



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	10025		
Country/Region:	Burkina Faso		
Project Title:	Capacity building for Burkina Faso's transparency system for climate change mitigation and adaptation		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CBIT-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,180,000
Co-financing:	\$150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,330,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Manuela Ravina da Silva	Agency Contact Person:	Geordie Colville

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MRS/JDS, March 26, 2018: Yes, the program is aligned with CBIT programming directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MRS/JDS, March 26, 2018: Yes, the project is consistent with the focus of the country's NDC, the third National Communication and BUR are being prepared with GEF funds. The project aligns also with national plans such as the PNDES where it points out the need of institutional capacity and	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		building capacity for implementation of MRV and tools applied.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MRS/JDS March 26, 2018: Not yet, please address following comments below :</p> <p>1) In the Project Justification section, the PIF should identify which sectors are of main importance for GHG emissions as stated in the NDC. The PIF should also provide the most recent data on the contribution of the AFOLU sector to the national GHG emissions.</p> <p>2) Please explain how this project intends to resolve the capacity issues described in the Project Justification section in order to address issues of sustainability and scaling.</p> <p>3) Please provide a description (or if available a diagram) of the institutional arrangements, or the current working relationships among the various ministries as it pertains to GHG inventory processes (e.g. data collection, QA/QC, etc...). Also, please specify which Ministry will serve as the primary project coordinator and responsible for delivery of the final outcomes.</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MRS/JDS, March 26, 2018: Yes, the PIF is designed based on conclusions and gaps highlighted during the National communication elaboration processes. The project is also complementary to the on-going BUR and the Third National Communication.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MRS/JDS, March 26, 2018: Not yet, please address following comments below:</p> <p>1) Although it is mentioned in the project description sectors of priority in the NDC, the project objective and table B do not reflect any priority sectors and seems to target all sectors of the NDC, this should be narrowed down to the priority sectors. Also, it is not clear in table B and under the alternative scenario description if the project will set up baselines in the sectors needed and work on updating emission factors and recalculation of GHG emissions, work on indicators, establishing information management systems and databases. Also, there is no specific information on which tools and MRV systems to be promoted, please clarify.</p> <p>2) Component 1: the name of the description does not fully reflect the intentions of this component while</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>mentioning "monitoring and evaluation transparency" . Please replace with a title that reflects better the purpose of the component.</p> <p>3) Output 1.1: For this output, please specify which stakeholders you are providing training for. In terms of project design, the GEF recommends that any training/capacity building workshop activities take place after Burkina Faso has a more concrete set of institutional arrangements in place. Please describe in more detail how outputs from the current NC/BUR process can be leveraged for this project.</p> <p>4) Output 1.2: The output overlaps the description of Outcome 1. Further, it is not clear how effective institutional arrangements will be established under the alternative project scenario.</p> <p>5) Output 1.3: Please describe how this output is linked with the establishment of institutional arrangements. Are these individual memorandum-of-understanding (MOUs) agreements between various agencies? If so, please describe any potential political or legal obstacles that might impede progress.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>6) Output 1.4: Please describe the need for this output further. Is this intended to be a political document? A legal framework? Who will organize and lead this task? How is this work related to other ongoing/planned projects, especially those that support the development of an enhanced transparency framework for UNFCCC reporting?</p> <p>7) Output 2.3: It is not clear what tools and targeted sectors these guidelines are intended for. Since there seems to be low availability of data, please explain why outputs referring to the improvement of GHG emissions estimates (e.g. via development of country-specific emission factors) or setting up baselines for priority sectors are not included as outputs.</p> <p>8) Output 2.4: Please specify what data collection tools to be used for the planned training and specify the targeted sector to implement the tools.</p> <p>9) Output 2.5: the name of this output in Table B is broad and does not describe much, further information should be added.</p> <p>10) Please describe how activities and outputs from the NC and BUR</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		processes can be used to accomplish Outputs 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MRS/JDS, March 26, 2018: Yes, several CSO organizations are partners in the project, covering gender and socio-economic aspects.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	MRS/JDS, March 26, 2018:N/A. This project requests funding from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MRS/JDS, March 26, 2018: Not yet, please address the comments in boxes 3 and 5.	
Review Date	Review	March 26, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.