



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

GEF ID:	<b>9318</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Burkina Faso</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Climate Resilience in the Nakambe Basin</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5429 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,416,210</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$10,800,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$15,216,210</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2016</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Katya Kuang-Idba</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mame Dagou Dioup</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.  GEFSEC, 5/17/2018 - Yes. Same as at original PIF submission.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	YES. The proposed project is clearly aligned with Burkina Faso's NAPA, as well as the Vision 2025, the Rural Development Strategy, the National	The NAP in Burkina Faso mentioned in the PIF only includes the development of the NAP document and the identification of priority axis. A meeting was organized

<sup>1</sup> 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
		<p>Policy for the Environment, the Forestry Code and the National Water Policy.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/17/2018 - More clarification requested. The agency has clarified that new policies have been developed with which this proposal is aligned, including the National Economic and Social Development Plan (PNDES), the National Adaptation Plan (NAP), the National Strategy for Climate Change learning, the Sectoral Policy for environment, green economy and climate change and the PNSR II. However, more information regarding how the proposed initiative intends to coordinate with the NAP process would be appreciated.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b> Please indicate how the proposed initiative intends to coordinate with and inform the NAP process, which was also developed by UNDP.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/24/2018 - Cleared. The agency has revised the PIF to indicate that that the proposed intervention is aligned with the priority axes identified in the roadmap for the NAP process, as listed on page 15 of the revised PIF. Additionally, capacity</p>	<p>to present these results. This was clarified in the PIF. The project is aligned with the priorities axis identified in the roadmap, including axis 1, 2, 4 and 5. The capacity building under outcome 1 will help advance the NAP process by improving the capacities of key institutions in the Nakambe Basin to plan for climate change adaptation in the face of climate risks. The second outcome will strengthen these trainings by providing field-tested experiences and lessons learned that will feed into national and local planning and budgeting, therefore advancing the NAP process.</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		building activities under component 1 of the proposed intervention will build capacity of key institutions in the Nakambe Basin to integrate adaptation into long-term planning. Under outcome 2, field tested experiences and lessons will be provided to inform national and local planning and budgeting, which will serve as an informational base for future NAP-related training.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p> <p>The PIF describes adequately the current and expected effects of climate change in the Nakambe Basin; as well as the associated, anthropogenic drivers of environmental degradation.</p> <p>In absence of further clarity regarding the baseline scenario and relevant baseline initiatives, however, the proposed sustainability strategy and opportunities for scaling up are not clear.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please revisit and strengthen the proposed sustainability</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>strategy and pathways to scaling up.</p> <p>12/12/15 – YES. With clear linkages to ongoing and planned investments in the Nakambe Basin and across the country; and the integration of climate risks and adaptation into the water sector strategy; the proposed project presents an adequate sustainability strategy, and it could be well placed to catalyze replication and scaling up beyond its intended target areas. It would be critical, however, to revisit and strengthen these elements of the project design by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/27/2018 - Yes. As at original PIF submission.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The baseline scenario and the associated baseline initiatives and sources of co-financing are not entirely clear.</p> <p>According to Table C indicative co-financing amounts to \$16 million, whereas the description of the relevant baseline initiatives on p. 8 only cites \$10.2 million in co-financing from three sources, and an unspecified share of the \$5 million 'Rural Sector National Program' (PNSR).</p> <p>With respect to all the baseline</p>	<p>This was corrected in Table C. US\$ 5 million are available from the Ministry of Agriculture, water resources, sanitation and food security, and US\$ 5 million are available from the Ministry of Agriculture, water resources, sanitation and food security, Nakambe Water Agency, and the DGM.</p> <p>As regards the SDAGE, this is the Master Plan for the Development and Management of Water Resources (SDAGE) in the Nakambé basin. The Nakambé Water Agency confirmed that the scenarios were developed but the plan was not approved yet and is still under</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>investments, the PIF should specify their target areas and their intended duration, and as for the 'Bagre Growth Pole Project' the PIF should specify how the proposed LDCF grant would build on and strengthen the broader World Bank-IDA grant (\$115 million).</p> <p>With regard to Component 1, the proposed project would focus on building the capacity of the Directorate General for the Nakambe Water Agency, as well as local communities. It is not clear what role other national and local authorities -- such as the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources, Sanitation and Food Security -- play under the baseline scenario, and how they would be engaged in the proposed project.</p> <p>Moreover, the additional reasoning for Component 1 does not clearly consider the dynamic baseline scenario associated with Burkina Faso's hydro-meteorological and climate information services; and the potential constraints in terms of the absorptive capacity of the General Direction of Meteorology. The LDCF-financed project on strengthening climate information and early warning systems (GEF ID:</p>	<p>development. This gives a chance to the project to support the PNE, in charge of the SDAGE, to ensure the integration of climate change in the finally approved version. PNE will therefore be involved during PPG consultations.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>5003) is clearly relevant beyond the hardware it would deploy, including through capacity development for end-users. The technically cleared project 'Promoting index-based weather insurance for smallholder farmers in Burkina Faso' (GEF ID: 8032) would also invest in hydro-meteorological and climate information services.</p> <p>With respect to Component 2, the proposed, additional adaptation measures seem relevant, but the linkages between the proposed LDCF grant and the relevant baseline investments are not evident.</p> <p>As for coordination with other relevant initiatives, the PIF could provide further information as to how the proposed project would be coordinated with the on-going FAO-LDCF project (GEF ID: 5014), which has activities in the same target areas, and the IFAD project 'Fostering Participatory Natural Resource Management Project' (GEF ID: 9141) under the Food Security Integrated Approach Pilot Program (GEF ID: 9070).</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b> Please (i) ensure that the indicative sources</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and amounts of co-financing are consistently described across Table C and pp. 8-11; (ii) specify the target areas and intended duration of each baseline initiative; (iii) clarify how the proposed LDCF grant relates to the broader World Bank investment associated with the 'Bagre Growth Pole Project'; (iv) provide further information regarding the baseline scenario for Component 1, including the institutional arrangements and upcoming investments in hydro-meteorological and climate information services; (v) specify the linkages between the proposed, LDCF-financed activities and the baseline projects under Component 2; and (vi) describe further how coordination and complementarity would be ensured with other relevant, GEF-financed projects.</p> <p>12/12/15 – YES. The revised PIF addresses adequately the recommendations made. The re-submission provides a clearer and more consistent description of the baseline scenario, relevant baseline initiatives and associated sources and amounts of co-financing, as well as how the proposed project would be coordinated with and complementary to other relevant, GEF-financed</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>projects.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/17/2018 - Unclear. The co-financing amount is different when comparing Table C and what is described in the text. Currently in the text co-financing is listed as \$5 million coming from the second phase of the PNSR II and another \$5 million coming from the DGM, whereas Table C described \$10m coming from the DGM.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify the discrepancy above. Additionally, please clarify if the SDAGE is the Master Plan for the Development Scheme and Water Management of the Nakambé Management area and whether this is under development or ongoing.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/24/2018 - Cleared. The agency has revised the PIF document as requested to clarify that \$5 million is coming from the Ministry of Agriculture's Rural Sector National Program and \$5 million is coming from the same Ministry's Directorate for Meteorology's (DGM) Master Plan for the Development and Management of Water Resources (SDAGE), which is currently still being developed.</p>	



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please revise the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>12/12/15 – YES. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/16/2018. Yes. As at original PIF submission.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>YES. Socio-economic aspects and gender considerations have been adequately described in the PIF.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/16/2018 - Yes. As at original PIF submission.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 3, 4 and 5.	There is no project team yet, but the CO is closely working with the different development partners in the country and

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>12/12/15 – YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project may be processed for clearance/ approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/17/2018 - Not yet. Please refer to Items 2 and 4 and resubmit. Additionally, please indicate whether the project team is aware of and coordinating with FAO, which has developed a readiness proposal for GCF funding, to ensure complementarity going forward.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/24/2018 - Yes. The agency has officially addressed Items 2 and 4 and this project resubmission is being cleared for approval and PPG. The Agency has also provided justifications for how this project is still aligned with national priorities, as well as updates to co-financing.</p> <p>The PIF, as originally cleared, offers little tangible and measurable outputs in the support of the delivery of adaptation benefits. At CEO Endorsement stage, the Secretariat is expecting a higher level of detail regarding the proposed outputs and targets that the project aims to</p>	<p>will facilitate the coordination with the GCF readiness team to ensure complementarity, starting with the formulation team for the full project document.</p>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		achieve.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	November 03, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 12, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 17, 2018	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<sup>3</sup> 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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		