



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

|  |  |                              |                          |
|--|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | <b>9141</b>  |                              |                          |
| Country/Region:                            | <b>Burkina Faso</b>  |                              |                          |
| Project Title:                             | <b>GEF-IAP: Participatory Natural Resource Management and Rural Development Project in the North, Centre-North and East Regions (Neer Tamba project)</b> |                              |                          |
| GEF Agency:                                | <b>IFAD</b>  | GEF Agency Project ID:       |                          |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | <b>GEF Trust Fund</b>  | GEF Focal Area (s):          | <b>Multi Focal Area</b>  |
| GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | <b>LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5;</b>   |                              |                          |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | <b>\$70,000</b>  | Project Grant:               | <b>\$7,269,448</b>       |
| Co-financing:                              | <b>\$35,900,000</b>  | Total Project Cost:          | <b>\$43,239,448</b>      |
| PIF Approval:                              |  | Council Approval/Expected:   |                          |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |  | Expected Project Start Date: |                          |
| Program Manager:                           | <b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>  | Agency Contact Person:       | <b>Naoufel Telahigue</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>                                       |                     |                 |
|                            | 2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? |                     |                 |
| <b>Project Design</b>      | 3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,                  |                     |                 |

<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)?

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

## PIF Review

| Review Criteria                  | Questions   | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|
|                                  | market transformation, scaling, and innovation?   |                     |                 |
|                                  | 4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?  |                     |                 |
|                                  | 5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs? |                     |                 |
|                                  | 6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?                |                     |                 |
| <b>Availability of Resources</b> | 7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):            |                     |                 |
|                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>  |                     |                 |
|                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>  |                     |                 |
|                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>                      |                     |                 |
|                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>                         |                     |                 |
|                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>   |                     |                 |
| <b>Recommendations</b>           | 8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?                   |                     |                 |
| <b>Review Date</b>               | Review  |                     |                 |
|                                  | Additional Review (as necessary)  |                     |                 |
|                                  | Additional Review (as necessary)  |                     |                 |

## CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria                     | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement   | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| <b>Project Design and Financing</b> | 1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided? | <p>This is a child project under the Food Security IAP, for which a PIF stage was not required. The project, however, is well aligned with the PFD and is consistent with the overall framework to advance sustainability and resilience for food security.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |                                  |
|                                     | 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?  | <p>The overall project structure is sound, and appropriate for achieving the expected outcomes. However, there are issues that need to be addressed and clarified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The overall context is not clear with respect to land area under agriculture and livestock production. How much of the 17,885 km<sup>2</sup> is actually under production? What proportion this area will be targeted for "scaling-up" under the IAP? How does that relate to the 8,500 ha targeted each for Integrated management and SLM, respectively (i.e. total 17,000)?</li> <li>2. In Table E: The target of 8,500 ha is indicated each for integrated management and SLM (Corporate Results 1 and 2). Please provide a clear explanation as to how these two estimates are different based on</li> </ol> |                                  |

## CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement  | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-----------------|-----------|---|----------------------------------|
|                 |           | <p>interventions proposed; For Corporate Result 6, please note that inserting a target means that the country will deliver "integrated framework with measurable targets for development and sectoral planning", and "a functional environmental information system;" please delete if this is not the case.</p> <p>3. Please provide a brief explanation of how the project will be connected to the other IAP child projects in the same agroecosystems (Senegal, Niger), and further supported through the cross-cutting "hub" project.</p> <p>4. This project is one of the few addressing land tenure and land rights related issues and needs a special attention at the IAP level; rather than merely "noting" comments by Germany's comment, please clarify how the project will influence policy in this regard.</p> <p>5. Explain the sustainability (or exit strategy) of the investment fund, sub-component 2.4.</p> <p>6. A particular attention is needed in tackling scaling up issues in project designing (STAP's comment): please make clear the linkages with the component 2 of the cross-cutting HUB about the development of lessons and best practices on this aspect.</p> |                                  |

## CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement   | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
|                 |   | <p>7. Clarify how the RIMS and MPAT tools will help to measure the enhancement of resilience and sustainability of agroecosystems. These tools focus on information at the household level, but we do not see the connection with land use and the evolution of agroecosystems. We recommend to make explicit the linkages with the cross-cutting hub and the third IAP component.</p> <p>August 9, 2016<br/>All points are clear, but one: item 2: there are not enough elements to justify 8,500 ha under the CR1. There is no proof of benefits for a biodiversity of global importance. Please, justify or just remove the mention of 8,500 ha in the table E.</p> |                                  |
|                 | <p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p> | <p>The overall objective is to ensure that the government of Burkina Faso scales up policies and activities to build resilience and sustainable management of the environment. However, the target of only 8,500 ha each under SLM and integrated management is not consistent with the need to "scale-up" for sustainability and resilience. With the long term experience from IFAD in the region and this \$8 million GEF grant linked to a significant IFAD investment, we would have expected</p>   |                                  |

## CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement   | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
|                 |  | <p>a more ambitious target relative to geographical scale of the project. The cost effectiveness is therefore questionable in this regard, and needs to be addressed. Please, justify.</p> <p>August 9, 2016<br/>Addressed.</p>  |                                  |
|                 | 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) | <p>Yes, all relevant risks have been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |                                  |
|                 | 5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?  | <p>Co-financing amounts are confirmed with letters. However, there are inconsistencies with amounts in the tables. Please review and correct the amounts to ensure consistency in totals between Tables A, B and C.</p> <p>August 9, 2016<br/>Cleared.</p>   |                                  |
|                 | 6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?  | <p>The completed TT was submitted, but the following issues need to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please check the information between the request for CEO endorsement, the project document (result framework), and the tracking tools and make the estimates consistent: see notably the carbon information (6,175 vs. 16,612 tCO<sub>2</sub>e) and the # of ha for SLM.</li> </ul> |                                  |

## CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement  | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-----------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
|                 |   | <p>- Please, include an annex to explain the carbon reasoning, the assumptions, and the reference values used as estimate.</p> <p>August 9, 2016.<br/>The revised tracking tools are not included.</p> <p>August 25, 2016<br/>Thanks for the revised package with the IAP Tracking Tools. However, the CCM section is empty, while the direct and indirect gains in GHG reduction should be included.</p> |                                  |
|                 | 7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i><br>Has a reflow calendar been presented?   | NA.   |                                  |
|                 | 8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region? | <p>- While you responded to Germany's comments that BMZ projects will be associated to the project development, we do not see how the different projects will interact. Please, clarify.</p> <p>- We appreciate the linkages with the CPP and other SLM projects.</p> <p>August 9, 2016<br/>Cleared.</p>  |                                  |
|                 | 9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?           | A budgeted M&E plan is included. However, the project includes an important sub-component with microgrants (renewable energy, Non Timber Forest Products, marketing,  |                                  |

## CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria         | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement   | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
|                         |   | ...). We wonder how their impacts on the ground will be measured. Please clarify.<br><br>August 9, 2016.<br>Cleared  |                                  |
|                         | 10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?                  | The approach to KM is in line with priorities of the IAP. Please clarify how the KM framework will support and contribute to the overall IAP program, including through the "hub" project.<br><br>August 9, 2016.<br>Cleared |                                  |
| <b>Agency Responses</b> | 11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from: |  |                                  |
|                         | • GEFSEC  |  |                                  |
|                         | • STAP  | Addressed.   |                                  |
|                         | • GEF Council   | We thank the Agency for responses to comments from Germany, Canada, and the US. However, please, check issue raised in cell #8.<br><br>August 9, 2016<br>Addressed.  |                                  |
|                         | • Convention Secretariat  |  |                                  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>   | 12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?   | July 18, 2016<br>Not yet. Please address the comments above.   |                                  |

<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 |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
|                    |                                  | <p>August 9, 2016<br/>All points have been addressed, but two: See the item 2 and 6.</p> <p>August 25, 2016<br/>The project is recommended for CEO endorsement (however please complete the CCM section of the IAP tracking tools; the CEO endorsement will be possible after the four week reviewing period only the completed TT).</p> |                                  |
| <b>Review Date</b> | Review                           | July 18, 2016  |                                  |
|                    | Additional Review (as necessary) | August 09, 2016  |                                  |
|                    | Additional Review (as necessary) | August 25, 2016  |                                  |