

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10516

Countries

Burkina Faso

Project Name

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

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

3/3/2022

Review completed by PM

9/17/2022

Program Manager

Tshewang Dorji

Focal Area

Climate Change

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes

Update, GEFSEC, 9/23/2022: Please revise the "Expected Implementation Start" date to the more realistic date, as the review may not be completed within the anticipated date of 10/1/2022.

GEFSEC, 11/17/2022: Cleared with much thanks for the revision.

Agency Response

5 October 22

The expected implementation date has been revised.

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Thank you. The project design is appropriate to achieve the outcomes and outputs. However, for detail comments, please refer to question 3 under part II.

With regards to Table B, it is noted that financing type is mentioned as "investment" under Component 1-3, while the most activities are Technical Assessment in nature. Please revise the information in the Table B as appropriate.

Update GEFSEC/4/19/2022: Thank you for the revision. For component 3, we encourage to use both "Investment" and "Technical Assessment"

GEFSEC, 5/13/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response

5/6/2022

Thank you for the suggestion. Noting that both investment and TA cannot be selected simultaneously for a single component, and the design team concurs that the component has an important TA nature, TA has now been selected for component 3 as well.

10/4/2022

Thank you for the comment. The type of LDCF financing has been changed for component 1. However, component 3 has a dominant investment nature, not only strengthening the capacity of farmer communities to produce, process and commercialize, but also equipping field schools and others. Therefore, only the nature of component 1 was amended.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Thank you

GEFSEC, 5/19/2022: Please address the following:

1. We are unable to locate English translated co-financing letters from the 2 recipient country government sources. Please note that submission of English translated co-financing letters is a requirement.
2. The 2 attached co-financing letters simply list several projects and they don't indicate the grant amount. Please revise the co-financing letters by (i) listing relevant projects, the original funding sources, and implementation timeline, (ii) indicating total co-financing amount (reasonable amount which will directly support the LDCF project implementation, the co-financing amount must be available for disbursement during the LDCF project implementation), and (iii) confirming these projects will support the LDCF project implementation. Please report the amount as "Public Investment / Investment mobilized".
3. The latest project document contains a English translated co-financing letter issued by UNDP reporting PAMED project as grant, but is not reported in the co-financing table.

GEFSEC 9/7/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Update: GEFSEC 9/23/2022: On the Table C, please ammend the Type of Co-financing from "Grant" to "Public Investment"

GEFSEC, 11/17/2022: Cleared with much thanks for the revision.

Agency Response

5 October 22

This has been changed.

1. Sorry for some confusion around cofinancing letters. This is because the governmental changes that followed the coup d'état in Burkina Faso in January created some uncertainty among national partners as to who was habilitated to sign these letters. This has been clarified, and two letters (from MTEE and MAAHRAH) have been uploaded, and corresponding English translations have been inserted in Annex N.
2. Please see revised cofinancing letters.

3. Please see revised cofinancing letters; PAMED is included in the letter signed by MTEE.

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 GEFSEC, 4/10/2022: Yes

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes

Update, GEFSEC 4/19/2022: Noted with thanks for upward revision of the indicators

GEFSEC, 5/13/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Thank you. It is well described

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Thank you. It is well described

Update: GEFSEC 4/19/2022: A short section that describes the interlinkages on the decision making powers between regions, communes, municipalities and village development council would be useful, so as to demonstrate that project would empower local communities with the view to enhance resilience at larger system at national level.

GEFSEC, 5/13/2022: Cleared with much thanks for the clarification.

Agency Response

05/06/2022

Thank you for the suggestion; a paragraph describing these aspects has been added in a separate box under Paragraph 32.

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2022. Thank you very much for clear articulation of the project outcome, output and the activities. Highly appreciate effort to empower local people in making climate adaptation choices. Following additional clarification would be highly valuable.

- ? References to 'resilience' in the document refers is to resilience to the impact of climate change.
- ? The activity 1.5.2 could be linked to 1.5.1?
- ? Clarify functional/operational relationship between Dimitra Club under output 2.1 with the AFPS under Outcome 3.
- ? Under outcome 3.1. While acknowledging need of trainings and capacity building as at the core, the time demand of the participants need to be considered, which might have adverse consequences on the project deliverables, as the participants might have other competing priorities such as farming etc.

- ? Welcome proposed output 3.6 to help with access to finance for local. In this regard, it might be useful to explore ways to provide some financial assistance in addition to setting up AVECs.
- ? Also, while acknowledging importance of the capacity building, it might be useful to review the budget allocation for workshops and trainings. Preliminary analysis suggested that 40% of the LDCF resources are allocated for workshops and trainings. Also, please clarify how the allocation of workshop/training budgets are arrived
- ? As the project involves major landscape planning exercise, it might be useful to consider recruiting national GIS experts for each project landscape for entire project duration
- ? Kindly review the proposal of purchasing car for the project. It might be useful to explore alternatives.

Update: 4/19/2022: Thank you for the clarification. Please provide further clarification as:

- We would encourage to you to use term resilience as per the recent IPCC report that describes not just the ability to maintain essential function, identity and structure, but also the capacity for transformation (IPCC, 2022: Summary for Policy Makers)

Component 1

- While it is understood that interventions are going to take place in 3 regions, some sites will be selected for pilot activities. In this regards, it is unclear when the pilot sites will be selected. Please clarify
- Number of outputs under this outcome 1 has a references to the pilot, while there are output such as 1.3 & 1.4 that anticipates to cover the entire project areas (3 regions). Please clarify, if that is correct. In other worlds, please clarify when will pilot sites be decided and how the outcome of pilot activities will be used to upscale, if any.
- Output 1.1 has mentioned that "at least 100 staff" will be trained, while proposed activities for this output as training provisions for members of the local government. Please clarify on the number of staffs that are anticipated to be trained from various levels of governance and organizations.
- Please confirm that the "extension workers" under Activity 1.1.1 is represents staff from central/regional government.
- Output 1.3 has references to the "platforms". Please clarify that it refers to "Multistakeholder platform" as referred under 1.3.4

-Activity 1.3.3. Please clarify what is "socio-tenure" survey, and also what is referred to "this resources"

Component 2:

- As mentioned under component 1, please clarify when "pilot" sites will be determined, and how the outcome will be used to inform potential upscaling.
- Noted the proposal to establish club Dimitra. However, please describe the linkages with capacity building program under component 1, if any. Will the members from club Dimitra target potential members of the CVD, CFVs and CCFVs?

Component 3:

- Please clarify, if those activities on the AFPS will be limited to the pilot sites

Component 4.

- Notes with appreciation to share the lessons and knowledge at the international level. However, it is not advisable to use the project resources to convene such international level workshop with the dedicated budget to fly in international participants, given the competing priorities at the national level. Therefore, please revise the budget allocation for Activity 4.1.1

GEFSEC, 5/19/2022: Thank you for the clarification. However, please provide the following additional clarification:

1. Component 1:

We see there could be a ways to better synergies the activities and outputs under this component. For example, the activities that laid out on the capacity building under output 1.1 may be more feasible to expand beyond ?to be pilot? sites, since all these relates to capacity building. Similarly, targeted activities related to output 1.4 may seems to be deserve more attention for generating information on climate vulnerability assessment. Therefore, we would urge you to provide clear linkages and clarification on ?what pilot? activities will lead to ?what output? towards realization of the Project Outcome.

2. Component 2:

Please clarify if all this outputs and activities under this component will be limited within the pilot sites.

GEFSEC, 9/7/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response

5/23/2022

1. Indeed, activities under Output 1.1 are planned to benefit to stakeholders beyond pilot landscapes, as members of Regional Chambers and Councils of Agriculture will be targeted in each of the three regions. Regarding local-level institutions to benefit from these activities (namely, Rural Land Services (SFR), Village Development Committees (CVDs), Village Land Commissions (CFVs) and Village Land Conciliation Commissions (CCFVs)), the 23 selected communes will be targeted.

With regards to Output 1.4, sufficient budget has been planned for (USD 80,000) to undertake the climate vulnerability assessments and ensure that these are based on solid and comprehensive data.

The Theory of Change diagram provided in Annex T shows the causal pathway between outputs and outcomes under Component 1. To further explicit this, a paragraph and a figure have been added in the description of Component 1.

2. Indeed, all outputs under Component 2 will be implemented in pilot landscapes.

5/6/2022

Thank you, the definition of resilience has been explicitly updated (see NB just before paragraph 9) as per suggested reference.

Component 1

- Pilot sites (within identified communes) will be selected during the inception stage, based on updated information on additional consultations with local authorities and communities to confirm and further specify initial interest expressed during the PPG phase.

- Indeed, not all outputs and activities will have the same scope. While some will encompass the whole target regions (e.g. support to regional councils), others will target a subset of communes and villages within these communes. This differentiated approach was favoured so as to match differentiated mandates across decentralised institutions. Target landscapes, communes and villages within pre-identified areas will be further selected at the inception stage, as mentioned above. This pilot approach can form the basis for future upscaling, both within the target regions and in other regions as well. This will be facilitated by the knowledge-sharing approach under Component 4. However, given the already integrated and extensive range of activities planned under this project, upscaling in itself will be left to national partners outside the scope of this project.

- Output 1.1 will target relevant staff from both deconcentrated state services (local branches of the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture) and local government.

Although the exact split between various institutions will need to be refined at implementation stage (and may differ across regions, depending on needs), it can be anticipated that 30 trainees will be from deconcentrated state services and 70 from local government (including Village Development Committees, Village Land Commissions and Village Land Conciliation Commissions. Please note that the overall target of 100 trainees may be a conservative one.

- Extension workers are part of the deconcentrated services of the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment. A number of them are part of the SNVACA (National Agricultural Extension and Support System (Système National de Vulgarisation et d'Appui Conseil Agricole, SNVACA).

- Indeed, these are the multi-stakeholder platforms. This has been clarified in the wording of the output. Please note that the inconsistency in the target number of multistakeholder platforms has been corrected (23 platforms, one per target commune).

- The socio-tenure surveys will be a survey on land tenure with specific focus on social aspects including differentiated access to tenure per gender, per age, potentially wealth etc. This will be used to bring a complementary light to the land & natural resource mapping to be conducted under Activity 1.3.2.

Component 2

- Please see response above.

- There will be direct linkages in terms of themes between Dimitra Clubs and some of the activities under Component 1. For example, Dimitra Clubs have been proven to participate to conflict prevention and resolution, which will complement actions in this regard under Component 1. Likewise, Dimitra Clubs will also be a forum to discuss land tenure issues. In general, experience has shown that establishing these Clubs allow to create local ownership of the project's approach prior to the implementation of other activities. The proposed approach for this project builds on this experience. Please note that Dimitra Clubs are aimed for community members. Should some of the members of the village-level bodies targeted under Component 1 activities be interested in joining Dimitra Clubs, this will be in their personal capacity (as member of the civil society), not as holders of public mandates.

Component 3

- APFS activities will be limited to pilot sites; however, the knowledge-exchange activities (e.g. open days) planned under Component 3 should allow to reach an audience that may extend beyond the pilot sites themselves.

Component 4

- Noted, the budget for Activity 4.1.1 has been revised and funding for international travel has been removed.

10/4/2022

- The definition of resilience that has been used to guide the elaboration of the project strategy is the one cited by UNFCCC from the IPCC Assessment Report 4 (2007), namely "the ability of a social or ecological system to absorb disturbances while retaining the same basic structure and ways of functioning, the capacity for self-organization and the capacity to adapt to stress and change". In the context of this LDCF project, it mostly applies to climate resilience; nevertheless, the agroecological approach empowers communities to better withstand the consequences of a diversity of shocks, including the disruption of regional /international markets (e.g. during the Covid-19 pandemic), insecurity, health issues (thanks to improved livelihoods and savings accrued) etc.

- Indeed, Activity 1.5.2 is very much linked to Activity 1.5.1. These have been formally distinguished to underline the logical sequencing between the two.

- From a functional perspective, Dimitra Clubs have been found to be highly complementary with APFSs. They multiply the impact of APFS outcomes and make it possible to reach a larger rural population. In particular, implementing Dimitra Clubs ahead of APFSs allows to mobilise community groups, especially women and youth, and create broader engagement and participation in APFSs. In addition, Dimitra Clubs catalyze change on a great number of aspects of life, aligned with the holistic approach to resilience adopted in this project. Topics to be discussed in Dimitra Clubs may include climate adaptation strategy, land-use planning, conflict prevention and resolution etc. "all themes that will be further supported through the project components. Complementarities between Dimitra Clubs and APFSs have been documented through a number of initiatives, including a GEF-financed project in Senegal. More information can be found here. NB: the clarification above has been added under Output 2.1. in the ProDoc.

- The APFS approach has been designed to account for the constraints inherent to adult learning in remote rural areas, including time constraints, analphabetism, learning by doing, and more. Farmers would meet at agreed regular intervals during cropping season and/or 18 month periods of time for pastoral field schools. For annual crops, such meetings may be every 1 or 2 weeks during the cropping season. For other farm/forestry management practices the time between each meeting would depend on what specific activities need to be done or be related to critical periods of the year when there are key issues to observe and discuss in the field. Being intrinsically a guided, demand-led approach, APFSs adapt to the needs of trainees to ward off the risks of training fatigue

or conflicting agendas. In terms of master trainers and facilitators, availability for training sessions will be a selection criteria. Stipends have been budgeted for to compensate for time invested in these sessions, and, for master trainers under line ministries, discussions may be held to arrange for their availability as in-kind cofinancing. Overall, it has seldom been found in APFS projects that availability of either trainers or trainees was a constraint impending implementation.

- Access to finance will not only be promoted through AVECs, but also through capacity-building on business & marketing literacy and provision of grants to fund investments in climate-resilient IGAs (Output 3.4). As suggested, an activity has been added under this latter output to facilitate links between local business developers and existing micro-financing institutions.

- The relatively high share of training and workshop is because of the importance of the APFS component, comprising training of master trainers, facilitators, endogenous facilitator and farmers, including facilitators fees. Most of the APFS budget has therefore been filed under ?training and workshop?.

- Thank you for this suggestion. We discussed it in light of existing capacities at the national and regional level, and identified an opportunity to have: i) one GIS expert to coordinate GIS work under Component 1; and ii) contracts with a/ several partner(s) for the execution of studies/field work (covering the three regions). This has been reflected in the budget.

- The purchase of a car has been discussed with the executing partner. The MAAHRAH only has vehicles of its own for senior officials, while the execution of donor-funded projects relies on project-funded vehicles. Although the MAAHRAH will provide means of transportation to the extent possible as part of cofinancing; however, ensuring the smooth execution of this complex project in three regions will require to have several missions in the field at the same time, hence the request for the purchase of a single 4x4 vehicle.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Thank you. It is well elaborated

GEFSEC, 5/13/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

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

N/A

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

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

N/A

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

Update: GEFSEC 4/19/2022: We note that important point about secured land tenure rights for improving climate resilience. In this regards, appreciate the reference made on the efforts towards implementation of Law No 034/2009. Please include this legislation and its key provision that will facilitate the implementation of this project.

GEFSEC, 5/13/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response Noted with thanks. Reference has been made in paragraph 82.

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

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

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes. Thank you.

Update, GEFSEC, 5/19/2022:

1. Budget table: National Project Coordinator and National Procurement Expert are charged to project components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 2.0 million, and co-financing for 42.4 million represented in grants – this could be used to cover the costs of the project's staff.
2. It is indicated that the FAO is providing some limited project support services. However, we didn't find the Government request for this support services to be provided by FAO. Please submit.
3. On the project vehicle, as you are aware, the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicle is strongly discouraged. Instead, such fund should go to actual investment in the ground. Such are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicle must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project. Please provide such justification in a separate document and upload it on the portal.

GEFSEC, 9/16/2022: Cleared. Thank you

Update, GEFSEC, 9/23/2022:

1. We recognize the importance of National Project Director. However, as per the GEF policy, we will not be in position to fund the salary of National Project Director and PSC members, as we understand that they are government officials. For the National Project Coordinator, we underscore the importance of having dedicated and full time coordinator and not anticipating to cost-share cost with any projects. Therefore, the cost of for the National Project Coordinator should be fully charged to PMC and not project components. Please amend it.

2. On the execution letter support, it was noticed that the OFP request does not mention "OPA Manager", while it is so reflected in the budget. Please amend the budget table or submit the revised letter from OFP

Update GEFSEC, 11/28/2022: Cleared

1. Thank you for revision made on the budget for National Project Coordinator.
2. Thank you for removing OPA manager from the project budget

Agency Response

22 November 22

In order to secure timely CEO endorsement of this important LDCF project, FAO deleted the cost of the OPA Manager from the project budget. This cost will be entirely absorbed by the Agency fees. Therefore, the grant budget has been revised.

5 November 22

1. It is well understood that the NPD will not be funded by the project ? this position does not appear in the budget. As requested, costs associated with the NPC have been fully integrated under PMC.

2. FAO's role in the management of the operational partner agreement was extensively discussed with all project partners and the OFP throughout the PPG phase, and is reflected in the original letter signed by the OFP and shared in the previous resubmission. This original letter spells out the "day-to-day management" of the operational partnership agreement (first bullet). This OPA management includes a dedicated person, i.e. the OPA Manager, as well as spot checks and audits.

Please, do appreciate the institutional challenges the country is facing, having had two coups d'etat in 2022. Administrative times to process requests are lengthy, possibly extending beyond the time allotted to secure successful endorsement of this project. If an updated letter is deemed critical for project endorsement, note that the amendment in the letter (an addition to further unpack what was already in the originally signed letter) has no impact on the institutional arrangements, roles and responsibilities of project partners, and budget. The suggested revised letter has been uploaded in the Portal for your appreciation. It was discussed and shared with the OFP who's informed all relevant partners.

5/23/22

1. PMC co-financing is already funding the following: salary of the National Project Director and some PSC members, office space both in Ouagadougou and in the target regions, transportation at field level, salary of local-level staff crucial for project execution (e.g. Rural Land Services officers, MAAHRAH & MTEE extension officers). However, and after in-depth assessment with partners of all other co-financing sources, there is no available co-financing to cover salary of the National Project Coordinator.

In addition, it was identified that cost-sharing arrangements of the National Project Coordinator would bear high risk of under-performance because the execution of the LDCF project require full-time dedication a coordinator. Cost-sharing arrangements of

the coordinator would result part time availability of the coordinator which is not possible.

2. The letter has been uploaded on the Portal, along with an English translation.

3. A justification has been uploaded on the Portal.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC 4/10/2022: Yes.
Thank you.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 5/13/2022:
Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 5/13/2022:

Cleared. Thank you

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 5/13/2022:

Cleared. Thank you

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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 4/19/2022: Not yet. Please clarify on the above points

GEFSEC, 5/13/2022: Recommended for CEO Endorsement

Update, 5/19/2022: Please address these additional comments.

Update, GEFSEC, 9/16/2022: The agency has addressed the latest set of comments, including a revised budget and justification for vehicle purchase. This is now recommended for CEO endorsement

Update, 9/23/2022: Please address these additional comments.

Update 11/17/2022: Please upload revised OFP request letter for "OPA Manager"

GEFSEC, 11/28/2022: Recommended for CEO Endorsement, as remaining comments are addressed

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/10/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/23/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/17/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Burkina Faso, ranked 183 out of 189 countries in the 2018 Human Development Index, is among the 14 poorest countries in the world[1]¹. Its population of 19.7 million[2]² is highly dependent on natural resource-based sectors with agriculture sector representing about 60% of employment source. As the agriculture sector is highly sensitive to the changing climatic conditions, its impact is expected to worsen in the future[3]³, causing major food production systems collapse. In this context, the proposed project seeks to address the increasing climate vulnerability of communities relying on agro-sylvo-pastoral (ASP) production systems in the Sudano-Sahelian regions of Centre-Ouest, Boucle du Mouhoun and Hauts-Bassins. These three regions are selected based on number of criteria, including safety conditions, as the security situation in parts of the country has deteriorated since 2018. The project considers the complexity of interactions between humans and ecosystems within agro-sylvo-pastoral systems and seeks to enhance governance at the landscape level, secure land tenure, and facilitate market linkages through the following components:

COMPONENTS AND RESULTS

- **Component 1:** Governance for climate resilient development of agro-sylvo-pastoral communities in the Sudano-Sahelian zone;
- **Component 2:** Climate-resilient productive landscapes;
- **Component 3:** Climate resilient agro-sylvo-pastoral livelihoods; and
- **Component 4:** Monitoring, evaluation, capitalization and knowledge building.

The project will enhance governance at landscape level for resilience of the ASP communities; develop and test packages of innovative production, restoration and management practices; develop and diversify livelihoods; and co-create knowledge. The project has been designed with a strong focus on gender equality and empowerment, recognizing that women in rural area are exposed to higher level of vulnerability to the impacts of climate change. Overall, it will directly benefit 100,000 people (50% women), enable the climate resilient management of 250,000 ha of land and train 60,750 (50% women) people about climate risks and adaptation measures. The project will also mainstream climate resilience into 27 policies/plans.

On COVID-19, the project is expected contribute to strengthening the overall resilience of local communities, thus aligning with the 'Build Back Better' approach. Two projects that are addressing the effects of COVID-19 are considered as source of co-finance for this project.

[1] In terms of GDP per capita. Source: World Bank, 2018.

[2] Source: World Bank, 2018.

[3] Source: Burkina Faso's National Adaptation Plan, 2015.
