

## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS

Country/Region: Burkina Faso  
 Project Title: Burkina Faso: SLM subprogram for the Centre-West Region  
 GEFSEC Project ID: **4301**  
 GEF Agency Project ID: 3970 (UNDP) GEF Agency: UNDP  
 GEF Focal Area (s): Land Degradation  
 GEF-4 Strategic Program (s):  
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$0 GEF Project Allocation: \$2,219,594 Co-financing:\$8,141,633 Total Project Cost:\$10,361,227  
 PIF Approval Date: Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: August 28, 2006  
 Program Manager: Jean-Marc Sinnassamy GEF Agency Contact Person: Josep A. GarÃ-

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		July 10, 2010 Addressed.
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		NA
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		July 10, 2010 Addressed.
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	July 10, 2010 The project fits with the CPP framework and its overarching objectives.	July 10, 2010 The project fits with the CPP framework and its overarching objectives.
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?		July 10, 2010 Addressed in the CPP programme.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?		NA (GEF3).
	• The focal areas?		GEF3 project financed under the LD focal area.
	• Strategic objectives? • Strategic program?		OP15 (GEF3) The project is the adaptation of the Parent programme in the Center-West region.

Project Design	6. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?		
	7. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		The project will produce measurable global environment benefits on 50,000 ha of forest lands, 35,000 ha of pastoral lands, 10,000 ha of river banks, 5,000 ha of wetlands, 10,000 ha of agricultural lands, and 10,000 ha of transition areas for fauna protection that will benefit of a SLM system. Efforts will be deployed to train farmers and facilitate the use of SLM practices (at least 50 percent of the targeted farmers are expected to do so), and the results will also be measured with the increase of carbon stocks (20 percent). The legal and regulatory reforms will focus on solving at least 50 percent of the constraints identified in the national framework.
	8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	Cf. CPP framework	Yes, the project framework fits with the programmatic approach.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?	Cf. CPP	Addressed.
	10. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	- The CPP was designed in this spirit of coordination and synergy with other national or regional initiatives.	Addressed.
	11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	Addressed in the CPP.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		Addressed. The cost effectiveness is searched through an institutional and capacity building approach, associated to field demonstration with farmers.
	13. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		Addressed. The project fits with the CPP framework.
	14. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and	cf. in the CPP.	Addressed.

	includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?		
Justification for GEF Grant	15. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?	Addressed in the CPP.	Addressed.
	16. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?	NA	NA
	17. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		Without the support of the GEF
	18. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?		7.82%
	19. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		No major comments.
	20. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?		
	21. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		Addressed.
	22. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators?		NA
	23. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes. a M&E plan is included.
	Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP	
Convention Secretariat			
Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments			
Agencies' response to Council comments			

Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendations at PIF	24. Is PIF clearance being recommended?		
	25. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	26. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		<p>July 10, 2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 74: please revise the text on global environment benefits.</li> <li>- section 36: is it reasonable to affirm that no issue has been identified during project preparation, and all implementation risks are low and manageable? The five year time of preparation needs a minimum of explanation, and any mechanism or management decision will be welcome to avoid such uncomfortable situations for all partners (country, GEF secretariat, partners, and agency) in the future and for the implementation of the CPP .</li> <li>- Last, the principle to have a Principal Technical Advisor paid half on the management costs and half on a technical component needs to be justified.</li> </ul> <p>Upon clarification of these 3 points, the project will be recommended for clearance.</p> <p>July 20, 2010 (UA): The 3 issues have been adequately addressed in the re-submission of the CEO endorsement request. PM recommends endorsement.</p>
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review		July 12, 2010
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review		July 20, 2010
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review		

## REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	
Recommendation	<b>5. Is PPG being recommended?</b>	
Other comments		
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review	
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review	
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review	

wb21049  
 C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf  
 8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM