

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

Basic Information

GEF ID

11003

Countries

Burkina Faso

Project Title

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

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6678

GEF Focal Area(s)

Land Degradation

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

May 10, 2022

Addressed.

April 16, 2022

- The PIF is developed under the LD2.5 objective. It is a possibility. to be confirmed.
- The UNDP Audit Checklist is missing. This document should be included in every PIF or project submission from UNDP.

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

Response to point #1:

Yes, the project is developed under the LD2.5 objective. This keeps the project strategy simpler than if two or three LD Objectives had been selected. This will also help keep the target expected under the GEF core indicators more attainable and easier to report upon. LD Objective 2.5 is sufficiently broad to encompass what the project will focus on, in particular the mainstreaming of SLM and LDN. In the PIF, Part II, Section 4 the justification for the focal area LD objective selected (2.5) is provided, along with more details.

UNDP confirms the choice of LD2.5 objective.

Response to point #2:

The audit checklist has been included with the resubmission.

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

May 10, 2022

Addressed.

- Please, confirm during the PPG that the proposed activities aims to generate global environment benefits. Irrigation, even small-scale irrigation, should be well thought to be justified. The complementarity with cofinancing will be reviewed at CEO endorsement. The added-value of GEF resources should be demonstrated.

April 16, 2022

- The activation of the national coalition is a very good proposal (output. 1.3), as well as the implementation of platforms at local level (multi-stakeholder platform (output 2.1).

- We would like to see during the PPG an action plan or terms of reference to support this national coalition to push the LDN agenda beyond the environmental sector (agriculture, land-luse planning, ...) and promote integration at national and landscape/local level. If needed, you can refer to the following STAP document: <https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20multi-stakeholder%20dialogue%20May%202020.pdf>

- Please, clarify the role of irrigated agriculture in this project.

- Component 2: Please clarify who you name "extension services" and please, consider a very broad definition of potential agriculture advisory services: from experts from the Ministry of Agriculture, to farmer organizations, "chambre d'agriculture", Research centers, NGOs, Farmer Field Schools, etc. See <https://www.cirad.fr/en/cirad-news/news/2022/perspective-no.-57-field-schools-for-agroecology>. See also: EL BILALI H. et al., 2022. AGRICULTURE EXTENSION AND ADVISORY SERVICES IN BURKINA FASO AND NIGER. AGROFOR International Journal, Vol. 7, Issue No. 1, 2022 5 Review paper 10.7251/AGRENG2201005E UDC 338.43.1(662.6); and <https://www.inter-reseaux.org/en/publication/food-sovereignty-brief-n29-are-agricultural-advisory-services-moving-towards-a-revival-in-africa/>

- Output 2.2: about the conception of LDN solutions for different landscapes in the Centre-Nord region: please clarify the origin of resources (capacity building, financing).

- About the knowledge platform (under output 4.2) to be established with online and face-to-face elements, including project stakeholders and all related initiatives (peace building, adaptation, mitigation, sustainable agriculture etc.): Please, clarify the role and anchorage of this platform.

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 11 May 2022

We confirm that the question of GEBs of small-scale irrigation, including the possibility of cofinance, will be thoroughly explored and discussed during the PPG.

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

Response to point #1)

During the PPG, the project preparation team and UNDP will work with the government to activate and strengthen the National Coalition for Sustainable Land Management (CNGDT). This will be operationalized by through output 1.3.

The CNGDT is only newly formed – it met for the first time in January 2022. CNGDT is chaired by the Permanent Secretariat for the Coordination of Agricultural Sectoral Policies (SP/CPSA) – an organ of the ministry responsible for agriculture (*Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Ressources animales et halieutiques*) – and co-chaired by the Permanent Secretariat for the National Council for the Sustainable Development (SP/CNDD), under the ministry responsible for environmental affairs (*Ministère de l'Environnement, de l'Energie, de l'Eau et de l'Assainissement*). One of the key goals of the CNGDT is to promote cross-sectoral integration for LDN, both at the national and landscape/local levels.

The LDN agenda is already perceived by the sectors as being cross-cutting and going beyond the mandate of the environmental sector only. Typical sectors that are relevant for LDN in Burkina Faso include: agriculture, forests, water, spatial planning, mining, local development, gender inclusion, tenure, among others. What is needed is to develop practical mechanisms for integrated land-use planning and implementation and engaging a wider set of stakeholders.

Expected outputs of this work during the PPG can be at least two (indicatively):

(a) the development / consolidation of a mandate (or terms of reference) to the National Coalition for Sustainable Land Management (CNGDT) for leading the coordination such efforts, which will establish the mechanisms for cross-sectoral collaboration in view of integrated planning at the landscape level; and

(b) the preparation of an action plan on how the above-referred mandate can be implemented.

According to the LDN-SCF, three pillars are important in the integration process and will help define the mandate of the Coalition and of other stakeholder, and outline the action plan proposed further up: (i) Land policies and regulations; (ii) Land Use Planning & Management;

and (iii) Land information.

The action plan will have progressive steps with the aim of achieving the first practical application of LDN on the ground. Inspired by the STAP 2020 Guiding Note on 'Multi-stakeholder Dialogue [MSD] for transformational change', these progressive steps will start with mere information exchanges, to then be gradually strengthened towards include collaborative management of landscapes involving all relevant sectors and stakeholders. With reference to 2020 STAP guidance, this would equate to moving at least three steps in the 'ladder of citizen participation' (refer the STAP publication's box 1). All processes that involve multiple sectors and stakeholders are complex. The MSD offers a list of catalytic elements for a more successful process. The guidance will be followed. Additionally, the application of 'LDN frameworks', as referred to in the Scientific Conceptual Framework for LDN (LDN-SCF) will also inspire the gradual processes foreseen in Outputs 1.3 and 1.2.

Response to point #2)

Concerning the project's approach to irrigation concerns small perimeters only, with horticulture and using the most sustainable and low-impact, low-cost techniques. Through the PAMED, UNDP is supporting farmers in other regions of Burkina Faso to apply small scale irrigation schemes in family farming horticulture systems using drip irrigation as the preferred technique. There are good results so far at, including cost-wise. For the GEF project in question, the strategy will be similar. The work in question will be operationalized in output 2.3, where we made a slight correction to specify that we are actually referring to small-scale irrigation. Despite the limitations to scale, UNDP safeguards concerning irrigation would be triggered, and the necessary impact studies will be developed.

Response to point #3:

Indeed different players are able to provide advisory services to land users on agriculture, forests, pasture and livestock management and several related topics – not just government officials. Globally, such services are becoming increasingly segmented.

In Burkina Faso, much of the extension services at the landscape level is rendered by the OPA/SCOOPs, which stand for 'producer associations & cooperatives and professional agricultural organizations (after the French term *'organisations professionnelles agricoles / sociétés coopératives'*). The Ministry of Agriculture maintains a database of OPA/SCOOPs across the country. There is a comparatively high number of those in the Centre Nord region in relation to other regions.

We examined the relevant literature on the performance of extension systems. We noted the 2022 CIRAD article, which had been recommended by the GEF Secretariat.[1] We analyzed the different trajectories towards agro-ecological systems by farmer field schools (FFS) respectively in Burkina Faso and Togo. While Togo maintained collaborative FFS, Burkina's FFS had a more consultative style. Both achieved results. But with differences. The different techniques and approaches to extension services will be taken into consideration during the PPG period.

Response to point #4:

Response to point #4:

GEF resources will go to capacity building and the funds will be within the project's budget. Investments, including for scale and infrastructures will come from the co-financing. The conceptualization of LDN solutions under output 2.2. is primarily linked to the innovative, collaborative and integrated land use planning, aimed at reducing land-based conflict and promoting responsible, inclusive and gender-sensitive land governance. This is what the GEF funds will deliver.

Response to point #5:

In order to ensure sustainability, institutional anchorage of initiatives such as the one in output 4.2 need to be ensured. In this case, the anchorage will be with SP/CNDD. The project governance mechanisms, it is possible to support a broad technical advisory committee or a working ground, also inspired by the guidance included in the STAP 2020 Guiding Note on 'Multi-stakeholder Dialogue [MSD] for transformational change.

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

April 16, 2022

May 10, 2022

Addressed.

April 16, 2022

- \$400,000 are provided in cofinancing by the government, but UNDP cannot include it in the budget. We wonder if this cofinancing 1) should be maintained and 2) should be considered as a grant and investment mobilized. To clarify and correct

be maintained and 2) should be considered as a grant and investment mobilized. To clarify and correct.

- By deduction, please confirm that the other cofinancing amounts (from Sweden, Canada, and Germany) are managed by UNDP.
- The ownership and commitment from the government is indispensable, also to anticipate sustainability issues. See if it is possible to increase the cofinancing from the government and include it in the budget.

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

Response to point #1:

The description and classification of the government's contribution to the project's co-financing has been corrected.

The Government intends to contribute \$400,000 as in-kind co-finance to this project, managed by SP/CNDD in the form of senior staff time of different public entities in LDN relevant topics (not just from the Ministry of Environment, but also others involved in the National Coalition for Sustainable Land Management - CNGDT). The co-financing contribution from government reflects their senior officials' participation in Project Board meetings and other project activities. It may possibly also include governmental subsidies to staff and young trainees for helping build the knowledge platforms foreseen in Component 4 and ensure its sustainable management by embedding the results of the Components in the host institution. SP/CNDD intends to also leverage the support of other government entities within and outside the CNGDT. The scope of the government will be assessed and detailed during the PPG.

Response to point #2:

The nature of the co-financing from Sweden, Canada, and Germany had been made explicit in the PIF. For now, amounts are indicative and tied to ODA programs that are currently on-going and funded by the entities listed. There is information on this in Part I, Table C, as well as in Part II, Table 1 (Baseline projects contributing co-finance to the GEFTF/LDCF project). These funds will not be managed by UNDP.

UNDP had also indicated in Part II, Table 7 (Key stakeholders and potential roles in the project) that the projects, programs and initiatives that provide the prospective co-financing to this project from the baseline had been thoroughly described in Table 1. This pertains from bilateral donors as sources and potentially also from the EU. At this stage, a dialogue with the Embassy of Sweden and other ODA partners is on-going and it may be possible to develop a joint pipeline of new projects around the LDN idea.

UNDP had additionally indicated in a separate stakeholder engagement report submitted to the GEF along with the PIF that a donor round table concerning the project is slated to take place in late April 2022 or later (currently planned for May 2022). The plans will soon advance and there will be more certainty about the co-financing.

All project co-financiers will have a seat at the project board, influence project planning and take part in all of the important project decisions.

Response to point #3:

Government commitment is high. At the same time, it is possible but very rare that the government of Burkina Faso, entrusts funds to UNDP for managing them together with projects. Currently, the government is cash-strapped. Therefore, it is not possible to increase the government contribution.

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

April 16, 2022

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 16, 2022

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 16, 2022

Yes: LD.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

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

April 16, 2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 13, 2022

Addressed.

May 10, 2022

- In the table of core indicators, we can read a target of 350,000 ha under the Core Indicator 4. However, in the text and in the table 3 on incremental reasoning, we can read a target of 250,000 ha. Please, revise.

April 16, 2022

- There are different numbers in the text and the indicators that would deserve some clarifications, and eventually corrections.

- Under the core indicator 3 on restoration, 10,000 ha are targeted. Please, confirm.

- Under the core indicator 4.3 (SLM), 1.1 million ha are targeted for "avoided degradation". This target seems quite high, with a potential confusion with the definition of SLM and the role of the project. In a country of 27.4 million ha, it is difficult to buy that a \$4 million grant is going to develop SLM on 1.1 million ha. Moreover, elsewhere in the text, it is mentioned that 20,000 ha and 80,000 ha of pastures and woodlands will be targeted by LDN strategies to avoid land degradation. Under the core indicator 4.3, we expect to find a target in ha that will benefit from a mix of capacity development, access to resources (knowledge, credit, grant), and eventually planning to justify SLM. The target of 1.1 million ha does not seem realistic. Moreover, this target is not aligned with the number of beneficiaries (19,000), knowing that the average farm size in Burkina Faso is 3-6 ha. Please, clarify and correct.

- There is a notion of "indirect contribution" to reach 20% of the national target (1.1 million ha). We do not understand this notion of indirect contribution that does not seem acceptable to estimate the targets. You can refer to the ha reached by the GEF project + cofinancing, but the notion of indirect contribution does not exist.

Agency Response

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 11 May 2022

This has been corrected. The overall area target is 250,000 ha. This includes 20,000 ha of pasture areas and 80,000 ha of woodlands.

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

Response to point #1:

There are different numbers because we propose to apply different 'LDN strategies' (avoid, reduce, reverse) to different 'land use systems'. The latter includes:

- intensively used productive lands: cropland;
- intensively used productive lands: pastures near critical waterways;
- intensively used productive lands: woodland areas near critical waterways;
- open access pasture and common property woodlands and shrubs, displaying light to moderate degradation
- wider landscape management with approx. 250K ha of multi-use rangelands across communes, displaying only light or no degradation.

Also, different land use systems may display different degrees of land degradation and, depending on conditions on the ground, different strategies should to apply.

We refer to PIF Table 4 (Estimation of area in the practical application of the LDN Response Hierarchy in this project) and to PIF Part III, ANNEX A. CORE INDICATOR WORKSHEET. In the mentioned tables, the number of hectares, which are but indicative, are sorted and calculated. Annex A provides detail and Table 4 a summary. During the PPG, the numbers will be sorted in through mapping and proposed locations will be validated. By then, there will be more clarity on what the project sets out to achieve on the ground.

Response to point #2:

For now, we confirm that 10,000 ha is the target. It is the sum for targets under Core Indicators 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. The indicative break-downs are provided in PIF Part III, ANNEX A. CORE INDICATOR WORKSHEET. UNDP would like though to clarify the working definition of restoration considered in this case is primarily about rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems.

The work at hand will focus on improving the productivity of pasture, applying agro-forestry techniques in areas where such land use systems are suitable and enforce longer fallow periods where possible.

Rehabilitation will also focus on restoring some of the ecological functions and structure in riparian strips, but in small areas.

Considering these rehabilitation and restoration techniques from an LDN strategy, we have both 'reduce' and 'reverse'. Therefore the targets for Core Indicator 3 'Area of land restored' add up to 10,000 ha.

for Core Indicator 5. Area of land restored add up to 10,000 ha.

Response to point #3:

Initially, we had assessed that a broader approach to landscape management through active land-use planning across wider landscapes would be considered as a way of avoiding degradation. This would include simple and enforceable measures linked to e.g. a coordinated land-use planning with the mining sector and a proactive management of large livestock corridors and ranges together with stakeholders. The target areas could potentially be large. Therefore, we had initially suggested 1.0 million ha (about half of the surface Centre-Nord region).

However, to be more precise about the area targeted, we reduced the figure of 1 million ha to 250,000 ha (relating to Core indicator 4.3), both in PIF Part III, ANNEX A. CORE INDICATOR WORKSHEET, and in Part I, Table F. In other passages where the figure had been mentioned were also corrected.

Response to point #4:

The idea of an 'indirect target' for areas that benefit from the project is no longer included in the PIF. The text in question has been removed. The use of the term 'indirect', could have been confounded with work that can be done at the landscape level to avoid degradation, or with potential contributions to area-based targets through baseline co-financing interventions. With the edits performed. There is clarity now on what the project can effectively deliver.

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

May 10, 2022

Addressed.

April 16, 2022

The following information is provided for the purpose of transparency:

The list of keywords seems embryonic. To be completed

For instance: LDN, SLM, agriculture, women, smallholder farmers, drought, indigenous people, fragility, conflict, vulnerability, climate risks, displaced people, livestock...

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

The taxonomy has been updated. Please refer to CEO ER, Annex C, Taxonomy.

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

April 16, 2022

Yes, there is an interesting ToC built on the LDN principles.

Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 10, 2022

Addressed.

April 16, 2022

- About the lessons from the CPP (p.16-17), it is true indeed that the CPP was a pilot and successful national programmatic approach with a series of SLM projects in the Centre West region and the "Boucles of Mohoun" implemented by UNDP and in the North region by IFAD, completed with a national coordination project also developed by UNDP. We could also consider the SILEM from the WB (GEFID 1178, Sahel Integrated Lowland Ecosystem Management/SILEM), as an additional component of this SLM approach that brought a lot in terms of SLM results, lessons, and capacities. We recommend UNDP during PPG to dig into the lessons of this programmatic approach and the different field projects.
- However, we wonder the interest to recuperate and revive any relevant databases from this period (as proposed in the PIF, table 2 p17). Without forgetting all the good points of the CPP, we may also question some issues related to the sustainability of the approach and the commitment from concerned stakeholders from local to national. We would be pleased to see this issue of sustainability assessed and analyzed, considering the commitment from national and local institutions, as well as national and local budgets.
- We also suggest including these sustainability aspects in the risks and assumptions of the ToC.
- Please, during the PPG, check the portfolio from IFAD. It seems to us that they were active in the North region, starting with the CPP region in the North region (GEFID 3567).

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

Response to point #1:

During the PPG, lessons from the early intervention 'GEFID 1178, Sahel Integrated Lowland Ecosystem Management/SILEM' will be fully explored. A note on it was added to Table 2. Other related initiatives concurrent with the GEFTF project. We read their brochure with attention:

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Burkina-Faso-final-web2_0.pdf.

However, UNDP found it relevant to stress the importance of the BDOT recuperation success story and added a long footnote on it. Edits to Table 2 were made.

Response to point #2:

In Table 2, we changed the formulations relating to the CPP by mentioning the following:

If relevant and useful, databases that may have been produced in connection with the CPP can be attempted recuperated and revived, just like the BDOT national database on land use was recuperated and put to use. The BDOT case is actually stressed within the relevant scientific community as an emblematic success story in putting land use data to good use. Further to this, the important legacy from the SILEM will also be attempted recuperated during the PPG.

BDOT is Burkina Faso Land Use Database. Burkina has possessed a database on land use compliant with a scale of 1:100,000 since 2005. This database was created by the IGB (Burkina Faso Geographic Institute – see <https://www.ignfi.fr/en/portfolio-item/occupation-des-terres-burkina-fao/>) in collaboration with IGN FI over the period 2004-2005 for the direct benefit of the PNGT 2 (National land management program), a program run by the country's Ministry of Agriculture. This biophysical land occupation inventory called BDOT1992 and BDOT2002, adapted using European experience gained from CORINE Land Cover, contains more than forty types of land use is linked to a database tracing changes from 1992-2002 "BDOT_Change1992-2002". It provides precious information on land use and its evolution over the decade for the whole of Burkina Faso. Currently, BDOT is publicly available online in the easy-access platform "EarthMap" by Google. To highlights how important this is for Burkina Faso, in the proceeds of a 2019 NASA sponsored international conference on land use management, mentioned that Countries like Burkina Faso have made great progress by setting up a horizontal structure, which brings together all the producers, analysts, intermediaries, users, decision makers, and beneficiaries of LULC information. BDOT is mentioned, including with respect to PPP collaboration between IGB and a private consulting outfit (source SERVIR LULC Conference Report February 2019, Conference: West Africa Land Classification and Methodologies Conference, held in Accra, Ghana, June 4-7, 2018At: Accra, Ghana – see:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331276537_SERVIR_LULC_Conference_Report, accessed on 01/05/22).

Noting that the CPP was part of the PNGT 2, UNDP agrees with the GEF Secretariat that the issue of sustainability is very important and will be assessed and analyzed in depth in the PPG.

The commitment from national and local institutions is certainly key for sustainability. The possibilities of engaging national and local budgets will be discussed, also during the PPG, but it is important to consider the national circumstances in Burkina Faso. In order to strengthen the pursuit of sustainability goals since design, UNDP intends to use participatory methods in the engagement of key stakeholders to consider a realist forecasting and backcasting of what the GEF intervention can effectively deliver, and thereafter leave as impact and legacy. The TOC will be liberally used in such exercises of stakeholder engagement during the PPG, exactly with this purpose.

Response to point #3:

UNDP thanks for the suggestion of including sustainability in the TOC. We believe that sustainability is implicit in it, but we made it explicit anyway in a couple of boxes on the right side of Figure 4. Theory of Change (TOC).

Response to point #4:

UNDP has already contacted its sister Agency IFAD to query about past and current projects in Burking Faso. Indeed it is worth learning more about the successes that they had through the CPP intervention in the North region (GEFID 3567). We retrieved some reports from

that period (around 2007) and they are worth consulting for lessons-learning.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 16, 2022

Yes, there is a very interesting reasoning to build the ToC, using the LDN framework.

Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 16, 2022

Yes, the project is developed under the LD2.5 objective.

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

April 16, 2022

Yes

Agency Response

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

May 10, 2022

Addressed.

April 16, 2022

See above (Part I, item 6) about the indicators.

No, the proposed targets contributing to GEB do not seem reasonable and achievable.

To be revised.

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

We reduced the figure of 1 million ha to 250,000 ha (relating to Core indicator 4.3), both in PIF Part III, ANNEX A. CORE INDICATOR WORKSHEET, and in Part I, Table F. I other passages where the figure had been mentioned were also corrected.

A related correction was also made to Table 3. Incremental cost reasoning.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 10, 2022

Addressed.

April 16, 2022

- Yes about innovation with the development of a LDN framework.
- Sustainability: to be developed (see also some comments above about sustainability).
- Scaling up: yes, included in the LDN framework.
- Please, see how you can move forward the potential for integration/multi-sector approaches.

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

Response to point #1:

The issue of sustainability is very important and will be assessed and analyzed in depth in the PPG. The commitment from national and local institutions is certainly key for sustainability. The possibilities of engaging national and local budgets will be discussed, also during the PPG, but it is important to consider the national circumstances in Burkina Faso. In order to strengthen the pursuit of sustainability goals since design, UNDP intends to use participatory methods in the engagement of key stakeholders to consider a realist forecasting and backcasting of what the GEF intervention can effectively deliver, and thereafter leave as impact and legacy. The TOC will be liberally used in such exercises of stakeholder engagement during the PPG, exactly with this purpose.

Some edits were made in Part II, Section 7 (Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up), in order to reflect the enhanced approach towards sustainability.

As explained in the mentioned section, the strengthening of the National Coalition for Sustainable Land Management (CNGDT) foreseen under Output 1.3 will specifically cater for aspects of stakeholder engagement and sustainability.

Response to point #2:

Integration across sectors and multi-sectoral approaches have more inherent challenges than single-sector approaches. However, with certain topics—and LDN is one of them—a cross-sectoral approach is needed.

We are inspired by the STAP 2020 Guiding Note on 'Multi-stakeholder Dialogue [MSD] for transformational change', these progressive steps will start with mere information exchanges, to then be gradually strengthened towards include collaborative management of landscapes involving all relevant sectors and stakeholders. With reference to 2020 STAP guidance, this would equate to moving at least three steps in the 'ladder of citizen participation' (refer the STAP publication's box 1). All processes that involve multiple sectors and stakeholders are complex. The MSD offers the catalytic elements for a more successful process. The guidance will be followed. Additionally, the application of 'LDN frameworks', as referred to in the Scientific Conceptual Framework for LDN (LDN-SCF) will also inspire the gradual processes foreseen in Outputs 1.3 and 1.2.

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

April 16, 2022

Yes

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?

appropriate? Does the PIF/FPD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 16, 2022

Yes

Agency Response

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

April 16, 2022

Yes, there is a very interesting tentative to mainstream gender issues in the LDN framework. to be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 10, 2022

Addressed.

April 16, 2022

Yes at PIF level. To be reinforced during the PPG and at CEO endorsement. Please, confirm.

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

UNDP confirms that the engagement of the private sector will be strengthened during the PPG. A key stakeholder for assisting with this purpose is Farmers' Confederation from Faso (CPF). Not only they are a member of the 'National Coalition for Sustainable Land Management (CNGDT), but they are also a national umbrella organization that brings together 14 other umbrella organizations of agricultural producers, which will be engaged in the project through the Coalition and through CPF.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

May 10, 2022

Addressed.

April 16, 2022

Yes. However, please, consider the risks related to a possible weak commitment from the government and a top sectoral approach. It

ies. However, please, consider the risks related to a possible weak commitment from the government and a too sectoral approach. It seems a recurrent difficulty in past projects (CPP): to promote intersectoral decisions and frameworks for integration and have domestic financial contributions for sustainability.

Agency Response

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

The GEF Secretariat appears to suggest that weak commitment from the government and a narrow sectoral approach seems to be “a recurrent difficulty in past projects”, and mentions the CPP – a program approved for implementation in GEF-3 (around 2009/10) and whose last evaluation was concluded in 2018. The GEF Secretariat asks UNDP to consider that such patterns may occur again, and that this should be addressed as a risk.

In the risk table (Table 8), there are three risks that directly relate to the possibility of weak commitment from the government and of challenges in the pursuit of an integrated approach to land use planning: risks #1, #4 and #5. Other risks in Table 8 relate to these possibilities indirectly (e.g. #2, #4 and #6).

All project risks listed in Table 8 have been meticulously formulated in relation to the assumptions that were included in the TOC. They reflect the possibility of these assumptions not realizing – assumptions that serve to underpin the project strategy and its scope, including the issues that it will address and those that the project cannot address but will consider as part of the ‘system’. Therefore, UNDP does not see the need to propose a new risk or to amend the formulation of existing risks. Yet, in response to the comment from the GEF Secretariat, the overall risk level has been revisited and the risk mitigation responses strengthened.

Changes were made to Table 8 as follows:

- Risks ratings for risk #1 and #5 were elevated to ‘Moderate’.
- The risk rating for #6 was corrected to ‘Moderate’, but remained the same, given that ‘medium’ (previous formulation) is not the correct terminology for ratings.
- A more thorough set of mitigation measures were included for risks #1, #4 and #5;
- Risk mitigation measures were slightly amended for risk #3

In connection with the reassessment of project risks at PIF stage, it is important to consider exogenous aspects linked to governance in Burkina Faso. During the CPP’s design, implementation and evaluation timeline (2009/10 through to 2018), Burkina Faso went through a number of disruptive events that affected institutional stability, and still continue to affect it.

In order to adequately consider in the proposed project the risk of weak commitment from the government and the risk of an excessively narrow sectoral approach it is important to effectively learn the lessons from past projects. At PIF stage, it is particularly important to mitigate it preemptively, and considering that, during the PPG, the ground can be laid for taking the necessary measures into consideration.

The official repository for UNDP’s evaluations is <https://erc.undp.org/>. Evaluation reports were consulted, especially those for the CPP project. UNDP has also reached out to IFAD, which implemented one out of four GEF-3 CPP projects, and queried about the lessons learned and from their CPP experience. Finally, UNDP has also considered a related and relevant evaluation exercise, namely the 2020 “Independent

Country Program Evaluation, Burkina Faso”, conducted by UNDP Independent Evaluation Office and covering the previous programming (2018-2019), which can be accessed in: <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12267>.

Indeed the CPP made important efforts to promote intersectoral decisions and frameworks for ‘integration’, in particular CPP National Coordination Project (GEF Project ID 3884). One of the lessons reads as follows (translated):

"[S]takeholders have internalized the principles of GEF intervention in terms of SLM: the coordination unit of the CN-CPP Sub-program has internalized the principles of GEF intervention, by developing an intervention partnership with rural development technical services, development projects and programs, local authorities, NGOs, the private sector and civil society. It has implemented an integrated and holistic, participatory approach, based on a multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral approach that applied both nationally (national platform, thematic studies) and in the regions (Centre-Ouest and Boucles du Mouhoun). This approach has made it possible to raise stakeholders' awareness on the complementarity of SLM actions. It has demonstrated its validity even if the issue of financing the platform remains a real challenge."

The ‘2020 Independent Country Program Evaluation (IPCE), Burkina Faso’ considers its assessment of development results and mentions “significant disruption of administration and socio-economic activity, further limiting access to basic public services and weakening social cohesion” when referring to the evolving programming context in the country. As clear recommendations to the UNDP Country Office, the 2020 IPCE also mentions that:

- “[...] UNDP in Burkina Faso has made remarkable efforts to adapt its program and operational capacities to the deteriorating security context and to promote capacity building at national, regional and local levels”
- “[...] the country office will have to strengthen integration and synergies in the design and implementation of its interventions, supported by its newly established regional offices” and
- “It will need to strengthen partnerships with key development players and continue to focus on
- targeting the most vulnerable segments of the population. Such a consolidated approach must be grounded in an intervention logic, and based on knowledge management systems, that will guide the development of the next program.”

The 2020 IPCE concludes that “results [...] remain fragile, and the sustainability of interventions, particularly those that target institutional strengthening, is undermined by the limited scope and resources.”

In this light, the risk of weak government commitment and the barriers to an integrated approach to land use planning and management will be taken into consideration. The STAP 2020 Guiding Note on ‘Multi-stakeholder Dialogue [MSD] for transformational change’ will inspire the stakeholder engagement process.

At this stage commitment from the government is strong and manifested through the SP/CNDD and through the strong participation in the PIF development process, which has so far directly engaged 107 unique stakeholders (18-22% women). The PPG will give continuity to the intense engagement of stakeholders in design and decision-making about the project.

Finally, the goals for the project in terms of sustainability are clear from the TOC, now slightly revised to include explicitly include sustainability.

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

May 10, 2022

Please, note that the comments made in the last box will be checked at CEO endorsement, upon the results of the PPG, not at PIF level.

April 16, 2022

Yes

To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

UNDP Response – 11 May 2022

This is noted – thank you for the clarification.

UNDP Response - 07 May 2022

Yes, the arrangement will be confirmed during the PPG.

Please note that ADDITIONAL COMMENTS from GEF side have been placed to the last section that doesn't have any box for entering UNDP responses hence we are entering them here within our last response.

Response to points #1 & # 2)

UNDP has explored Terminal Evaluations and lessons from past SLM and LDCF projects. starting by the CPP and the SILEM.

Through revisions in several sections of the PIF Develop the sustainability aspects, including those related weakness from past projects, have been considered.

Refer to response to comment 11. Refer also to changes to Table 2 (Other related initiatives concurrent with the GEFTF project) and to Table 8 (Project Risks).

Response to point #3)

Slight changes to PIF Part I, Table C, and to table notes on investment mobilized were made to correct the nature of the co-financing from government.

As referred to the response herein to Comment 3, the nature of the co-financing from Sweden, Canada, and Germany had been made explicit in the PIF. For now, amounts are indicative and tied to ODA programs that are currently on-going and funded by the entities listed. There is information on this in Part I, Table C, as well as in Part II, Table 1 (Baseline projects contributing co-finance to the GEFTF/LDCF project). Refer to the mentioned response for additional information on co-financing.

Response to point #4)

Realistic targets under the Core Indicators 3, 4, 6, and 11 have now been presented. Refer to response to Comment 4 for more details.

Response to point #5)

Refer to response to Comment 11 for more details. The arrangement will be confirmed during the PPG.

Response to point #6)

Content in project's Risk table (Table 8) has been revisited and revised. Refer to Agency Response 10 for more details. A full risk analysis with more thorough mitigation measures is now included in the PIF.

Response to point #6)

Part II Section 3 of the PIF includes a sufficiently thorough gender analysis for the current stage of project deployment.

UNDP confirm the strategic mainstreaming of gender issues into the project and into the LDN framework, although it must me mentioned that LDN frameworks, as defined by the Scientific Conceptual Framework for LDN (LDN-SCF), are already includes the delivery of multiple benefits (including gender equality and women's empowerment).

In complementing this response, UNDP stresses that the project is strongly focused on creating gender-sensitive frameworks for LDN, gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment what is reflected in the design of the project components. Output 1.1. includes gender-sensitive approaches to land use planning and management of landscapes and their applications at national and sub-national levels

ensuring proper women participation in the decision-making processes. Component 2 of the project will focus on the activities on the ground with an emphasis on women's inclusion. Output 2.1. will establish or strengthen land use planning and management committees on the ground and will ensure the participation of vulnerable groups, including women and youth. This will contribute to better and more inclusive land use planning decision making on the ground. Output 2.1. will also ensure that traditionally underrepresented groups are being heard and have a real influence over land use-related decisions on the ground. Output 2.3. will operationalize the main idea of Component 2, by implementing selected gender-sensitive LDN solutions on the ground, targeting at least 35% of female-headed beneficiary households. Additionally, all training activities foreseen under this project have ambitious but viable gender targets.

Response to point #7)

UNDP confirm that the private sector will have a role in this project and that this role is described in PIF Part II, Section 4. The engagement of private sector players will be mostly focused on land productive sectors (agriculture, forestry, livestock rearing), although intends to engage during the PPG with players from the extractive sectors (mining industry operating in the project zone). The latter will be primarily in the sense of discussing the approaches to land use planning in the implementation of LDN strategy 'avoid' land degradation across landscapes.

As for the land productive sectors, their engagement has so far been with those from the agricultural business through the Farmers' Confederation from Faso (CPF). A representative from CPF was present in the PIF Validation workshop and participated actively. CPF is one of the five structures / entities that form part of the 'National Coalition for Sustainable Land Management (CNGDT). CPF is a national umbrella organization that brings together 14 other umbrella organizations of agricultural producers.

More details can be found in the PIF Part II, Section 4.

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

April 16, 2022

Yes

Agency Response

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

April 16, 2022

Yes

Agency Response

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 16, 2022

Yes

Agency Response

art 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

April 16, 2022

There is indeed a Letter signed by the current GEF OFP for Burkina Faso, endorsing \$4 million (PPG + project grant + fees).

Addressed.

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

EFSEC 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

May 10, 2022

All comments are addressed at PIF level, but the item 6 on the indicator 4. Please, revise. Upon reception of a revised package, the PIF will be recommended for technical clearance and inclusion in the Work Program. Please, note that the responses to the "additional comments" below will be checked at CEO endorsement, after the PPG.

April 16, 2022

The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the points above.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Dig into the Terminal Evaluations and lessons from past SLM and LDCF projects, starting by the CPP and the SILEM.

- Develop the sustainability aspects (relative weakness from past projects).
- Confirm cofinancing.
- Confirm realistic targets under the Core Indicators 3, 4, 6, and 11.
- Develop the Implementation arrangements.
- Provide a full risk analysis with mitigation measures.
- Confirm the strategic mainstreaming of gender issues into the project and the LDN framework.
- Confirm the role of the private sector.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/16/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

