regulatory frameworks are supported to inform scaling up of investments in sustainability and resilience for food security (5 operational policy platforms)</li> <li>- A climate change adaptation strategy/vision is developed for the ago-industrial sector</li> <li>- Institutional support is provided to value chain actors to foster scaling up of sustainable production practices through knowledge sharing and dissemination.</li> </ul>	1,944.502	8,750.258
Monitoring and assessment of ecosystem services, global environmental benefits resilience	INV	<p><b>Outcome 4.2 Innovative mechanisms for multiple stakeholder planning and investments in SLM at scale.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;A is supported through adequate tools and effective institutional arrangements</li> <li>- Improved environmental and GEBs M&amp;E and overall programme evaluation are established</li> <li>- Socioeconomic and gender indicators mainstreamed in project design and</li> </ul>	1,044.581	4,375.128

		implementation - Capacity of local communities strengthened for a better access to national and regional protocols on benefit sharing		
		Subtotal	6941779	26,055.388
		Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup> GEFTF	277671	1,800.000
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>7,219.450</b>	<b>27,855.388</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	IFAD	Loan	25,000,000
GEF Agency	UNIDO	In kind and cash	400,000
Government	GoS	In kind	1,655.388
Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries	In kind	800,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>27,855,388</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)*	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP - Food Security	LD	IAP - Food Security	1,334,863	120,138	1,455,001
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	CC	IAP - Food security	440,000	39,600	479,600
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	IAP Set aside	IAP - Food security	1,834,862	165,138	2,000,000
UNIDO	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	LD	IAP - Food security	1,364,863	120,138	1,455,001
UNIDO	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	CC	IAP - Food security	440,000	39,600	479,600
UNIDO	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	IAP Set aside	IAP - Food security	1,834,862	165,138	2,000,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7,219,450</b>	<b>649,751</b>	<b>7,869,201</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here

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

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### Project Overview

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting;*

As most Sahelian countries, Senegal's agriculture is characterized by a precarious and uncertain agro-pastoral and cereal – root crop mixed farming systems, combined with a poor rural community base facing high level of food insecurity. Amongst the challenges, these households are facing significant risks of droughts, high amount of post-harvest losses, water mismanagement etc.

This project will target geographical areas and value chains which are needy of most investments to reduce their environmental risks. Such value chains include millet, sorghum, maize, fonio, hibiscus, sesame, cowpeas, family poultry, inland fishing, beekeeping, horticulture and forestry.

The target value chains are considered as part of IFAD's programme in Senegal and UNIDO's planned investment in the field of agribusiness development. UNIDO and IFAD interventions will target water resource management, sustainable land degradation, capacity building and the provision of technologies and infrastructure all along these value chains. Therefore GEF investment will be able to benefit from a greater impact in terms of outreach and inclusiveness.

### *Context and baseline scenario*

The Senegalese agricultural sector plays a leading role in the national economy, it contributes to 7,6% of GDP and employs 58% of the active population. It is mainly driven by agricultural livelihood activities such as rice, millet / sorghum, cowpea, maize, family poultry, inland fisheries, beekeeping and forestry.

The climate change and variability is a source of vulnerability, especially in rural areas. Indeed, Senegal has a Sudano-Sahelian climate characterized by lower rainfall, higher temperatures and land degradation (34% of the area of the country, CSE, 2011). In addition, climate change adds a layer of complexity to existing development challenges, such as high levels of poverty and inequality, especially in rural areas (57.3% of the poor live in rural areas, PSE) combined with rapid population growth (2.7%), weak market infrastructure and service provision. This context justifies the urgent need to strengthen the resilience and food security, especially in areas inhabited by agricultural value chains for benefits not only to the rural poor, but also to a rapidly growing population in the cities.

Up to date, baseline investments have mainly focused on the promotion of access to inputs, mechanization, marketing, structuring actors of value chains and capacity building. Basic scenarios have not paid particular or significant attention to safeguarding the productive bases and the ecosystem services (land, water, forests, etc...) which enhance sustainability and improve resilience of the production systems and the value chains that depend on them. For example, baseline scenarios were not taking sufficient consideration to green growth options (use of renewable energies) and investment at watershed level to safeguard the value chains. Sustainable growth options would require further attention to be adequately addressed and integrated in more inclusive value chains. Development interventions would need to further enable smallholders and rural communities to have adaptive responses to environmental degradation and climate variability by progressive diversification of their income, reducing post-harvest losses, enhancing their ability to cope and to adapt to harsh environmental conditions and climate change, with the ultimate goal of enhancing food security and increasing the resilience of communities and their livelihood systems. In this respect, Government planned and existing investments addressing food security are as follow:

- *The Agricultural Value Chains Support Project – Extension COVERS: (i) the central and northern groundnut basin, encompassing the regions of Kaolack, Fatick, Kaffrine and Diourbel; and (ii) the Louga agropastoral*

region. The project zone represents 27 per cent of the country's land area and is home to 35 per cent of its population and will target beneficiary groups of which: a) small-scale farmers and herders who are members of farmers' and herders' organizations, within which it will ensure the incorporation of the most vulnerable households, the young, and women and their organizations, b) other economic actors: micro- and small rural enterprises (MSREs) providing services, for preference those run by young people, both upstream and downstream of the value chains in question, c) market operators, d) public and private structures providing the products and services needed for development of the targeted value chains. The main outcomes that are expected from this baseline investment are: (i) an increase in production and an improvement in agricultural productivity; (ii) an increase in the value of the additional production thanks to contractual agreements between producers' organizations and market operators; and (iii) the empowerment of professional agricultural organizations through the provision of social and economic services to their members. The project will run for six years. The total project cost is US\$50.4 million and the main financiers of the project are the Senegalese Government, IFAD and the beneficiaries. IFAD will contribute an equivalent of US\$34.7 million in the form of a loan on highly concessional terms. The Government will contribute an equivalent of US\$12.7 million, of which US\$7.6 million will mostly be for investments in agricultural and livestock water supply schemes, while US\$5.1 million corresponds to duties and taxes, making a total Government contribution of 25.2 per cent of total costs. The beneficiaries' contribution is estimated at US\$3.0 million, or 6 per cent of the total project cost.

- The Government development Plan ( Plan Senegal Emergent - PSE) considers the establishment of agropoles as priority intervention foreseen in the next four years, with a planned investment around 20 Million for the first agropole. In this context, UNIDO's Partnership Country Programme for Senegal will contribute to the PSE's objective of establishing agropoles in the in close collaboration with Development and financial partners such as the World Bank, the EU, AfDB as well as private investors. The geographical location of the agropoles includes north ( covering Louga, Saint Louis), center region ( including Kaolack) and Casamance.
- Other ongoing programmes involving the target value chains and rural households of this project include Programme de Développement Inclusif et Durable de l'Agrobusiness au Sénégal (PEDIDAS), the Programme d'accélération de la cadence de l'agriculture sénégalaise (PRACAS), the Programme National de Développement de l'Elevage (PNDE) and the national d'action pour l'adaptation (PANA).

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework;*

The proposed project will respond to the 3 components of the IAP and the results framework. It will i) support and strengthen institutional frameworks (policy dialogue, awareness raising, harmonization etc.), ii) give a priority to Scaling up of integrated approaches that contribute to better resilience and environmental sustainability and iii) respond to the third component of the IAP by ensuring that an effective M&A framework is implemented and adequate monitoring of GEBs and impact on ecosystem services is in place.

The project will reflect on these priorities through the following components and activities:

**Component 1: Agricultural Diversification and Market Access:** This component will focus on the promotion of good practices that would be scaled up through an integrated approach to land to support the sustainability and resilience of value chain and ensure food security. Additional GEF investments will be mobilized to contribute to improved and wider investment in soil and water conservation (bunds, half moons, etc.). This activity will target about 20 000 ha of degraded land. It will also promote the dissemination of assisted natural regeneration (ANR) over an estimated area of 10,000 hectares and will be coupled with investment in Agroforestry. GEF support will also focus on the scaling of best and tested practices for the rehabilitation and sustainable rangelands management. The additional investment of GEF will pay special attention to the improvement of water resources management. In this regard, it will implement the rehabilitation of ponds for livestock and irrigation in at least five sites.

On the other hand, GEF investment will support the promotion of renewable energy based on a green and resilient approach to the development of the value chains. GEF funding will support the implementation of a variety of technologies ranging from solar, wind and biogas. Most of these investments will target the irrigation sites (about 250 ha of irrigated land) and storage infrastructure to provide post-harvest services and initiatives for job creation in favour of young people. The remaining technologies will be promoted across the different stages of the supply chain through the value chain approach for an inclusive and sustainable development. GEF support will also focus on capacity building of the producers involved in climate sensitive agro-value chains by creating and upgrading 35 storage facilities and 5 processing units using effective and appropriate energy technologies as a way to reduce post-harvest losses in the context of the strategy to adapt to climate change. This will be combined with capacity building and training on sustainable production/processing practices in 500 vulnerable villages.

**Component 2, Development and structuring of value chains:** The GEF grant will add value to all selected value chains (millet, sorghum, maize, fonio, hibiscus, sesame, cowpeas, family poultry, inland fishing, beekeeping and forestry) contributing to the integration of best management environmental management practices and adapting to climate-related risks across the supported value chains. This project will ensure the dissemination and mainstreaming of best sustainable practices in major national programs (Integrated water resources management, soil Improvement, rangeland rehabilitation and sustainable management, rehabilitation of degraded lands etc.). GEF support will also target capacity building and institutional support at all levels. It is expected to train at least 15 000 people on sustainable land management and water conservation, at least 5,000 people on sustainable pasture management techniques and at least 10 000 people on proper handling / storage and food processing.

To ensure that producers and actors are involved in a participatory and effective way, GEF funding will support the integration of sustainable land management and sustainable environmental management principles into business plans implemented in the basic investment framework for the development of the value chain (100% target). This effort will be supported by a participatory approach to sustainable management of natural resources and improved resilience at the community level in at least 50 villages (10% of the 500 targeted villages). GEF funding will also support efforts to improve the environmental and social monitoring and evaluation and to facilitate learning and exchange visits across the IAP countries (such as with Niger and Burkina Faso). This will catalyze scaling up across the participating countries. At least 6 visits should be arranged for 72 producers which will be subsequently disseminating good practices that they will be learning and acquiring. The political dialogue will be essential to contribute to a favorable environment for the sustainability and resilience. This will be achieved through at least 5 platforms (including cross-sectorial platforms) to engage in a process of political dialogue on issues that can support the implementation and scaling up.

In addition, GEF support will support the integration of adaptation strategies to climate change in policies, strategies and plans of the agro-industrial sector. The GEF investment will contribute to the assessment of climate-exposed sectors in relation with the value chain development. It will also contribute to the development of strategies for adaptation to Climate Change and awareness for 30,000 beneficiaries and stakeholders at all levels (government, private sector, and farmers' organizations). Further dissemination of strategies to adapt to climate change will be achieved through workshops involving at least 500 stakeholders and study tours to promote an exchange of experiences on adaptation to climate change. Cross- visits will play a key role in promoting community participation and engagement and will complement/strengthen this intervention. A special attention will be given to youth and women.

### **Component 3. Monitoring and assessment of ecosystem services, global environmental benefits resilience**

Monitoring and evaluation of project activities will be considered as an integral part of this intervention. A comprehensive monitoring and assessment framework will be developed in the context of this IAP operation in Senegal. This framework M&A will offer an effective tool for multi-scale assessment and monitoring of integrated approaches and their impacts in terms of sustainability, resilience and food security along a well-defined results chain. The M&A framework will be developed during the preparatory phase and will include

Quality control monitoring instruments, baseline assessment on environmental and climate sensitive value chains, improved environmental M&E and overall evaluation of the programme. During the implementation phase, local institutions will be supported in order to benefit and effectively contribute to the implementation of the M&A framework. Also, attention will be paid to the coherence between the regional and the national framework.

### *Global environmental benefit*

The Global environmental benefit of the Project comes from the promotion and the scaling up of well tested practices such as good land management and water conservation practices (NAR, zai, half moons, etc), greening value chain development approach . These practices have been tested and proven sustainable in countries like Niger and Burkina Faso (including through previous and ongoing GEF project like PASADEM in Niger). The promotion of efficient water use technologies and clean energy solutions across the promoted value chains (from production to storage and processing) will contribute to better use of natural resources and will safeguard ecosystem services. The scaling up of SLM practices will contribute to carbon sequestration and is expected to lead to increase in biomass and biological diversity. The exact GEBs will be assessed during design.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The project will target around 30 000 people, of which about 50% are women and youth amongst vulnerable communities in eco- geographical zones of the selected streams (millet, sorghum, maize , fonio, hibiscus , sesame, cowpeas, family poultry , fishing continental, horticulture, beekeeping and forestry). These include : i) small and medium farmers who practice competitive and sustainable agriculture; ( ii) active actors in the value chain; and (iii) SMEs and large operators benefiting from the infrastructure of primary irrigation, enabling them to expand their production. Other beneficiaries include members of smallholders' households, value chain stakeholders, and wage workers engaged in new activities. The project will ensure that women and young people are actively involved in its implementation. .

The project will use participatory methods to engage the stakeholders in project design / preparation via a number of activities: i) Sensitization activities at community and institutional levels to reach the different groups of stakeholders (farmers associations and their household's members, Governmental institutions, Private sectors). Community sensitization will focus on the strategic assessment outcome, stressing the arising benefits; ii) Information sharing activities regarding project objectives which will contribute to mobilize the stakeholders, iii) participatory Assessments involving data gathering and hence direct contact with stakeholders.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

Potential risks	Mitigation measures
Potential partners reluctant to cooperate with project initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Activities and initiatives are based on demand driven initiatives. Also participatory methods is used during the project cycle to engage all stakeholders</li> </ul>

Possible lack of sufficient skills and availability of implementation partners/service providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Updating of the list of service providers and market operators drawn up by IFAD and UNIDO and partnership with other projects working in the area should allow its mitigation</li> </ul>
Possible coordination weaknesses for the implementation of the project activities across many value chains involving several partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project design phase will provide clear elements that define exact roles and responsibilities. It will also establish coordination and M&amp;E mechanisms that will allow for harmonized implementation of the project activities. Joint supervisions and good communication between all stakeholders will be also encouraged to mitigate this risk.</li> </ul>

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

The project is building on good projects to promote best practices. Many of these were tested and promoted under previous and ongoing GEF projects in Senegal and in other countries like Niger, Burkina Faso etc. During the project design phase, IFAD and UNIDO will ensure that the project will work through a coherent national institutional framework to: (i) build on existing mechanisms and consolidate them for wider impact (e.g the CSI/SLM) and (ii) establish linkages with the relevant ongoing and planned projects.

The following GEF projects will offer potential opportunities for synergies that will be particularly explored:

- MSP3386: Innovations in Micro Irrigation for Dryland Farmers
- FP4080: SPWA-BD: Participatory Biodiversity Conservation and Low Carbon Development in Pilot Ecovillages in Senegal
- FP4234: Climate Change adaptation project in the areas of watershed management and water retention
- FP5449: PSG- Sustainable and Inclusive Agribusiness Development Project
- FP5503: Mainstreaming Ecosystem-based Approaches to Climate-resilient Rural Livelihoods in Vulnerable Rural Areas through the Farmer Field School Methodology
- MSP5802: Promoting SLM Practices to Restore and Enhance Carbon Stocks through Adoption of Green Rural Habitat Initiatives

Finally, IFAD and UNIDO will build a complementary approach based on their own planned investments and operations in the country. The primary link for the GEF grant will be the Agricultural Value Chains Support Project – Extension which will link with the UNIDO’s Senegal Programme for Country Partnership which focuses on the establishment of agro-poles and associated Rural Transformation Centers for poverty reduction and income generation.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 IS THE PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH THE NATIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANS OR REPORTS AND ASSESSEMENTS UNDER RELEVANT CONVENTIONS? (YES /NO ). IF YES, WHICH ONES AND HOW: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, ETC.: THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES OF SENEGAL. IT SPECIFICALLY RESPONDS TO THE FOLLOWING INSTRUMENTS;*

- The Plan Sénégal Emergent (PSE) ;
- The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (national strategy for economic and social development, 2013-2017)
- Programme de Développement Inclusif et Durable de l'Agrobusiness au Sénégal (PEDIDAS)
- Cadre National d'Investissement Stratégique/GDT ;
- *Programme d'accélération de la cadence de l'agriculture sénégalaise (PRACAS) ;*
- *Programme National de Développement de l'Elevage (PNDE) ;*
- *Nouvelle Politique Forestière (NPF, 2005 – 2025) ;*
- *Lettre de politique sectorielle de l'Environnement ;*
- *Lettre de Politique sectorielle de la Pêche ;*
- *Programme national d'action pour l'adaptation (PANA)*

**NAME OF PROGRAM:  
FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY  
Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Agricultural Value Chains Support Project
Country(ies):	Senegal
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD, UNIDO
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agricultural and Rural Equipment
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land Degradation (LD) Climate Change (CC) IAP-Set aside

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2 (component 1 of the project which corresponds to component 2: Scaling up of integrated approaches)	GEFTF	4,331,670	16,713,233
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4 (component 2 of the project which is contributing to 1, 2 and 3 of the IAP: scaling up, Institutional frameworks and monitoring and assessment)	GEFTF	1,443,890	5,571,078
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5 (component 2 of the project which is contributing to 1 and 2 of the IAP scaling up and Institutional frameworks)	GEFTF	721,945	2,785,539
IAP-Food Security, CCM-2, Program 4 (component 1 of the project which corresponds to component 2: Scaling up of integrated approaches)	GEFTF	721,945	2,785,539
Total Project* Cost		7,219,450	27,855,388

\* The proposed project is in line with the IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2 priorities. It also responds to LD 3 (programme 4) and to LD 4 (programme 5).

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

Project Objective: Increasing sustainability and resilience of agriculture and value chains for an enhanced food security in Senegal				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
Diversification and access to market through Scaling up of integrated approaches	INV	<p><b>Outcome 1.2 functionality and cover of ecosystems maintained.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sustainable production practices are promoted and scaled up over 30000 ha of land</li> <li>- Sustainable rangeland management practices are promoted and water</li> </ul>	3,952.696	12,930.000

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- management improved</li> <li>- The use of renewable energy is promoted and scaled up</li> <li>- Rural storage and processing facilities are climate proofed for better resilience and improved food security</li> <li>- Rural communities' capacity are strengthened to promoted integrated approaches and sustainable value chain practices</li> </ul>		
Structuring and developing value chains through strengthen institutional frameworks	INV	<p><b>Outcome 3.1 Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutional support and capacity building are provided for the integration of sustainable production practices in 100 % of the targeted smallholders business plans</li> <li>- Institutional frameworks support the dissemination of resilient and sustainable land and water management practices through exchange visits</li> <li>- Policy dialogue and regulatory frameworks are supported to inform scaling up of investments in sustainability and resilience for food security (5 operational policy platforms)</li> <li>- A climate change adaptation strategy/vision is developed for the ago-industrial sector</li> <li>- Institutional support is provided to value chain actors to foster scaling up of sustainable production practices through knowledge sharing and dissemination.</li> </ul>	1,944.502	8,750.258
Monitoring and assessment of ecosystem services, global environmental benefits resilience	INV	<p><b>Outcome 4.2 Innovative mechanisms for multiple stakeholder planning and investments in SLM at scale.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;A is supported through adequate tools and effective institutional arrangements</li> <li>- Improved environmental and GEBs M&amp;E and overall programme evaluation are established</li> <li>- Socioeconomic and gender indicators mainstreamed in project design and</li> </ul>	1,044.581	4,375.128

		implementation - Capacity of local communities strengthened for a better access to national and regional protocols on benefit sharing		
		Subtotal	6941779	26,055.388
		Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup> GEFTF	277671	1,800.000
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>7,219.450</b>	<b>27,855.388</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	IFAD	Loan	25,000,000
GEF Agency	UNIDO	In kind and cash	400,000
Government	GoS	In kind	1,655.388
Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries	In kind	800,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>27,855,388</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)*	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP - Food Security	LD	IAP - Food Security	1,334,863	120,138	1,455,001
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	CC	IAP - Food security	440,000	39,600	479,600
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	IAP Set aside	IAP - Food security	1,834,862	165,138	2,000,000
UNIDO	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	LD	IAP - Food security	1,364,863	120,138	1,455,001
UNIDO	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	CC	IAP - Food security	440,000	39,600	479,600
UNIDO	GEFTF	IAP - Food security	IAP Set aside	IAP - Food security	1,834,862	165,138	2,000,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7,219,450</b>	<b>649,751</b>	<b>7,869,201</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here

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

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### Project Overview

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting;*

As most Sahelian countries, Senegal's agriculture is characterized by a precarious and uncertain agro-pastoral and cereal – root crop mixed farming systems, combined with a poor rural community base facing high level of food insecurity. Amongst the challenges, these households are facing significant risks of droughts, high amount of post-harvest losses, water mismanagement etc.

This project will target geographical areas and value chains which are needy of most investments to reduce their environmental risks. Such value chains include millet, sorghum, maize, fonio, hibiscus, sesame, cowpeas, family poultry, inland fishing, beekeeping, horticulture and forestry.

The target value chains are considered as part of IFAD's programme in Senegal and UNIDO's planned investment in the field of agribusiness development. UNIDO and IFAD interventions will target water resource management, sustainable land degradation, capacity building and the provision of technologies and infrastructure all along these value chains. Therefore GEF investment will be able to benefit from a greater impact in terms of outreach and inclusiveness.

### *Context and baseline scenario*

The Senegalese agricultural sector plays a leading role in the national economy, it contributes to 7,6% of GDP and employs 58% of the active population. It is mainly driven by agricultural livelihood activities such as rice, millet / sorghum, cowpea, maize, family poultry, inland fisheries, beekeeping and forestry.

The climate change and variability is a source of vulnerability, especially in rural areas. Indeed, Senegal has a Sudano-Sahelian climate characterized by lower rainfall, higher temperatures and land degradation (34% of the area of the country, CSE, 2011). In addition, climate change adds a layer of complexity to existing development challenges, such as high levels of poverty and inequality, especially in rural areas (57.3% of the poor live in rural areas, PSE) combined with rapid population growth (2.7%), weak market infrastructure and service provision. This context justifies the urgent need to strengthen the resilience and food security, especially in areas inhabited by agricultural value chains for benefits not only to the rural poor, but also to a rapidly growing population in the cities.

Up to date, baseline investments have mainly focused on the promotion of access to inputs, mechanization, marketing, structuring actors of value chains and capacity building. Basic scenarios have not paid particular or significant attention to safeguarding the productive bases and the ecosystem services (land, water, forests, etc...) which enhance sustainability and improve resilience of the production systems and the value chains that depend on them. For example, baseline scenarios were not taking sufficient consideration to green growth options (use of renewable energies) and investment at watershed level to safeguard the value chains. Sustainable growth options would require further attention to be adequately addressed and integrated in more inclusive value chains. Development interventions would need to further enable smallholders and rural communities to have adaptive responses to environmental degradation and climate variability by progressive diversification of their income, reducing post-harvest losses, enhancing their ability to cope and to adapt to harsh environmental conditions and climate change, with the ultimate goal of enhancing food security and increasing the resilience of communities and their livelihood systems. In this respect, Government planned and existing investments addressing food security are as follow:

- *The Agricultural Value Chains Support Project – Extension COVERS: (i) the central and northern groundnut basin, encompassing the regions of Kaolack, Fatick, Kaffrine and Diourbel; and (ii) the Louga agropastoral*

region. The project zone represents 27 per cent of the country's land area and is home to 35 per cent of its population and will target beneficiary groups of which: a) small-scale farmers and herders who are members of farmers' and herders' organizations, within which it will ensure the incorporation of the most vulnerable households, the young, and women and their organizations, b) other economic actors: micro- and small rural enterprises (MSREs) providing services, for preference those run by young people, both upstream and downstream of the value chains in question, c) market operators, d) public and private structures providing the products and services needed for development of the targeted value chains. The main outcomes that are expected from this baseline investment are: (i) an increase in production and an improvement in agricultural productivity; (ii) an increase in the value of the additional production thanks to contractual agreements between producers' organizations and market operators; and (iii) the empowerment of professional agricultural organizations through the provision of social and economic services to their members. The project will run for six years. The total project cost is US\$50.4 million and the main financiers of the project are the Senegalese Government, IFAD and the beneficiaries. IFAD will contribute an equivalent of US\$34.7 million in the form of a loan on highly concessional terms. The Government will contribute an equivalent of US\$12.7 million, of which US\$7.6 million will mostly be for investments in agricultural and livestock water supply schemes, while US\$5.1 million corresponds to duties and taxes, making a total Government contribution of 25.2 per cent of total costs. The beneficiaries' contribution is estimated at US\$3.0 million, or 6 per cent of the total project cost.

- The Government development Plan ( Plan Senegal Emergent - PSE) considers the establishment of agropoles as priority intervention foreseen in the next four years, with a planned investment around 20 Million for the first agropole. In this context, UNIDO's Partnership Country Programme for Senegal will contribute to the PSE's objective of establishing agropoles in the in close collaboration with Development and financial partners such as the World Bank, the EU, AfDB as well as private investors. The geographical location of the agropoles includes north ( covering Louga, Saint Louis), center region ( including Kaolack) and Casamance.
- Other ongoing programmes involving the target value chains and rural households of this project include Programme de Développement Inclusif et Durable de l'Agrobusiness au Sénégal (PEDIDAS), the Programme d'accélération de la cadence de l'agriculture sénégalaise (PRACAS), the Programme National de Développement de l'Elevage (PNDE) and the national d'action pour l'adaptation (PANA).

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework;*

The proposed project will respond to the 3 components of the IAP and the results framework. It will i) support and strengthen institutional frameworks (policy dialogue, awareness raising, harmonization etc.), ii) give a priority to Scaling up of integrated approaches that contribute to better resilience and environmental sustainability and iii) respond to the third component of the IAP by ensuring that an effective M&A framework is implemented and adequate monitoring of GEBs and impact on ecosystem services is in place.

The project will reflect on these priorities through the following components and activities:

**Component 1: Agricultural Diversification and Market Access:** This component will focus on the promotion of good practices that would be scaled up through an integrated approach to land to support the sustainability and resilience of value chain and ensure food security. Additional GEF investments will be mobilized to contribute to improved and wider investment in soil and water conservation (bunds, half moons, etc.). This activity will target about 20 000 ha of degraded land. It will also promote the dissemination of assisted natural regeneration (ANR) over an estimated area of 10,000 hectares and will be coupled with investment in Agroforestry. GEF support will also focus on the scaling of best and tested practices for the rehabilitation and sustainable rangelands management. The additional investment of GEF will pay special attention to the improvement of water resources management. In this regard, it will implement the rehabilitation of ponds for livestock and irrigation in at least five sites.

On the other hand, GEF investment will support the promotion of renewable energy based on a green and resilient approach to the development of the value chains. GEF funding will support the implementation of a variety of technologies ranging from solar, wind and biogas. Most of these investments will target the irrigation sites (about 250 ha of irrigated land) and storage infrastructure to provide post-harvest services and initiatives for job creation in favour of young people. The remaining technologies will be promoted across the different stages of the supply chain through the value chain approach for an inclusive and sustainable development. GEF support will also focus on capacity building of the producers involved in climate sensitive agro-value chains by creating and upgrading 35 storage facilities and 5 processing units using effective and appropriate energy technologies as a way to reduce post-harvest losses in the context of the strategy to adapt to climate change. This will be combined with capacity building and training on sustainable production/processing practices in 500 vulnerable villages.

**Component 2, Development and structuring of value chains:** The GEF grant will add value to all selected value chains (millet, sorghum, maize, fonio, hibiscus, sesame, cowpeas, family poultry, inland fishing, beekeeping and forestry) contributing to the integration of best management environmental management practices and adapting to climate-related risks across the supported value chains. This project will ensure the dissemination and mainstreaming of best sustainable practices in major national programs (Integrated water resources management, soil Improvement, rangeland rehabilitation and sustainable management, rehabilitation of degraded lands etc.). GEF support will also target capacity building and institutional support at all levels. It is expected to train at least 15 000 people on sustainable land management and water conservation, at least 5,000 people on sustainable pasture management techniques and at least 10 000 people on proper handling / storage and food processing.

To ensure that producers and actors are involved in a participatory and effective way, GEF funding will support the integration of sustainable land management and sustainable environmental management principles into business plans implemented in the basic investment framework for the development of the value chain (100% target). This effort will be supported by a participatory approach to sustainable management of natural resources and improved resilience at the community level in at least 50 villages (10% of the 500 targeted villages). GEF funding will also support efforts to improve the environmental and social monitoring and evaluation and to facilitate learning and exchange visits across the IAP countries (such as with Niger and Burkina Faso). This will catalyze scaling up across the participating countries. At least 6 visits should be arranged for 72 producers which will be subsequently disseminating good practices that they will be learning and acquiring. The political dialogue will be essential to contribute to a favorable environment for the sustainability and resilience. This will be achieved through at least 5 platforms (including cross-sectorial platforms) to engage in a process of political dialogue on issues that can support the implementation and scaling up.

In addition, GEF support will support the integration of adaptation strategies to climate change in policies, strategies and plans of the agro-industrial sector. The GEF investment will contribute to the assessment of climate-exposed sectors in relation with the value chain development. It will also contribute to the development of strategies for adaptation to Climate Change and awareness for 30,000 beneficiaries and stakeholders at all levels (government, private sector, and farmers' organizations). Further dissemination of strategies to adapt to climate change will be achieved through workshops involving at least 500 stakeholders and study tours to promote an exchange of experiences on adaptation to climate change. Cross- visits will play a key role in promoting community participation and engagement and will complement/strengthen this intervention. A special attention will be given to youth and women.

### **Component 3. Monitoring and assessment of ecosystem services, global environmental benefits resilience**

Monitoring and evaluation of project activities will be considered as an integral part of this intervention. A comprehensive monitoring and assessment framework will be developed in the context of this IAP operation in Senegal. This framework M&A will offer an effective tool for multi-scale assessment and monitoring of integrated approaches and their impacts in terms of sustainability, resilience and food security along a well-defined results chain. The M&A framework will be developed during the preparatory phase and will include

Quality control monitoring instruments, baseline assessment on environmental and climate sensitive value chains, improved environmental M&E and overall evaluation of the programme. During the implementation phase, local institutions will be supported in order to benefit and effectively contribute to the implementation of the M&A framework. Also, attention will be paid to the coherence between the regional and the national framework.

### *Global environmental benefit*

The Global environmental benefit of the Project comes from the promotion and the scaling up of well tested practices such as good land management and water conservation practices (NAR, zai, half moons, etc), greening value chain development approach . These practices have been tested and proven sustainable in countries like Niger and Burkina Faso (including through previous and ongoing GEF project like PASADEM in Niger). The promotion of efficient water use technologies and clean energy solutions across the promoted value chains (from production to storage and processing) will contribute to better use of natural resources and will safeguard ecosystem services. The scaling up of SLM practices will contribute to carbon sequestration and is expected to lead to increase in biomass and biological diversity. The exact GEBs will be assessed during design.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The project will target around 30 000 people, of which about 50% are women and youth amongst vulnerable communities in eco- geographical zones of the selected streams (millet, sorghum, maize , fonio, hibiscus , sesame, cowpeas, family poultry , fishing continental, horticulture, beekeeping and forestry). These include : i) small and medium farmers who practice competitive and sustainable agriculture; ( ii) active actors in the value chain; and (iii) SMEs and large operators benefiting from the infrastructure of primary irrigation, enabling them to expand their production. Other beneficiaries include members of smallholders' households, value chain stakeholders, and wage workers engaged in new activities. The project will ensure that women and young people are actively involved in its implementation. .

The project will use participatory methods to engage the stakeholders in project design / preparation via a number of activities: i) Sensitization activities at community and institutional levels to reach the different groups of stakeholders (farmers associations and their household's members, Governmental institutions, Private sectors). Community sensitization will focus on the strategic assessment outcome, stressing the arising benefits; ii) Information sharing activities regarding project objectives which will contribute to mobilize the stakeholders, iii) participatory Assessments involving data gathering and hence direct contact with stakeholders.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

Potential risks	Mitigation measures
Potential partners reluctant to cooperate with project initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Activities and initiatives are based on demand driven initiatives. Also participatory methods is used during the project cycle to engage all stakeholders</li> </ul>

Possible lack of sufficient skills and availability of implementation partners/service providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Updating of the list of service providers and market operators drawn up by IFAD and UNIDO and partnership with other projects working in the area should allow its mitigation</li> </ul>
Possible coordination weaknesses for the implementation of the project activities across many value chains involving several partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project design phase will provide clear elements that define exact roles and responsibilities. It will also establish coordination and M&amp;E mechanisms that will allow for harmonized implementation of the project activities. Joint supervisions and good communication between all stakeholders will be also encouraged to mitigate this risk.</li> </ul>

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

The project is building on good projects to promote best practices. Many of these were tested and promoted under previous and ongoing GEF projects in Senegal and in other countries like Niger, Burkina Faso etc. During the project design phase, IFAD and UNIDO will ensure that the project will work through a coherent national institutional framework to: (i) build on existing mechanisms and consolidate them for wider impact (e.g the CSI/SLM) and (ii) establish linkages with the relevant ongoing and planned projects.

The following GEF projects will offer potential opportunities for synergies that will be particularly explored:

- MSP3386: Innovations in Micro Irrigation for Dryland Farmers
- FP4080: SPWA-BD: Participatory Biodiversity Conservation and Low Carbon Development in Pilot Ecovillages in Senegal
- FP4234: Climate Change adaptation project in the areas of watershed management and water retention
- FP5449: PSG- Sustainable and Inclusive Agribusiness Development Project
- FP5503: Mainstreaming Ecosystem-based Approaches to Climate-resilient Rural Livelihoods in Vulnerable Rural Areas through the Farmer Field School Methodology
- MSP5802: Promoting SLM Practices to Restore and Enhance Carbon Stocks through Adoption of Green Rural Habitat Initiatives

Finally, IFAD and UNIDO will build a complementary approach based on their own planned investments and operations in the country. The primary link for the GEF grant will be the Agricultural Value Chains Support Project – Extension which will link with the UNIDO’s Senegal Programme for Country Partnership which focuses on the establishment of agro-poles and associated Rural Transformation Centers for poverty reduction and income generation.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 IS THE PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH THE NATIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANS OR REPORTS AND ASSESSEMENTS UNDER RELEVANT CONVENTIONS? (YES /NO ). IF YES, WHICH ONES AND HOW: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, ETC.: THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES OF SENEGAL. IT SPECIFICALLY RESPONDS TO THE FOLLOWING INSTRUMENTS;*

- The Plan Sénégal Emergent (PSE) ;
- The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (national strategy for economic and social development, 2013-2017)
- Programme de Développement Inclusif et Durable de l'Agrobusiness au Sénégal (PEDIDAS)
- Cadre National d'Investissement Stratégique/GDT ;
- *Programme d'accélération de la cadence de l'agriculture sénégalaise (PRACAS) ;*
- *Programme National de Développement de l'Elevage (PNDE) ;*
- *Nouvelle Politique Forestière (NPF, 2005 – 2025) ;*
- *Lettre de politique sectorielle de l'Environnement ;*
- *Lettre de Politique sectorielle de la Pêche ;*
- *Programme national d'action pour l'adaptation (PANA)*

**NAME OF PROGRAM:**  
**FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY**  
**Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Climate-Smart Agriculture for Climate-Resilient Livelihoods (CSARL)
Country(ies):	Swaziland
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), Swaziland Water and Agriculture Development Enterprise (SWADE), Swaziland Environment Authority, Swaziland Meteorological Service
GEF Focal Area(s):	BD, LD and CCM

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2	GEFTF	1 833 888	12 000 000
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4	GEFTF	1 562 729	10 800 000
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5	GEFTF	1 833 887	12 000 000
IAP-Food Security, BD-3, Program 7	GEFTF	450 115	3 000 000
IAP-Food Security, BD-4, Program 9	GEFTF	450 115	3 000 000
IAP-Food Security, CCM-2, Program 4	GEFTF	1 080 275	7 200 000
Total Project Cost		7 211 009	48 000 000

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

<b>Project Objective:</b> Project Objective: Replicate and up-scale the SLM approach on the ground, to increase or maintain ecosystems service flows for sustained crop, livestock and forest production, and conserve biodiversity. The project would also endeavor to build climate resilience households.				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
1. Institutionalization of Chiefdom Development Plans	TA	1.1 Chiefdom Development Plans (CDP) Institutionalised within Ministry of Tinkhundla 1.1.1 CDPs revised to provide multistakeholder and multi-scale platforms to support policy and institutional reform and upscaling of INRM (PFD outcome) 1.1.2 Institutions at state and local levels are better equipped for planning and investment in SLFM and adaptation (Chiefdom Development Plan, CDPs)	1 500 000	9 600 000
2. Appropriate INRM and SLM scaled up across all four regions through	TA	2.1 Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under INRM and SLM (PFD) 2.1.1 Appropriate INRM and SLM promoted across all four regions through	2 050 459	17 200 000

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

uptakeof CDPs		adoption of CDPs and the investments they attract (PFD) 2.1.2 Household become more climate-resilient and food secure through the scaling out of appropriate interventions 2.1.3 Adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration		
	TA	2.2 Increase in investment flows to INRM following development of CDPs 2.2.1 CDPs provide clear targets for the rehabilitation of degraded lands and improved management of agricultural and pastoral lands 2.2.2 Biodiversity of global importance is protected 2.2.3 Ecosystem regulating functions and their services are preserved at landscape scale	1 650 000	8 000 000
3. Robust knowledge management and learning systems developed to support conventions targets and share lessons both nationally and regionally	TA	3.1 Capacity and institutions in place for monitoring of GEBs and resilience 3.1.1 National monitoring capacities to report on global environmental benefits and increased resilience is strengthened 3.1.2 Establishment of national Land Degradation Surveillance Framework	1 650 000	10 800 000
Subtotal			6 850 459	45 600 000
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>			360 550	2 400 000
<b>Total Project Cost</b>			<b>7 211 009</b>	<b>48 000 000</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	International Fund for Agricultural Development	Grants	500 000
Recipient Government	Government of Swaziland through its loan from IFAD (SLMP)	Loan	8 300 000
Recipient Government	Government of Swaziland – Departmental Budgets (SLMP)		6 600 000
Beneficiaries	Farmers and communities (SLMP)	In Kind	2 000 000
EU	Land Governance Project (SLMP)		9 000 000
Private sector	(SLMP)		600 000
Government of Swaziland	Commercial bank loan from LUSIP II	Loan	21 000 000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>48 000 000</b>

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

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>**

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b <sup>5</sup>
IFAD	GEFTF	Country	LD	IAP food security	2 619 841	235786	2 855 627
IFAD	GEFTF	Country	BD	IAP food security	450 114	40510	490 624
IFAD	GEFTF	Country	CC	IAP food security	540 137	48612	588 749
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security incentive (set-aside)	IAP food security	IAP food security	3 600 917	324083	3 925 000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7 211 009</b>	<b>648991</b>	<b>7 860 000</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**Project Overview**

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:*

This proposal will target the Southern Africa Region, within the maize mixed farming system in a landscape characterized by montain grassland and shrubland, rich biodiversity and diverse habitats. The main rational for targeting this agroecosystem are the climate resilience and food security challenges related to land degradation and nutrient loss, declining biodiversity, reduced water availability, low crop productivity and reliance on rainfed agriculture. Climate variations are expected to exacerbate these challenges.

*Context and baseline scenario:*

Land suitable for cultivation is rather limited (about 15-20% of the country), while the proportion of potentially arable land that is no longer viable is increasing. The demand for food is larger than production, currently roughly 60% of the food consumed is imported. The GoS has been addressing problems of rural poverty through the promotion of new farming practices. The Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Programme (LUSIP I) and the associated GEF (LUSIP-GEF) are cases in point. However, Swaziland requires additional financing, institutional capacity and knowledge to encourage Sustainable Land and Forest Management (SLFM) and climate-resilient livelihoods.

CSARL will provide significant added value to the on-going efforts to reduce land degradation in Swaziland. It would expand the coverage areas of the CDP model nationwide, in other river basins and communal areas. IFAD is in fact working to build upon both past and current investments programmes that have supported INRM and food security in the country with the Government of Swaziland including current investment programmes, namely the IFAD-funded Smallholder Market-led Project (SLMP) and the Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Programme II (LUSIP II) funded by AfDB (African Development Bank), BADEA(Arab Bank for International Development), EIB(European Investment Bank), Taiwaneese ICDF(International Cooperation Fund for Development) and Kuwait Fund to upscale investment under LUSIP I. Co-financing from these sources combined is in excess of US\$48,000,000 and jointly target more 138 300 households farming some 50,500 ha in 35 Chiefdoms.

<sup>5</sup> Excludes Project Preparation Grant of 150,000 USD including fees

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:*

The Goal of CSARL is to reduce land degradation, rehabilitate ecosystems and build resilience to climate change through the up-scaling of SLFM and adaptation community-based planning processes in the country, while strengthening national monitoring capacities to report on GEB. The Objectives are to replicate and up-scale the SLM approach on the ground, to increase or maintain ecosystems service flows for sustained crop, livestock and forest production, and conserve biodiversity. The project would also endeavor to build the climate resilience households. and will have three key components:

**Component 1. Institutionalization of Chiefdom Development Plans:**

GEF would support the establishment of multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral approaches that build on existing SLFM investments, to ensure that policy frameworks integrate priorities from the community, local to national level, as well as from the public and private sectors. Priorities for agro-ecosystem resilience and food security would subsequently be mainstreamed into relevant sector plans and budgets.

Community and government SLFM and adaptation planning and management capacity will be improved through the nationwide replication of the Chiefdom Development Plans (CDPs) model to realize the greatest sustainable benefits from land resources. The CDPs will enable the assessment of land carrying capacity, identify climate risk challenges, as well as define investment options to reduce land degradation, reduce climate change-related impacts on the maize-based systems, increase biodiversity and sequester carbon.

**Component 2. Appropriate INRM and SLM scaled up across all four regions through uptake of CDPs**

GEF support would target scaling up processes focused on connecting farmers to markets by linking them to value chains in an equitable and sustainable way, supported by a strong baseline of governance and policy reforms, as well as the institutional frameworks supported under Component 1. Agro-ecosystem would be protected and rehabilitated through the adoption of SLFM practices that result in: i) land and water conservation, ii) biodiversity conservation; iii) reduced GHG emission and carbon sequestration; iv) improved resilience to shocks; as well as v) diversified livelihood. This will ensure that ecosystem regulating functions and their services will be preserved at the landscape scale.

**Component 3. Robust knowledge management and learning systems developed to support convnetions targets and share lessons both nationally and regionally**

This component will establish M&A systems to quantify and monitor ecosystem services at multiple scales, from farm scale, landscape to national and regional level. GEF would support the strengthening of existing national monitoring capacities to report on global environmental benefits in terms of: i) changes in vegetation and tree cover, ii) availability of water resources, iii) carbon stocks and iv) biodiversity conservation. Specifically, the project will support the establishment of a national land degradation monitoring system building on the Land Degradation Surveillance Framework approach. The project will also benefit from LUSIP-GEF experience with carbon benefit and GHG emission reductions assessment performed through the Carbon Benefit Tool. Information and results will be documented and disseminated using a range of appropriate media and tools. A knowledge management and M&E system with associated communication/dissemination strategy and materials will be developed.

*Global environmental benefits:*

The Global Environmental Benefits of project comes from scaling up lessons learned from an earlier GEF experience, namely the Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project (LUSIP-GEF). The Chiefdom Development Planning Process is being incorporated into the Government systems of Swaziland and will provide frameworks for development investments in each chiefdomship with clear targets and lines of accountability. Better utilisation of Swazi Nation Land, through soil and water conservation measures at catchment and homestead-levels, will enhance productivity, and will demonstrate that agricultural intensification does not need to result in degradation of land or loss of cultural biodiversity. The development of a nation-wide LDSF will help the early identification of land degradation risks and enable mitigation measures to be developed during the CDP process. Tried and tested SLFM that result in: i) land and water conservation, ii) biodiversity conservation; iii) reduced GHG emission and carbon sequestration; iv) improved resilience to shocks; as well as v) diversified livelihood will be promoted. This will

ensure that ecosystem regulating functions and their services will be preserved at the landscape scale. The exact GEBs will be assessed during design but are expected to include reduction in land degradation, enhanced ecosystem services, specifically food security, freshwater and terrestrial biodiversity, and improving human well being.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The proposed executing partners are: the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), Swaziland Water and Agriculture Development Enterprise (SWADE), Swaziland Environment Authority (SEA) and Swaziland Meteorological Service. The project will engage with the National SLM Steering Committee that was set up to promote policy dialogue and inform processes of SLM policy and legal development under the framework of the LUSIP-GEF. It comprises experts from Government and CSOs, namely the Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy (MNRE), Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Communications (MTEC), among others.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

The principal risks affecting the realisation of the CSARL include swift preparation and start-up, coordination with similar projects and programmes, and the long-term sustainability of land use in the project development area. Given the present climate, with its skewed rainfall distribution, likely higher temperatures and less, but more intensive rainfall, agricultural land will be vulnerable to degradation. This is aggravated by the widespread practice of overstocking the Swazi Nation Land with grazing cattle. Cattle husbandry practices are deeply engrained in the Swazi culture. Changing the cattle husbandry practices is beyond the capacity of the project, but will build on successful examples of grazing management and reforestation. The development of a nation-wide LDSF will help the early identification of land degradation risks and enable mitigation of land use risks. It be critical to introduce well-tuned interventions to halt land degradation and respond to climate change.

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

This project will build on lessons learned from an earlier GEF experience, namely the Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project (LUSIP-GEF). Furthermore, CSARL will be complemented by two programmes, namely LUSIP II and SMLP, that aim at expanding the command area under soil and water conservation and support smallholder agricultural production and food value chains. The fact that all these projects are undertaken under the aegis of the Ministry of Agriculture, and that SWADE is the agency assigned to take on the management responsibilities will build coherence between these interventions and provide the necessary platforms to scale the CPD approach and SLM/Food security nationally.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:*

- Summarize alignment of proposed priorities with relevant national sustainable development policies and strategies

The GoS has ratified all three Rio Conventions (UNCCD, CBD and UNFCCC). In its goal of up-scaling interventions for sustainability and resilience, this proposal would result in maintenance of ecosystems functions and services, biodiversity and habitats would be better preserved. This would also ensure improved climate regulation, reduced vulnerability to environmental shocks and carbon sequestration, which are relevant actions for the three Rio Conventions.

- Summarize alignment of proposed priorities with relevant local sustainable development policies and strategies

The CDP is embraced by the Ministry of Tinkhundla (Local Government) after testing in the IFAD-funded LUSIP and LUSIP-GEF project areas. It is recognized as good practice as it introduces participatory planning in the chiefdoms, so that decision-making on socio-economic development activities are informed by consultation of households and communities.

**NAME OF PROGRAM:  
FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY  
Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Reversing Land Degradation trends and increasing Food Security in degraded ecosystems of Semi-arid areas of central Tanzania
Country(ies):	United Republic of Tanzania
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD
Other Executing Partner(s):	Vice President's Office – Division of Environment (VPO-DOE); Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives; Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development; Ministry of Water; and Local Government Authorities.
GEF Focal Area(s):	LD, BD and CCM

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1, Program 2	GEFTF	521 790	3 130 736
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4	GEFTF	521 790	3 130 736
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5	GEFTF	521 790	3 130 736
IAP-Food Security, BD-4, Program 9	GEFTF	3 727 062	22362381
IAP-Food Security, CCM-2, Program 4	GEFTF	1 863 531	11 181 191
Total Project Cost		7 155 963.3	42 935 778

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

<b>Project Objective:</b> The project aims at reversing land degradation trends and increase food security in central Tanzania through supporting sustainable land and water management and ecosystem-based adaptation.				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
<b>Component 1.</b> Institutional capacity building on sustainable land management forest conservation and sustainable pastoralism	TA	1.1 Strengthening of existing village institutions 1.2 Strengthening natural resources climate change and biodiversity awareness at the local and district level 1.3 Sustainable Land Management through the promotion of Climate Smart Land Use Planning (LUP)	1 644 494	9 234 092

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

<b>Component 2.</b> Sustainable and climate smart land, water and pastoral management systems through ecosystem based adaptation scaled out	TA	2.1 Improve management of agricultural and pastoral systems	4 703 671	26 174 868
		2.2 Support mechanisms for sustainable land management, including wetlands, in the wider catchment		
	TA	2.3 Support mechanisms to increase resilience and food security of pastoralists, farmers and livestock		
		2.4 Reduced land degradation, improved soil health and increased productivity of agro ecosystems		
<b>Component 3</b> Monitoring and lessons learned	TA	2.6 Diversified and climate resilient production systems that increase food security and household incomes	450 000	2 526 818
		2.7 Promote forest and biodiversity conservation		
Subtotal			6 798 165	37 935 778
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>			357 798	5 000 000
<b>Total Project Cost</b>			<b>7 155 963.3</b>	<b>42 935 778</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF/Donor Agency	International Fund for Agricultural Development	Grants	10 000 000
Recipient Govt	Government of Tanzania through its ASDP and WSDP	Loans and grants	32 935 778
Others	Beneficiaries and stakeholders	In kind	TBC
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>42 935 778</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b <sup>5</sup>
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security incentive (set-aside)	LD	IAP food security	894 495	80 504	975 000

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

<sup>5</sup> Excludes Project Preparation Grant of 150,000 USD including fees

IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security incentive (set-aside)	BD	IAP food security	1 788 991	161 009	1 950 000
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security incentive (set-aside)	CC	IAP food security	894 495	80 504	975 000
IFAD	GEFTF	IAP-Food Security incentive (set-aside)	IAP food security	IAP food security	3 577 982	322 018	3 900 000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					7 155 963	644 037	7 800 000*

- a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.
- b) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](#).
- c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )
- d) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](#).
- \*Excludes PPG of 200,000 USD (183 486.2 GEF Financing + 16 513.8 in Fees)

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### Project Overview

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:*

The project targets dry and degraded areas of Tanzania. Unsustainable livestock keeping/pastoralism and agricultural activities, among other factors, have exacerbated land degradation and the degradation of water catchment areas and the erosion of the otherwise rich biodiversity of Tanzania. The increase of population and livestock, paired with the increase of extreme weather events is aggravating the already precarious conditions pastoralists and farmers in central Tanzania are living in. Land for both livestock and crops is becoming more scarce and less fertile, forcing pastoralists and farmers to access land that has not been allocated to them, and therefore causing day to day conflicts and overgrazing. Water is also becoming less and less available, resulting in conflicts and land degradation. Some activities concerning climate smart ecosystem-based SLM could also be replicated in Zanzibar to complement the ASSP/ASDP-L. The ASSP/ASDP-L established successful field farmer schools on agriculture and livestock activities and the GEF could provide an opportunity to scale it up and integrate more climate smart activities.

The targeted project area represent a total population of around 4 million potential direct and indirect project beneficiaries of which 51% are females.

*Context and baseline scenario:*

Agriculture and food security are ranked as the most vulnerable sector within the Republic of Tanzania and severely impacted by climate change and land degradation due to an increase of unreliable rainfall resulting in decline agricultural productivity, including loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Yet, 62.1% of the population accounting depends on agriculture for their livelihood, with 34% living below the poverty line. Poverty rates are highest in rural areas, with an overwhelming majority of poor Tanzanians dependent on incomes/food security derived from the natural resources base that is being continually degraded, with an influx of invasive alien species. This degradation and lack of resilience is compounded by limited access to credit facilities, that restrict the uptake of improved agricultural practices, markets assurance and investments in infrastructure facilities (storage, transport, value addition, irrigation, etc).

Investment programmes that are addressing these baseline problems are the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP), the Water Sector Development Programme (WSDP) and the ASDP-L/BFFS. The WSDP is a framework plan that promotes a Sector Wide approach to address shortfalls in urban and rural water supply infrastructure, to improve water resource management and to strengthen the sector institutions and their capacities. The Agricultural Sector Development Programme – Livestock (ASDP-L) is an IFAD funded programme co-financed

by Belgium Fund for Food Security (BFFS) and the Government of Tanzania. It is implemented in the semi-arid region of Dodoma, in central Tanzania. The project aims at: (i) improving livelihoods of the poorest agro-pastoralists and pastoralists, strengthen the capacity of livestock communities through improved health and nutrition; (ii) provision of water for both human and livestock in adequate quality and quantity through deep boreholes drilling; protection of spring catchment areas; construction of charco-dams, rain water harvesting; swallow well and water gravity schemes, water committee capacity building; and (iii) promote and support environmentally sustainable rangeland management for livestock development.

This IAP project will cover about 150,000 ha of agricultural land in the semi-arid zone of central Tanzania. A specific series of activities will focus on severely degraded land in the regions of Dodoma, Singida, Tabora, Mwanza, Geita and Zanzibar, where the baseline investments are located. The project will have an overall indirect impact also on the wider central Tanzania area and Rufiji catchment, influencing the lives of more than 100,000 rural households.

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:*

The BFFS project, located in the semi-arid Dodoma region in central Tanzania aims, among other activities, at the constructions of water points and boreholes for pastoralists, farmers and livestock. The presence of the new water source, together with the lack of implementation of the land use plans and the increasing number of people and livestock has exacerbated land degradation.

The proposed GEF activity aims at supporting ecosystem-based climate smart agriculture and pastoralism in the semi-arid central Tanzania. The Goal is to reduce land degradation, rehabilitate ecosystems and build resilience to climate change through the design and update of sustainable and climate smart land use plans and through the up-scaling of best practices on sustainable land and water management, ecosystem-based adaptation, and biodiversity conservation approaches that can support resilient agriculture and pastoralism at the local level.

Component 1: Institutional strengthening. The GEF will support the institutional capacity building on sustainable land management, forest conservation and sustainable pastoralism at a district and village level. The GEF will also support the scaling up of participatory, climate smart, dynamic Village Land Use Plans with the aim of managing land and water more sustainably and reverse the land degradation trend which affects the region.

Component 2: Scaling up of Sustainable and climate smart land, water and pastoral management systems through ecosystem based adaptation. The proposed GEF activity will support the scaling-up of best practices sustainable land and water management, ecosystem-based adaptation, and biodiversity conservation approaches that can support resilient agriculture and pastoralism at the local level.

Component 3: The project will support monitoring and, evaluation and dissemination of the lessons learnt during the implementation of the baseline projects

Adequate information will be collected, evaluated, reported and readily available/accessible. Best Practices on Sustainable Land Management, Biodiversity Conservation and Climate Change Adaptation and mitigation identified, documented, disseminated and up-scaled. The project will seek to create innovative ways in which lessons learned can be captured, up-scaled, widely disseminated and the impacts monitored. This will include the development and implementation of a comprehensive awareness raising program, and an up-scaling strategy.

*Global environmental benefits:*

The Global Environmental Benefits of project comes from scaling up demonstrated best practices throughout the country and includes provision of appropriate water management practices for both human and livestock, and the promotion environmentally sustainable rangeland management for livestock development. Water management technologies that will be promoted include protection of spring catchment areas; construction of charco-dams; rain water harvesting; shallow well and water gravity schemes, water committee capacity building; and of deep borehole

drilling. At the landscape level sustainable land and water management, ecosystem-based adaptation, and biodiversity conservation approaches that can support resilient agriculture and pastoralism at the local level will be promoted through the empowerment local community planning processes. The exact GEBs will be assessed during design but are expected to include improved water quality and water quantity; enhancing ecosystem services, specifically food security, freshwater and terrestrial biodiversity, and improving human well-being for pastoral communities.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The project will require an effective multi-sectoral approach involving close cooperation and coordination between different government ministries and departments (i.e. those with responsibility for environment, agriculture, Livestock, land-use planning, Local Government Authorities, etc.), and equally close collaboration between government and development partners, private sector and CSOs (NGOs, CBOs and FBOs).

This project will be coordinated through the climate change, Biodiversity, and Land degradation coordinating group. Coordination will be spearheaded by the Vice President's Office, who is acting as National Executing Agency for this project and the National Focal Point for the three Post Rio Conventions (UNCCD, UNFCCC and CBD). Other Executing Agencies are Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives; Ministry of Water; Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development; and Local Government Authorities. Collaborating partners will include private sector and CSOs. In order to allow broadest participation, there shall be a Project Steering Committee and Technical Committee to advise on the implementation of the project activities that will enhance sustainability and resilience for food security.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

The principal risks affecting the realization of the project are

- The limited capacity of local institutions to implement integrated project operation and mainstream SLM, biodiversity conservation, climate change resilience into their plans, programmes and strategies. The project will mitigate this risk through an intensive capacity building programme using the skills of ongoing projects and bilateral agencies to transfer SLM, biodiversity conservation, Climate Change resilience skills to local counterparts during the project phases. This will include specific learning visits to other projects and countries.
- The impacts associated with climate change risk are already experienced in many systems and sectors and pose a direct threat to people's survival in the project areas. There is high probability of occurrence of extreme weather events in some districts e.g. floods or droughts which could delay some of the project activities and could also cause contingencies as well as emergencies during project operations. The project will explore linkages with the Early Warning initiatives led by the Tanzania Meteorological Agency and support the development of appropriate climate information services. In addition linkages with disaster risk reduction initiatives will be developed and best practices in biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation and SLM promoted.
- Lack of engagement /involvement of local stakeholders/institutions/communities in the project activities. This will be addressed during the design phase of the project through a detailed stakeholder analyses and appropriate participatory approaches to ensure multi-stakeholder involvement that includes the LGAs, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and Farmer Organizations. This will ensure stakeholders are aware of the risks and benefit of project interventions.

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

IFAD will ensure that the project: (i) will build on existing mechanisms and consolidate them for wider impact and (ii) will establish linkages with the relevant ongoing and planned projects. The following GEF projects will offer potential opportunities for synergies that will be particularly explored:

- The council approved UNEP Ecosystem-Based Adaptation for Rural Resilience;
- Reducing Land Degradation on the Highlands of Kilimanjaro (GEF-UNDP);
- Sustainable Management of the Miombo Woodland Resources of Western Tanzania (GEF-UNDP);
- Developing Core Capacity to Address Adaptation to Climate Change in Productive Coastal Zones of Tanzania (LDCF-UNEP); and
- Implementation of Concrete Adaptation measures to reduce vulnerability of livelihoods and economy of coastal communities of Tanzania.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes  /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:*

The project will directly contribute to the implementation of priorities under the CBD-NBSAP, UNFCCC-NAPA and the UNCCD-NAP by promoting sustainable land use, Ecosystem based adaptation, and conservation of biodiversity. The project is also in line with national policies, plans, and strategies including:

- Tanzania Development Vision (TDV) 2025, which provides broad guidance on the strategic goals for achieving sustainable growth through achieving a high quality livelihood for the people, attaining good governance through the rule of law, and developing a strong and competitive economy.
- Tanzania Five Year Development Plan (2011 - 2016) aims to unleash the country's resource potentials so as to fast-track the provision of the basic conditions for broad-based and pro-poor growth.
- National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty ((NSGRP II) (2010) includes the goal on "Ensuring food and nutrition security, environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation and mitigation". Some of the identified strategies to achieve this goal include enhancing sustainable forest management for improved governance, livelihoods, forest conditions, resilience of forest ecosystems and trees outside forests and more efficient use of wood resources; promoting specific adaptation and mitigation options according to ecological conditions; and improving soil and water conservation measures.
- National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP) (2013) provides the basis for integrating Sustainable Land Management, Biodiversity conservation and Climate Change concerns in formulation and implementation of development plans and programmes. It contains strategies for addressing various environmental challenges including land degradation; water resources degradation and pollution; degradation of aquatic resources; loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity; deforestation; urban pollution; climate change; modern biotechnology; electronic waste; Invasive Alien Species (IAS); and biofuels.
- Strategy on Urgent Actions on Land Degradation and Water Catchments, 2006 was put in place as a policy response towards the widespread environmental degradation particularly degradation of land and water catchments.
- Strategy on Urgent Actions for the Conservation of Marine and Coastal Environment, Lakes and Rivers Ecosystems and Dams, 2008 was formulated as a response towards environmental degradation in coastal environment, lakes and river ecosystems and dams.
- National Climate Change Strategy (2012) has been developed in response to the growing concern of the negative impacts of climate change and climate variability on the country's social-economic and physical environment.

The project is in line with the Dodoma district authorities priorities, such as sustainable land and pastoral management and biodiversity conservation.

**NAME OF PROGRAM:  
FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY  
Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Karamoja sub region.
Country(ies):	Uganda
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP, FAO
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)
GEF Focal Area(s):	LD and BD

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP-Food Security, LD-1, Program 1	GEFTF	1,978,550	15,000,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-3, Program 4	GEFTF	2,630,221	18,000,000
IAP-Food Security, LD-4, Program 5	GEFTF	804,862	5,000,000
IAP-Food Security, BD-4, Program 9	GEFTF	1,725,817	10,000,000
Total Project Cost		7,139,450	48,000,000

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

<b>Project Objective:</b> To contribute to enhancing long-term environmental sustainability and resilience of food production systems to achieve improved national food security.				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
Strengthen institutional frameworks for improving food security	TA	<p>1.1 Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms in support of policy and institutional reform and upscaling of integrated natural resources management in place (such as the Market and Watershed platforms based on the country SLM frameworks)</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Functioning multi-stakeholder platforms in place in Karamoja - at local/landscape scale</i></li> <li>• <i>At least one Gender/age sensitive decision-support tool and participatory processes applied</i></li> </ul> <p>1.2 Supportive policies and incentives in place at local level to</p>	1,445,826	9,540,000

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

		<p>support smallholder agriculture and food value-chains</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Value chain approaches integrated with sustainable production systems approaches, including consideration of post-harvest losses</i></li> <li>• <i>Gum Arabic, Amarula, Tamarind, Palm value-chains strengthened</i></li> <li>• <i>Increase in value chains supporting smallholder farmers to scale up good practices</i></li> </ul>		
Scaling up integrated approaches at national and landscape level.	TA	<p>2.1 Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources management and SLM (including practices linked to GHG emission reduction -CSA)</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>X million ha with improved soil and water management</i></li> <li>• <i>X million ha under diversified production</i></li> <li>• <i>X million of ha of agro-pastoral systems under integrated management</i></li> <li>• <i># of farmers with increased access to food</i></li> </ul> <p>2.2 Increase in investment flows to integrated natural resources management</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>X million in increase from the local private sector;</i></li> <li>• <i>X number of innovative funding mechanisms/ schemes in place</i></li> </ul> <p>(Baselines to be determined during the PPG)</p>	3,633,550	25,714,000
Monitoring and assessment of global environmental benefits	TA	<p>3.1 Capacity and institutions in place to incorporate resilience into project design and implementation, and for monitoring of GEBs,</p> <p><i>Indicators and targets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Multi-scale monitoring of ecosystem services and global environmental benefits established at national level</i></li> </ul> <p>3.2 Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in</p>	1,722,074	10,346,000

		production landscapes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework for monitoring of resilience established at national and landscape level</li> <li>Key Program socio-economic and gender indicators mainstreamed</li> </ul> (Baselines to be determined during the PPG)		
		Subtotal	6,801,450	45,600,000
		Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>	338,000	2,400,000
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>7,139,450</b>	<b>48,000,000</b>

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

### C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	9,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	13,000,000
GEF-Agency	World Bank - The Africa Regional Pastoralism Livelihood Resilience project	Grant	10,000,000
Government	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	In Kind	16,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>48,000,000</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b <sup>5</sup>
UNDP/FAO	GEFTF	Country	LD	IAP food security	1,894,954	170,546	2,065,500
UNDP/FAO	GEFTF	Country	BD	IAP food security	525,459	47,291	572,750
UNDP/FAO	GEF TF	Country	CCM	IAP food security	1,149,312	103,438	1,252,750
UNDP/FAO	GEFTF	IAP- set-aside		IAP food security	3,569,725	321,275	3,891,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					<b>7,139,450</b>	<b>642,550</b>	<b>7,782,000</b>

a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.

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

c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )

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

<sup>5</sup> Excludes Project Preparation Grant of 150,000 USD including fees

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **Project Overview**

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:*

The target geography is Karamoja sub region in Northern Uganda, which is characterized by semi arid climate, with one long rainy season, long dry spells, poor rainfall distribution and vulnerability to droughts. These factors make the sub-region chronically food insecure with a long hunger period from April to July because harvests are usually below their potential especially in drought and flood prone areas. The project will cover 7 districts in Karamoja with potential to extend to additional 4 districts in Lango and Acholi sub-regions. Priority will be given to communities lacking the means to restore or improve their food production landscapes, and low-income women requiring investments that ensure greater access and control over resources.

*Context and baseline scenario:*

Karamoja inhabits over six million people with approximately 21% of households headed by females. Only 32 percent of the population is between the ages of 18 and 63 years; which translates into a dependency ratio of 2:1 (compared to a national dependency ratio of 1:1) and impacts negatively on the attainment of household food security given the higher percentage of non-working dependants within the community. The Karamoja Food Security Assessments of March and June 2014 attribute the recurrent threats to food security to low productivity, climate variability (long dry spells), and pests and diseases among others. The relatively high access to land (average size of 1.3 hectares cultivated per household) has not translated into greater food availability for the households due to low productivity. Other constraints to crop and livestock production include inability to access key agricultural inputs (seeds, tools, labour, and fertilizers), weak extension support and inadequate access to the necessary drugs and veterinary services. Food insecurity is exacerbated further by poor cultivation practices, overgrazing around kraals and watering points, and high levels of deforestation to meet insufficient fuel wood and fencing materials. Due to loss of vegetation cover, soil erosion has become a big challenge especially along the riverbanks. The sale of charcoal or firewood and brewing of local alcohol are the most common sources of income reported across Karamoja followed by agriculture and wage labour. Over 30 percent of households reported incurring debt purposely to purchase of food. .

The Government of Uganda is committed to addressing food insecurity exemplified by the Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security, which prioritizes crop farming to ensure sustainable food security and increased household income in Karamoja.

### **Baseline projects and Potential Co-financing**

The project will partner and build on with the following initiatives that are already in place at national and local level:

- i. Strengthening Capacities for Disaster Risk Management and Resilience Building (UNDP contribution USD 15,000,000). This project is enhancing integrated climate risk management including climate smart agriculture to break the cycle of food insecurity, restoring livelihoods, preventing further land degradation and improving community adaptation to climate variability. The project is implemented in the drought and flood prone districts of Karamoja, Lango, Acholi, Teso, Bugisu and Kasese. Through the component on enhancing food security, livelihoods and resilience building in Karamoja, about 100,000 persons from the districts of Nakapiripirit and

Amudat have benefited from the community resilience-building activities, climate change adaptation interventions, and new water facilities.

ii. Strengthening Adaptive Capacity of Agro – Pastoral communities and Local Government to reduce Impacts of Climate Risk on Livelihoods in Karamoja’ (FAO/JEEP Grant: USD 9,000,000). The purpose of this project is to strengthen the resilience of Agro-Pastoral communities and the Local Government in order to reduce impacts of climate risks on livelihoods in Karamoja. through three result areas: (1) Strengthening Drought Early Warning, Preparedness and Contingency Planning & Response system; (2) strengthening livestock disease surveillance, diagnostic, and livestock vaccination/treatment services and improved livestock nutrition through rehabilitation of degraded rangelands resources and promoting appropriate techniques for forage conservation and utilization.

iii. The Africa Regional Pastoralism Livelihood Resilience project (US\$40,000,000 for Uganda). This World Bank funded project, which benefits pastoralists in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda aims to enhance livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in cross-border drought prone areas and improve the capacity of governments to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency. This includes enhancing sustainable management and secure access of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities to natural resources (water and pasture) with trans-boundary significance; improving the market access of the agro-pastoralists and pastoralists to the intra-regional and international markets of livestock and livestock products; enhancing drought-related hazards preparedness, prevention and response at the national and regional levels. The project will focus on border sub-counties of the following districts in Karamoja: Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, Napak and Amudati; and the neighbouring districts of Katakwi and Kween.

*Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:*

GEF support is being sought to address the major environmental drivers of food insecurity, reverse land degradation and enhance carbon stocks in the acacia dominated landscapes of Karamoja sub region.

Component 1: Institutional Framework for Influencing Sustainability and Resilience: - Existing multi-stakeholder platforms established under the Country SLM Investment Framework (CSIF) will be strengthened to ensure that sustainability and resilience issues are mainstreamed and implemented. Market stakeholder platforms (MSP) Watersheds as community organizational units for natural resource planning and management that have already proven to be effective in initiating policy dialogue and reversing land degradation in some districts will be extended to the target sites.

Furthermore, in line with the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP), this component will support the Ministry of Agriculture to operationalize the rangeland management and pastoralism policy by strengthening relevant institutions at the local level – such as the District and local environment committees, the District natural resource management teams to implement the policy provisions. Activities will include regular training events and exchange programs to enhance the capacity of local communities and institutions at national and sub-national levels. Due to the prolonged war in Karamoja, most of the Government and donor programs that exist in other districts are yet to be introduced and this project will for the first time address this gap and unlock some of the barriers.

Component 2: Scaling-up practices for Sustainability and Resilience: - This component will scale up appropriate integrated approaches that foster sustainability and resilience. Emphasis will be given to the following areas: (a) Building capacity for community-based integrated watershed management; (b) community initiatives to increase carbon stocks (c) Promoting sustainable agricultural livelihoods and food value chains for dryland products; (d) Rehabilitating degraded watershed areas and promoting soil and water conservation measures; (e) Rehabilitating degraded rangeland resources in acacia landscapes and promoting appropriate techniques for forage conservation and utilization; (f) Promoting small scale irrigation/ water for production systems; (g) integrated pest and disease

management (h) Promoting participatory technology development and small –scale adaptive research activities; and (I) demonstrations of value addition post-harvest management and Manure Management and use technologies.

This component will also support engaging the private sector in investing in value chains for the dry land products, building on work already started by UNDP to establish the Private Sector in Northern Uganda. With the war finally over and roads opening, Karamoja is attracting private sector investors in tourism and mining sectors, and this project provides is an opportunity to engage them further and increase SLM flows. The project will scale up existing UNDP support to Moroto Private Sector Development Center to catalyse investments in SMEs that are engaged in innovative dryland commodities such as Gum Arabic, Amarula, Tamarind, and Palm.

Component 3: Monitoring and assessment (M&A): This component will support monitoring and assessment to determine whether integrated approaches to improving food security and natural resource management have a positive impact on resilience of ecosystem services, livelihoods and food security, to understand tradeoffs and synergies among environmental, agricultural and livelihood outcomes, including for food security, using standardized tools that can be applied across scales, from the local, to national and landscape scales. Support will entail establishing integrated baselines, capacity building of key institutions in charge of monitoring, support to development of tools and systems for monitoring global environmental benefits, such as carbon benefits and GHG emission reductions, as well as for monitoring of resilience, agricultural productivity and socio-economic benefits and gender mainstreaming. Tools such as the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT), Land Degradation Assessment (LADA); Randomized sampling approaches and Self-evaluation Assessments of Climate Resilience of farmers and Pastoralist (SHARP) will be used.

#### *Global environmental benefits:*

The IAP will generate global environmental benefits in Karamoja sub region located in the globally recognised East Sudanian Savanna ecoregion. With numbers of humans and livestock increasing, nomadic and pastoralism declining in favor of settlement, small holder farmers are heavily dependent on this ecoregion for their livelihoods, water and food security. GEBS will be ensured through scaling up sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes), integrated management of pasture, livestock and water, production of marketable goods and services. Developing the food value chains in the natural products from Karamoja dryland areas presents an opportunity to positively impact on the livelihoods of its inhabitants as well as on the environment, preserving the dry land from degradation through erosion. A more detailed assessment of GEBS will be carried out during the PPG phase.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries shall spearhead project implementation, with the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Sustainable Land Management providing a platform for cross sector engagement on climate smart agriculture and integrated watershed management. The Office of Prime Minister together with that of Local Government in collaboration with civil society shall mobilize local leadership and community support and ensure that proposed interventions contribute to overall objectives of National Plan for Recovery and Development in Northern Uganda and to the Karamoja Integrated Development Program.

Ministry of Water and Environment and the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) shall be engaged to integrate water catchment management strategies in addressing environmental drivers of food security and climate change adaptation; and ex-situ protection of high value species such as gum Arabica and acacias, that are currently harvested indiscriminately for charcoal. The National Forestry Authority NFA shall also be engaged to support production of tree seedlings that fit in the targeted agro-ecosystem, to increase carbon stocks and promote

planting more such trees on crop land, diversify production with production lines that do not increase stress on the land (e.g. bee keeping), and develop the value chains of these dryland products, with food security outcomes. Their engagement will also bring to the forefront mappings (ecosystem health, degraded lands) done for the area and how resources therein can be harnessed sustainably and land degradation halted. The National Agricultural Research Organisation shall be engaged to develop tools for monitoring ecosystem health, resilience, and global environmental benefits.

Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development (MoLHUD) will be engaged to bring on board knowledge of land use planning, which is key for making choice of appropriate crop and livestock production systems, addressing equity and gender issues in allocation of land resources, establishing guidelines on land use (policy, laws, and by-laws at lower governance levels) and thereby halting land degradation. Engagement with the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives (MTIC) shall be valuable for establishment of multi-stakeholder market platforms that will enhance organisation of producers into cooperatives for collective marketing, involve private sector players appropriately and widen markets for different products, with food security benefits. In this respect, the National Bureau of Standards and Uganda export promotions board shall play a key role in building capacity of producers to generate competitive products that meet required market standards. With the growth of the extractive industry in Uganda and its high potential in the project target area, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development shall be engaged so that synergies arising from extractive industry income generation can be tapped into, but also that potential negative impacts of extraction on environmental sustainability can be mitigated to achieve food security outcomes.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

Potential risk	Proposed mitigation measure
Drought- may be so severe that it threatens crop and livestock survival thus curtailing the basis for development of value chains appropriate for food security	Promote climate smart agriculture practices for both crop and livestock production systems.
Front loading all planning activities (related to policies and strategies) prior to any on-ground actions may lead to nothing to show by the end of 2 years when GEF wants to see results	At project design, care shall be taken to have a carefully blended mixture of on-ground and planning actions going on concurrently.
Inadequate involvement of beneficiaries in project designing stage (because of the fragmentation of the communities) leading to a miss match between proposed actions and the acceptable norms and socio-economic set up of the targeted population	Key lessons shall be learnt and utilized from Local government, civil society, non-governmental organisations already working in the area

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

The proposed project draws on lessons learned and experiences from a number of UNDP and FAO-led projects and initiatives in Uganda and other African countries. It will integrate lessons learned from several ongoing, related projects, like the GEF funded Conservation of Kidepo Critical Landscape woodlands in Karamoja, Lango and Acholi; which uses an integrated landscape approach to protection of biodiversity; Kagera Transboundary Agro-ecosystem management project (TAMP), which uses a sustainable land management approach to address land degradation, biodiversity and CC related issues; and climate smart initiatives that aim at reducing emission while increasing adaptive capacity of small scale farmers. Efforts will be made to utilize existing institutional arrangements such as Biodiversity Technical Working Committee and the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Sustainable Land Management. For ongoing projects to minimize overlap and duplication of efforts. This will include use of a common steering committee for resilient projects. The inter-Ministerial Platform for the implementation of the Uganda Sustainable Land Management Investment Framework (2010-2020) will provide policy guidance and harmonization.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:*

The project is in line with a number of national plans and strategies including:

- i) Vision 2040 that aims to ‘transform Ugandan society from peasant dominated to a modern and prosperous middle income country within 30 years’; and the draft second National Development Plan 2015-2020 which has adopted a value chain approach and prioritized agriculture as one of the key development opportunities.
- ii) The Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP) and the SLM Strategic Investment Framework, which calls for scaling up adoption of measures for sustainable land management and climate change mitigation. The DSIP is the principal mechanism for delivering outcomes of Uganda’s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP).
- iii) Rangeland Management and Pastoralism Policy: - The Government of Uganda, with support from development partners including UNDP has developed a rangeland management and pastoralism policy, which is now in the final stages of approval. This project will lay a big role in operationalization the policy Development Partners
- iv) The National Action Programme to Combat Desertification (NAP): which is a response to the UNCCD, prioritizes afforestation, agroforestry and improved water management in the drylands of Uganda, as well as development and use of affordable and environment friendly energy sources, by building on a baseline of sustainable charcoal production.
- v) The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) which is a response to the convention on biodiversity (CBD), prioritizes conserving biodiversity outside protected areas, (in production landscapes) and making biodiversity conservation financially profitable and economically worthwhile to all the groups whose activities have the most potential to impact on biodiversity, including private sector and local communities.
- vi) Other Climate Change and disaster management Policies that have been adopted, including the National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management; the draft National Policy on Climate Change; and the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (REDD) Readiness Strategy.

**NAME OF PROGRAM:**  
**FOSTERING SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY**  
**Child Project Concept Note**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION<sup>1</sup>**

Project Title:	Cross Cutting Capacity Building, Knowledge Services and Coordination project for the Food Security Integrated Approach Pilot Program
Country(ies):	Regional
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD (Implementing Agency) UNEP, FAO, UNDP, CI
Other Executing Partner(s):	CGIAR, AGRA, CSIRO (amongst others, to be determined during detailed design)
GEF Focal Area(s):	LD, BD and CCM

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

Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
		GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
IAP Food Security - LD4, Program 5	GEFTF	\$6 808 562	\$116.46m
IAP Food Security - BD 4 Program 9	GEFTF	\$2 008 562	\$38.82m
IAP Food Security - CCM2, Program 4	GEFTF	\$2 008 564	\$38.82m
Total Project Cost		\$10 825 688	\$194.10m

**B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

<b>Project Objective:</b> Reinforce applied knowledge aspects of institutional frameworks, scaling up, and monitoring and assessment of integrated approaches to natural resources management in each and across all country child projects in SSA, and establish and operate governance structure and process for coordination and general management of the IAP on Food Security;				
Project Components	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
1. Create and/or strengthen integrating institutional frameworks and mechanisms	TA	<p><b>1.1 Policy Platform</b> in place to support dialogue and advocacy for mainstreaming of ecosystem services, climate resilience and gender sensitive approaches to food security at national and regional levels.</p> <p><b>1.2 Scientific platform</b> established to promote and underpin innovations for sustainability and resilience of agroecosystems in a food security context (linked to 4.2)</p>	2 130 820	IFAD 10m UNEP 5m FAO 5m Bioersity 2m ICRAF 10m

<sup>1</sup> This Concept Note is intended to convey whatever preliminary information exists at this stage on a child project and that is indicative of how it will contribute to the overall Program.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the Program Results Framework, which is already mapped to the relevant [Focal Area Results Framework](#) in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#).

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

## Annex A

		<b>1.3 Applied South-South exchanges occurring between countries</b> on specific IAP themes to improve context-specific understanding and inspire better use of ecosystem services and landscape approaches across the targeted geographies		
2. Scaling up of integrated approaches	TA + INV	<p><b>2.1 Multiple benefit innovative practices promoted</b> which generate or safeguard ecosystem services in the food value chains and food production systems</p> <p><b>2.2 Wide-scale and enhanced uptake of INRM</b> to foster sustainability and resilience in production landscapes and agroecosystems facilitated directly through support to other child projects as well as more broadly</p>	3 608 898	IFAD 45m AGRA 10m UNDP/AFIM 10m FAO 3m Bioversity 2m ICRAF 20m
3. Monitoring and assessment of global environmental benefits and agro-ecosystem resilience	TA	<p><b>3.1 Framework in place for multi-scale monitoring and assessment of ecosystem services and socio-economic benefits</b> (gender dis-aggregated) for each target geography.</p> <p><b>3.2 Operational framework in place for monitoring global environmental benefits</b> in all target geographies.</p> <p><b>3.3 Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience at multiple scales</b></p>	3 108 898	IFAD 10m CI/Vital Signs 16.1m FAO 3m UNEP 3m Bioversity 2m ICRAF 10m
4. Coordination, reporting and general management functions across IAP projects for programmatic impact, visibility and coherence	TA	<p><b>4.1 Structures and processes in place to ensure program coherence, reporting aggregation and comparability</b></p> <p><b>4.2 Knowledge Management framework</b> for synthesis and experience based learning to integrate information on ecosystem services and social issues.</p> <p><b>4.3 Impact assessment of projects and program</b> possible, as well as effectiveness of IAP modality and guidance generated on refinement of IAP approach</p>	1 461 564	IFAD 10m CGIAR 5m Bioversity 1m ICRAF 10m
		Subtotal	10 310 180	

**Annex A**

Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup> (select)	515508	
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	10 825 688	\$194.10m

For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in Table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust

**C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE, BY TYPE AND BY NAME**

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	IFAD	Grant	75,000,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant + in-kind	13,000,000
GEF Agency	UNEP (including WCMC)	Grant + in-kind	8,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP[AFIM]	Grant	10,000,000
GEF Agency	CI (Vital Signs)	Grant + in-kind	16,100,000
Multilateral donor	EU (via CGIAR)	Grant	5,000,000
Other	AGRA	Grant	10,000,000
	ICRAF	Grant	50,000,000
	Bioversity	Grant + in-kind	7,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			194, 100,000

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS<sup>a)</sup>**

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b <sup>5</sup>
IFAD	GEFTF	Regional	IAP Food Security	IAP Food Security	10 825 688	974 312	11 800 000

Formatted: Left

- a) No need to fill this table if it is a single Agency, single Trust Fund, single focal area and single country project.
- b) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](#).
- c) If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total amount; enter trust fund PMC breakdown here (LD: 343 980; BD:101 010; CC: 101 010)

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

<sup>5</sup> Excludes Project Preparation Grant of 150,000 USD including fees

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### Project Overview

*A.1. Project Description. Briefly describe: 1) Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting; 2) Context and baseline scenario; 3) Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework; 4) Global environmental benefits*

*Proposed geography / landscape / agroecosystem for IAP, include rationale and justification for targeting:*

This child project is intended to strengthen overall delivery of the IAP program in a coherent and consistent manner, as a means of maximizing the potential for transformational change beyond what is possible through the separate country child projects. It is therefore intended to cover all geographies targeted by the IAP program, including countries that requested but could not receive the matching funds from the incentive. It will also engage all GEF Agencies concerned and key partners in providing the technical support services, capacity building, and knowledge innovations that will ensure successful implementation of country projects under the IAP program.

More specifically, the cross-cutting / coordination project will support the countries and the child projects submitted by the IAP countries to design and implement modalities which (i) facilitate the establishment of integrating frameworks and processes, which in turn influence approaches to achieving food security in the participating countries and beyond (ii) facilitate the upscaling of multi-benefit approaches via the GEF associated baseline projects as well as via other upscaling pathways and (iii) ensure that protocols are put in place to be able to assess impact at a program level as well as to support the application of analytical tools in each country which highlight the environmental costs and benefits and climate resilience of existing and alternative possible food security approaches.

A critical main objective of the program and hence of this project is to facilitate upscaling in ways which will become eventually independent of the program. This will be achieved, for example, through the provision of the right types of evidence in the right forms to the right decision makers; most importantly through highlighting success stories on the ground, including from the country child project and exposure to these success stories by decision makers as well as in the media. The integrating platforms established through Component 1 should have been internalized in the structures of governments, donors and other development actors who contribute to upscaling multiple benefit approaches; they will have been designed to require minimum recurrent costs in order to maximize the likelihood of continuing to exist and function.

### *Context and baseline scenario:*

Agricultural intensification in Africa is critical to meeting the growing demand for food production. To improve food and nutritional security without diminishing global environmental benefits, and in the context of climate change, change is needed in the way African agricultural systems are managed. Land degradation, declining agricultural productivity, malnutrition and rural poverty are interrelated problems that require a systems-level approach to planning, management, monitoring and decision making.

Challenges to the greater use of ecologically based sustainable management of production landscapes include:

Institutional frameworks:

## Annex A

- *Environmental issues are still seen as separate from production issues* and agricultural and environmental policy and planning at the regional and national level are often done separately
- *Lack of integration* between agriculture and other sectors or development themes (land management, water, environment, food security, biodiversity, climate change etc)
- *Linkages to other key players* such as those involved in climate change adaptation or in the achievement of other related development goals (e.g. health sector or employment) are lacking
- *Exchange of knowledge and coordinated actions between countries* on sustainable agricultural development and environment is not sufficient.

### Scaling up:

- Lack of *appropriate policies* at national and regional levels to support ecosystem and landscape based production strategies
- Poor development of the capacities needed to support *wider adoption of the required approaches at all levels* and in particular *at the smallholder level* in both the public and private sectors.

### Monitoring and Assessment:

- *Under-developed and often incompatible diverse monitoring and evaluation procedures* to help target interventions and measure results
- Many monitoring tools linking agricultural practices, food security and environmental indicators exist, but with *divergent sectorial approaches*, making it difficult to derive a unified message
- Monitoring and assessment tools *have not been used in a systematic manner* to monitor ecosystem services across multiple scales
- Data and indicators on agriculture, livelihoods, water, carbon, soil degradation and biodiversity in sub Saharan Africa are being generated by a range of institutions but much of these data are *collected at various scales and using various methodologies and metrics*, preventing an overall assessment of trade-offs against multiple development objectives

### *Priorities for IAP support, with brief descriptions of expected outcomes, based on program components and results framework:*

While much of the work required to address these challenges will necessarily be country driven, there are a number of aspects that will benefit from a supra-national approach. The rationale for the proposed cross-cutting approach is based on the need to identify, support and enhance the most relevant existing multicountry and multi stakeholder platforms (and, if needed, facilitate the creation of new ones) and building partnerships which will provide an open-source and inter-operable framework for an integrated set of actions to address the challenges described above.

### **Component 1: Create and/or strengthen institutional frameworks.**

At the regional level, two platforms will be established or elaborated to leverage policy and scientific support for ecological approaches to resilience in agriculture. The following outcomes will be delivered:

- Policy Platform to facilitate and support dialogue and communication on mainstreaming ecosystem services and gender sensitive agroecological approaches at national and regional levels. It will support development/strengthening of national and regional policy frameworks between a wider range of institutions from agriculture and environment sectors, ie CAADAP, NEPAD, the AU's EOA initiatives, climate resilience initiatives

## Annex A

such as those of CILSS and IGAD, national ministries (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, water, land, and environmental coordinating bodies). Finally it will also ensure that stakeholders are engaged from farmer and forestry groups, civil society, local and national governments and the private sector.

- Scientific platform to promote and underpin innovations for sustainability and resilience of agroecosystems, including ecological agriculture and use of biodiversity (including crop, forest and animal genetic resources), analysis of agro-ecosystem resilience, and comparative analysis of effectiveness of different modalities for ensuring nutritional security, building social networks, value-chains and market access for smallholder farmers. Inform collective goal setting such as the SDGs and influence their application and measurement at country level.
- Enhanced South-South exchanges between countries to foster greater understanding and discourse on the role of ecosystem services and landscape approaches across the targeted geographies in agricultural production and the ability of production systems to generate multiple goods and services.

### Component 2: Scaling up of integrated approaches.

The IAP approach presents a clear opportunity to influence how food production and food value chains are managed so that environment (including climate impacts) is more effectively accounted for and accommodated at multiple scales. Project Component 2 focuses on addressing the growing demands on agricultural systems to produce food, provide employment, and achieve higher yields while safeguarding vital ecosystem services and contribute to the resilience of the livelihoods of smallholders. This will not be achieved directly through the activities of the coordination/cross-cutting project; rather this project will support the country child projects (and beyond) to achieve:

Multi-benefit innovative practices promoted which generate or safeguard ecosystem services in the food value chains and food production systems via, in particular:

- Targeted support provided to countries to implement environmentally and sustainable agricultural practices
- Models for influencing food value chains to ensure food and nutritional security developed and institutionalized (e.g. incentive mechanisms such as Payment for Environmental Services, micro-capital grants for sustainable agri-business supply chain development, Public-Private Producer Partnerships for smallholder farmers.

Wide-scale and enhanced uptake of INRM to foster sustainability and resilience in production landscapes and agroecosystems facilitated directly through support to other child projects as well as more broadly, ie:

- Conservation agriculture practices adopted– providing technical guidance and identifying institutional and market incentives that help address challenges associated with minimum or zero tillage, and providing sustained cover to the soil through mulch or cover crops
- Enhanced uptake of agroforestry interventions and management of natural regeneration of trees and shrubs in production landscapes
- Wide-scale adoption of water management technologies and water captured more efficiently on farms – enhancing water productivity, especially that of rainfall or ‘green water
- Integration of crop, livestock, agroforestry and forestry and possibly aquatic diversity into the production system and tightening nutrient cycling of the farming system – with increased uptake of ISFM
- Scaling up of storage facilities, reduce post-harvest losses, and enhance off-take
- Improving formal and informal seed systems

### Component 3: Monitoring and assessment of global environmental benefits and agro-ecosystem resilience.

## Annex A

Effective planning, management, monitoring and decision making also require better data, analytical methods, information sharing protocols with local communities and risk management approaches for evaluating the trade-offs and synergies among policies for food production, nutritional security, poverty alleviation and ecosystem services. This challenge will be addressed through delivery of the following outcomes:

Operational framework in place for multi-scale monitoring and assessment of ecosystem services and gender dis-aggregated delivery of socio-economic benefits for each target geography:

- Multi-scale monitoring of ecosystem services and gender dis-aggregated delivery of socio-economic benefits established in all target geographies
- Baselines for ecosystem services and gender dis-aggregated delivery of socio-economic benefits established in all target geographies
- Capacity, tools and systems in place for multi-scale monitoring of ecosystem services and gender dis-aggregated delivery of socio-economic benefits and information sharing with beneficiary communities
- Operational framework in place for monitoring global environmental benefits in all target geographies.
- Multi-scale monitoring of global environmental benefits established in all target geographies
- Baselines for global environmental benefits established in all target geographies
- Capacity, tools and systems in place for monitoring global environmental benefits
- Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience at multiple scales (e.g. RATA resilience framework)
- Resilience framework incorporated into project design in all target geographies
- Capacity, protocols, tools and systems in place for monitoring and assessment of resilience of socio-agroecosystem resilience in all country projects and to inform application to broad development goals such as the SDGs

### **Component 4: Coordination, reporting and general management functions across IAP projects for programmatic impact, visibility and coherence**

Coordination of country child projects through this Component will contribute significantly to the programmatic impact and incremental benefits of a GEF investment. The most important of the functions which this Project will bring to the program include:

- Structures and processes in place to ensure program coherence, reporting aggregation and comparability; niche identification and visibility for program; adaptive management of IAP modality and feedback mechanisms in place and effective. Informs SDGs
- Knowledge Management framework for synthesis and experience based learning to integrate information on ecosystem services and social issues.
- Impact assessment of projects and program possible, as well as effectiveness of IAP modality and guidance generated on improvements recommended

*Global environmental benefits:*

## Annex A

Global environmental benefits will be achieved through the country child projects and their associated baseline, as well as through a larger influence on the approach taken to achieving food security. This coordination/cross-cutting project will act as a handmaiden for this outcome, in particular through the provision of technical assistance on the conceptually and methodologically complex dimensions of the environmental sustainability and climate resilience of the food security policies and practices in the participating countries and beyond. This child project will enable the program to have a much greater opportunity of making the case, providing credible evidence through the channels established under Component 1 in each country, by facilitating the documentation of the achievement of GEBs in each child project through a significantly enhanced baseline and subsequent M&E process, including of GEBs. It will do so using protocols, methodologies and metrics which are scientifically credible but also operationally applicable and are comparable, in order to aggregate up to program level impacts.

*A.2. Stakeholders. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society and indigenous people? (yes /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation:*

The key stakeholders are the participating countries, sub-regional and regional institutions, development partners, civil society. Engagement has already begun at design stage and the participatory approach will continue through detailed design and implementation.

*A.3 Risk. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable):*

Availability of GEF resources and competing priorities may place constraints on the extent to which the project objectives can be fully met, however through detailed design, which will be coordinated between child project processes, the likelihood of unrealistic designs which could affect the program outcomes will be minimized. In terms of climate and environmental risks, all projects will go through quality control processes related to safeguards employed by each of the GEF accredited implementation agencies for the respective child projects. A risk management strategy for the program will be established through the cross-cutting project as part of the design of this project and as more information emerges from the design processes for the country child projects.

*A.4. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives:*

The project is building upon GEF-5 funding to the STAP to develop indicators for resilience and on GEF-6 funding to Conservation International to develop a multi-scale indicator for reporting on land degradation under the UNCCD, among numerous other GEF funded activities of the Implementing Agencies and of the participating countries.

*Description of the consistency of the project with:*

*B.1 Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:*

The project addresses issues at the intersection of the UNCCD, CBD and the UNFCCC and their respective action programmes. For example, it supports the recognized need for a coordinated set of common indicators to support country reporting across the three conventions and, in particular, post 2015.

**Annex A**

