

Climate Resilience in the Nakambe Basin

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9318

Countries

Burkina Faso

Project Name

Climate Resilience in the Nakambe Basin

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

2/25/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Katya Kuang-Idba

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - Please see item 3.

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - Some outputs are not written as such. Outputs should be easily measurable and quantifiable through their indicators as well as against the delivery of the outcomes. In addition, please refer to Item 3.

Recommended action: Please revisit some of the outputs and ensure they are written in a way that is not an outcome, and/or describes the level of performance or achievement that occurred as a result of activities or services under each component. For example, output 1.1: "The capacity of the DG-AEN, ANAM, DGRE, AGROMET and communities are strengthened in terms of collecting and analysing climate change vulnerability and risks" is written as an outcome. Additionally, the body of the portal submission is very difficult to read. Particularly the baseline and alternative scenario sections. Please ensure that the body text uses normal spacing/formatting so that it is easier to read. There is currently no spacing or formatting between project components/activities and very laborious to read through.

GEFSEC, 5/14/2020 - This is cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

JP, 20 April 2020:

Output 1.1 (?Skills, methods and tools for the climate change risk and vulnerability assessments introduced at the mandated institutions (DG-AEN, ANAM, DGRE, AGROMET and communities?)), output 1.4 (?At least seven hydrologists, five civil

protection workers, four meteorological maintenance technicians and 10 provincial government officers are able to develop and implement flood/drought forecast and manage disasters?), and output 2.3 (?Micro-enterprises for livelihood diversification are set up in at least five local structures in the Nakanb? basin through the provision of livelihood grants?) were revised to be written as outputs.

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - More information requested. No details regarding cost-effectiveness are in provided in the submission. Additionally, there have been significant changes to the cost structure of the first and second components. While the rationale for the changes are reasonable, there is not a lot of information regarding how this impacts the original design of component 2. Will the scope and impact remain as it was presented at PIF, and if not, how will it change; considering the budget has been reduced around 20%?

Recommended action: Please briefly indicate how the activities chosen are cost effective in comparison to viable alternatives - was there any alternatives analysis conducted? Please provide a brief explanation of how the financing shifting from component 2 to component 1 will impact the project and the implementation of the EbA pilots. Please also refer to the comment above regarding the very dense and difficult to read body text.

GEFSEC, 5/14/2020 - This is noted and cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

JP, 20 April 2020:

Cost-effectiveness is now discussed under section 4.7 of the project document (page 36):

?Cost efficiency of the project will be achieved through close collaboration and partnerships with ongoing initiatives These partnerships are presented in section IV. The LDCF project activities under the Outcome 1 will build on existing networks, achievements and planned actions by ANAM, DGRE, DG-AEN. This will allow institutional capacity to be built cost-effectively, which will ultimately assist in planning and implementing the flood forecast and early warning service for the Nakanb? Basin. The LDCF project will also work closely with existing ANAM and DGRE projects and promote cost shar-ing with other on-going projects, reducing overheads and enhancing cost-effectiveness.

Outcome 1:

An alternative to outcome 1 would be to strengthen the current post-disaster response plans put in place, which are reactive rather than preventive. This would involve strengthening the capacity of authorities to react faster and more efficiently in case of climate hazard. This approach does not address the root causes and is considered less cost-effective considering the resources and the time needed to address the impact of a disaster. Impacted communities will have to cover the cost of the losses, in particular farmers will have to address the loss of their livelihoods while waiting for support from

the existing reactive system ? if any support. The approach proposed by this LDCF project provides an opportunity to address the root causes of vulnerability in the Basin (economic, institutional and environmental) by offering a preventive strategy, thereby avoiding human and material losses and achieving lasting impact in the selected sites and at national scale.

Under outcome 2, alternatives were considered for some of the outputs as follows:

Under output 2.1, a focus was put on EbA measures, which are expected to have longer term impacts in terms of adaptation, as compared to gray infrastructures, especially given the existing information gaps and uncertainties around localized risk projections. The role of forests has long been recognized as critical for the fight against erosion, in addition to providing increasing benefits over the years (through their NTFP, the soil regeneration, etc.). Even though communities might sometimes consider gray infrastructures as more effective due to the immediate benefits, the PPG team has opted for more sustainable solutions, combined with awareness raising to ensure the engagement of local populations.

Under output 2.2, the PIF had initially identified CLEs as the most adequate stakeholder for the provision of livelihood grants to local communities. The PPG team observed during field visit and stakeholder consultations that CLEs are not present in all the targeted communities and that CCCos would be more appropriate to support this output. To the extent possible, CLEs will be included into CCCos and will provide technical guidance for the output delivery.

Under the output 2.4, alternative options included the development of fair trade for some high value products with potential market in Ouagadougou or even internationally (ie. shea butter, hibiscus, mangoes). In particular, the work from UNCDF is strongly supporting the development of the private sector and has recognized the opportunities for fair trade. However, based on consultations with communities and the realities in these highly vulnerable communities, some innovative approaches cannot realistically and sustainably be introduced until a more enabling environment is created. Future programming might therefore support more innovative interventions.?

Regarding the changes in the amounts between outcomes, the needs in meteorological equipment had been underestimated during PIF formulation. The work of the PPG experts, who conducted consultations with key stakeholders involved in climate information enabled a more detailed bottom-up budgeting, taking into account the most urgent needs. Similarly, at PIF stage, the budget for component 2 was calculated based on approximate costs. Component 2, is still reaching its outcome as per the PIF to support the adoption by smallholder farmers of climate risk management and sustainable forestry practices. The design of the activities under this outcome were adequately revised and re-adjusted based on the budget allocated to outcome 1, without impacting the scale of the impact.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - Yes.

The risk matrix adequately accounts for a range of potential risks and offers appropriate mitigation measures.

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/2/2020 - Action requested. While the co-financing letters have been uploaded onto the roadmap section of the portal, they are in French and need to be translated.

Recommended action: Please include a translated version of each of the co-financing letters (unofficial translation is ok), with a clear indication of the type of co-financing that it's labeled as (grant, in-kind, etc.).

GEFSEC, 5/14/2020 - This is cleared, thank you. However, it is noticed that a project "CREWS" is listed as providing co-financing to this project, but it is not in the table. ANAM has listed it as providing .48 million in co-financing in the translated co-financing letter, but it seems this project ended in 2019, which does not make it eligible as a co-financier. Additionally, this number is different from the body text, which refers to CREWS as providing "1.6 million as co-financing." Please remove CREWS and ANAM as a co-financier in the portal submission.

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Not cleared. This has not been changed on the portal.

GEFSEC, 12/16/2020 - CREWS is still listed as providing \$1.6m in co-financing.

GEFSEC, 6/25/2021 - Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

JP, 20 April 2020:

A word document with the translation of co-financing letters is now available.

CG ? 7/27/2020

The numbers were corrected in the Prodoc and CEO ER co-financing table. Note that the project is still ongoing, and is currently expected to end in December 2020.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/28/2020 - No. The LDCE-SCCF has its own core indicators spreadsheet, which was circulated to agencies after the ATF task force meeting in April 2019.

Recommended action: Please remove any entries in the portal under the core indicators section (currently, hectares is filled out) and upload the CCA Core Indicators and Meta-Information Worksheet onto the Roadmap section of the portal.

GEFSEC, 5/14/2020 - Thank you for providing the worksheet - this portion is cleared. However, please remove the entries in the core indicators table on the portal to avoid double counting.

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - This is cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

JP, 20 April 2020:

The CCA Core Indicators and Meta-Information Worksheet is now uploaded onto the roadmap section of the portal.

CG ? 7/27/2020

Entries in the core indicators table on the portal were removed.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/2/2020 - Not clear, more information requested. There is no information provided regarding how the project will coordinate with other LDCF-financed projects in Burkina Faso (except for one LDCF-EWS project).

Recommended action: Please indicate how the project will coordinate with all any active projects financed by the LDCF in Burkina Faso. Please also indicate how the project will coordinate with any projects in the GCF pipeline, so as to maximize synergies and prevent duplication.

GESFEC, 5/14/2020 - The other projects listed as not approved had (8032) has just finished PPG and is about to begin implementation as soon as the CEO ER is approved - similar to this one. In that context, the comment was inquiring whether and how this project has coordinated with this initiatives, and if so, to please indicate and include that information this in the submission. Additionally, the closed projects can provide lessons and good practices which could be relevant and useful - the comment was inquiring if the project developers have coordinated with representatives from the closed projects to glean relevant lessons and/or information.

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

JP, 20 April 2020:

According to the GEF website (and as confirmed by the PPG consultants), there are 7 LDCF project in Burkina Faso. 2 are already completed (ID 2156 ? closed in 2012 ? and 3684 ? closed in 2016), 2 are not approved yet (ID 9318 and 8032), 1 is the EWS project (ID 5003), the EbA project is outside of the project area (ID 4971) and the last one will end in April 2020 and is outside of the project area (ID 5014).

CG- 27/7/20

The insurance project was developed with support from the same team within the UNDP CO in Burkina Faso and will be implemented under the same government agency (CNDD). However, the focus area (weather-based insurance) and project areas (Gorom-Gorom and Boucle du Mouhoun) are different. Therefore, even though any potential for coordination will be promoted by the CNDD and UNDP as relevant during implementation, the formulation process did not identify potential yet. Nevertheless, considering that both projects will be implemented under the CNDD, with UNDP as executing agency, knowledge exchange will be ensured through the conduct of regular coordination meetings. If relevant, joint capacity-building or sensitization workshops on climate change adaptation at the national level could be conducted in coordination.

As for the two closed projects:

- ID 2156 is the NAPA project, therefore lessons learned were used to guide the formulation of the project components, in particular for the identification of the national priorities. However, this project was closed in 2012, and baseline information was updated in the NAP, which served as a stronger baseline to the Nakanbe project.
- ID 3684 ?Strengthening adaptation capacities and reducing the vulnerability to climate change in Burkina Faso? ended in March 2014 and was implemented outside of the Nakanbe project areas. We can note that some capacity building was conducted at the national level on agro-forest-pastoral adaptive practices which might be relevant for this project. However, as mentioned, the project closed more than 6 years ago and the changes in the Government as well as the evolving knowledge on adaptive practices might make recent projects more relevant for lessons learned and information. Nevertheless, it should be raised that, by being one of the first CCA projects in Burkina Faso, this project has set the ground for CCA sensitization in the country and, as such, is an important base for the Nakanbe project.

9. 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, 3/4/2020 - Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - More information requested. At this stage, there should be an indicative plan for how knowledge and information regarding this project's progress and results are generated and captured. Please refer to this link for an overview of requirements for GEF-6 and GEF-7

projects: <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/events/Knowledge%20Management%20Requirements%20Jan-2020.pdf>

Recommended action: Please provide more details of how a coherent KM strategy. Please indicate how M&E and results will be captured, managed, and disseminated in a coordinated manner.

GEFSEC, 5/14/2020 - Considering this was also a comment from the German council member, and that special attention may be paid to this item, the Secretariat would appreciate more detail here. The Secretariat appreciates the information on page 41 of the Prodoc, but there does not seem to be an actual strategy indicated. The text indicates that a specialist will be hired and reiterates portions of the GEF strategy but offers no cogent approach to doing so. At this stage of project development a simple but specific approach to how knowledge will be generated and captured, is expected. Please include this in the portal as well as in the prodoc.

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

JP, 20 April 2020:

The KM strategy was developed as per the GEF strategy in the Project Document (page 41, section VI) and CEO ER (page 37, B9. Knowledge Management). As raised in the documents, a communication and Knowledge Specialist will be recruited to develop and implement a KM strategy at the inception of the project.

?More specifically, and in conformity with the GEF Knowledge Management strategy, the project will ensure lessons learned from this project are captured and capitalized and the knowledge from other projects is also used in this project. In particular, the Table 2 (Potential synergies with current projects in Burkina Faso) and Table 3 (Stakeholder matrix) give a good overview of the projects and institutions from which knowledge can be collected and used. The first task of the communication and Knowledge Management expert, as per its ToR is to ?Develop a project communications strategy / plan, incorporate it with the annual work plans and update it annually in consultation with project stakeholders; coordinate its implementation work closely?. This will follow the 7 areas of focus of the GEF KM strategy (ie. (i) an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept; (ii) plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations; (iii) proposed processes to capture, assess and document information, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation; (iv) proposed tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites; (v) proposed knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders, (vi) a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project/program impact and sustainability; and (vii) plans for strategic communications). S/he will work with the M&E specialist on knowledge management aspects of the project. Processes such as the PIRs and MTR will be important tools to understand the knowledge generated by the project. The roles of the M&E specialist and Communication and KM expert are detailed in the ToRs available in Annex 8.?

CG ? 7/27/2020

A KM strategy was developed based on the GEF KM requirement (link shared in March 2020 by the GEF). A table was added in the CEO ER (page 37-39) and the Prodoc (p41-

43). The strategy will be revised and updated by the Communication and KM expert at the beginning of the project implementation.

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - No. Please indicate where the responses to any STAP comments are located.

GEFSEC, 5/14/2020 - Cleared. There does not seem to be any STAP comments.

Response to Secretariat comments

JP, 20 April 2020:

There is no record of STAP comments. Please advise.

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - No. Please indicate where the responses to any Council comments are located. They were shared with the team via email on 9 July 2018 (Pradeep, Jaturong, Clotilde)

GEFSEC, 5/14/2020 - Noted that these are located in the Prodoc, not the CEO ER. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

JP, 20 April 2020:

The comments from Germany are available in Annex B of the CEO ER.

Comment	Response
Although the overarching project objective and its rationale are clear, the proposal would benefit from more explicit description of how the proposed outputs will be achieved. So far the activities to achieve the outputs of Component 1 and Component 2 are not entirely clear. For instance, Output 2.3 seeks to facilitate the access to finance and credit as well as to strengthen the relations between producers, organizations and micro-credit agencies. But how this will be achieved in practice is not made explicit. Partly due to the fact that activities are not further specified, the differences between some outputs (for instance, between output 1.1 and output 1.2) are not clear-cut. Germany would appreciate if further details were provided on how the various project outputs will be achieved.	Details on the project outputs and activities are available in the project document (page 18 to 28, section IV Results and Partnership, 4.1 Expected results) and CEO ER (page 15 to 23, A1.3) The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a description of expected outcomes and components of the project).
Once more tangible and measurable outputs have been established, Germany highly recommends developing a robust M&E strategy in support of the delivery of the adaptation benefits. This would help to ensure that that project goal will be achieved. So far the proposal provides fairly little indication of how it will track its impact.	The M&E strategy is available in the Project Document (page 40 to 43, section VI. Monitoring and Evaluation) and CEO ER (page 37 to 40, B.9. Monitoring and Evaluation), following UNDP standard. This includes an M&E budget, that is reflected in the component 3 of the project budget.
Although Germany appreciates the outline of the knowledge management approach, it seems to be a bit too general. Therefore, Germany requests that more details are provided on the knowledge dissemination strategy and the potential networks and partners the project wishes to involve and share experiences with are indicated.	The Knowledge management strategy was developed as per the GEF strategy in the Project Document (page 41, section VI) and CEO ER (page 37, B9. Knowledge Management). The Project Document has also identified technical and financial partners as well as possible partner projects (including providing co-financing) that are listed in Table 2 (Potential synergies with current projects in Burkina Faso) and Table 3 (Stakeholder matrix).
While the proposal identifies a number of stakeholders, it provides little information on how they are going to be engaged. Germany would appreciate if more details are provided on the involvement of the various stakeholder groups. So far it is not entirely clear how and where (in which project components) the project plans to integrate the various groups.	Table 2 (Potential synergies with current projects in Burkina Faso) and Table 3 (Stakeholder matrix) provide information on the engagement of relevant stakeholders and projects.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 5/14/2020 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit. Additionally, please change the Executing partner type to Government. Currently, it is listed as GEF Agency.

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit. Mainly, the item on co-financing does not reflect the changes indicated in the review sheet.

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit. Mainly, the item on co-financing does not reflect the changes indicated in the review sheet. Additionally - as communicated in past reviews, please remove all vehicle costs associated with this project from the LDCF budget (budget line 13). The GEF Secretariat strongly prefers these types of costs to be covered by co-financing. Please also remove the salary and fees for consultants listed as coming from the PMC. For more clarifications, visit: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.52.Inf_.06_Guidelines_on_the_Project_and_Program_Cycle_Policy.pdf

- Please see above - there is no updated Prodoc submitted, and the co-financing remains unchanged from the last review. Additionally, please include the UNDP Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project with resubmission.

GEFSEC, 6/24/2021 - Thank you for submitting the updated prodoc with the budget and the Checklist.

Comments on budget:

- Please remove miscellaneous expenses or provide an explanation

- M&E expenses seem to be double counted on the M&E budget as well as under component 3? Please advise.

- Please remove all vehicle expenses (budget note 13), as according to the guidelines, this cost is strongly preferred to be covered by co-financing.

Response to Secretariat comments

JP, 20 April 2020:

Noted, please see the responses above

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/5/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/15/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/10/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/24/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/23/2020	

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations