

# Improving the climate resilience of agro-sylvo-pastoral production systems in Burkina Faso

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10516

**Countries**

Burkina Faso

**Project Name**

Improving the climate resilience of agro-sylvo-pastoral production systems in Burkina Faso

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

3/20/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/16/2020

**Program Manager**

Katya Kuang-Idba

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Yes. The project is aligned with CCA-1 and CCA-2.

#### **Agency Response N/A**

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - More clarification requested. A number of the outputs in Table B are not written as outputs, but rather presented as outcomes. Outputs should be easily measured and quantifiable against the the delivery of the project's objective and outcomes. Please see the item on the alternative scenario for further details regarding the project design/approach.

**Recommended action:** Please rewrite the outputs so they are easily measurable and reflect the tangible and intangible products that result from project activities. Additionally, there does not seem to be much connection between the first two components, please provide some basis for which the two will be implement in concert as part of a coordinated approach, as opposed to disparate activities with their own scope and impact.

GEFSEC, 4/8/2020 - This is cleared.

**Agency Response**

Outputs under Outcome 1 have been reworded as suggested.

The logical sequencing of Components 1 and 2 is outlined in the Theory of Change diagram presented in Annex E. In summary, Component 1 will provide an enabling environment in terms of mainstreaming of climate resilience into land-use planning, along with the necessary capacities to implement and monitor these plans (incl. the management of conflicts, the frequency of which is increasing with the impacts of climate change). Under Component 2, the climate-resilient land-use plans will be implemented on the ground through a series of interventions aiming to strengthen the resilience of ASP resources and producers from the perspective of natural assets. This will be complemented under Component 3, with activities to support economic activities of ASP communities that are threatened by climate change.

Please see also response to comment II.3.

**Co-financing**

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Further clarification requested: one of the baseline projects identified as providing co-financing to this project is under implementation only between 2015-2021 (PRAPS). By the time this project is ready for implementation, that project will be closed. Therefore it does not seem appropriate to list this as a project which is providing co-financing to the proposed initiative. Additionally, it's unclear how and why these initiatives are classified as investment mobilized.

**Recommended action:** Please revisit the co-financing attributed to this project to ensure initiatives providing co-financing are current and ongoing. Additionally, it's not immediately clear regarding the projects providing co-financing, exactly what is being financed and creates some uncertainty regarding the additionality. Please try to clarify the descriptions of the projects providing co-financing which are also listed in the baseline section by grouping them together at the very least. Please also see the item on additionality.

GEFSEC, 4/7/2020- Additional clarification requested. As iterated in the first review, it is a bit confusing the way the co-financing is presented. Is there a reason why projects providing co-financing are not listed individually here, but instead, are listed by co-financier -- which seem to be providing co-financing through different projects? This is adequate for this stage of project development, with the understanding that a detailed breakdown is made available at CEO endorsement. However, please explain how each of these initiatives have been classified as grant financing - as several explanations do not seem to qualify as true grants.

GEFSEC, 4/9/2020 - Cleared.

**Agency Response**

3/25/2020

The list of baseline projects providing co-financing has been revised. Projects ending in 2021 – namely PRAPS and PDPS-BF – have been removed, and rather described in the Coordination section, as synergies with some of their activities and expected results will be capitalised upon in the proposed project. Co-financing figures have been adjusted accordingly in the project identification tables as well as in Section 5 “Additional cost reasoning”.

The description of these baseline projects has been revised to clarify the investments considered as co-financing.

4/7/2020

Please, consider the amendments made to table C in the PIF.

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Yes. Burkina Faso is eligible to access up to \$10 million from the LDCF under the current GEF-7 cap.

**Agency Response** N/A

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Yes. Burkina Faso is eligible to access up to \$10 million from the LDCF under the current GEF-7 cap.

**Agency Response** N/A

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Yes.

**Agency Response** N/A

Core indicators

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Action requested. Please remove all entries in the core indicators section of the PIF submission on the portal - the LDCF/SCCF has its own core indicators, as per the spreadsheet circulated after the ATF meeting in April 2019.

**Recommended action:** Please upload the CCA Core Indicators and Metadata worksheet onto the roadmap section of the portal. Please remove any entries on the portal, as those count toward GEF Trust Fund indicators and will then be double-counted if not removed.

GEFSEC, 4/7/2020 - Clarification requested. According to table in section 1e, the total combined population of the 3 target regions is 6.1 million. 30k expected beneficiaries is therefore extremely low - both in terms of impact as well as cost-effectiveness. Kindly please provide some more insight into this, as the LDCF is aiming to achieve higher impact across its indicators.

GEFSEC, 4/9/2020 - The Secretariat appreciates the updated figures. A final clarification please: Please providing some rationale for the project's impacts. At face value 80,000 alone is not a substantial number but indirect impacts, characteristics of geo-physical terrain, demographic realities, etc. can help inform the estimate to provide a more robust narrative on this project's impact. Please provide some additional information on this aspect that can support the impact rationale.

GEFSEC, 4/10/2020 - This is cleared.

### **Agency Response**

3/25/2020

Information has been removed in the Portal and the worksheet uploaded in the Roadmap section.

4/7/2020

Thank you for the observation. The figures have been updated throughout the PIF and supporting documents.

4/10/2020

Please, consider the additional language provided in the adaptation benefits section of the PIF. It explains the challenges faced by the country and the inherent impact on project ambition. It goes on and elaborates how the scaling potential has been estimated (the impact), based on the direct benefits from LDCF financed activities.

### **Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Yes.

**Agency Response** N/A

**Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/26/2020 - More details requested. Have climate projections been taken into consideration into the project design? Current adaptation problems are articulated, but the design should also consider future scenarios and modeling predictions. Additionally, conflict over natural resources is presented as a key issue - is table 1 meant as a conflict analysis?

GEFSEC, 4/7/2020 - Cleared.

**Agency Response**

Climate projections have been taken into consideration and form the basis of the whole problem analysis presented in Section 1.a.b-c-d and summarised in the Problem tree (Annex D).

As described in footnote 18, Scenario A1B are projections from five regional climate models from the African Monsoon Multidisciplinary Analysis programme. Scenarios A2 & B1 are projections from nine global climate models by the University of Cape Town. Time horizons are 2046 to 2065 and 2081 to 2100 for scenarios A2 and B1, and 2021 to 2050 for scenario A1B. For example, the conflict analysis presented in Table 1 outlines how future climate change could impact the various causes of conflicts. A climate risk screening was also performed by FAO experts and is joined as Annex G. Local climate impacts at the scale of the target landscapes will be further analysed during the PPG phase.

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/27/2020 - This section is confusing to read. Please clarify between baseline projects and co-financing and separate the projects accordingly.



GEFSEC, 4/9/2020 - Cleared for this stage of project development.

**Agency Response** This has been clarified as per response to Comment I.3. All the baseline projects described in this section are considered for co-financing.

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/27/2020 - Some clarifications requested. As for the way the project is presented now, the adaptation angle should be further emphasized and strengthened. This particularly applies to the first two components, which sound very much like components of a land management/land degradation project. The LDCF finances activities which increase the resilience of people, communities, and natural/physical assets to the negative impacts of climate change specifically. The two objectives that this project is responding to are CCA-1 and CCA-2, which related to *Reduce Vulnerability and Increase Resilience through Innovation and Technology Transfer for Climate Change Adaptation* and *Mainstream Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience for Systemic Impact*. Please ensure that the project components and activities are supporting these broader framework objectives and that adaptation is the principal aim of these project activities, with land management co-benefitting, and/or utilized as a strategy to achieve increased climate resilient, versus the opposite.

GEFSEC, 4/7/2020 - Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

Thank you for the comment. We have amended some misleading language to avoid this project is being read as a land degradation project. However, the project's intervention strategy was developed to address specific climate resilience challenges faced by agro-sylvo-pastoral communities, livelihoods and landscapes. This is reflected in the structure of the "Adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed" section, in which climate resilience is examined as a key driver of the specific governance (conflicts), safety, land degradation and development challenges. The intervention logic was thus designed to address these climate adaptation challenges – land degradation being only one of them. In this perspective, the mainstreaming of climate change into land management is but a tool to foster the resilience of said communities, livelihoods and landscapes.

Some elements of the logical framework as well as the ToC diagram were revised to better reflect this focus.

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Yes.

## Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Please provide details regarding the co-financing projects in this section. It seems that the ministries which are involved in the co-financing are listed here, with some activities described in a very general way. It's difficult to determine the additionality without details of the specific activities being co-financed by these ministries.

**Recommended action:** Please add some more detail regarding the specific projects and project activities here. Additionally, none of the description of additionality under each component presented here are framed with a strong adaptation rationale.

GEFSEC, 4/7/2020 - Cleared.

## Agency Response

Please, note some additional language has been provided in the relevant section of the PIF. Moreover, Ministries providing co-financing will do so through the donor-funded projects that they manage. These are the baseline projects listed for co-financing that have been further described in the Baseline project section in response to Comments I.3 and II.2. The breakdowns of the contributions of each project considered for co-financing towards the components of the proposed project has been added for clarity. Additional details will be sought during the PPG phase.

The additionality of LDCF resources vis-à-vis baseline investments has been clarified.

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Not clear. Please refer to item 6 in the previous section.

GEFSEC, 4/9/2020 - More articulation is requested, please refer to item 6.

GEFSEC, 4/10/2020 - Cleared.

**Agency Response** Changes have been made in the Portal.

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - Yes. The project is innovative in its agro-ecological approach and VC intensification actions; sustainability is built into the project design; and includes an indicative approach for scaling.

**Agency Response** N/A

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/26/2020 - Yes this information is in Annex A.

**Agency Response**

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/26/2020 - Yes, an indicative list of stakeholders has been provided with the understanding that more detail on this will be provided at CEO endorsement.

**Agency Response** Acknowledged by the Agency.

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/26/2020 - Yes, the project does provide some gender context while articulating the project's approach to proactively address gender. This is cleared with the understanding that a full gender analysis and related action plan, in line with the GEF's gender policy will be undertaken at PPG.

**Agency Response** Acknowledged by the Agency.

**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/26/2020 - Yes there will be some private sector engagement under component 3, which is described and will be expanded upon during PPG.

**Agency Response**

**Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/26/2020 - More information requested. Is there any risk for fiduciary risk?

GEFSEC, 4/7/2020 - Cleared.

**Agency Response** Please, consider the additional risk in the risk table.

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/26/2020 - Partially. Clarifications requested: (i) There are 4 other LDCF-financed projects approved in Burkina Faso at the moment (not including the one already mentioned and one which has already closed). Please provide some information on whether and how the proposed project will coordinate with these initiatives to ensure complementarity and prevent duplication; (ii) Please also provide some information on how this project is coordinating with any GCF-financed initiatives - there seems to be at least 3 GCF readiness proposals in Burkina Faso that could be relevant; (iii) Lastly, please articulate any linkages with proposed GGW project under development with GCF in the proposal.

GEFSEC, 4/8/2020 - (i) is cleared with the understanding that more details on the coordination group will be provided at PPG. For (iii) it would be appreciated if this information regarding GGW coordination can be articulated in the submission.

GEFSEC, 4/9/2020 - Well noted this is cleared.

**Agency Response**

4/8/2020

Clarifications pertaining to the GGW GCF project have been included in the PIF.

3/26/2020

A suggestion to create a coordination group for GEF projects in Burkina Faso has been added in the PIF. This mechanism would facilitate information exchanges and operational coordination among GEF project teams, and would be chaired by the GEF OFP. This group will be an appropriate forum to coordinate with GEF LDCF projects, which have been included in the list of projects to coordinate with.

The two GCF Readiness proposals executed by IUCN and GGGI pertain to the strengthening of Burkina Faso's Nationally-Designated Authority and the GCF country programme, and are only marginally relevant to the proposed project. This is the reason why they have not been described in the PIF.

The third GCF Readiness proposal approved for Burkina Faso is to advance the Great Green Wall project, and has been executed by the FAO. This Readiness project is concluded, and its outputs have been validated. These include a consolidated report on the mitigation and adaptation potential of the Great Green Wall, as well as a great wealth of information on adaptation (and mitigation) practices, approaches, models, lessons in support of forestry and land use adaptation. These outputs have been guiding the PIF design and will be further orienting the PPG phase, when relevant and locally adopted adaptation practices will be selected in a participatory way.

Please, know that the design process of a GGW full project proposal financed by the GCF is being negotiated at the regional level, with a number of GGW countries. Burkina Faso is planned to take part in this regional project. Still, the timing of finalization and submission of this project (and consequent approval) is unsure.

#### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/27/2020 - Clarifications requested

- 1) The submission refers to the "NAP" as being published in 2015. The NAP is an ongoing, iterative process, not a document. Please clarify how this project will inform and coordinate with the NAP process. The NAP document in 2015 is a guiding document.
- 2) Please indicate any CURRENT relevant national climate change and land management plans and policies that this project is aligned with (aside from UNFCCC-related).

GEFSEC, 4/9/2020 - Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

- 1) The proposed project will contribute to the Specific Objectives outlined in the NAP guiding document for agriculture (SO1 – SO3) and environment & natural resources (SO1 – SO4). In addition, the proposed project will strengthen the institutional environment for the NAP process and contribute to the mainstreaming of climate adaptation into land-use and investment planning (Component 1). This has been mentioned in the PIF.
- 2) Other current national policies that the project aligns with are described in II.1.f, namely the ENP, SCADD, SNADDT, PNDES, SNDA, PNIA, PNSR, PEDD, Forestry Code etc. A reference has been added in this section.

## **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/27/2020 - Yes. There is an indicative plan for KM included. At CEO endorsement a more detailed KM plan that captures the overall approach to create, manage, and disseminate knowledge and information generated by this project is expected.

## **Agency Response**

### **Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/27/2020 - Yes the current OFP has endorsed this project in an LOE dated August 2019 and reiterated his support via email.

## **Agency Response**

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

## **Agency Response**

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 3/27/2020 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 4/8/2020 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 4/9/2020 - One final clarification is requested regarding the indicators. Please address and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 4/10/2020 - Yes. The agency has adequately addressed the review items for this stage of project development and this project is being recommended for technical clearance.



GEFSEC, 4/15/2020 - Several additional policy-related comments to be addressed prior to consideration for inclusion in the June 2020 Work Program below:

1) On executing functions: The Coordination section of the PIF mentions the possibility for FAO to provide some execution functions to be determined at PPG. As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

2) On co-financing: Government co-financing is mostly projects that are government loans from other development Agencies. Please revise, and in the "Name of Co-Financier" field, provide the name of the entity that provides the co-financing, rather than the name of the project with which it is associated. For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines.

3) ESS: Section 5 of the PIF show that some risks screening has taken place, and the Environmental and Social Risks Level Certificate has been attached indicating low risk rating. but the PIF does not elaborate on any other preliminary ESS potential risks and impacts. Please attach the FAO screening report and or indicate more clearly, in line with the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, the indicative information regarding any Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project or program and, if applicable, any measures to address such risks and impacts.

GEFSEC, 4/16/2020 - This is cleared. As for point 2 - The agency has had discussions with PPO and gotten confirmation that when Ministries are responsible/liable over the funds and will ultimately sign the co-fin letters, their names should be listed in the Co-fin tables. This is the case for Burkina. The agency indicates they will partner with the Gov not with the donors and that is our (and GEF policies) strong preference every time that there are the conditions in place and Ministries can be held accountable for the resources. This is the case. Co-fin letters will come from the Ministries and will be articulated with all sources but under their responsibility.

GEFSEC, 4/16/2020 - Please amend the co-financing Table C to indicate the co-financier, which are articulated in the description field for co-financing and which are originating from various donor agencies. For example, Agricultural Value Chains Promotion Project, PAPFA, is a loan/project from IFAD. As such, they should indicate the “source” of these funds as IFAD, a donor Agency. And similarly for all the other projects.

GEFSEC, 4/17/2020 - This is cleared, now in the additional reasoning section and in the co-financing section, the total amounts from MAAH and MVECC are listed by project and totaled. Table C shows the co-financiers as requested.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

The FAO/LDCF project (GEF ID 10516), "Improving the climate resilience of agro-sylvo-pastoral production systems in Burkina Faso," will increase the climate resilience of agro-sylvo-pastoral family farming communities in the Sudanian and Sudano-Sahelian zones of Burkina Faso. Burkina Faso is among the poorest countries in the world and is highly dependent on natural resources-based sectors, with agriculture accounting for 60% of employment and one third of national GDP, making it particularly vulnerable to the negative impacts of climate change. A changing climate has also exacerbated structural issues existing in Burkina Faso that have resulted in conflict over the usage and allocation of natural resources, and is expected to continue to do so over the medium term. This project aims to achieve its objective through 4 components which will result in (i) Strengthened climate resilience of agro-sylvo-pastoral (ASP) community development in 3

pilot landscapes through improved governance and institutional capacity, with a focus on conflict resolution ; (ii) New landscape management plans integrating climate resilience into ASP production systems; and (iii) Diversified and improved livelihoods of agro-sylvo-pastoralists, through upstream upscaling of the Agro-Pastoral Field Schools approach and downstream support to transformation and market linkages and value chain development. The last component will ensure that the results of the project are evaluated, and lessons learned are documented and disseminated. This intervention will directly benefit 80,000 people and an estimated 100,000 hectares of production land will be managed in a more sustainable way to more resiliently withstand climate stressors. In parallel, the project will create the conditions to maximize the potential for up-scaling and out-scaling of the approaches, practices and technologies. Therefore, the potential impact expected from this project is a multiplication of the direct adaptation benefits