



COMPILATION OF COMMENTS  
SUBMITTED BY COUNCIL MEMBERS  
ON THE  
APRIL 2013 LDCF/SCCF  
INTERSESSIONAL WORK PROGRAM

NOTE: This document is a compilation of comments submitted to the Secretariat by Council members concerning the project proposals presented in the April 2013 LDCF/SCCF Intersessional Work Program

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>MULTI-TRUST FUND.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Ecuador - FAO: Promotion of Climate-smart Livestock Management Integrating Reversion of Land Degradation and Reduction of Desertification Risks in Vulnerable Provinces - GEF ID = 5112 .....	1
2. Regional (Guinea, Mali, Mauritania and Senegal) - World Bank: Senegal River Basin Climate Change Adaptation Project - GEF ID = 5112 .....	2

## MULTI-TRUST FUND

### 1. Ecuador - FAO: Promotion of Climate-smart Livestock Management Integrating Reversion of Land Degradation and Reduction of Desertification Risks in Vulnerable Provinces - GEF ID = 4775

#### ✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves this PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

- Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal
  - We recommend to revise the number of farmers that should be trained (Part I, Project Framework, point 2.1.1) since the stated number (280) appears too small in order to restore 35,000 ha of degraded grassland.
  - In the same section, point 2.1.3 mentions the development of an online knowledge platform to disseminate lessons learned for livestock management. It is recommended to integrate this function into the existing platform developed by the Agrarian Revolution Schools (ERAs), so as not to create additional platforms that could confuse users.
  - In addition to the Second National Communication to the UNFCCC, Part II, A.2 should also include the National Climate Change Strategy, which outlines the core of Ecuador's CC-related activities until 2025.
  - Part II, Section B.2, Component 2 mentions that the "potential of up-scaling of the project is enormous" without clarifying how such scaling-up can be achieved. Thus, the full project proposal should describe clearly what measures are necessary to ensure the project results being replicated and the scaling-up being financially feasible.
  - In Part II, Section B.2, Component 3, under GEBs, it is recommended to specify whether the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> to be sequestered in silvopastoral and agroforestry systems is indicated in annual values or values for the entire project duration. In the latter case, the values appear to be too small.
  - The research undertaken with regard to related initiatives in B.6 is commendable. Nevertheless, in the case of the GIZ programme, GESOREN, it should be added that the programme also works on adaptation and mitigation issues, including their relation to sustainable agriculture and livestock management. The programme's experience in the province of Tungurahua can be particularly useful for the development of incentive schemes for climate-smart livestock practices.
  - It is highly recommended that FAO coordinate this project with MAGAP's Unit for International Cooperation, which was recently tasked with coordinating all CC-related activities within the Ministry of Agriculture.

## 2. Regional (Guinea, Mali, Mauritania and Senegal) - World Bank: Senegal River Basin Climate Change Adaptation Project - GEF ID = 5133

### ✓ Germany's Comments

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal; in addition, Germany requests that the Secretariat sends draft final project documents for Council review four weeks prior to CEO endorsement:

- The proposed project aims at integrating climate change adaptation into trans-boundary water resources management, building on the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the World Bank “*Senegal River Basin Multi-Purpose Water Resources Development Project*” (MWRD 2). The LDCF/GEF contribution is proposed to be blended to all components of the MWRD. While Germany appreciates this regional mainstreaming approach; we have serious concerns regarding the design, implementation and impact of the project. We fully agree with the concerns expressed by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and strongly recommend composing the final project document according to the STAP suggestions.
- With regard to the description of the LDCF/GEF funded activities and their connection to the baseline project, the proposal remains general and vague. We require further clarification both on the activities and outcomes of the baseline project and on the specific results expected to be achieved by the LDCF/GEF contribution. To this end, further information should be given regarding concrete adaptation actions that are to be implemented by the project.
- From an adaptation perspective, some formulations included in the proposal such as “[...] *adaptation will reduce the final impacts of climate change and thus is important for measuring vulnerability* [...]” (P. 14), generate lack of clarity which is reflected throughout the proposal. The underlying concepts of adaptation and vulnerability need to be defined more clearly and then applied consistently in the final product document.
- In Component 2 of the project proposal, the main activity is to conduct a vulnerability assessment. While we welcome this, we recommend clarifying how the results of the assessment are intended to be used and if they will be fed into the activities planned under Component 3. Also, it should be clarified whether and what kind of climate change data will be used in the context of the vulnerability assessment.
- The national strategies and plans listed under A.2 appear to be partly outdated. For example, in December 2011, Mali has adopted the third Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (Growth and Poverty Reduction Framework) for the period 2012 - 2017, which is not included in the list. Further, in December 2012, as a result of the ongoing economic crisis, the Malian transitory government elaborated, with support of the UNDP, a plan for urgent priority actions covering the period 2013 - 2014 (“Plan d’Actions prioritaires d’Urgence”). In the case of Mauritania, the latest Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper was adopted in 2011. In addition, a national environmental action plan was adopted in 2012. These and other relevant outdated or missing documents should be added and/or updated to the list of national strategies and plans. These should be reviewed and updated, as applicable. We also suggest listing adaptation projects identified within the NAPAs that are currently being implemented in order to identify possible synergies, inter-linkages and cooperation potential.