



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5187		
Country/Region:	Burkina Faso		
Project Title:	Community based Rural Development Project 3rd Phase with Sustainable Land and Forestry Management		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	130568 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3; CCM-5; BD-1; BD-2; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,858,741
Co-financing:	\$71,942,384	Total Project Cost:	\$77,801,125
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Paola Agostini

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		Addressed at PFD level.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A letter of endorsement in date of July 2, 2012 is included. We will need further explanation about the breakdown per component that is annexed to the letter. It is a very good signal that the project document is fully compatible with the priorities set up by the country through the NPFE. However,	

		<p>provided in the table, some ideas do not seem eligible per se (SGP coordination, budget for SP/CONEDD, budget for OFINAP). Please, clarify.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Addressed.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		Addressed a PFD level.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		Yes.
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		Yes.
Resource Availability	6. 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? 		<p>Please, confirm that budget issues are crystal clear with the OFP and the Burkina Faso authorities. There are currently adequate star allocations remaining although in the request for CEO endorsement there is a reference to other pending projects for Burkino Faso that may influence the STAR allocation balance.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Point taken. Cleared.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 		<p>Please, confirm that budget issues are crystal clear with the OFP and the Burkina Faso authorities. There are currently adequate star allocations remaining although in the request for CEO endorsement there is a reference to other pending projects for Burkino Faso that</p>

			November 16, 2012 Cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		<p>The project is triggering \$2 million from the SFM/REDD+ incentive program on the top of the \$6 million from the STAR allocations. This ratio of 1:3 is the maximum possible, meaning that all the project is focused on forest issues.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 The point is not addressed. It is certainly not a new request and your presumptions are not exact. Please, refer to the document GEF/C.38/Inf.4/Rev.2. For your convenience, please find the following elements of guidance to understand how the ratio of 3:1 works: The forest program aims to be used as an incentive to coalesce and augment multi-sectoral and multi-focal area investments in transformative initiatives in forests. The rationale to use STAR allocations from three focal areas to work specifically on forests reflects the guidance coming from all three conventions dealing with forests, and for which the GEF is a financial mechanism (UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD). The incentive is only provided if they leverage contributions and foster convergence of investments from GEF-5 STAR balances in the focal areas of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation directed towards forest activities. Only forest activities. The aim is to achieve multiple benefits under more cost-effective strategies. If it is not the case, there is no obligation to use the ratio of 3:1. On one hand, we have many examples of projects that use a lower ratio when the project is not 100 percent focused on forests. On other hand, we have always been flexible on understanding what forest issues mean in a landscape approach.</p> <p>November 21, 2012 Cleared. Thanks for the clarification</p>

Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		<p>- In the Table A, please provide the missing information into brackets for the SFM and the BD outputs (number, hectares).</p> <p>- For the Climate Change result framework, please, see comments in #8.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Addressed.</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCE/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		<p>- Please, confirm that the project will be able to report on indicators requested for each focal areas.</p> <p>- Please revise the CCM5 objective in Table 1 to read: "Outcome 5.1 Good management practices in LULUCF adopted both within the forestland and in the wider landscape".</p> <p>- From the table A, we understand that \$1.3 million will be used under the CCM-5. However, we are not sure to find the activities eligible under CCM5 in the result framework, table B. Thanks to clarify.</p> <p>- In the same direction, it is difficult to understand the added value of the SFM (in the component 3? in the component 4?). For instance, in the component 4, there are many outputs that are more clearly achievable under the BD strategy (ecosystem management plan, three protected area management plans, business plans for the PAs, improved management of existing corridors and livelihood options for local communities). In addition, the only mention of forests is in the title of the component "Sustainable Land and Forestry management". It is then difficult to understand what will be done on forests or in terms of Sustainable Forest Management. Please, explain the synergy here that warrants the additional resources from the incentive. Thanks.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Addressed.</p>
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant		<p>Please, mention the updated UNFCCC National Communication document currently in draft and submitted by December 2012. Thanks.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Cleared.</p>

	NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		<p>We understand that the document needs to be short. This is probably why we do not find further details on the sustainability. Please, explain the sustainability of the approach (notably once the management plans will be done: how will they be implemented? Is the How carbon benefits will be sustained once the project is completed).</p> <p>November 16, 2012 We understand that sustainability and the future of any incentive mechanism are difficult issues beyond this project. addressed.</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?		<p>Baseline problems were described, and included forest degradation, but there was no description of carbon stocks or GHG emissions. This information is essential to justify incremental/additional cost reasoning for CCM5 funding.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Cleared.</p>
Project Design	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>Lessons were taken from past projects to propose coherent approaches in harmony with the ongoing decentralization. Key issues, as land tenure and NRM, have been included. Capacity building is focusing legitimate institutions. Communication and conflict solving mechanisms are also considered. All these aspects will contribute to develop a cost-effective approach.</p> <p>However, it is not clear if other alternatives have been considered and explored. Thanks to clarify this point.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Clarified.</p>

	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>		<p>Please provide estimated values for the indicators for expected outcomes (see notably the table A, with the number of hectares under management practices, the number of ha with an improved management, protected, or not protected, and the number of ha of Forests under sustainable management).</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Addressed.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>		<p>In the PFD, some interesting activities were planned, for instance: evaluation of carbon stock in forest formations and agroforestry, assessment of the carbon sequestration potentials of local forest landscapes, MRV. We make the assumption that, due to the changes of the baseline projects, these activities cannot be maintained and will be developed through the FIP. Thanks to clarify.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Clarified. Many thanks.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please clarify how the activities align with CCM-5 objectives and please provide methods for measuring values for outcome indicators. - If forest restoration is to be conducted, please provide details on the methods to be used. - Please fill in tracking tool SFM/REDD+ (III Project Outcomes, Core Results) for indirect ha and carbon benefits (amount accrued between end of project and 20 years after end of project). This should be the incremental amount beyond the baseline (that would have occurred without GEF investment) and beyond the direct benefits (accrued within the project period). <p>November 16, 2012 Thanks for the clarification. On one hand, please, note that the question related to the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental reasoning is not a new requirement. This question is the number 15 in the review and has been used since the beginning of GEF5. On other hand, we understand the difficulty to consider indirect benefits and that this part has not been fulfilled in the tracking tools. Addressed.</p>

	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?		Addressed.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		Addressed.
	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)		<p>- For the second risk "Inaccessible or inappropriate scientific methods and tools" please consider that this is an appropriate place to include as a risk mitigation measure the use of some of the tools that can help quantify carbon stores and avoidance of GHG emissions.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Cleared.</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		<p>There appears to be a number of interrelated initiatives that will provide synergy with this project. At PFD level, this project was supposed to be developed in cofinancing with the FIP. We understand that for calendar reasons, the FIP will just be considered as parallel activities. However, it could be useful to explain how this current project is complementary of the FIP, notably because this project is using \$2 million of the SFM/REDD+ on the top of the STAR allocations.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Addressed. Thanks.</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		<p>We appreciate that the right supervision authorities are involved and that local departments will be empowered, working closely with decentralized powers, notably the Village Development Councils. However, there is no mention of technical and operational partners on the ground. that also have their legitimacy. as the "Chambres</p>

			<p>that it is relevant that the Administration is doing everything? Did you explore other cost-efficient options. Actually no other options seem to have been discussed. Thanks to clarify.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Cleared.</p>
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		There was no PIF per se. However at PFD level, a project summary was provided. See comment, cell 19.
	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?		<p>The management costs should be under 5 percent, meaning under \$352,000. Please adjust. We remind that the management costs have to be calculated from the sub-total used for the project (\$7,037,038), and not from the total project costs (\$7,407,408).</p> <p>November 16, 2012 The rule of five percent for management costs cannot be a surprise and has always been applied the same way - meaning 5 percent of the project grant out of the management costs. We take note that the management costs only exceed the five percent of \$18,370 and that may be fully acceptable for such complex project in a LDC context. However, we would like to invite the writer to prefer the dialogue and provide arguments -as it has always been the case for other projects and other writers- rather than forcing unilaterally a decision that is not in the agency's mandate.</p>
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		<p>It is difficult to accurately check this point, as the cofinancing is not provided by outcomes and outputs, but per component. However, we subscribe to the general project reasoning and the total cofinancing is good (1:13).</p> <p>In the table B, please, tell us if it is possible to mention the cofinancing per outcome, and/or indicate how each project component and expected outcome and output lines up with funding</p>

			<p>better understand the reasoning for each focal area. For instance, the incremental reasoning with the LD focal area is easy to capture. For the BD focal area, the reasoning is less obvious and without further explanations, some activities might be taken by the cofinancing (capacity building, management plans,...). Some questions were already raised for the activities under the CCM5 and the SFM objectives. Thanks to clarify.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 - Ok for the cofinancing. - For the reasoning on BD: Actually, we do not see contradictory comments. Each comment should be put under its context and the specific related questions in the review. It is one point to consider that activities fit into the GEF5 BD strategy. It is another point to consider these activities as the result of a reasoning and justify the use of GEF resources on the top of a baseline scenario. "Ecosystem management plan, protected area management plans, business plans for the PAs, improved management of existing corridors and livelihood options for local communities" are actually perfect examples of activities potentially eligible under the GEF5 BD strategies. However, without a right GEF reasoning (rationale, baseline, evidence of the complementary use of the GEF) and the understanding that these activities complete government and baseline project efforts and will be sustainable, we cannot be conclusive on the interests of these activities. If you need further information, you can refer to the following GEF Documents (http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEFME-C30-2-IncrementalCostEvaluation110206.pdf, as well as the document GEF/C.31/12, May 14, 2007, and http://www.thegef.org/gef/strategies).</p> <p>The point is not addressed. Please confirm the efforts made by the national and local agencies on these management planning issues. Confirm the reasoning, confirm these plans will be implemented, and confirm the sustainability.</p> <p>November 21, 2012 Cleared</p>
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement:</p>		<p>Please, provide the minutes of negotiation when they will be available.</p>

	financing is provided.		Cleared.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		Addressed.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		- Tracking tools for C estimation are included but estimates for indicators are not included on the tracking tool (t CO2eq.emission avoided or sequestered). November 16, 2012 Addressed.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Addressed.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>Message to the STAP: Please, see if the responses fully address the points raised in the review, notably about the indicators and how the Global Environment Benefits will be tracked.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 Thanks for the response. Actually, the point was not for the Agency, but for the STAP. Our wish is to avoid any conflict of interest and be sure that the STAP is fine with your elements of response. Cleared.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation	32. At endorsement/approval,		NA

Endorsement/ Approval	progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>We thank the Agency for the close work with the client to reflect their expectations. The CEO endorsement shows a high standard. Please, address the few points above and we will be pleased to recommend the project.</p> <p>November 16, 2012 We thank the Agency for the clarifications. Please, see the remaining points in the questions 6 about the use of SFM and 25. Some responses from our part may help you for future reviews (15, 23, 29, for instance).</p> <p>November 21, 2012 The CEO endorsement is recommended. However, please check the table B: the breakdown for the cofinancing does not match with the sub-total. There is a difference of \$390,001.</p> <p>11h05: Cleared. The project is recommended for clearance.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*		October 29, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		November 16, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		November 21, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.