

AFB/PPRC.17/26 28 September 2015

Adaptation Fund Board Project and Programme Review Committee Seventeenth Meeting Bonn, Germany, 6-7 October 2015

Agenda Item 7 f)

PROPOSAL FOR ETHIOPIA, KENYA AND UGANDA

Background

- 1. The strategic priorities, policies and guidelines of the Adaptation Fund (the Fund), as well as its operational policies and guidelines include provisions for funding projects and programmes at the regional, i.e. transnational level. However, the Fund has thus far not funded such projects and programmes.
- 2. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), as well as its Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) and Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) considered issues related to regional projects and programmes on a number of occasions between the Board's fourteenth and twenty-first meetings but the Board did not make decisions for the purpose of inviting proposals for such projects. Indeed, in its fourteenth meeting, the Board decided to:
 - (c) Request the secretariat to send a letter to any accredited regional implementing entities informing them that they could present a country project/programme but not a regional project/programme until a decision had been taken by the Board, and that they would be provided with further information pursuant to that decision

(Decision B.14/25 (c))

- 3. In its eighth meeting in March 2012, the PPRC came up with recommendations on certain definitions related to regional projects and programmes. However, as the subsequent seventeenth Board meeting took a different strategic approach to the overall question of regional projects and programmes, these PPRC recommendations were not included in a Board decision.
- 4. In its twenty-fourth meeting, the Board heard a presentation from the coordinator of the working group set up by decision B.17/20 and tasked with following up on the issue of regional projects and programmes. She circulated a recommendation prepared by the working group, for the consideration by the Board, and the Board decided:
 - (a) To initiate steps to launch a pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, not to exceed US\$ 30 million;
 - (b) That the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes will be outside of the consideration of the 50 per cent cap on multilateral implementing entities (MIEs) and the country cap:
 - (c) That regional implementing entities (RIEs) and MIEs that partner with national implementing entities (NIEs) or other national institutions would be eligible for this pilot programme, and
 - (d) To request the secretariat to prepare for the consideration of the Board, before the twenty-fifth meeting of the Board or intersessionally, under the guidance of the working group set up under decision B.17/20, a proposal for such a pilot programme based on consultations with contributors, MIEs, RIEs, the Adaptation Committee, the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), and other relevant bodies, as appropriate, and in that proposal make a recommendation on possible options

on approaches, procedures and priority areas for the implementation of the pilot programme.

(Decision B.24/30)

- 5. The proposal requested under (d) of the decision above was prepared by the secretariat and submitted to the Board in its twenty-fifth meeting, and the Board decided to:
 - (a) Approve the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, as contained in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2;
 - (b) Set a cap of US\$ 30 million for the programme;
 - (c) Request the secretariat to issue a call for regional project and programme proposals for consideration by the Board in its twenty-sixth meeting; and
 - (d) Request the secretariat to continue discussions with the Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN) towards operationalizing, during the implementation of the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, the Synergy Option 2 on knowledge management proposed by CTCN and included in Annex III of the document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2.

(Decision B.25/28)

- 6. Based on the Board Decision B.25/28, the first call for regional project and programme proposals was issued and an invitation letter to eligible Parties to submit project and programme proposals to the Fund was sent out on 5 May 2015.
- 7. According to the Board Decision B.12/10, a project or programme proposal needs to be received by the secretariat no less than nine weeks before a Board meeting, in order to be considered by the Board in that meeting.
- 8. The following project pre-concept document titled "Agricultural Climate Resilience Enhancement Initiative (ACREI)" was submitted by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), which is a Multilateral Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund.
- 9. This is the first submission of the proposal. It was received by the secretariat in time to be considered in the twenty-sixth Board meeting. The secretariat carried out a technical review of the project proposal, assigned it the diary number AFR/MIE/Food/2015/2, and completed a review sheet.
- 10. In accordance with a request to the secretariat made by the Board in its 10th meeting, the secretariat shared this review sheet with WMO, and offered it the opportunity of providing responses before the review sheet was sent to the PPRC.
- 11. The secretariat is submitting to the PPRC the summary and, pursuant to decision B.17/15, the final technical review of the project, both prepared by the secretariat, along with the final submission of the proposal in the following section. In accordance with decision B.25.15, the proposal is submitted with changes between the initial submission and the revised version highlighted.

Project Summary

Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda – Agricultural Climate Resilience Enhancement Initiative (ACREI)

Implementing Entity: WMO

Project/Programme Execution Cost: USD 441,628 Total Project/Programme Cost: USD 4,608,295

Implementing Fee: USD 391,705 Financing Requested: USD 5,000,000

Project Background and Context:

The Greater Horn of Africa is extremely vulnerable to climate variability. Extreme precipitation changes over Eastern Africa such as droughts and heavy rainfall have been experienced more frequently during the last 30-60 years. The risk of loss of rural livelihoods and income due to climatic hazards is particularly real for farmers and pastoralists in the arid and semi-arid regions. Communities have limited information about improved farming practices and socio-cultural and economic barriers often inhibit uptake of new technologies. The project objective is to improve adaptive capacity and resilience to current climate variability and change among targeted farmers, agro-pastoralists and pastoralist communities. Enhancing the capacity of communities to cope and adapt to climate variability will build the resilience of communities and livelihoods dependent on climate-sensitive resources. Adaptation can be enhanced through the appropriate use of climate information in decision-making for agriculture.

Component 1: Supporting Adaptation Strategies (USD 1,823,200)

This component, led by FAO in close collaboration with relevant country ministries of Agriculture, Livestock and Environment, will support genuine dialogue and consultation with communities on climate change related trends, and link traditional mechanisms for climate information and implications on food and livelihood systems with packaging and dissemination of localized down-scaled climate services (climate forecasts, analyzed historical climate information, assessment of local risks and vulnerabilities) for decision making for sustainable food production and food security. Communities will be supported to apply climate smart agricultural farming practices through participatory training and experimentation on appropriate technology and land use options. A total of 120 Field School groups will be established in the target localities, reaching 3000 households and 18,000 direct beneficiaries, at least half of whom will be women.

Component 2: Climate Proofing Extension system (USD 1,215,467)

This component, led by FAO and IGAD, will support climate proofing of existing agricultural advisory services in the target countries and ensure a minimum level of climate awareness among development actors and advisory support service actors. Selected project and government technical staff from the participating countries will be trained on appropriate climate data collection/analysis tools through a combination of face to face and e-learning training processes. Through an initial season-long training of facilitators, run by experienced Master trainers sourced from the region, the capacity of community members, government and NGO field actors will be built on climate sensitive Field Schools. The institutionalization process and integration of participatory extension in government mainstream programs and funding streams

started in the region will be facilitated and enhanced, building on member countries and IGADs ongoing efforts.

Component 3: Climate informed decision making (USD 1,128,000)

Under the leadership of WMO, the capacity of the NMHSs in the target countries to produce the required climate services will be built through training, infrastructure development and other resource investment. ICPAC, the Regional Climate Centre, will be the main provider for capacity building, including support for improved climate modeling and down-scaling climate scenarios for application in agriculture. Automatic weather stations will be installed in the selected locations to provide localized climate information.



ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSAL

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: Pre-Concept for a Regional Project

Countries/Region: Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda

Project Title: Agricultural Climate Resilience Enhancement Initiative (ACREI)

Thematic focal area: Food security

Implementing Entity: World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

Executing Entities: Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) and the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD)

AF Project ID:

IE Project ID: Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars): **5,000,000**Reviewer and contact person: **Daouda Ndiaye**Co-reviewer(s): **Christian Severin, Mikko Ollikainen**

IE Contact Person(s): Jean-Paul Gaudechoux

Review Criteria	Questions	Comments on 21 August 2015	Comments on 10 September 2015
	Are all of the participating countries party to the Kyoto Protocol?	Yes.	
Country Eligibility	Are all of the participating countries developing countries particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	Yes. The Greater Horn of Africa is extremely vulnerable to climate variability, with increased extreme precipitation changes such as droughts and heavy rainfall over the last 30-60 years.	
Project Eligibility	Have the designated government authorities for the Adaptation Fund from each of the participating countries endorsed the project/programme?	A letter from Uganda is provided, along with signatures from Ethiopia and Kenya. Formal letters are required for those two countries.	Addressed.

 2. Has the pre-concept provided necessary information on the problem the proposed project/programme is aiming to solve, including both the regional and the country perspective? 3. Have the project/programme objectives, components and financing been clearly explained? 	Yes.	
 4. Has the project/programme been justified in terms of how: it supports concrete adaptation actions? it builds added value through the regional approach? it promotes new and innovative solutions to climate change adaptation? it is cost-effective? it is consistent with applicable strategies and plans? it incorporates learning and knowledge management? it will be developed through a consultative process with particular reference to vulnerable groups, including gender considerations, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Adaptation Fund? it will take into account sustainability? 	proposed activities needs further	Partially addressed. Support to the most vulnerable farmers in implementation of Practices learned in the Field Schools including conservation agriculture, water retention and harvesting, soil management, agroforestry, rangeland management, livestock management, farm diversification, improved storage and marketing of produce, as well as investment in infrastructure for improved production of climate information could be integrated in the project's approach to complement the capacity-building activities.
	The sharing mechanisms between the three countries need also to be better explained. Overall the rationale for the regional approach should go beyond seeking cost effectiveness and harmonization of policies.	Partially addressed. The rationale for the regional approach needs to be better demonstrated.

	5. Does the pre-concept briefly explain which organizations would be involved in the proposed regional project/programme at the regional and national/sub-national level, and how coordination would be arranged? Does it explain how national institutions, and when possible, national implementing entities (NIEs) would be involved as partners in the project?	Yes. The potential role that the AF NIE for Kenya could take as partner of the project could also be explained, if any.	Addressed. To be further developed at concept stage.
Resource Availability	6. Is the requested project / programme funding within the funding windows of the pilot programme for regional projects/programmes?	Yes.	
	7. Are the administrative costs (Implementing Entity Management Fee and Project/ Programme Execution Costs) at or below 20 per cent of the tota project/programme budget?	Yes.	
Eligibility of IE	8. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?	Yes.	

Technical Summary

The objective of the project is to improve the adaptive capacity and resilience to current climate variability and change of targeted farmers, agro-pastoralists and pastoralist communities in selected countries in the Greater Horn of Africa.

The initial technical review found that the "concreteness" of the proposed activities needed further demonstration. For instance, it was not clear which activities would be implemented in the Field schools and whether they would be limited to training only. In general, most of the activities of the project seemed related to capacity building, creation and dissemination of information. Also, the mechanisms for sharing knowledge and information between the three countries needed to be better explained. Overall it was observed that the rationale for the regional approach should go beyond seeking cost effectiveness and harmonization of policies. Lastly, the potential role that the AF NIE for Kenya could

take as partner of the project needed to be explained, if any.

The proponent has prepared a revised document following the observations made by the secretariat and the final technical review finds that there are still some issues that were not adequately addressed.

The following observations are made:

• To complement the capacity-building activities, the proposal could integrate in the project's approach activities of support to the most vulnerable farmers in implementation of Practices learned in the Field Schools including conservation agriculture, water retention and harvesting, soil management, agroforestry, rangeland management, livestock management, farm diversification, improved storage and marketing of produce, as well as investment in infrastructure for improved production of climate information. This could result in an increased budget request to the adaptation Fund.

• The rationale for the regional approach needs to be better demonstrated.

10 September 2015.

Date: