

Sustainable management of dryland landscapes in Burkina Faso

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10291

Countries

Burkina Faso

Project Name

Sustainable management of dryland landscapes in Burkina Faso

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

12/10/2020

Review completed by PM

5/1/2021

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

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

April 15, 2021

Cleared.

April 5, 2021

- The Rio marker has not been updated to CCM 2: please, complete.

January 22, 2020

Portal issues:

- Rio marker: Please update to CCM 2 (as the project benefits from the Drylands IP incentive cofinanced by CCM).
- Table A: Remove the focal area objectives and only mention the IP SFM Drylands objectives.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 25 March 2021

Rio marker for CCM and table A have been modified in this reviser version

IUCN - 12 April 2021

- Done

- This was done already in the previous submission. Please check the portal and let us know if there is still an issue.

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

April 15, 2021

Cleared.

April 5, 2021

Component 1

- Output 1.1.1 (Activity 1.1.1.2?): we would like to see some activities to measure climate risks and the vulnerability of smallholder farmers. This comment is aligned with a STAP comment to improve the inclusion of resilience in GEF project.

- Outcome 1.2: Please confirm/explain the role of cofinancing related to the Ecovillages. The concept of Ecovillage is very often related by the development of an energy strategy (to find alternative to wood, charcoal, and petrol) with aspects far beyond what can be financed under this GEF project.

- Output 1.1.2: About the ten land-use and restoration plans and the governance aspects, please, explain how the proposed sets of activities are well coordinated with on-going WB and AFD initiatives to equip all communes from Burkina Faso with local development plans in the context of decentralization.

Component 2

- Activity 2.1.2.1: Please explain how the project is well positioned to ?develop production models for the set of agro-sylvo-pastoral value chains that are environmentally friendly and climate-smart to improve their sustainability in each landscape, taking into consideration the local environmental, social and economic context?.

Component 3

- There are several activities in the result framework addressing M&E and KM aspects out of the component 3 and the activity 3.1.1.4. Please, confirm that there is no

duplication of activities in the budget (see 1.1.3.5, 1.1.3.6, 1.2.2.1, 1.2.2.5, 2.1.2.4, and 2.2.2.5).

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

The project recognizes the importance of fully considering climate risks and the vulnerability of local stakeholders, and assuring the project contributes to increased resilience. Activity 1.1.1.2 has been modified to make more apparent that climate risks, as well as the potential for interventions to address vulnerability and strengthen resilience, will be considered in the assessments of restoration opportunities.

The project recognizes that energy interventions, i.e. facilitating access to climate-smart energy services, is a significant component of the development of ecovillages. It intends to develop at household level a strong linkage between access to energy and sustainable land management through the promotion of biodigestors as a climate-smart energy source that helps to neutralize waste, reducing the pollution potential of said waste, while also producing valuable products (fertilizer rich in nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium). It will also complement on-going ecovillage initiatives through assessing the potential interventions that can support more inclusive and resilient supply of ecosystem services, manage natural resources and biodiversity over the long-term, strengthen governance in the rural sector, and improve the performance of agro-sylvo-pastoral production systems, all of which are also key strategies of the project.

The project was designed taking into consideration the ongoing work being supported by the WB and AFD. The ten municipalities targeted under this project are at different points in terms of the development and timeline of their local and regional development plans. These plans provide important and significant information on the environmental, social (including gender aspects), and economic context of each area. They also provide details on social services and development objectives. However, they are not founded on a strong basis of sustainable land management, and do not consistently address issues of land use planning or restoration. Although, land is the main economic assets in rural areas, most local development plans lack of consideration of these issues when weighing different trade-offs. This project will provide additional value to these efforts by

building the capacity of stakeholders to take the landscape, ecosystem approach needed to manage land and resources sustainably, secure ecosystem services and build resilience over the long-term. A key aim of the restoration and LUP processes in this project will be to work with stakeholders to be able to integrate the outputs of the restoration and land use planning processes in the context of their frameworks for integrated development planning and sustainable land management. This includes through the development of Land Charters or other relevant agreements on land and resource use, such as the attestation of rural land property.

The project is well positioned because it intends to demonstrate the linkages between the value chain performance and the ecosystems services they depend on. In fact, current initiatives to develop agro-sylvo-pastoral value chains do not take into consideration the capacity of the ecosystem to maintain steady growth of the value chains until the ecosystems collapse.

The M&E and KM activities and associated budgets have been carefully reviewed and there is no duplication of costs or activities. Costs for results-based monitoring activities and some core support for M&E and KM has been budgeted under components one and two. Component 3 integrates activities and costs to i) manage environmental and social risks, gender inclusion and project-level grievance mediation under A.3.1.1.2; staff and basic equipment to support M&E under A.3.1.1.4; and iii) specific activities and costs related to scaling lessons learned under Output 3.1.3.

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

April 20, 2021

Cleared.

April 15, 2021

The corrections have not been made in the table C: the in-kind cofinancing is still mentioned as "investment mobilized" and the nature of cofinancing is still missing for the Ministry of Animal and fisheries Resources.

April 5, 2021

It is very difficult to consider the in-kind cofinancing as investment mobilized, as these cofinancing would happen without the project in any way.

- This comment is applicable to in-kind cofinancing from IUCN;
- Same comment for the in-kind cofinancing from the PS/NCSD;
- Same comment for the three in-kind cofinancing from the Ministry of Environment, Green Economy, and Climate Change (FIE, GGW Coordination, and DGEF);
- Same comment for the in-kind cofinancing from the Ministry of Animal and fisheries Resources.
- Please, note that the nature of cofinancing is missing for the contribution from the Ministry of Animal and fisheries Resources

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

There was a misunderstanding of the investment mobilised. All confirmed cofinancing as recurrent cost from on-going investment that this project will build on.

IUCN 19 April 2021

Corrections have now been made into the portal

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 Addressed.

Agency Response NA

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

April 20, 2021

Cleared.

April 15, 2021

Is the study on the private sector the only study financed under the PPG? Please, confirm or provide a list of studies and assessments.

April 5, 2021

Please, provide a list of studies and/or assessments delivered under the PPG.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

The scoping study on the private sector is attached.

IUCN 19 April 2021

Yes, the private sector is the only one that was done specifically. Other studies such as the gender analysis and actions, and stakeholders analysis have been done part of the PPG as standard practice.

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

April 20, 2021

Cleared.

April 15, 2021

- We take note of the change for the carbon targets.

- Please make the targets in the portal and the prodoc coherent (876,000 ha of landscapes under improved landscapes in the prodoc vs. 730,000 ha in the portal (core indicator 4).

April 5, 2021

Core indicators

- We take note of the use of EXACT to provide carbon gains. However, in the annex 12, please insert a page to justify and explain the reasoning and assumptions: the final result of 44 million of tons CO₂e seems extremely high in comparison with the other Drylands IP projects.

- At PFD stage, the carbon gains were at the opposite very conservative (50,000 metric tons of Co₂e over a 20-year period). Please, explain.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

The calculations at the PFD stage were conservative and based on limited information before the project strategies were fully developed. The calculation in the previous version of the ProDoc erroneously classified significant area of the landscapes currently under annual systems of agriculture as grasslands. This error has been corrected and the tool has been reapplied with assistance from FAO using the precise figures for area of direct intervention (which remain constant with what was proposed at PFD stage) and based on an analysis of land cover in the three project landscapes. The final carbon-balance for the project is -3,776,377 tCO₂e. for the entire period of analysis of 20 years (5 years of implementation and 15 years of capitalization).

The calculation used the following assumptions:

- Annual agricultural systems covering 67,373 ha will be under improved practices that deliver important benefits, but may not affect emissions.
- 70,990 ha of grasslands will be restored to an improved state.
- 11,253 of dry forest will be under improved management.

IUCN ? 19 April 2021

Area has been aligned between the portal and Prodoc to 730,000

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

Yes. The logical reasoning from the problem to the proposed strategy was well explained very early at Expression of Interest stage and in the PFD.

Addressed.

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

- Several Baseline programs and projects mentioned at the regional level have closed for several years for some of them and are not relevant anymore. We suggest including the dates of start and closing, and remove closed projects, except if there is a specific interest : SAWAP, BRICKS, AAD, FLEUVE, PRAPS, WABICC, and ASPP for instance.

- Same comment for national based projects: PRAPS-Burkina Faso (2016-2020), PASF (2018)

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

This comment has been well noted. Projects that have now closed have been removed.

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

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

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 15, 2021

Addressed.

April 5, 2021

From a general point of view, we would like to see a more accurate rationale to explain the role of cofinancing in the project under the different components and justify the added value of GEF resources. Without these aspects, there is a risk that the GEF activities stay stand-alone, with a lack of impact and anchorage with existing partners. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

Current land-related projects and programmes are targeting capacity building, land restoration and sustainable forest management. In addition, land management and value chain development as per the baseline and identified cofinancing are weak to promoting of land-based planning and inclusive governance of landscape and marker continue to drive land degradation through unsustainable development of value chains. All these can lead to locally increasing land productivity in the short term. This project will demonstrate the feasibility of land-based planning through landscape, inclusive and gender-responsive approaches and the approach that connects agrosylvopastoral value chains to the ecosystem they rely on.

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

Addressed (See the item related to the core indicators and the carbon values).

Agency Response

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

April 20, 2021

Cleared.

April 15, 2021

We cannot open the two versions of the revised prodoc (track changes and clean). It seems that the files are corrupted. Please insert the new text on innovation in the response below and load new documents.

April 5, 2021

In addition to the sustainability and replication or scaling up potentials, we suggest including a section on innovations in the project. Please, correct.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

Section 4.10 on innovation has been integrated in the ProDoc.

IUCN ? 19 April 2021

Revised ProDoc with track change and without are attached to the resubmission in the portal. If there is still an issue, please let us know asap so we can send them by e-mail to the programme manager.

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

Addressed.

Agency Response

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
Addressed.

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
Yes

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
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
April 15, 2021

Point taken. to be developed at inception workshop and during project implementation.

April 5, 2021

There is no co-finance from the private sector, however there are strong contributions from CSOs who may be channeling private sector/philanthropic revenues. Private and public sector actors will be encouraged through dialogue to better incorporate consideration of market drivers into their planning and consider scope for PPPs in key value chains.

- We suggest looking at broader Sahelian programs to potentially increase the scope for private sector engagement and investment ;

- There are potentially opportunities with meteorological services which are a focus for the AU and across the region;

- See also financing partners, as microfinancing institutions and investment funds as Investments & Partenaires (<http://www.ietsp.com/en>).

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

During the project preparation, efforts were made to secure private sector engagement through scoping study that helped identifying potential private sectors to buy-in. In fact, Coris Bank and the Banque de l'Agriculture du Burkina Faso were identified during the project preparation. However, due to the covid-19 the interaction with these actors could not be concluded as planned. Yet, they showed and expressed interest to be part of this project and prospect way on cofinancing. It is expected that this process will be catch up during the inception workshop. The project will also work to identify new opportunities, e.g., in the framework of the Project to Support the Resilience of Youth Enterprises in the G5 Sahel Countries (PAREJ) currently under development.

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

April 15, 2021

Addressed.

April 5, 2021

- We take note of the first risk related the Political and security situation. However, the response should not be limited to a discussion about the targeted landscapes. The

priority #1 in this case of situation is obviously the security of the project team and beneficiaries. Now, it is also an opportunity to assess the intervention modes and prefer partnerships with active entities and perennial stakeholders rather than temporary staff or consultants. Please, develop, and refer the changes in the budget.

- The global health situation is listed in the (high) risks. However, we would like to see further information and measures on how the COVID-19 situation is included in this project both risks and opportunities. Please, correct.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

The project recognizes the different risks associated with the security situation in areas of Burkina Faso, and will be implemented in accordance with the safety policies of the GoBF and IUCN. The project has consulted with numerous stakeholders, including organizations such as APROS and IUCN as well as local leaders and representatives, that have extensive experience working and achieving impacts in areas affected by insecurity. The project design takes their lesson learned into consideration, while also relying on an adaptive management approach to react to any changes in the security situation. It should be noted that the project relies almost exclusively on national capacity. PMU technical consultants will provide sustained support to the project and serve as important means of coordination with local organizations and associations partnering or being targeted by the project. The budget reflects this design (as detailed under the budget comment below).

COVID-19 Risk Analysis and Action Framework provided.

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

April 20, 2021

Cleared.

April 15, 2021

Please, reload revised versions of the prodocs.

April 5, 2021

- There is a list of GEF initiatives and projects. However, we would have appreciated a short analysis of lessons from the rich SLM and LD portfolio in Burkina Faso. Please, complete.

Institutional arrangements

- It is mentioned that the Project Management Unit (PMU) will be established ?with the help of the Implementing Agency to ensure overall efficient management, coordination, implementation, and monitoring of the project?. The PMU ?will follow GEF/IUCN procedures and rules?. Please, confirm that this role of IUCN is within the implementing agency mandate and does not trigger any exception in terms of financing management.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

Section 4.14 on lessons learned during project preparation and from other relevant projects has been added to the ProDoc.

This has been corrected

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

April 15, 2021

Addressed.

April 5, 2021

Following a comment from the STAP at PFD level, we take note of the mention of various national strategies and plans from different sectors. However, these sectors do not work much together, and we wonder how integration will happen at the level of the landscapes. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

Although the Ministry of the Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change (MEEVCC) hosts the Permanent Secretariat for the National Council for Sustainable Development (SP/CNDD), it is a multi-sectoral institution whose mandate come from the National Conference of Sustainable Development headed by the Prime Ministry. It also includes civil society organisation in its functioning, which makes it a conducive institution to bring together different sectors and civil society to execute the project in the field. As the executing agency for this project, the SP/CNDD will provide leadership as regards working across sectors.

In addition, the project designed approaches that require coordination and integration at the landscape level. Before starting the landscape-scale restoration assessments, the project will undertake preparation aimed at engaging key stakeholders across sectors and at various levels (e.g., regions, municipalities), as well as collectively defining a clear framework for the process. The process itself will provide an opportunity to raise the awareness of stakeholders on the importance of implementing an ecosystem, landscape approach to address cross-sectoral issues of dryland management.

IUCN ? 19 April 2021

Done. Please see above.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

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

April 15, 2021

Addressed.

April 5, 2021

Building on a comment from the STAP at PFD level, we would like to see some activities related to the measurement of climate risks in view of defining the notion of vulnerability of beneficiaries. Please, address and refer the changes in the budget.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

Component 1, and most notably Activity 1.1.1.2 has been modified to better demonstrate the integration of analysis of climate risks and potential for restoration to strengthen resilience.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 20, 2021

We acknowledge the explanations provided about the role of cofinancing. The purchase of vehicles within this GEF project is acceptable.

Cleared.

April 15, 2021

Please, respond to the item related to the role of cofinancing to cover some vehicles.

April 5, 2021

Budget

Training

- On one hand, we want to see a certain amount of budget for participation in regional and national events that help knowledge sharing in line with the programmatic approach. On the other hand, you need to justify the proposed costs that seem quite high without further explanation (# of beneficiaries, expected outcomes,...): international regional event (\$48,000), national event (\$40,000), and agropastoral event (\$70,000).

- These expenses come in addition to \$637,900 budgeted to international workshops, conferences and meetings. Please, justify such budget for non-sustainable activities.

- 4x4 vehicle purchase: \$135,000: Please, justify this purchase. Preference would be to see vehicles bought by cofinancing. Please, clarify the role of cofinancing about vehicles.

- Motorcycle purchase: \$21,000: Please, justify this purchase. Preference would be to see vehicles bought by cofinancing. Please, clarify the role of cofinancing about vehicles.

- There is \$1.09 million for consultants. We wonder if the decision to involve consultants is the best opportunity in regards to the security risks and the COVID-19 situation. Don't you think that some strategic partnerships could be better considered on the ground with active entities on the ground (NGO, farmer organizations, Academia,?)? In view of the COVID-19 situation, different ways should be explored. About consultants, we suggest focusing on national or regional ones, and reconsider the use of international consultants.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

The meeting/events budget has been reviewed in detail taking into consideration the comments received. Please note that the meetings previously labelled as ?regional? have been relabelled as ?landscape? to avoid confusion. To clarify the budget figures, the events under Activity 2.2.2.4 are part of strategies to strengthen agro-sylvo pastoral

value chains by helping stakeholders meet and develop partnerships with other key actors. Specifically, the \$48,000 for landscape events will cover the costs for 80 smallholders to participate in meetings or other events within the landscape. The costs take into consideration the fact that these producers may be engaging with input providers or off-takers and therefore transporting some goods. The \$40,000 will support 40 local stakeholders to participate in events at the national level, while the \$70,000 will cover the costs for 20 stakeholders to participate in international events related to specific value chains. These costs do not overlap with the costs for other workshops, conferences or meetings, in particular pertaining to KM. However, recognizing that the expenses for meetings and workshops was high and that some results could probably be achieved through fewer events at the national level, the number of these events was reduced under A2.2.1.1 , A.2.2.2.1, and A.2.2.2.3.

The road conditions in Burkina Faso can be difficult and significant distances will need to be covered to reach the three project landscapes and coordinate the implementation of activities across these three areas simultaneously. To ensure the safety of PMU staff and technical consultants, it is critical they have suitable means of transportation. At present, the potential for co-financing from the government to support the purchasing of new equipment is limited because significant resources are being allocated to the national response to COVID-19, and humanitarian activities for locally displaced people.

The majority of costs allocated to consultants include senior national consultants that will provide sustained technical support to the PMU, including the Restoration Coordinator, Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral Value Chain Coordinator, Knowledge Management and M&E Specialist, and the Safeguards & Gender Specialist. As well as costs for field agents that will assist with day-to-day implementation of activities in the project landscapes (anticipated to work approximately 90% time over 4 years). These consultants are considered critical support to project implementation.

Less than 10% of the budget has been allocated for regional or international consultants. These consultants have been proposed to provide specific technical skills that may not be available at the national level. As relevant the project could consider pairing national and regional/international consultants so that they can work together.

IUCN - 19 April 2021

Co-financing from Ministries is related to investment mobilized. It corresponds to projects that will be running in the agriculture sector and that the GEF funded project under this IP will support in transforming the landscapes with more sustainable

practices. The project is additional to this baseline, and therefore the use of vehicles in those projects cannot be duplicated to this project. In order for the GEF funded project to play its role in catalysing the baseline investments into more coordinated transformative action, it is needed this project has its own vehicles. This need is reinforced by the fact that the project will intervene on three landscapes, which are not systematically covered by the same baseline projects (meaning vehicles from these baseline projects do not move around the three landscapes covered by this GEF funded project).

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 20, 2021

Cleared.

April 15, 2021

Potentially addressed, but the last sentence is uncomplete. Please, correct.

April 5, 2021

There were no specific Council Member comments to the Burkina Faso Child project. However, the comment made by the US to the Namibia situation and the difficulty of institutions to work together in implementing laws against logging and export of indigenous tree species may also be relevant. If this is the case, please, provide a response applied to the Burkina Faso child project.

?Can the GEF or implementing agency further justify the contribution of additional external resources given the widely reported absence of successful coordination between Namibian state entities to enforce current laws prohibiting the logging and export of indigenous tree species??

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

The comments made on the difficulties of institutions working together to implement laws on logging and export of indigenous tree species are not considered widely relevant to the situation in Burkina Faso and this project in particular. The Forest Law provides clear guidelines on logging and the required certification for logging and export. The country has a long-standing ban on the export of raw logs (2005), and has banned a limited number of species from export (e.g., rosewood). While lack of coordination is not a widespread issue, there continue to be challenges enforcing laws and regulations due to inadequate capacity (low mobility capacity) in key agencies, such as the Ministry of the Environment. Civil society organisations are also very active in

IUCN ? 19 April 2021

Addressed in the portal

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 15, 2021

Addressed.

April 5, 2021

No

STAP comments were made at PFD level. Please check if you well address the items potentially applicable to all child projects, including this one for Burkina Faso: Theory of Change, inclusion of climate risks, inclusion of resilience aspects, lack of integration implementation, testing behavioral change, potential for scaling up, innovation, gender issues,

Full STAP review: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/web-documents/10206_STAP_Screen.pdf

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

The project has taken into consideration the comments from the STAP in the project design. The project is based on a theory of change that is specific to Burkina Faso, and takes into consideration: national (and sub-regional) causes and drivers of land degradation; barriers to SLM in Burkina Faso; and positive, local enabling conditions which the project can use to optimize its intended outcomes. Gender considerations have been fully integrated into its design.

Under its first component, the project will undertake extensive assessments of restoration opportunities, a priority intervention in the framework of Burkina Faso's LDN targets. These assessments will cover different land types in the landscapes and include multiple analyses to assess trade-offs between different interventions, including assessments of climate risks and sensitivity to climate change, and how interventions can contribute to addressing these risks and strengthen the long-term resilience of drylands. In alignment with the LDN response hierarchy, the interventions that are supported will aim to avoid, reduce and if required reverse land degradation.

The project design is tailored to the framework for land governance in Burkina Faso, and aims to progress landscape-scale sustainable management considerations into official land use planning processes that promote improved coordination and integration across sectors. It includes inclusive processes to assess priorities and design targeted interventions to restore drylands and strengthen ecosystem-based value chains, which will be monitored in a participatory manner to assess behavioral changes. Finally, the project will target three landscapes. These landscapes were chosen in part because of key differences in their ecosystem composition, which will allow for scaling out and up of lessons learned. In addition to cross-landscape and national sharing of lessons learned, the project will partner with the Great Green Wall Initiative (GGWI) and the secretariat of the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative (GGWSSI) to scale up to the regional level.

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

April 20, 2021

Cleared.

April 15, 2021

Is there more than the private sector study?

April 5, 2021

A list of studies and assessments financed under the PPG would be welcome.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 24 March 2021

Studies financed under the PPG are attached.

IUCN - 19 April 2021

See above

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

26 April 2021 - IUCN - Response to quality control

1. Addressed
2. Addressed
3. Addressed. You'll notice that, to be consistent with other reviews, in-kind co-financing has been then changed to recurrent expenditures?
4. Office supplies are included in PMC now. A revised version of the budget has been submitted. However, and in order not to go beyond the 5% threshold for PMC, per-diem cannot be added to PMC.

28 April 2021

Budget has been updated and revised version of the documents inserted.

1 May 2021

The budget has been adjusted and included in the portal as per the guidance received.

5 May 2021

The budget has been included as for the Guinée-Equatoriale project that was cleared recently. We believe the project can be cleared now.

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2021

Addressed. The project is recommended for clearance.

May 3rd, 2021

Child project to be returned to the Agency due to:

The budget still is incomplete ? it is a summary of the excel budget uploaded in Portal. Please ask the Agency to include a comprehensive budget that includes (i) the details of the items; (ii) a clear differentiation of what is being covered by PMC, M&E and Project's components; (iii) the budget must be within the margins.

May 1st, 2021

The remaining point was addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement and Council circulation.

April 30, 2021

Please, address the comment below from the Control Quality.

At the time, the Control Quality reviewed the project in the portal, the revised version of the budget was not yet available. The missing element is now a budget table after the annex C that can directly be read from the portal. A summarized budget per component is possible to fit the page (see the example sent by email). Thanks.

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Please refer to Annex in excel file attached to this submission

Here is the full comment from the Quality Control:

Child project to be returned to the Agency due to:

- As per paragraph 2 ? page 42 of the Guidelines, ?The Budget Template in Appendix A should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal. ?The same Budget Template in excel format should be uploaded in the Portal - section ?Documents?. This means that the budget must be the same as that uploaded in the Document's tab ? also , please ask the Agency to make the budget fit within the margins as often times the external audiences only have access / only look at to the CEO Endorsement/Approval template in Portal once posted on the website, so the budget information is only accessible through Portal. That is why having a comprehensive Budget in Portal is key for transparency purposes. If the Agency finds difficult to include the budget because it goes off the margins, you can suggest to present the budget only per component (instead of per output) + PMC + M&E, so the table will be slimmer.

April 29, 2021

All points have been addressed. We take note of the justification for a slight increase of pmc (5.2%) and find them acceptable. The project is recommended for clearance and Council consultation.

April 28, 2021

All points are addressed, but one. Please, maintain the per diem budget in the pmc and justify a slight increase of the pmc above 5% due to the context in Burkina Faso. With a plausible justification, we will be ready to consider it.

April 24, 2021

Quality control: please address the following comments

1. On Project Information: Kindly note that the duration of the project does not match the expected implementation and completion dates. If the project is expected to last 5 years then the completion date should be 5/31/2026 and the duration should be corrected to 60 months.

Submission Date 12/11/2020	Expected Implementation Start 6/1/2021	Expected Completion Date 5/29/2026
Duration ⓘ 48 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 601,265.00
Submission Date 12/11/2020	Expected Implementation Start 6/1/2021	Expected Completion Date 5/29/2026
Duration ⓘ 48 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 601,265.00

2. On the PMC Proportionality: there is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$33,336,123 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,666,806 instead of \$952,000 (which is 2.8%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

	Sub Total (\$)	6,362,604.00	33,336,123.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	318,130.00	952,000.00
	Sub Total(\$)	318,130.00	952,000.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	6,680,734.00	34,288,123.00

3. On Co-financing:

- Co-financing letter from IUCN lists different donors as sources of co-financing (e.g. WB, SIDA). Please specify this 'donor Agency' co-financing in table C (even if the letter is submitted by IUCN).
- All co-financing letters from Recipient Country Government indicate that their co-financing is 'in-kind'. Please revise table C accordingly.
- Co-financing letter from Ministry of environment, green economy and climate change (FIE) lists different donor sources. Please specify this in table C.

-

4. On budget:

- Office supplies is charged to project components and M&E but not to PMC.
- PMU per diem should also be charged to PMC.

April 20, 2021

The project is recommended for CEO clearance.

April 15, 2021

Some questions were not fully respond or the responses not reflected in the portal. Please address the pending items.

April 5, 2021

The resubmission is uncomplete - please provide all the documents needed for the review (revised project document in tracked changes for instance), and please reflect the corrections in the portal.

January 22, 2021

Not yet, please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/5/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/15/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/24/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations