



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4971		
Country/Region:	Burkina Faso		
Project Title:	Adapting Natural Resource Dependent Livelihoods to Climate induced Risks in Selected Landscapes in Burkina Faso: the Boucle du Mouhoun Forest Corridor and the Mare d'Oursi Wetlands Basin		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4598 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-2; CCA-1; CCA-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$7,000,000
Co-financing:	\$30,672,541	Total Project Cost:	\$37,792,541
PIF Approval:	July 19, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	August 21, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Burkina Faso is an LDC and therefore eligible under LDCF.	Yes, no changes since PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Yes, a letter of endorsement signed by the OFP is attached.</p> <p>Update 6/11/2012: Correction -- no letter by OFP is found.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide a letter as proof of OFP endorsement of this project.</p> <p>Update 6/14/2012: The letter of OFP</p>	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		endorsement has been supplied.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNDP has the comparative advantage to support climate change adaptation and natural resource management projects in Africa and in Burkina Faso.	Yes, no change since PIF.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, UNDP has a significantly large programme of projects focusing on governance, decentralization, environment, etc., in Burkina Faso. Three key strategy documents also provide a chapeau for the project's fit within the UN's and UNDP's Programs in Burkina Faso: UNDAF, CPD, and CPAP.	Yes, no change.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a	
	• the focal area allocation?	n/a	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	yes	Yes, no change.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes.	Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF	Yes, the project is aligned with Objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.	Yes, no change since PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	objectives identified?		
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, the project is consistent with six of the 12 priorities identified in the country's NAPA. The project is also consistent with national development strategies, such as the draft Strategy for Rapid Growth and Sustainable Development, 2011- 2015, the Rural Development Strategy (2003), and other plans and reports.	Yes, no change since PIF.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>Yes. The project aims to develop capacity at a national level.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement, please elaborate concerning the sustainability of project outcomes.</p>	<p>Not clear. Please provide a response to the request for elaboration issued at PIF review stage on the support of the capacities development to the sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>Update 4/23/2014: The proposal elaborates on how capacities developed are expected to contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes, and capacity building activities are embedded throughout the project components. The activities and arrangements appear to be promising in terms of supporting the sustainability of project outcomes.</p>
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	The proposal brings forward several baseline projects for proposed adaptation activities. Two of these projects are the PNGT2 and PAGIRE. Both baseline projects contribute to the largest share of the co-financing, with a total of \$6 M in grants, through the Ministry of Agriculture, Hydraulics and Fisheries Resources (MAHRH). PNGT2 will target a portion of its	Yes, the baseline project and problems are clear.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>resources to the sites of this project; it fits well with key interventions in Component 2 as it supports land management. PAGIRE is an integrated water resource management plan launched in 2003, which activities fit well with wetland restoration activities in Component 2.</p> <p>Other relevant baselines for the investment Component of the project are:1) AfDB-PLCE's interventions on the Niger River Basin, which brings an estimated contribution of \$1.5 â€“ 2M to the LDCF project; and 2)PRD/SP-CONEDD, which has financed hydrological studies and has made investments on environmental management activities in the local communities targeted by the LDCF project. Approximately \$1.7M of this baseline qualifies as co-financing.</p> <p>However, it is not clear if the pilot sites of the project will be aligned with pilot sites of PAGIRE and AfDB-PLCE interventions.</p> <p>Other projects are listed as baseline projects, which can support activities in the areas of: development planning and policy in Component 3 (AAP/BKF and GCCA); building institutional and community-level capacity (UNDP COGEL and UNDP ACRIC); water resource management (AMSED); improved climate projections that could support Component 1 (CORDEX).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Recommended Action: Please clarify the area of intervention of the PAGIRE plan and the AfDB-PLCE, so that these are aligned with the pilot sites of the project in which water management activities will take place.</p> <p>Update 5/22/2012: Additional clarifications have been provided. In addition, the reviewer supports the applicant's position concerning the necessity to engage in consultations as part of the project site-selection process.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>Cost-effectiveness has been considered for all of the project components, through comparing various options, exploring cost-saving arrangements, for instance by housing the National Observatory for Environment and Sustainable Development system in the project's executing agency which has the necessary fixed resources already in place, and other.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Not clearly. Some projects included in the "baseline" of this proposal do take into account climate change (i.e., PANA BFK UNDP/DANIDA). These initiatives must be removed from the baseline, as adaptation measures should not build on other adaptation initiatives.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please remove baseline initiatives that take into account climate change, when describing additionality of the project. Please</p>	<p>Yes, the activities are based on additional reasoning, and the recommendation at PIF stage has been taken on board.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>specify which baseline development activities in the two pilot sites the LDCF project will be building on (specifically for Component 1 and 3).</p> <p>Update 5/22/2012: this has been done.</p> <p>Update 6/11/2012: Please ensure that at CEO Endorsement no adaptation projects are included in the baseline or cofinancing.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Not entirely. Recommended Action: Please disaggregate Inv and TA from Component 2.</p> <p>Update 5/22/2012: The GEF project application templates for the period covered by GEF-5 are designed to support tracking of funding dedicated to TA or Investment activities. Accordingly, the correct use of template requires the user to designate each project component as falling under one or the other category, but not both. Where there is a mix of TA and Investment activities, the user is advised either to select that category for which most funding will be dedicated, or to restructure the project, where appropriate, in such a way as to better separate TA and investment activities.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please clarify the grant type category for each component.</p> <p>Update 6/11/2012: The grant type</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		category has been clarified for each component.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Not entirely. Please refer to Section 13. Update 5/22/2012: Yes.	Yes.
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	Yes, for this stage. By CEO endorsement, please provide further details.	Yes, and additional details have been provided, as requested at PIF stage.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. CSOs and NGOs are active participants in the project, as well as local stakeholders, composed of herdsmen, women, community organizations, farmers' associations, etc.	Yes.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes, the project has identified three main risks: 1) information systems may not be sustained beyond the lifetime of the project; 2) local communities are not receptive to changing traditional practices; 3) land use and tenure conflicts. The proposal also identifies management strategies for these risks.	Yes. There is a more thorough risk framework in place, due to efforts undertaken during the project preparation stage. Mitigation measures are adequately identified and described.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project explains the coordination efforts with other active development and climate initiatives in BF, including the project under preparation in the country, by FAO. Recommended Action 6/19/2012: By CEO Endorsement, please ensure full consistency and complementarity of the project, particularly Component 1, with other LDCF Initiatives on related topics.	Yes, the project document elaborates on the relationship between the grant, baseline, and other related initiatives.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Furthermore, by CEO Endorsement, please ensure to provide full cost-effectiveness evidence, including that of Component 1, currently estimated at USD 1 million of LDCF grant funding.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>No. There is no section in the proposal that mentions the execution arrangements.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please include execution arrangements in the proposal.</p> <p>Update 5/23/2012: The project will be executed by the National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development. In addition, a number of other national institutions will play a pivotal role in the project due to their mandate in the management of resources like water, land, forests, livestock, etc.</p>	Yes, the project implementation and execution arrangements are adequate.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes, the project structure is quite close to the structure at PIF, and justifications for minor changes have been provided. This is satisfactory.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, PMCs are below 5% of the sub-total, i.e. total of project components financed by the LDCF grant.	No change since PIF.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Please see comment under #25 Update 5/23/2012: Yes, the funding and cofinancing per objective appear adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.	Yes, the cofinancing has increased relative to the amount indicated at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Indicative co-financing reflects a 1:2 ratio, and is composed of \$14,550,000 in grants (96% of total co-financing). Recommended action: please consider adjusting the ratio, so that the cofinancing is relatively higher with respect to the LDCF grant, or provide justifications. Update 5/23/2012: This has been done, and the grant-to-cofinancing is now at a 1:3 ratio.	No. The cofinancing letters do not match the amounts indicated in the proposal. Recommended Action: Please check the amounts listed in Table C against those stated in the letters provided. In the resubmission, please ensure that the total cofinancing figures are also correctly reflected throughout. Update 4/23/2014: The pending issue has been resolved.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes, UNDP is bringing \$2,250,000 in co-financing, in the form of grants.	Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please address issues under 11, 13, 14, 15, 20, 24, and 25. Update 5/23/2012: Not yet. Please address issues under 14.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update 6/11/2012: Please supply the letter of OFP endorsement. Update 6/19/2012: The letter of OFP endorsement has been provided.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please take note of recommendation under 19.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		No. Please include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG. Update 4/23/2014: Yes, the information on the PPG progress has been submitted.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		CEO endorsement will be recommended after comments under 10, 25 and 32 are adequately addressed. Update 4/23/2014: All pending issues have been resolved and the project is now recommended for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 01, 2012	April 09, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 23, 2012	April 23, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 11, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes, the proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	The PPG request will be approved after the adjustment of the agency fee according to the revised fee structure policy. Update 1/23/2013: The agency fee has been to adjusted 9.5% and the PPG is ready for clearance.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.