

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title: RLACC - Rural Livelihoods' Adaptation to Climate Change in the Horn of Africa (PROGRAM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country(ies):</strong> Republic of Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEF Agency(ies):</strong> AfDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Executing Partner(s):</strong> Ministry of Habitat, Urban planning, and Environment; Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, Livestock and Halieutic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEF Focal Area(s):</strong> Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Parent Program (if applicable):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ For SFM/REDD+ X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ For SGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ For PPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Area Objectives</th>
<th>Expected FA Outcomes</th>
<th>Expected FA Outputs</th>
<th>Trust Fund</th>
<th>Grant Amount ($)</th>
<th>Cofinancing ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCA-1</td>
<td>Outcome 1.1 Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas</td>
<td>Output 1.1.1 Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks (local governments' development plans)</td>
<td>LDCF</td>
<td>997,778</td>
<td>14,051,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
2 Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.
| CCA-1 | Outcome 1.3: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas  
Indicator 1.3.1  
Households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets (Score) – Disaggregated by gender | Output 1.3.1: Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability  
Indicator 1.3.1.1: % of targeted households that have adopted resilient livelihoods under existing and projected climate change | LDCF | 2,040,000 | 10,000,000 |
| CCA-3 | Outcome 3.1: Successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas  
Indicator 3.1.1. % of targeted groups adopting adaptation technologies by technology type (disaggregated by gender) | Output 3.1.1: Relevant adaptation technology transferred to targeted groups  
Indicator 3.1.1.1. Type of adaptation technologies transferred introduced to targeted groups  
Indicator 3.1.1.2. Type of relevant climate change adaptation technology implemented in selected areas by participatory stakeholders (number of households) | LDCF | 2,040,000 | 10,000,000 |

**Total project costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust Fund</th>
<th>Grant Amount ($)</th>
<th>Confirmed Cofinancing ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDCF</td>
<td>5,077,778</td>
<td>34,051,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK**

**Project Objective:** Increasing resilience to climate change risks and decreasing disaster risk using an ecosystem management approach targeting protected areas and fragile ecosystems in the Southwestern Peninsula of Haiti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Grant Type</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Trust Fund</th>
<th>Grant Amount ($)</th>
<th>Confirmed Cofinancing ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Improved resilience to climate change of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in targeted areas | TA         | Outcome 1. Climate change-related adaptation measures integrated into development plans | Output 1.1. Sensitization, awareness and information on CC of local stakeholders  
Output 1.2. Training of officials at the national and local level | LDCF       | 610,000          | 12,851,500              |
### Output 1.3
Mainstreaming of climate-sensitive pastoral development issues into development planning

**Output 2.1** Workshops organized at national level to draw lessons from project activities and achievements, and mainstream them into development policies and strategic frameworks

**Output 3.1** Grants provided to targeted communities to finance micro-adaptation projects (in the areas of water and rangeland resources, livestock and IGAs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.</th>
<th>Outcome 3.</th>
<th>Output 3.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness raised and local stakeholders involved in planning pro-active adaptation measures to climate change</td>
<td>Vulnerabilities of local populations reduced through social transfers and the implementation of adaptation practices that respond to climate change-induced stresses in livestock</td>
<td>Grants provided to targeted communities to finance micro-adaptation projects (in the areas of water and rangeland resources, livestock and IGAs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Invest in sustainable measures aimed at improving the resilience of pastoral communities to climate change and variability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 4.</th>
<th>Output 4.1</th>
<th>Output 4.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of project activities efficiently coordinated, monitored and evaluated</td>
<td>Knowledge products at national and regional level</td>
<td>Timely, efficient and cost-effective M&amp;E systems put in place at national and sub-regional level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of Cofinancing</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LDCF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project management Cost (PMC)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LDCF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total project costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>LDCF</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>4,843,000</td>
<td>33,551,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management Cost (PMC)</td>
<td>234,778</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total project costs</strong></td>
<td>5,077,778</td>
<td>34,051,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Co-financing</th>
<th>Name of Co-financier (source)</th>
<th>Type of Cofinancing</th>
<th>Cofinancing Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

3. Monitoring and Evaluation, Project Management

**Outcome 4.** Implementation of project activities efficiently coordinated, monitored and evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 4.2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timely, efficient and cost-effective M&amp;E systems put in place at national and sub-regional level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>LDCF</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management Cost (PMC)</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total project costs</strong></td>
<td>286,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Sources of Co-financing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Co-financing</th>
<th>Name of Co-financier (source)</th>
<th>Type of Cofinancing</th>
<th>Cofinancing Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. **PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.**
D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEF Agency</th>
<th>Type of Trust Fund</th>
<th>Focal Area</th>
<th>Country Name/Global</th>
<th>Grant Amount (a)</th>
<th>Agency Fee (b)²</th>
<th>Total c=a+b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>LDCF</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>5,077,778</td>
<td>406,222</td>
<td>5,484,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Grant Resources

1 In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

2 Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grant Amount ($)</th>
<th>Cofinancing ($)</th>
<th>Project Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Consultants</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>4,348,010</td>
<td>4,463,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/Local Consultants</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>5,649,500</td>
<td>6,274,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRAIN” INSTRUMENT?  Yes

If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

While the objectives and the thrust of the program and its individual sub-projects remain the same, the logical framework at programmatic level was readjusted to reflect the knowledge gained after receiving comments from the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and from the council members. Furthermore, individual results frameworks were created for each of the sub-projects in line with national circumstances and needs (please refer to Technical Annex for Djibouti). Each of the results frameworks at national level links up to the program-level results framework, with only a few minor variations to account for national differences.

In addition, during the project design phase a reconstruction of the Theory of Change (ToC) was completed, which resulted in the re-organization of project outputs and the re-phrasing of some components, outcomes and outputs, in line with current practice. Therefore there have been changes from the logical framework in the PFD and the regional logical framework. For more details, please refer to the tables below.

---

² For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the PFD</th>
<th>Changes made in the country PAR and CEO endorsement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1:</strong> To improve the resilience to climate change of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in targeted areas, and increase the adaptive capacity of their livelihoods.</td>
<td>Rephrased to: <strong>Component 1:</strong> Improved resilience to climate change of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in targeted areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> Climate change-relate adaptation measures integrated into development plans of targeted local government (arid and semi-arid districts)</td>
<td>Component 1 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> Climate change-relate adaptation measures integrated into development plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> =&gt; <strong>Output C</strong> (Workshops organized at national level to draw lessons from project activities and achievements, and mainstream them into development policies and strategic frameworks) was moved to: Component 1 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 2</strong> =&gt; <strong>Output 2.1</strong></td>
<td>Component 1 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 2</strong> =&gt; <strong>Output 2.1</strong>: Workshops organized at national level to draw lessons from project activities and achievements, and mainstream them into development policies and strategic frameworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> =&gt; <strong>Output C</strong> (2nd part) has become Component 1 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> =&gt; <strong>Output 1.3</strong></td>
<td>Component 1 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> =&gt; <strong>Output 1.3</strong>: Mainstreaming of climate-sensitive pastoral development issues into development planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> was moved (more details in right column)</td>
<td>Component 2 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> was incorporated into Component 2 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 2</strong>: Vulnerabilities of targeted pastoral and agro-pastoral communities to climate risks reduced</td>
<td>Component 2 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 3</strong> Vulnerabilities of local populations reduced through social transfers and the implementation of adaptation practices that respond to climate change-induced stresses in livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> =&gt; <strong>Output A</strong> (Matching grants provided to targeted communities to finance micro-adaptation projects (in the areas of water and rangeland resources, livestock and IGAs))</td>
<td>Component 2 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 3</strong> =&gt; <strong>Output 3.1</strong>: Grants provided to targeted communities to finance micro-adaptation projects (in the areas of water and rangeland resources, livestock and IGAs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 1</strong> =&gt; <strong>Output B</strong> (Adequate social transfers provided to vulnerable household) was moved (more details in right column)</td>
<td>Component 2 =&gt; <strong>Outcome 3</strong> Vulnerabilities of local populations reduced through social transfers and the implementation of adaptation practices that respond to climate change-induced stresses in livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 3:</strong> Support efficient, timely, and accountable coordination and monitoring and evaluation of project activities</td>
<td>Rephrased to: <strong>Component 3:</strong> Monitoring and Evaluation, Project Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of costs provided in the PFD for each component has been refined and changed for the following reasons:

- Upon assessment of what the DRSLP had already planned, we re-evaluated what the GEF funds could legitimately support without being too duplicative. The proposed Rural Livelihoods’ Adaptation to Climate Change in the Horn of Africa (RLACC) – Djibouti is indeed conceived as a complement to the ongoing Drought Resilience and Sustainable Livelihoods Program (DRSLP – Phase I and Phase III), and designed to support the additional dimensions of climate change resilience. The proposed RLACC project will cover the watersheds in regions where the Drought Resilience and Sustainable Livelihoods in the Horn of Africa (DRSLP I and III) – Djibouti project is being implemented: watershed of Gaggade-Derela and sub-watersheds of Mouloud, Harou, Aroua (Dikhil region), watersheds of Beyya Dader, Beyya Aday, Dedey Weyn and Barislé (Ali Sabieh region), Weima (Tadjourah-Obock regions) and of Douda et de Damerjog (Arta region). This is why more cofinancing is being used in order to avoid duplication among projects.
Furthermore, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) requested “significant revisions” to the initial PFD, which has contributed to the changes made in the cost distribution of each component.

The initial cost estimates provided in the PFD stage were calculated at a macro level of each component without the knowledge of local needs, circumstances and specific issues. While some of the outputs were relevant for Kenya, they were not necessarily for Djibouti, which is the reason why two different country-level results frameworks were created. The changes made in the country PAR and this CEO Endorsement reflect the specific needs and issues to be addressed in Djibouti, as well as the responses to comments from STAP and council members. Each outcome has been broken down to the activities levels, which were defined more accurately and for which the costs were updated accordingly. For instance, Component 2’s indicative financing has increased because rural roads in Djibouti are essential for communities to reach markets to sell their products. While the DRSLP provide rural roads, this project will adapt these roads to make them climate-resilient.

The cofinancing amounts have changed to take into account the updated figures from DRSLP III PAR in order to reflect the DRSLP implementation plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the PFD</th>
<th>Changes made in CEO endorsement (increases are in red, decreases are in orange)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCA-1: Outcome 1.1 Indicative financing ($) 1,015,556</td>
<td>CCA-1: Outcome 1.1 Indicative financing ($) 997,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA-1: Outcome 1.3 Indicative financing ($) 3,300,556</td>
<td>CCA-1: Outcome 1.3 Indicative financing ($) 2,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA-1: Outcome 3.1 Indicative financing ($) 507,778</td>
<td>CCA-1: Outcome 3.1 Indicative financing ($) 2,040,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost distribution by component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1. Climate change-related adaptation measures integrated into development plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2. Awareness raised and local stakeholders involved in planning pro-active adaptation measures to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative financing ($) 1,015,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component 1
Outcome 1. Climate change-related adaptation measures integrated into development plans
Outcome 2. Awareness raised and local stakeholders involved in planning pro-active adaptation measures to climate change
Indicative financing ($) 610,000

The cost of the component were revised to take into consideration the achievements of other projects in mainstreaming climate related adaptation and the fact that there are fewer local plans in which to pursue integration. Furthermore, following project preparation consultation, it was agreed that the priority would be Component 2.

Component 2
Outcome 3. Vulnerabilities of local populations reduced through social transfers and the implementation of adaptation practices that respond to climate change-induced stresses in livestock
Indicative financing ($) 4,080,000

Component 2’s indicative financing has increased because rural roads in Djibouti are essential for communities to reach markets to sell their products and therefore represents an essential activity for the project’s successful outcome. While the DRSLP provides rural roads, this project will adapt these roads.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4. Implementation of project activities efficiently coordinated, monitored and evaluated Indicative financing ($)</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4. Implementation of project activities efficiently coordinated, monitored and evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>507,778</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicative financing ($)</strong>: 153,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This component cost has decreased to take into consideration the presence of IGAD in Djibouti (for project coordination and regional linkages), the achievements of other projects in knowledge sharing and awareness raising and a need to place emphasis on the investment cost under Component 2.

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

No change since the PIF. However the links between this project and national policies was updated. The project arises from a thorough country-driven process and contributes to key national and sector strategies and programs, such as:

- The *National Programme for Food Security* (NPFS), is an action plan on the primary sector, with the general objective of “ensuring access for all Djiboutian at all times to the food needed to sustain a healthy and active life by 2025”. This action plan, approved in April 2012 during a workshop held in Djibouti under the Development Programme of African Agriculture, contains 26 projects in the fields of agriculture, livestock, fisheries and capacity building.
- The *program to fight against drought*, is on-going since 2006, has allowed the rehabilitation of a number of water access points and the solar system equipment, training, user awareness and capacity building of water directorate of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, Livestock and Halieutic Resources (MAEM-RH). Under the same program, a project to rehabilitate 25 pumping stations with their solar system equipment is also on-going.
- The *National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Program* (PNIASA 2014-2018) focuses on four major programs: sustainable food security in the regional context, water resource mobilization for the hydro-agricultural development, support to vulnerable groups and the promotion of new sources of growth and finally, support of exportation.
- The aim of the *program to mobilize surface waters and sustainable land management* (PROMES-GDT) is to improve the living conditions of the agro-pastoral communities who live in a state of extreme poverty and vulnerability regarding the sustainable management of natural resources
- The *program for the creation of agro-pastoral areas around water access points* is based in different regions within the country and aims to mitigate the effects of recurrent drought on nomadic people by creating a number of areas in each of the five regions of the country.
- The *master plan on water resources* is a national plan, developed in 2000, aims to supply water to the cities as well as rural areas of the country (see Master Plan 2009-2018, p. 20 for details)
- The *master plan on fishing* is a national plan offers seven strategic areas to strengthen and build capacity of stakeholders in the sector of fisheries (see Master Plan 2009-2018, p. 21 for details).
- The *National Action Programme to combat Desertification* is developed under the United Nations Convention on the fight against desertification. The actions implemented in this program relate to reforestation, the fight against erosion, water control, the fight against the destruction of mangrove forests, agro-forestry-pastoral development and income-generating activities.
- The *Drought Resilience and Sustainable Livelihoods Programme* (DRSLP), to which this project is attached, supports activities to restore livelihoods by investing in the management of natural resources (water, pasture), the integrated management of land restoration and ecosystem protection, and in agricultural and livestock infrastructure. The DRSLP also aims to improve storage, marketing and transportation infrastructure, such as rural roads. The project aims to address the root causes of
vulnerability of the region to build drought resilience in the medium and long term, as well as further consolidate peace, resolve conflicts, and promote the equitable use of limited natural resources.

- The project contributes to the African Development Bank’s strategy for 2013-2022 in which agriculture and food security are one the three areas of special emphasis, aiming at strengthening investment in rural infrastructures, such as irrigation, storage facilities, conservation systems and supply networks, access to markets and rural roads.

These programs help to create a solid base of development, but do not impact all of the vulnerable population in Djibouti. Moreover, few of these programs have been designed with a climate change lens, increasing the potential risk for maladaptation. However, while most government officials at the national level among are aware of the challenges of climate change, no more than 30% of people living in project targeted areas declare knowing about climate change and how they are affected. This project aims to fill these gaps and to raise awareness by training local stakeholders to share information on climate change and identify sustainable and resilient alternative livelihoods of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities.

The proposed project is consistent with the principles of key sub-regional initiatives, policies and programs, adopted by the governments of the participating countries over the last few years, namely (i) The “Global Programme of African Agriculture” (CAADP), an African initiative (as part of the “New Partnership for Africa's Development” NEPAD), which aims to stimulate agriculture on the continent and accelerate the driven agricultural growth and reducing poverty. CAADP is itself aligned with the policy of the Common Market of Southern and Eastern Africa (COMESA), which approved the principle to move from a national approach to a regional approach in dealing with regional issues food safety. (ii) The IGAD- ‘Minimum Integration Plan’ which focuses on joint use and management of water resources for food security; and the Livestock Policy Initiative (IGAD-LPI), (iii) The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015, which contains the collective commitment of governments and the United Nations to work towards reducing societal vulnerability to disasters generally and stop drought in particular. The proposed project also has links to the 2011 Nairobi Strategy. The project also takes cognizance of the Bank Group Regional Integration Strategy Paper (RISP) for Eastern Africa (2011-2015), especially the two pillars and the national development strategies of the different countries involved.

At the national level, the project is aligned with Djibouti’s development strategy that is contained in the National Social Development Initiative (INDS), which has been revised for 2011-2015. This strategic framework, implemented through a five-year action plan aims to promote pro-poor and inclusive growth for the most vulnerable segment of the population. The government of Djibouti has also established the mobilization of water resources and their sustainable management as one of the major axes of its Plan of Development 2010-2020 and of its National Food Security Programme. More details on the country specific alignment of the program is provided in the PAR for Djibouti.

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

This project fits well within the results framework of the LDCF, and makes contribution to all three adaptation objectives in Djibouti, as presented in Table A, the project will:

Reducing Vulnerability (CCA-1): The project will reduce vulnerability by implementing urgent and immediate adaptation measures in vulnerable areas and by strengthening the capacity of key institutions associated with adaptation planning and management, as well as raising awareness of local population and NGOs on climate change impacts and adaptation.

Increasing Adaptive Capacity (CCA-2): The project will increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change by implementing a set of targeted protective measures against water-related climate change hazards, and
promoting an integrated watershed management (IWM) approach. The project will promote targeted vulnerability and risk assessments, climate change impact monitoring and data collection / management; expansion and rehabilitation of existing infrastructures related to climate monitoring, with particular emphasis on completing the early warning system; and development of institutional capacity.

**Carrying out Adaptation Technology Transfer (CCA-3):** The project will promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology, particularly to ensure rehabilitation of key productive and protective assets, climate and vulnerability monitoring capabilities as well as the demonstration best practices. By promoting pilot interventions, the project will promote learning and increase the adaptive capacity of stakeholders to manage, monitor and utilize new technologies against climate change impacts.

Furthermore, the project responds to the following priorities of the NAPA for Djibouti, including various priority projects, as it addresses the major challenges posed by water scarcity and low agricultural technical capacity. For example, the RLACC contributes to addressing the following priority projects that had not yet been implemented in the targeted zones:

- Priority Project Number 3: Implementation of restoration and management actions adapted to surface waters
- Priority Project Number 4: Improvement of restoration and management to mitigate the risks associated with traditional extensive livestock
- Priority Project Number 5: Promotion of the integrated agro-pastoral industry and the development of irrigation techniques to control the salinization of soils

**A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:**

No change since the PIF. However, the articulation of the Bank’s comparative advantage was further detailed.

Faced with the recurrence of droughts that affect all countries in the Horn of Africa including Djibouti, decimating livestock and wiping out crops, the African Development Bank launched in October 2008, a comprehensive study on livestock sustainable development in the region. This study resulted in the development of an investment program of 15 years called for building resilience and the elimination of negative effects of drought, through the revitalization of livestock management systems in the region, including the realization of hydraulic and agricultural infrastructure and the promotion of other economic opportunities in vulnerable regions. It is in this context that, taking part in the African donor conference organized by the African Union (AU) in Addis Ababa in August 2011 to raise funds to help drought victims in the Horn Africa, that the Bank announced an aid of 300 million dollars between 2011 and 2013 for the first phase of the special regional program DRSLP.

The proven experience of the Bank in the development of rural infrastructure in general and its thorough knowledge of the rural sector in Djibouti gives it a clear comparative advantage to ensure this project implementation. It is worth noting that the Bank has successfully financed projects in the country to help agro-pastoralists affected by the drought. The Bank’s comparative advantage stems from its experience gained through its successful longstanding commitment with the Government of Djibouti and in building community initiatives and infrastructures, group training on natural resources management, as highlighted in the Country Strategy Paper for 2011-2015 and in the Bank’s more recent Strategy for 2013-2022, and from the implementation of similar projects, especially DRSLP, which acts as the baseline for the current project.

The bank is implementing a major investment project portfolio in Djibouti, whose historical cumulative total value amounts to 190 million AU. Most of the Bank’s project consists of investments in the infrastructure sector. The Bank also has a strong experience in developing rural development projects in Djibouti and in the region. Moreover, DRSLP structures and systems, upon which the GEF grant will build, are already in place and running, enabling an economy of
effort and resources and a capitalization of know-how and lessons learned. The country office for the implementation of DRSLP is composed of a team of approximately 10 staff, including a project manager, M&E officer, financial manager and other technical officers and project coordinators that will serve on this project.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:
No change but the baseline situation was further detailed as per the STAP comments (see Section 2.1-2.3 of Djibouti Technical Annex).

A.5 Incremental/Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:
The preparation phase allowed for the definition of activities and the identification of the additional cost of adaptation. No change, but the argumentation has been strengthened following the STAP comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Baseline (B)</th>
<th>GEF Alternative (A)</th>
<th>Additional cost of adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1. Improved resilience to climate change of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in targeted areas</td>
<td>The DRSLP (Component 3) provides training to veterinary stations and laboratory analyses staffs as well as targeted sensitization of management and maintenance committees of infrastructures. Training on nutritional education, HIV Aids/STDs and other diseases is also provided to women cooperatives and associations. DRSLP also provides technical equipment for veterinary stations and laboratory analyses.</td>
<td>GEF financing will provide training to local NGOs and CBOs on resilience to climate change in an agro-pastoral context and will raise awareness of local communities on resilience to climate change through the support from trained NGOs and CBOs and from local media campaigns. GEF financing will provide training for officials at the national and local levels on climate risk management and resilience planning. In addition to these trainings, the GEF will also develop and distribute technical manuals on resilience building in ASALs to be used by the relevant ministries of Djibouti and the DRSLP team.</td>
<td>610,000 USD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 2. Invest in sustainable measures aimed at improving the resilience of pastoral communities to climate change and variability

DRSLP (Components 1 & 2) provides infrastructures, namely to improve access to water and develop irrigation systems, build rural roads, improve animal health by building veterinary stations, immunization and deworming programs. The DRSLP also invests in developing subsistence strategies such as the rehabilitation of fishing boats and weapons, and cooling systems rehabilitations of Djibouti fishing port, but also agricultural development of 200 hectares of irrigated land, of which 50 ha for women and youth.

GEF financing will provide grants provided to targeted communities to finance micro-adaptation projects (in the areas of water and rangeland resources, livestock and IGAs) in order to support the development of producer groups and of participatory identification of alternative livelihood strategies, support the dissemination of resilient irrigation technologies, equipment and infrastructures. GEF financing will also support the rehabilitation or upgrade, taking climate change into consideration, of rural roads, to facilitate and increase commercialization of agro-pastoral products. GEF financing will also implement anti-erosion measures in upper watersheds and reforestation of targeted watersheds using local NGOs and/or community labor. GEF financing will also implement anti-erosion measures in upper watersheds and reforestation of targeted watersheds using local NGOs and/or community labor.

4,080,000 USD

Component 3. Monitoring and Evaluation, Project Management

DRSLP (Component 3) provides IT equipment, office furniture and furniture for the project coordination unit and decentralized technical services of ministries that are implementing activities in the field.

GEF financing will develop information products in local languages on climate adaptation, resilience and adaptive approaches to ASAL development, as well as support M&E activities (MTE, TE) and project management and operations.

387,778 USD

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Rating (High (H), Medium (M), Low (L))</th>
<th>Possible mitigation strategies</th>
<th>Rating following mitigation strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate change-related risks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature increase adding new threats on the viability of nomadic pastoral systems.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The diversification of income will make pastoral communities more resilient to potential changes related to a single source of income. Sources of non-farm or peri-agricultural income will reduce the population’s dependence on a limited number of crops.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successive droughts over the life of the project could put investments and ecosystems at risk</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The project not only plans on increasing the productivity of existing resources, but also on reducing the population’s dependence on natural resources. However, if the need arises, the project will be able to use social safety net strategies to</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
implement certain activities, for example through “cash for work” mechanisms to ensure an income during periods of scarcity.

| Investment-related risks | Medium | The investments will have long-term positive impacts on a large portion of the community. Furthermore, the project will set up community management systems including the reuse of a portion of the profits in the maintenance of infrastructures. Finally, the government is firmly committed to this project and will contribute, within its means, to the planning, execution and maintenance of infrastructure. | Low |

| Institutional risks | Low | All stakeholders will be trained and hazards that may result from the coordination of the project will be explicitly addressed. Regular coordination meetings with partners will be organized, in particular with the Ministry of Habitat, Urban planning, and Environment, which manages several adaptation projects. | Low |

| Social risks | Medium | The project will benefit different communities and should contribute to the diversification of income sources and will therefore promote a collective management of community problems. Conflict resolution and dialogue will be encouraged as well as an integrated approach will be favoured, so that stakeholders share a common vision for future change. | Low |

**A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives**

The Bank already has an active role in regularly coordinating with other current projects, financed by the Bank and other partners, related to water and sanitation, energy, health and education (see Annex III in the Technical Annex on Djibouti). The Bank will continue to coordinate the supervision of the implementation of this project with its partners. Furthermore, the project implementation unit (PIU) of the DRSLP will undertake the coordination with the Ministry of Habitat, Urban planning, and Environment, which coordinates the implementation of climate change projects in Djibouti. The Ministry of Habitat, Urban planning, and Environment helped develop the project and provided support to this initiative, which is in line with national policies on adaptation. The organization of regular meetings between the DRSLP team implementing this project and those responsible for other current climate change adaptation projects are also planned in order to coordinate efforts, avoid duplication of activities and maintain consistency between projects. Furthermore, regular meetings between the DRSLP manager and the director of Planning and Environment are planned to ensure coordination of project stakeholders.

Within the Regional Livelihood Adaptation to Climate Change project (RLACC), the Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD), based in Djibouti and involved in other regional programs such the Horn of Africa Initiative (HoAI) project on M&E, will ensure the linkages and coordination between individual national projects. The RLACC is a regional program because it targets common issues as well as the same kind of population through an integrated
watershed management approach (IWM). Cross-border issues will be addressed once each national project is finalized and that the migrating population targeted by the project is identified.

List of related projects financed by GEF in Djibouti:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Amount ($ US)</th>
<th>Approval date</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the most Vulnerable Coastal Zones in Djibouti</td>
<td>2,000,000 + 1,987,000 Cofinancing</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project’s objective is to address the impacts of climate change on coastal ecosystems and communities by implementing a set of urgent measures that will strengthen the capacity to predict future changes, while helping local populations to adapt through the adoption of more sustainable production methods, particularly in the areas of water management, agriculture, fisheries, and tourism. This project will be complementary to this proposed LDCF project, as they both target the same regions and aim at improving infrastructure to help local populations adapt to current and future impacts of climate change. Indeed, this project will be implemented in two of Djibouti’s most marginalized and poverty-stricken regions, Obock-Khor Anghar in the North and Atar-Damerjog in the South, while activities planned in this LDCF project will be implemented in the following regions: Dikhil, Ali Sabieh, Tadjourah-Obock, and the watersheds of Douda and Damerjog in the Arta region.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Adaptation Technologies in Fragile Ecosystems of Djibouti’s Central Plains</td>
<td>7,360,000 + 22 million Cofinancing</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project’s objective is to implement climate change adaptation interventions that protect human populations, maintain productive assets and enhance ecosystem resilience in the regions of Hanlé (Dikhil) and Tadjourah. It will be complementary to the proposed LDCF project as it is also targeting these 2 regions. This LDCF project will complement activities of this related GEF project by promoting an integrated watershed management approach, which will contribute to enhance ecosystem resilience.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Rural Community Adaptation to Climate Change in Mountain Regions of Djibouti</td>
<td>5,379,452 + 28 million Cofinancing</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project’s objective is to reduce climate-related vulnerabilities facing the inhabitants of mountainous regions of Djibouti through institutional strengthening, climate-smart water management and targeted investment in the regions of Adailou and Assamo. The proposed project will be complementary because it will complement activities of this related GEF project by promoting an integrated watershed management approach, which will contribute to adapt mountainous regions to climate change.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination will be established with the following non-GEF financed initiative:
- Enhancing Farmers' Access to Markets in East and West Africa (2014-2018), is a project funded by the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (Canada) and aimed at improving the livelihoods of small-scale African farmers by increasing their access to local, regional, and international markets. Coordination with this project will be ensured by creating opportunities for meetings between project coordinators, joint monitoring and potential coordinated delivery of field based actions as well as knowledge transfer activities.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

Overall, the stakeholders engaged in the project are:

1. Government partners: These will oversee, enforce, provide institutional support and receive capacity building training to support project implementation. They will also receive information on lessons learned during project implementation so that they may include this information in their own projects and activities. These include:
   - Ministry of Habitat, Urban planning, and Environment
   - Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, Livestock and Halieutic Resources
   - Ministry of Energy and Water
   - Regional councils in the 5 regions

2. Local Stakeholders from the communities in the Gaggade-Derela watershed and sub-basins Mouldou, Harou, Aroua (Dikhil region) Beyya Dader, Beyya Aday, Dedey Weyn and Barisle (region of Ali Sabieh), Weima (regions of Tadjourah-Obok) and Douda and Damerjog (Arta region) are mostly from the Afar indigenous peoples. These communities will be the beneficiaries of project interventions and contribute to the implementation of activities. The project did not explicitly target any specific ethnic group or indigenous group, so the direct project beneficiaries will be mainly pastoralists and agro-pastoralists living in the identified watersheds, as well as staff of technical ministries who will see their capacities strengthened. Most inhabitants of the region are considered indigenous people, belonging to the Afar, Issa and/or Somali ethnicity. The project will be jointly implemented with the DRSLP, aims at reaching directly and indirectly 20,000 households, that is to say 120,000 beneficiaries, of which half are women. In addition, during the project preparation phase, a targeting strategy was identified, noting three different types of beneficiaries exist and should receive a different type of support:
   1. Households that rely on subsistence, who have very little means of production and who do not benefit from social safety net nor from a cooperation with their community. In this case, the strengthening of livelihoods should also include support to the emergence of community structures.
   2. Households that manage to produce resources with a slight surplus, allowing them to market their product. These households tend to have a better support system and have access to already formed cooperation groups, and could be supported to increase production and market access.
   3. The few households that manage to increase their agro-pastoral farms at the commercial level. These are generally households that have received funding and have extensive technical knowledge. These rare individuals could support the project by helping on knowledge transfer.

Finally, local NGOs, and regional and national governments will also benefit from strengthening technical and institutional capacities.

The project will ensure that women are consulted and derive the expected benefits from project implementation. Project results will be disaggregated by gender so as to measure the impact on women.

3. Local NGOs
   - Ecologie du Village Association – EVA
   - Paix et Lait – P&L
Roles of stakeholders for each of the project’s outcome:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome 1. Climate change-related adaptation measures integrated into development plans</th>
<th>Outcome 2. Awareness raised and local stakeholders involved in planning pro-active adaptation measures to climate change</th>
<th>Outcome 3. Vulnerabilities of local populations reduced through social transfers and the implementation of adaptation practices that respond to climate change-induced stresses in livestock</th>
<th>Outcome 4. Implementation of project activities efficiently coordinated, monitored and evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Ministry of Habitat, Urban planning, and Environment</td>
<td>Coordination with the project, and with other adaptation projects also integrating climate change into development plans.</td>
<td>The Ministry will participate in the identification of local actors, including NGOs and associations who may benefit from capacity building</td>
<td>An exchange will take place with representatives of Adaptation projects coordinated by the Ministry in order to gather information on the technical and economic feasibility of adaptation options proposed by the project. Furthermore, support from the Ministry on environmental impacts assessments may be sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, Livestock and Halieutic Resources</td>
<td>Regional and national ministry officials may benefit from targeted training to the extent that these will strengthen their capacity to plan local investments resiliently.</td>
<td>The Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, Livestock and Halieutic Resources implements the project as a partner of main implementation</td>
<td>The Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, Livestock and Halieutic Resources implements the project as a partner of main implementation</td>
<td>The Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, Livestock and Halieutic Resources implements the project as a partner of main implementation. The ministry hosts the Project Steering Committee of the DRSLP and will therefore be responsible for the project’s activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional councils in the 5 regions</td>
<td>Regional councils will be called to support the engagement of stakeholders and local communities.</td>
<td>Regional councils will be called to support the engagement of stakeholders and local communities.</td>
<td>Full participation of regional authorities will be integrated into the implementation of all project activities.</td>
<td>Participation in the Project Steering Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Energy and Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mobilization and water management skills will be sought in order to learn best practices and inform adaptive practices.</td>
<td>Participation in the Project Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local NGOs, such as: Ecologie du Village Association – EVA or Paix et Lait – P&amp;L</td>
<td>NGOs will be important intermediates in the deployment of local capacity building strategies. They will also receive training to act as local support for resilient agricultural</td>
<td>Local NGOs will be required to work with the project to organize producer groups and working groups for the implementation of community work such as reforestation and anti-erosion measures.</td>
<td>NGOs will be invited to participate in the Project Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Component 1 of this project will contribute to strengthening the resilience of vulnerable communities through sensitization of local actors, brought by training on climate change that will provide tools and methods to integrate climate change adaptation into local agricultural development plans, as well as in the community livelihoods. Thanks to training and awareness raised on resilience to climate change, local NGOs and communities will develop a better capacity to consider the local impacts of climate change and will adapt their livelihoods to become more resilient during prolonged droughts. Training provided to the Ministry of Agriculture staff at national and regional levels will strengthen the government’s capacity to integrate climate risk and resilience concepts in national and regional development planning.

The second component of this project will improve agro-pastoral sectors and the development of sustainable and resilient livelihoods, also called “no regrets”. Indeed, the diffusion of irrigation technologies, resilient equipment and infrastructure, and the acquisition of resistant varieties and seeds will achieve better productivity and increase the income of agro-pastoral communities, including in the dry season, while diversifying their income sources to increase food security during droughts, subsequently limiting their vulnerability to climate change. Furthermore, the project will support the creation of groups of smallholder farmers in order to promote economic activities less susceptible to climatic shocks that could provide them with additional income especially in the dry season. Component 2 will also upgrade some rural roads, rehabilitated by the DRSLP, to reflect new climate data, particularly in terms of sunshine and runoff. This will help create systemic benefit in resilience, as access to goods and services will be greatly improved, including in times of heavy rain or prolonged drought.

Finally, Component 2 aims to create profits for adaptation through the restoration of the ecological services that are the basis for survival in arid environments. It is predicted that watershed reforestation will contribute to better rainwater conservation, currently lost in runoff, therefore will allow greater groundwater recharge. Moreover, it will also improve soil fertility, especially if reforestation is associated with an agroforestry approach to agricultural land planning. The implementation of anti-erosive measures will also help capture rainwater and reduce land degradation. In terms of adaptation benefits, this will contribute to increasing productivity in agriculture and livestock, and will strengthen efforts to improve systems to access, manage and distribute natural resources (water, grazing, and wood) at the community level.

Key expected socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the proposed project will be the following:

- Improved living conditions of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities (through diversifying and increasing production and income) and increased access to social services
• Better linkages between disaster risk management and climate change, by addressing existing vulnerabilities through development and operational planning, policy processes, and incentive systems.

• Improved role of the private sector in livestock development in ASALs, especially to boost economic diversification and generation of income within and outside the livestock economy.

• Innovative practices stressing the contribution of the livestock sector to a green and climate-resilient economy.

• Emphasis on a multi-level, integrated approach to pastoral development through support and funding for a range of initiatives to help pastoralist communities and households undertake livestock and no-livestock income generating activities, accompanied by awareness raising, information and capacity building.

• Parallel dynamic of social inclusion and economic growth to reintegrate the most vulnerable and marginalized population categories into the local economy and combat the social and economic marginalization in which many pastoral groups are trapped,

• Mainstreaming gender issues into pastoral development namely by:

   (i) Addressing in all initiatives the specific needs of women and men (for instance, through well tailored training programs gender-sensitive income generation activities, etc.); and

   (ii) Identifying interventions that specifically target women as main beneficiaries (for instance, in order to better address households’ subsistence priority needs, cash transfers will be provided directly to women).

• Larger contribution of a more efficient livestock sector to national economies and food security

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

In order to strengthen agro-pastoral production systems against climate change, the project will use an integrated watershed management approach (IWM) in the sites targeted by the DRSLP. While the DRSLP provides basic investment for infrastructures such as rural roads, wells, or the development of agro-pastoral perimeters in the targeted sites, the GEF finances the livelihood strategies for adaptation, mainstreaming all interventions within a IWM, composed of 4 inter-related elements: ecosystem rehabilitation, a better natural resources management, support to develop resilient livelihoods and support on planning. This integrated watershed management approach adapts the basic investments made by DRSLP, to climate realities faced by targeted sites.

A number of technical solutions have been adopted, while others have not been retained for the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives name</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
<th>Reasons for rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Broadcasting of alerts and agro-climate information through traditional media (newspapers, journals, etc.) | To inform and notice agro-pastoral communities about extreme climatic events that could affect them, and to disseminate relevant information | • Although the dissemination of alerts and information is essential, traditional media were judged as having little impact in the project areas.  
• The establishment of an early warning system was launched by some projects, including funded by the World Bank, mainly for Djibouti city, but with little success.  
• To effectively reach users, the system should use a transmission encoded by mobile phone. However, the signal in remote areas such as pastures, will remain low. It has been estimated that the implementation of such a system would require greater resources than the available resources.  
• Therefore, the transmission of agro-climatic relevant information will be done through technical services and NGOs in the region. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deployment of drilling and mobilization work of groundwater and surface water</th>
<th>The deployment of drilling and mobilization work of groundwater and surface water to maximize the use of surface water, runoff and groundwater.</th>
<th>Given that water availability is a limiting factor of agro-pastoral development, the project could have invested resources in the deployment of boreholes, dams and reservoirs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of new rural roads</td>
<td>The isolation of some regions is a limiting factor of development, particularly because it limits access to markets and productive inputs. The project could have built new roads to improve access.</td>
<td>The high cost of this intervention, compared to the low concentration of the population, would have been difficult to justify. Moreover, a better understanding of the status of water tables, as well as long-term planning was needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It was decided to meet the need for water through smaller-scale works (wells, small dams, dykes and ears), to maximize the use of surface water, runoff and groundwater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This will be combined with the strengthening of water user capacities to ensure a rational and efficient use of resources, and to maximize the productivity of the resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>The total cost of the project amounts to US$ 39,129,278 (total amount of the donation from the GEF, and the contribution of DRSLP I and III). The cost per beneficiary household amounts to US$ 1,956, or approximately US$ 326 per beneficiary. In comparison, the expected average income increase thanks to the interventions combined with DRSLP is nearly 125%, which represents an increase of income of about US$ 1,031 by the end of the project (4 years), which is expected to be sustained over a period of 20 years. This means that the amount invested for every dollar of sustainable income increase amounts to US$ 2 per household.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, it is expected that the Djiboutian government and its partners are investing US$ 250 per beneficiary who rely on social safety nets, while 15,000 people currently rely on these in the project areas. The project is expected to contribute to the withdrawal of about 5,250 people from relying on social safety nets, which would amount to savings of US$ 1,312,500 in national and international budgets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In terms of cost-benefit analysis of the proposed activities, the following elements are available:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The average estimated cost of reforestation could be around US$ 8,000 per hectare. This would enable the project to achieve about 60 ha of reforestation using the resources of the GEF only. This would lead to benefits in terms of fighting erosion, carbon mitigation, and a better retention of water in the water tables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The estimated cost to build 27 km of rural roads, depending on the type of coating chosen, could go up to US$ 115,000 per kilometer for a bilayer coating, including associated drainage works. In addition to resources generated by the DRSLP and the Djiboutian government, the project (GEF) will add US$ 1,000,000 to ensure that the type of coating and engineering are selected according to climate change criteria. This is equivalent to an additional US$ 37,037 per km, or the equivalent of an additional 8 km of rural roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Interventions planned in the baseline project (DRSLP I and III) target an annual income increase of 100%, upon which GEF funds will add an additional increase of 25%.
Furthermore, the project will generate intangible benefits, difficult to express in monetary terms, including the regeneration of pastures, increased agricultural productivity, increased availability of water for agriculture and livestock, and increased biodiversity. For example, the value of ecosystem services provided by healthy watersheds could be estimated as follows:

- Value of coal and firewood provided by tropical woodland ecosystems (Djibouti): DJF 18,528 / ha / year, or US$ 104 per hectare per year.

- Value of carbon sequestered in reforested land: DJF 472 / ha / year, or US$ 2.66 / ha / year. If this value is calculated on the 20 years of statistical duration of the project, assuming a continuous and sustainable conservation, this would represent US$ 53.2 / ha.

- Value of hay provided by the rehabilitated pastures under sustainable management: DJF 369,450 / ha / year, or US $ 2,078 per hectare per year.

- Value of anti-erosion measures: DJF 21,700 / ha / year, or US$ 65,482 / ha / year. It is worth noting that losses due to erosion are around 15 tons / ha / year for pastures, and lead to a drop in annual productivity livestock of approximately 0.1%. Losses of arable land amount to 12 tons / ha / year, which could lead to a decrease in agricultural productivity by 0.6% annually.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

The project will follow the African Development Bank’s standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. The M&E officer within the DRSLP program will undertake Monitoring and evaluation. Additional funds to what is already dedicated to M&E within the DRSLP were provided for monitoring and evaluation (US$ 60,000) to conduct mid-term evaluation as well as end of project evaluation. Knowledge management activities, such as developing information products in local languages on climate will be included at national and regional levels within Component 3.

The project implementation will be planned over a period of 4 years, starting from the date of approval by the GEF. The DRSLP Project Management Unit (PMU), through its M&E Unit, will be responsible for internal monitoring of the project and will establish quarterly and annual reports, disaggregated into gender, on the implementation progress according to the format recommended by the Bank and GEF’s requirements. The PMU (from DRSLP) will also provide the Bank with the necessary information to complete the annual implementation reports required by the GEF, as well as project evaluation. The Steering Committee and the Bank will be responsible for external monitoring through supervision missions, which will be held on a biannual basis, and the mid-term review will be planned six months into the second year of the project, together with the mid-term review of the DRSLP, if possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Monitoring activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>AfDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Signing of approval</td>
<td>AfDB /Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Fulfilment of required conditions before the 1st disbursement.</td>
<td>AfDB /Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Development of management tools and TORs for technical studies; Preparation and launching of a call for proposals – procurement notices</td>
<td>PMU (DRSLP) / AfDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016-July 2020</td>
<td>Procurement, implementation and monitoring</td>
<td>PMU (DRSLP) / AfDB / Corporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>Mid-term evaluation</td>
<td>AfDB /Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2020</td>
<td>Final report on achievement</td>
<td>AfDB /Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
   (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>MINISTRY</th>
<th>DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION
   This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date (Month, day, year)</th>
<th>Project Contact Person</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Outcome/Output/Activities</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>MoV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT:</td>
<td>Reduction in food insecurity in the project's regions during dry seasons and droughts</td>
<td>Annual income of beneficiaries' households at the end of the project; Number of households relying on social safety nets or with weak food security at end of project</td>
<td>Annual mean income is 145,000 DJF; There are currently 15 000 households relying on social safety nets in the project's regions</td>
<td>25% increase in annual income by the end of the project; 35% decrease in the number of people relying on social safety nets by end of project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1. Climate change-related adaptation measures integrated into development plans</td>
<td>Number of people trained in the integration of adaptation measures into development plans at end of project</td>
<td>0 trained in the integration of adaptation measures into development plans</td>
<td>At least 25 people trained in the integration of adaptation measures into development plans, of which at least 40% are women by end of project</td>
<td>Training reports, project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1. Sensitization, awareness and information on CC of local stakeholders</td>
<td>Number of men and women in project sites with increased awareness of resilience to climate change at end of project</td>
<td>No more than 30% of men and women in project sites declare to know what climate change is and how it affects them</td>
<td>At least 60% of men and women declare to know what climate change is and how it affects them in project sites at the end of the project, of which half are women, by end of project</td>
<td>Project surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.1 Training of local NGOs and CBOs on resilience to climate change in an agro-pastoral context
1.1.2 Awareness raising of local communities on resilience to climate change, through support to the NGOs and CBOs trained in 1.1.1 and local media campaigns

| Output 1.2. Training of officials at the national and local level | Availability of tools and methods for the identification and integration of adaptation into agricultural development plans, by end of project | Tools and methods are not available | At least 3 tools or methodologies are available and being used by at least 25 people within the Ministry of Agriculture, of which at least 40% are women, at end of project | Training reports, project reports |

1.2.1. Training of personnel within the MAPE-RH at central and regional level on climate risk management and resilience planning

1.2.2 Development and distribution of technical manuals on resilience-building in ASALs for use by the MAPE-RH, other ministries, and the DRSLP program team

| Output 1.3 Mainstreaming of climate-sensitive pastoral development issues into development planning | Number of development frameworks that include specific budgets for adaptation actions, at end of project | None of the development plans mainstream climate change and include explicit and specific budgets for adaptation actions | At least 1 development framework includes some provisions for adaptation actions by end of project | Development frameworks, policies, plans, programs |

1.3.1 Analysis of opportunities for integration of climate change issues into national, regional or local development or sectoral planning processes

1.3.2 Integration of adaptation measures in local, national or regional development plans

1.3.3 Develop, using a participatory process, and with the support of NGOs trained in 1.1.1, resilient community development plans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2. Invest in sustainable measures aimed at improving the resilience of pastoral communities to climate change and variability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2. Awareness raised and local stakeholders involved in planning pro-active adaptation measures to climate change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of men and women with increased awareness and engagement for undertaking adaptation measures, at end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 men and women declare to know what climate change is and be engaged to undertake adaptation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 60% of men and women in project sites declare to know what climate change is and be engaged to undertake adaptation measures, of which at least half are women, by end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.1 Workshops organized at national level to draw lessons from project activities and achievements, and mainstream them into development policies and strategic frameworks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of workshops, study tours and meetings held where lessons from the project were discussed, at end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 4 workshops, study tours and meetings to discuss project lessons, at end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Organization of workshops and consultations to identify lessons on climate change resilience from the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Organization of regional, national and/or international study-tours for policy makers, project managers, communities and/or producer groups to get familiar with the lessons learned from the project (<em>with IGAD</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3. Vulnerabilities of local populations reduced through social transfers and the implementation of adaptation practices that respond to climate change-induced stresses in livestock</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households in targeted areas that implement relevant climate change adaptation technologies, at end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 households implement climate adaptation technologies in targeted areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of DRSLP households implement climate adaptation technologies by end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reports, PIRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3. Monitoring and Evaluation, Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 4.1. Knowledge products at national and regional level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 Develop information products in local languages on climate adaptation, resilience, and adaptive approaches to ASAL development

| Outcome 4.2 Timely, efficient and cost-effective M&E systems put in place at national and sub-regional level. | Number of M&E activities conducted, at mid-term of project and end of project | 0 | At least 4 annual PIRs, one Terminal Evaluation, one Mid-term Review, at mid-term of project and end of project | M&E documents and systems |

### Output 3.1 Grants provided to targeted communities to finance micro-adaptation projects (in the areas of water and rangeland resources, livestock and IGAs)

| Number of households that have adopted resilient livelihoods under existing and projected climate change by end of project | 0 households undertake resilient livelihoods in targeted areas | At least 50% of DRSLP targeted households adopt resilient livelihoods by end of project | Project reports, PIRs |

3.1.1. Support to the development of producer groups and the participatory identification of alternative livelihood strategies

3.1.2 Provision of small grants to producer groups for acquisition of productive assets, along with technical support provided through NGOs trained in 1.1.1

3.1.3 Support the dissemination of resilient irrigation technologies, equipment and infrastructures

3.1.4 Acquire and disseminate resilient varieties and seeds to support the development of agro-pastoral perimeters

3.1.5 Support the rehabilitation or upgrade, taking climate change into consideration, of rural roads, to facilitate and increase commercialization of agro-pastoral products

3.1.6 Support the development of community-based natural resources management systems (rangelands, water)

3.1.7 Implement anti-erosion measures in upper watersheds using local NGOs and/or community labour

3.1.8 Implement reforestation of targeted watersheds using local NGOs and/or community labour

### Outcome 4 Implementation of project activities efficiently coordinated, monitored and evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of execution of the project M&amp;E Plan, in a timely manner</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>The M&amp;E plan is fully developed and executed in a timely manner</th>
<th>M&amp;E documents, PIRs, APRs, AWPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of knowledge products developed, at end of project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>At least 5 knowledge products are developed, at end of project</td>
<td>information documents and databases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 Develop information products in local languages on climate adaptation, resilience, and adaptive approaches to ASAL development

<p>| Number of M&amp;E activities conducted, at mid-term of project and end of project | 0 | At least 4 annual PIRs, one Terminal Evaluation, one Mid-term Review, at mid-term of project and end of project | M&amp;E documents and systems |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2.1 Support for M&amp;E activities (ie MTR, TE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Additional Support for project management and operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests / comments from STAP and council members</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENTS FROM STAP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. STAP recommends identifying the various factors that determine the current vulnerability of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities and the different strategies being adopted in response. The determinants of vulnerability include external climate-related factors (such as droughts, reduction and large spatial variation in rainfall), as well as socio-economic factors (such as markets, political conditions and capacities) affecting the communities. These factors often drive land-use/cover change, and influence communities' coping strategies to climate risks. D. Tsegaye et al. (2013) demonstrated that households in semi-arid and arid environments in Northern Ethiopia adopt new strategies in response to environmental changes, changing markets and political conditions. (D.Tsegaye, et al. "Pastoralists and livelihoods: A case study from northern Afar, Ethiopia". Journal of Arid Environments. 2013.) These strategies differ according to access to assets (family labor, wealth, livestock, cropland) and land tenure; thereby, the decision-making "...often reflects constraints and necessity rather than opportunity and free-choice"

We added a new section (2.1 - Djibouti Technical Annex) on background/context with information on Djibouti’s vulnerability to climate change, including details on climate-related factors and socioeconomic factors, enhancing the population’s exposure to climate change.

Project sites for the proposed intervention are the same as the DRSLP intervention sites. These were selected on the basis of an analysis of socio-economic vulnerability, including factors such as food insecurity and state of nutrition, high levels of migration and volatility, isolation and lack of investment in basic rural infrastructure. In addition, all these sites have been impacted by recent and recurring droughts, and stand to suffer more from impending climate change. The watersheds included in the DRSLP I and III all present conditions of significant needs in terms of adaptive strategies.

2. Thus, STAP recommends capturing the diversified conditions influencing adaptation strategies in pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in order to identify, and support, the proposed adaptation measures (e.g. livestock choices, water harvesting, soil and water conservation measures), and other response mechanisms (e.g. capacity building) that provide an enabling environment for reducing vulnerability to climate risks in the targeted communities. D. Tsegaye et al. (2013) provides a conceptual framework for considering a number of factors influencing adaptation strategies, which the project developers may wish to consider as one source for identifying these relationships and capturing their complexities.

We added a section (2.3) on the current coping and adaptation strategies already in place in Djibouti and explained in greater detail the factors influencing adaptation strategies in Section 2.4 on Components description (Djibouti Technical Annex).

3. Furthermore, E.Bryan et al. (2013) suggests that many households in arid zones may already be practicing livelihood strategies that may be considered climate resilient (e.g. diversifying into off-farm income sources, migrating over longer distances), potentially exhausting the range of feasible possibilities available to them. (E. Bryan et al.

We added a section (2.3 - Djibouti Technical Annex) on the current coping and adaptation strategies already in place in Djibouti by explaining the context, the problem to be addressed in the project, the baseline analysis and gaps
"Adapting agriculture to climate change in Kenya: Household strategies and determinants". Journal of Environmental Management. 2013.). Establishing the limits of these current practices will be helpful in determining the new or additional interventions required. For example, pastoralists and agro-pastoralists find it difficult to make the investments required to reduce their vulnerability (e.g. agroforestry and changing crop varieties). In such cases, land users often rely on access to resources (e.g. non-farm income), and information obtained through extension services. It is therefore important to identify measures that better support communities develop long-term adaptation strategies, particularly in semi-arid and arid regions where communities face extensive constraints in adapting to climate risks. The African Development Bank may wish to rely on this paper as one source of information when developing the proposal.

4. The STAP recommends describing further how this initiative responds to the LDCF's and SCCF's objectives. Currently, this appears only to be broadly defined in the proposal (section B.1.1.). For example, STAP recommends defining more clearly the NAPA priorities, and how the proposed activities will address them. The proposal seems to provide only a broad description of these priorities. Similarly, it would be useful to specify further the proposed components and programmatic goal in the context of the LDCF and SCCF objectives. This will be addressed in the CEO endorsement: how the project responds to LDCF and SCCF objectives

5. The proposed components appear to be described at a level of detail sufficient to fully assess their technical underpinning. For example, the adaptation measures on water resource management and livestock management are not defined in the proposal (Component 2). Consequently, it is difficult to evaluate their potential contributions to the immediate, and long-term, climate resilience of pastoral (and agro-pastoral) communities in Djibouti and Kenya. Further, given the need to build long-term resilience, it is important to assess the viability and effectiveness of the measures under climate change scenarios. (For example, there is significant evidence in the literature regarding an intensification of the precipitation regime. Sillman & Kharin (2013) suggest that significant increase in precipitation on wet days in tropical Eastern Africa, with the largest increases in the Horn of Africa. Even as there is intensification of precipitation, Dai (2012) indicates that the Sahel and Southern Africa will experience substantially increased drought risk.)

We added more details on the technical underpinnings of each of the project’s components with more detailed on activities (section 2.4 in the Djibouti Technical Annex). Component 1 aims at training national, regional and local actors on climate change issues and adaptation, therefore enhancing capacity to include adaptation to climate change into agricultural development plans. In Component 2, we detail an integrated watershed management approach that includes both water resources management and livestock management in a holistic way in order to integrate the participation of different actors at the watershed level.


(Dai, A. (2012). Increasing drought under global warming in observations and models.)
6. Additionally, STAP recommends detailing each adaptation measure by considering the following aspects: 1) define the communities at risk, or targeted regions; 2) indicate how climate change will affect these communities (or regions); 3) what, and how the, proposed adaptation measure will contribute towards strengthening the resilience of vulnerable communities (population) to climate change; and, 4) how will the proposed interventions affect the socio-economic conditions of the vulnerable communities, particularly in the context of adaptive management of livestock, and natural resources. Addressing these aspects may contribute to the evidence base of adaptation measure and their effect on reducing vulnerability to climate change. (It may also be helpful to consider the full range of measures, including traditional farm practices. For example, Waha et al (2012) suggest that declines in output might be lowest for traditional cropping systems, as compared to single cropping or highest-yielding sequential cropping systems.)


7. In particular, building this evidence could contribute to understanding better the impacts of climate change on livestock and livestock systems in developing countries. P.K. Thornton et al. indicates that little is known about these interactions and in relation to broader development trends. (P.K. Thornton et al. “The impacts of climate change on livestock and livestock systems in developing countries: A review of what we know and what we need to know”. Agricultural Systems. 2009.) The authors note that a contributing factor may be that livestock systems are changing rapidly, and the spatial heterogeneity of household responses to these changes may be significant. Therefore, the project developers may wish to draw from this paper to define the knowledge gaps on climate change’s impact on livestock, and refine accordingly the proposed adaptation measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature Climate Change. doi:10.1038/nclimate1633)</th>
<th>We added details on the communities at risk and the targeted regions and how climate change will affect these communities, in the new Section 2.3 on the problem to be addressed (Djibouti Technical Annex).</th>
<th>We added details on the communities at risk and the targeted regions and how climate change will affect these communities, in the new Section 2.3 on the problem to be addressed (Djibouti Technical Annex).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additionally, STAP recommends detailing each adaptation measure by considering the following aspects: 1) define the communities at risk, or targeted regions; 2) indicate how climate change will affect these communities (or regions); 3) what, and how the, proposed adaptation measure will contribute towards strengthening the resilience of vulnerable communities (population) to climate change; and, 4) how will the proposed interventions affect the socio-economic conditions of the vulnerable communities, particularly in the context of adaptive management of livestock, and natural resources. Addressing these aspects may contribute to the evidence base of adaptation measure and their effect on reducing vulnerability to climate change. (It may also be helpful to consider the full range of measures, including traditional farm practices. For example, Waha et al (2012) suggest that declines in output might be lowest for traditional cropping systems, as compared to single cropping or highest-yielding sequential cropping systems.)</td>
<td>To address the following points: 3) what, and how the, proposed adaptation measure will contribute towards strengthening the resilience of vulnerable communities (population) to climate change; and, 4) how will the proposed interventions affect the socio-economic conditions of the vulnerable communities, particularly in the context of adaptive management of livestock, and natural resources, we added a new Section on adaptation benefits (section 2.5).</td>
<td>More details on the climate projection data and socio-economic data and vulnerability assessment were added in 2.3 The problem to be addressed (Djibouti Technical Annex)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. The proposal appears to assume that vulnerable pastoral communities in the target regions have insufficient knowledge, or experience, to adapt to climate change. To balance this perception and contribute to the sustainability of the programme, STAP suggests integrating local knowledge of livestock management and climate risk throughout component 2. This could include local knowledge on sustainable natural resource management (water and land); sustainable husbandry; and, combining meteorological information with indigenous knowledge. For the latter, the project developers may wish to refer to the following paper based on participatory experiences from sub-Saharan Africa - "Integrating meteorological and indigenous knowledge based seasonal climate forecasts for the agricultural sector, IDRC. 2010 http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/12882908321CCAA_seasonal_forecasting.pdf

9. STAP appreciates the project framework will be completed during the project development. However, STAP encourages the project developers to consider defining explicitly the adaptation benefits at this stage of the project cycle. Additionally, STAP strongly supports defining indicators that will estimate and monitor the progress of the proposed adaptation benefits at this stage of the project cycle. This step also could include referencing the indicators in the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT). Defining explicitly the adaptation benefits and identifying its indicators will strengthen the additional cost reasoning for this investment. Currently, the adaptation benefits (page 18) are not defined, or they are worded as activities.

10. For the purpose of thoroughness, STAP suggests defining the program goal in the program results framework. Currently, this information is only available on page 6 (Part II. A.). Additionally, STAP recommends strengthening the rationale for the programmatic approach. For example, STAP believes a programmatic approach provides scope for maximizing adaptation benefits and scaling-up initiatives. In this regard, STAP recommends addressing the following points: i) how will the programme contribute to integrating and scaling-up adaptation benefits within national policies and decision-making within and across projects; ii) how will the programme enhance opportunities to catalyze action, replication, and innovation on adaptation to climate change and the resilience of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists communities; and, iii) increase the knowledge flow, and knowledge management, across projects. Currently, the technical rationale for the program appears to be missing or not defined clearly.

11. STAP appreciates the initial characterization of the socio-economic conditions of the pastoral communities, and descriptions of the potential climate change impacts in Djibouti and Kenya. To strengthen this section further (section C), STAP recommends including climate change projection data and strengthening further the socio-economic

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. The proposal appears to assume that vulnerable pastoral communities in the target regions have insufficient knowledge, or experience, to adapt to climate change. To balance this perception and contribute to the sustainability of the programme, STAP suggests integrating local knowledge of livestock management and climate risk throughout component 2. This could include local knowledge on sustainable natural resource management (water and land); sustainable husbandry; and, combining meteorological information with indigenous knowledge. For the latter, the project developers may wish to refer to the following paper based on participatory experiences from sub-Saharan Africa - &quot;Integrating meteorological and indigenous knowledge based seasonal climate forecasts for the agricultural sector, IDRC. 2010 <a href="http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/12882908321CCAA_seasonal_forecasting.pdf">http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/12882908321CCAA_seasonal_forecasting.pdf</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. STAP appreciates the project framework will be completed during the project development. However, STAP encourages the project developers to consider defining explicitly the adaptation benefits at this stage of the project cycle. Additionally, STAP strongly supports defining indicators that will estimate and monitor the progress of the proposed adaptation benefits at this stage of the project cycle. This step also could include referencing the indicators in the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT). Defining explicitly the adaptation benefits and identifying its indicators will strengthen the additional cost reasoning for this investment. Currently, the adaptation benefits (page 18) are not defined, or they are worded as activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We added more details on the importance of local knowledge in the section on knowledge management in the project summary on page iv (paragraph 5.) and in the components description in new Section 2.4 (Djibouti Technical Annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We added a section on: Adaptation benefits in Section 2 after explaining the components (new Section 2.5 in the Djibouti Technical Annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A program-level results framework, to which individual sub-project results will contribute, was created. It now includes an overall goal and impact indicator. Furthermore, the programmatic linkages were reinforced in the Regional Program Appraisal Report, as well as in each of the country technical annexes. It is expected that the regional dimensions of the DRSLP and RLACC will become more apparent as individual country projects come into execution. Further linkages will be made with the help of the IGAD regional project on Drought Monitoring, which is also supported by the DRSLP program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We added 3 sections before explaining the components of the project (Djibouti Technical Annex):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
data (per target community, if possible). This information could be obtained at the IPCC Data Distribution Centre, and the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal. http://sedac.ipcc-data.org/ddc/baseline/index.html http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm Together, the climate change and socio-economic data will strengthen the proposal description, the barrier analyses, and buttress further the rationale of the proposed interventions.

2.1 Background and context

=> Information on climate projection data and socio-economic data

2.2 The problem to be addressed in the project

2.3 Baseline analysis and gaps

12. A number of organizations will support this initiative as suggested on page 22 and 23. It would useful to detail further each stakeholders' role(s) in relation to the proposed components, specifying their comparative advantages. This will assist the project developers assess whether there are any stakeholders missing to cover the complexities and barriers the programme seeks to address.

We added a table identifying the stakeholders and their participation in each of the project’s components in Section 2.10: Participatory approach (Djibouti Technical Annex).

13. The components defined on page 14 appear to be different than those in the program result framework. For clarity purposes, STAP recommends using, therefore, the same titles as those listed in the results framework. Additionally, STAP suggests detailing the components and their activities. Currently, this information is not well-organized, or presented, in the document; therefore, it is hard to understand, and follow, the logic underpinning each component, and their expected outcome.

The formatting error was corrected.

14. The project proponents indicate gender approaches will be used throughout the programme interventions an initiative that STAP supports. However, STAP recommends detailing further what gender strategies, or approaches, will be used. For example, it would be useful to detail how each component will integrate gender to address men's and women's coping mechanisms to climate change and variability. Perhaps, the African Development Bank may wish to consider hiring a gender specialist to account thoroughly for gender when identifying and prioritizing adaptation measures including income generation activities from off-farm sources (micro-adaptation projects).

We added gender dimensions for each of the project’s components in Section 2.4 (Djibouti Technical Annex) and also within the performance indicators and in the logframe.

### COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS

**GERMANY 1.**

We added a new section (2.1 in the Djibouti Technical Annex) on
Germany welcomes that the project addresses the known challenges outlined for the arid and semi-arid areas (ASALs) in Djibouti and Kenya which are in line with priorities of the Kenyan government. However, regarding component 1 and 2 we would like to ask for details on how “targeted areas” as well as “vulnerable groups” are selected. Please specify what the base for the selection is (i.e. source and approach of the vulnerability assessment) and how this relates to national strategies, such as NAPA or also findings from the National Communications. See also STAP review (points 1 and 6).

**GERMANY 2.**

Regarding component 1, Germany would like to highlight that beside the training activities for strengthening technical skills and capacities for integrating climate change aspects into planning and decision-making processes, additional activities that accompany the actual integration in a participatory way could support that the gained knowledge is put into practice. Component 1 has been strengthened to reflect the participatory element of the project (see section 2.4 in the Djibouti Technical Annex).

**GERMANY 3.**

The proposal clearly addresses “efficient, timely and accountable coordination and monitoring and evaluation of project activities”. A more systematic monitoring of these specific aspects, e.g. baseline and changes in adaptive capacity of vulnerable groups and the impact of the interventions might be considered. Information generated on the country level could be fed into the National Framework. Currently, a number of tools are tested how to capture adaptive capacity and/ or adaptation and mitigation benefits, e.g. by the project “Adaptation to Climate Change and Insurance (ACCI)” implemented by GIZ on behalf of the German federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). We added more details on performance indicators (in new section 2.12 in the Djibouti Technical Annex) to measure adaptive capacity and adaptation benefits of the project. Indicators are fully developed, with funds allocated to support concrete measurements of each, in line with Bank supervision and M&E timelines. Information generated at the country level will be integrated into the regional M&E platform that is being supported by the IGAD under the larger program.

**GERMANY 4.**

As the proposed project aims at increasing the resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, Germany supports suggestions made by the STAP review, especially regarding the inclusion of local knowledge into the adaptation measures proposed (point 8), and the inclusion of existing data on climate change projections and strengthening further the socio-economic data (point 11). We added more details on the importance of local knowledge in the section on knowledge management in the project summary on page iv (paragraph 5.) and in the components description in new Section 2.4 (Djibouti Technical Annex).

**COMMENT 2 FROM THE US:**

Make a stronger case for how the project will integrate a climate change adaptation background/context with information on Djibouti’s vulnerability to climate change, including details on climate-related factors and socioeconomic factors, enhancing the population’s exposure to climate change.

We added details on the communities at risk and the targeted regions and how climate change will affect these communities, in the new Section 2.3 (Djibouti Technical Annex) on the problem to be addressed.
lens into the baseline project. The current rationale is unclear. For example, the PIF states in paragraph 43 that the baseline project will address the supply side by investing in infrastructure whereas the LDCF SCCF project will reinforce the demand side. How will more systematic incorporation of climate change-related knowledge into local development processes by the LDCF SCCF project result in communities benefiting from the baseline project’s enhanced regional market information systems – and in such a way that is resilient to climate change in the longer term? How will helping communities and households undertake gender-sensitive income generating activities help them benefit from the baseline project’s efforts to develop and promote gender policies – and in such a way that is resilient to climate change in the longer term?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT 3 FROM THE US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide more information on the social transfer schemes proposed under Component 2 paragraph 29, page 15). Have these social transfer schemes already been tested in the project areas? We are somewhat concerned with the sustainability of these safety nets if consideration is not given to details such as appropriate gap periods before benefits are felt or mitigating the participant’s perception of risk in adopting new practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We added more details on social security safety nets and how the project will contribute to help project beneficiaries (Section 2.11 in the Djibouti Technical Annex). Social transfer schemes will not be implemented in both projects, but they will be tested at a low scale in Kenya (micro-credit, index-based insurance), and to some extent, “cash for work” as a delivery mechanism may be integrated in the Djibouti project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT 4 FROM THE US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide more information on how a cross-border approach will be incorporated into the project design and implementation as we see this as particularly important in the case of Djibouti (paragraph 38, page 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We inserted details on cross-border and programmatic approach in the regional PAR document. Further details on coordination at regional level were also integrated into each country-technical annex.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT 5 FROM THE US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify how it plans to promote coordination in each country between ministries and agencies at both the national and district level. We appreciate the involvement of multiple government agencies and institutions across the various districts as the development of agro-pastoral adaptation technologies (e.g. water extraction technologies) and local development planning will not only require input from experts of various sectors but also produce information applicable to numerous ministries and institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We added more details on the coordination plan in Section 1.4 (Djibouti Technical Annex) and within Section 2.10 (Djibouti Technical Annex) on participatory stakeholder approach (table identifying the stakeholders and their participation in each of the project’s components)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT 6 FROM THE US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition, we expect that AfDB in the development of its full proposal will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand on how it will ensure the sustainability of climate change adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We added more details on the sustainability of each component of the project in Section 4.4 (IV- Execution section, Djibouti Technical Annex).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The communication of results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education for beneficiaries at the national and local level and how these trainings will be linked to similar proposed interventions at the household level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify how it will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project; and, Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations and women, in both the design and implementation of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during and after the project in Section 2.4 (Djibouti Technical Annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In Section 2.10 (Djibouti Technical Annex), we added a table identifying the stakeholders and their participation in each of the project’s components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</th>
<th>GEF/LDCF/NPIF Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception / Stakeholder Workshop and Beneficiary Consultation Meetings</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy preparation contract</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk vulnerability assessment (site visit and survey)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation workshop</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is valid for the 2 child projects since we granted a single consultancy contract for both projects.

---

6 If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.
ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

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

NA