



Sustainable Land Management to Strengthen Social Cohesion in the Drylands of Burkina Faso

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11003

Countries

Burkina Faso

Project Name

Sustainable Land Management to Strengthen Social Cohesion in the Drylands of Burkina Faso

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/16/2023

Review completed by PM

8/29/2023

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6th, 2023

Yes

Agency Response
Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
August 25, 2023

Addressed.

July 6th, 2023

Cofinancing table

- IUCN in this case should be considered as a donor agency, UNDP being the GEF Agency. Please, revise.
- All investment mobilized require a description on how it was identified. Please include an explanation at the bottom of co-financing section (c).
- We take note that most of the letters of cofinancing are in French. Please, provide informal translation.

Agency Response

UNDP response ? 16 Aug 2023

IUCN has been changed to donor agency in Section C. of the CEO ER on p.3.

A description was added on how investment mobilized was identified in Section C. of the CEO ER, on p.4.

Translations have been added after each letter of cofinance (PRODOC Annex 13)

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
August 25, 2023

Addressed.

July 6, 2023

Not fully:

- The value mentioned under the CI 6.1 on carbon sequestered seems very low. We are taking note on the information provided in the annex 14b, but we cannot really find the rationale to get these numbers, except that the 250,000 ha under SLM are not included. Please, clarify and complete.

- 250,000 ha under SLM should provide some carbon benefits... If not, please describe the definition of SLM, the nature of operations, and the kind of natural habitat that is targeted.

Agency Response
UNDP response ? 16 Aug 2023

The calculation of the GHG benefits had erroneously not included the effects of SLM on the 250,000 ha (mainly through improved fire management reducing the degradation level of the

vegetation). The value was revised to include benefits from the 250,000ha under improved management. The new value of -6,480,827 tCO₂e was inserted into Section E. of the CEO Endorsement Request on p. 5. The attached file on p.5 presenting the calculations has also been revised accordingly, and the EX-ACT calculations have also been inserted to the CEO ER document.

The corrected numbers have been inserted into the Results Framework (Annex A, p. 76 of the CEO ER) and the Monitoring Plan (p. 60 of the CEO ER) as well.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

Yes

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

Yes

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
July 6, 2023

Yes

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 6, 2023

Yes

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 25, 2023

Addressed.

July 6, 2023

Not fully.

Please describe the interventions from cofinancing and justify the added value of the GEF increment.

Agency Response

UNDP response ? 16 August 2023

The incremental cost reasoning has been revised on p.38 of the CEO ER, highlighting the gaps remaining after the baseline investments which focus largely on SLM and restoration activities but do not support LDN monitoring across scales, and do not put a focus on social cohesion at the core of their interventions without which SLM interventions may not be sustainable on the longer term.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 25, 2023

Addressed.

July 6, 2023

See the comments on core indicators.

Agency Response

UNDP response ? 16 August 2023

The calculation of GHG benefits has been revised ? see response above.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 6, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 25, 2023

Addressed.

The geographic coordinates are available in the Annex D "Project Map(s) and Coordinates".

July 6, 2023

Maps are available. However, we did not find the geographical coordinates of targeted landscapes. Please, correct.

Agency Response

UNDP response ? 16 August 2023

Geocoordinates of the 3 communes have been inserted to Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Request.

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 6, 2023

Addressed

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 6, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 6, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
August 25, 2023

Addressed.

July 6, 2023

See the comments on safeguards.

Agency Response

UNDP response ? 16 August 2023

Please see response to comments on safeguards further below.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

- The project will be implemented following the National Implementation Modality (NIM), according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Burkina Faso, and the Country Programme. No execution support will be provided by UNDP; however, a third party will be contracted by the SP/CNDD to support the government in the execution of the project.

- The SP/CNDD (Secr?ariat Permanent du Conseil National pour le D?veloppement Durable) will act as " Implementing Partner" (UNDP sensu) for this project under the Ministry of Environment, Energy, Water and Sanitation. SP/CNDD will coordinate the sustainable

development project by playing a key role in supporting the project and by coordinating and synergizing with other projects, programmes and initiatives. It will also provide the necessary institutional support as the leading executing partner.

- Because of the current instability situation of Burkina Faso, we support the involvement of a third party: IUCN which has prior experience in the implementation of GEF projects in the country. IUCN has been selected based on comparative advantage to provide execution support. The third party will be contracted by the IP according to Government procedures.

Addressed.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 6, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 25, 2023

See p78, Table 6 " Overview of knowledge management Activities timeline and indicative budget".

Addressed.

July 6, 2023

No.

- Knowledge Management: While there is an overall budget figure for Component 3 which includes KM and communications activities, the KM section does not indicate what the budget is for key KM and communications activities.
- There is also no timeline provided for the implementation of KM and communications deliverables. Therefore, the agency is requested to provide a simple table with timelines and budgets for key KM and communications activities and deliverables.

Agency Response

UNDP response ? 16 August 2023

The requested table was added with timeline and budget for proposed KM activities on p.56 of the CEO ER.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
August 25, 2023

Addressed.

July 6, 2023

Following existing policies (SD/PL/03 updated on June 13, 2019) and guidelines (SD/GN/03, approved on December 19, 2019), as this project is classified with substantial risks, an Environmental and Social Management Plan should be submitted to address identified types and levels of risks.

- We are surprised to only find a draft ESMP (not signed),
- And to see that the Environment and Social Impact Assessment is proposed as an activity during the first six months of the project, serving as a baseline for the Environmental and Social Management Plan, the Indigenous People Plan.
- Please, clarify if these activities are financed by the remaining PPG resources (\$78,099.29) and/or if GEF project resources will be used.

As a reminder of SD/PL/03: ?At CEO Endorsement/Approval, Agencies provide additional information regarding the relevant Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts associated with the proposed project, and associated measures to address such risks and impacts,

including any environmental and social assessments carried out, and any Environmental and Social Management Plans or the equivalent.?

As a reminder of SD/GN/03: For projects and programs identified ?High? or ?Substantial? risk classification, supporting documentation such as a management plan is required (such as e.g. environmental and social management plans or frameworks, resettlement action plan or frameworks, livelihood restoration plan, indigenous peoples plan, natural resource management plan, and labor management procedure).

Agency Response

UNDP response ? 16 August 2023

The project is indeed rated as ?substantial risk? through the Social-Environmental Screening Procedure (ESP ? Annex 5 to the PRODOC) and in compliance with UNDP's SES Policy, the following documents have been prepared during the PPG and their final, cleared versions are included in the project package: (1) Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF ? Annex 9), including an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF); (2) Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 8); (3) Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan (Annex 10). The ESMF erroneously had ?draft? in the title, and this has been corrected now ? this is indeed the version that has been cleared by UNDP safeguards specialists through UNDP's internal clearance processes after careful review - we apologize for this oversight. UNDP procedure is that the safeguards documents (SESP, ESMF) are not signed prior to submission, but only after CEO endorsement and prior to issuing the Delegation of Authority to the Resident Representative of the respective UNDP Country Office, in case changes should be requested during the GEF review. All documents presented for review by the GEF, have, however, been passed through UNDP's internal clearance requirements, with due diligence recorded in our project information management system.

As outlined in the SESP (Annex 5 - p. 14), the following assessments and plans will be elaborated at the beginning of the project:

?An **ESIA** (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) will be developed within the first 6 months of the project, including an **Economic Displacement Risk Assessment** and a Conflict Analysis and Assessment, based on an Environmental and Social Baseline Analysis ? as part of the ESIA - that will enhance the knowledge of the local context.

An **ESMP** (Environmental and Social Management Plan) for each commune will be developed by the first year of project implementation, including the **Livelihood Action Plan**, if needed. The ESMPs will include the findings of the ESIA, that will include a context analysis that will take into consideration and will analyse the data on ethnic minorities (such as Peuls and Tuaregs) and on artisanal mining, that is a practice in the local context.

The project is strongly focused on upstream activities, strengthening policies and institutional framework, therefore those aspects will be assessed following the SESA process, that will be

developed by the first 6 months of the project. The SESA will focus on the outputs 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 2.1.1.

An **Indigenous Peoples Plan** will be developed by the first year of the project, ensuring the involvement and engagement, including the FPIC process, of any indigenous peoples groups, tribes or ethnic minorities who can be consulted.

A **Grievance Redress Mechanism** (GRM) will be developed by the first 3 months of the project. This mechanism will ensure stakeholder (including indigenous peoples and/or minorities) can have access to a feedback mechanism ensuring their meaningful participation to project activities.

The SESA findings will be included in an **Action Matrix**.

Elaboration of the ESIA, ESMP, SESA and related plans at the beginning of the project is standard UNDP procedure. The PPG phase does not usually offer enough time for the elaboration of these plans, which also benefit from the involvement of the PMU. The elaboration and implementation of these documents is budgeted under the GEF project budget (budget lines 14, 15, 17); PPG resources are not used for this purpose.

We would like to emphasize that the volatile security situation in Burkina Faso has been taken into consideration at all stages of the design of this project, including during the field visits, and will also guide the project implementation (e.g. through a Security Plan as part of the ESMP), building on UNDP's substantial experience in implementing projects under substantial-risk conditions in this and other countries of the region.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response **Benefits**

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 6, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 28, 2023

Addressed.

August 25, 2023

Not addressed. We did not find the excel budget in the portal documents and in the project document we can read under the annex 1: " GEF Budget Template: To be provided by MSPU after TBWP clearance. Please provide the excel budget.

July 6, 2023

Budget

- The excel budget would be useful in attached document.
- Please, clarify the meaning of the activity ? inputs for SLM activities, \$60,000 and inputs for peace farm activities.
- Please, justify why there is a ?equipment? line of 2728 US\$ for computers and phones under the component 2 and not under pmc.
- \$90,000 is budgeted for a rental and maintenance under the component 2: it should be covered by the pmc. Please, correct.
- Please, justify the budget of \$144,000 for a gender and safeguards specialist under the component 3.
- The lumpsum of 1,269,988 to recruit a NGO should be developed. It is extremely difficult with the proposed presentation to have clear idea about what is financed. Please, correct and provide a budget line by line.
- Printing services (5,000) should be covered by pmc and not the component 1.

- Program Manager's Terms of References (pages 3 ? 4 of Annex 18 attached) describe a set of activities that cannot reasonably be covered only by 20% of the resources allocated in the budget line presented below. However, there is no other budget line that makes reference to the remaining 80%: this inconsistency needs to be amended.

Agency Response

UNDP response ? 28 August 2023

Please note that the budget previously presented as a separate annex has been included in the latest Project document under Annex 1. The same is now attached as a separate document.

UNDP response ? 16 August 2023

a) An Excel version of the budget (in GEF Budget template) is submitted as part of the submission package and available in the relevant section of the portal.

b) In line with the description of Output 2.1.3, additional details have been added to Budget Note 6 of the revised Project Document on p.77.

c) Moved to PMC

d) Moved to PMC

e) The salary for the gender and safeguards specialist was reduced to USD70,000 in accordance with the budget outlined in the ESMF and after consultation with the CO. A budget line was added to account for an additional international consultant to support the development of key safeguards plans in the first year of project implementation, at USD60,000 (Budget note 17).

f) In addition to Budget Note 5 in revised Project Document, details of the different MoUs are already presented in Annex 6 of the Project Document.

g) Moved to PMC

h) In the revised budget, the project manager's role is covered at 100% under Component 1 (28%) and PMC (72%). This is detailed in Budget Line 1 and Budget Line 28 of the revised Project Document. Moreover, the role description of the project management, which was split under PMC and Component 1 in Annex 6 of the Project Document, has been merged into a single role description of the Project Manager responsibilities to avoid confusion. Budgeting part of the PM salary under Component 1 is justified by the technical role as Senior Advisor

on LDN Monitoring and Governance that this staff member will play during part of his or her time.

It is important to note that the monthly salaries, and total number of months of work, assigned to PMU staff have been revised after further consultation with UNDP Country Office to accommodate additional charges to the PMC budget.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

Addressed

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

Yes, comments from Canada, Germany, and USA were addressed.

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 6, 2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
August 25, 2023

Addressed.

July 6, 2023

- Maps are available. However, we did not find the geographical coordinates of targeted landscapes. Please, correct.

- Geolocation: In Annex E on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field. This includes the Location Name, Latitude and Longitude. Further guidance and resources on how to proceed is provided in the write up just below the title of Annex E.

Agency Response

UNDP response ? 16 August 2023

See earlier response regarding addition of geocoordinates.

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
August 28, 2023

The project is recommended for Council circulation.

August 25, 2023

Please, see the comment on the budget. All comments have been addressed, but one. The project cannot be recommended yet for Council circulation.

July 6, 2023

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please address comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/6/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/27/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations