



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

GEF ID:	9764		
Country/Region:	Burkina Faso		
Project Title:	Integrated and Sustainable Management of PONASI Protected Area Landscape		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5938 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		BD-2 Program 3; LD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4; CCM-2 Program 4;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$5,279,452
Co-financing:	\$19,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,479,452
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Pascal Martinez	Agency Contact Person:	Saliou Toure

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>10 March 2017</p> <p>-The BD funding window the proposal is referring to is BD1- Program 2 and not BD2- Program 2. Please correct in table A accordingly.</p> <p>- The project proposal mentions several Aichi targets it is addressing. Considering the relative importance in the budget of the BD1- Program 2,</p>	

¹ 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>please be more explicit in the component description about in particular the Aichi target 11 the BD program is supporting, informing about the SMART indicators used to track the project's contribution toward achieving this target.</p> <p>7 April 2017 Cleared</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>10 March 2017 Yes, cleared.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>8 March 2017 The landscape approach with such a strong focus on biodiversity and PAs is innovative in the country and the project is expected to scale up in the surrounding areas and trough the neighbor country, Ghana. The low management effectiveness of the conservation areas is explained by the lack of means and the situation was worse in the corridors after the end of the project which established them. In that context and regarding in particular the PAs and the corridors, the sustainability of further investments appears uncertain. Please explain what will make the new financing plan different from previous</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>initiatives and work this time to ensure the financial sustainability of the conservation in the PONASI complex.</p> <p>10 April 2017 To ensure sustainability, it appears also important to take into account the lessons from past or current initiatives. We acknowledge the proposal made in the Box 5 of the response to the review sheet to conduct a study on lessons learned during the PPG phase. At this stage, please show that you take into account the main already known lessons when available from relevant experiences such as in particular the PAGEN evaluation, the UE/UNDP Program PAPE and the other GEF projects under implementation (the GEF4 ID 4221 "SPWA-BD: Protected Area Buffer Zone Management in Burkina Faso dans les on-going initiatives" with UNDP and the GEF5 ID 5187 "GGW: Community based Rural Development Project 3rd Phase with Sustainable Land and Forestry Management" with the World Bank).</p> <p>20 July 2017 Thank you for the complementary information provided. Cleared.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>8 March 2017</p> <p>The baseline section describes significant efforts of the Government and partners with the objectives of land use planning and management, protected areas, forest and carbon stock management and sustainable livelihoods. Nevertheless, the articulation of the proposed GEF project with this existing baseline of support is not clear. For instance, the PNGT2-3 in PONASI also intends to establish an integrated approach. Please provide more details on how the GEF project will articulate with the baseline projects and what will be its added value.</p> <p>10 April 2017</p> <p>In the baseline, the other GEF projects under implementation are not mentioned (GEF5 ID 5187 which also focuses on PONASI and GEF4 ID 4221). Please assess the relevance of integrating these project in the baseline and adjust accordingly if needed. Please check also the Environmental NGOS in the partnership to evaluate if there is no others suitable stakeholders that may worth being considered (such as NATUDEV for instance) and complete if needed.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		20 July 2017 Thank you for the complementary information provided. Cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	8 March 2017 COMPONENT 1 1) The component 1 provides support for better planning, monitoring and enforcement. Nevertheless, the concrete implementation in the field of the integrated management doesn't appear enough detailed to lead to the expected environmental benefits. Please explain how the establishment of the PONASI Landscape Management Board, the PONASI Landscape Management Plan and the management prescriptions adapted to different land units will result into concrete actions and provide further information about what will be these actions and how the landscape approach will be implemented in the field. 2) In particular, the carbon benefits result from decreased deforestation rate over 436,057 ha and no more information is provided. Please indicate in the project document the deforestation rate before and after the project and the source of the information so that we can understand	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>better the impact expected in terms of deforestation avoided.</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p> <p>The component 2 clearly respond to the barrier #2 and #3 (low management effectiveness of conservation areas and insufficient capacity of communities for sustainable land management and livelihood diversification). There are nonetheless, some issues that require attention:</p> <p>1) Not clear why the BD budget (\$3,370,320) is not used in full in this components (\$2,330,000). Please use all BD funds to Component 2.</p> <p>2) Please provide a more visible Map with the 4 Target Protected Areas and the 2 corridors.</p> <p>3) The project is proposing far too many plans: "PA management plans, action plans, operational plans, business plans, species management plans, community engagement plans. With that "paper-based" activities there is going be no funding for improving the effectiveness of the 4 target PAs. Please reconsider all these TA activities and concentrate more in</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>INV. May want to reconsider the number of PAs so more resources become available for the priority areas.</p> <p>4) The interventions in the corridor are not clear. There is a proposal for zoning plans? What is the meaning of these "zoning plans" when there are local communities already in place? Who is going to enforce the results of the plans? What are the suggested measures to mitigate the impact of roads already in place? Same for measures to address HWC? Can the project really "control irregular settlements? Is the planting of trees and bush species really necessary? All in all, the proposed interventions in the corridors (and their design and implementation are more aspirational that grounded on the realities of the ground. Please re-thing the investments in these corridors.</p> <p>5) Please elaborate on the Elephant protection plan (p.13). The PIF suggest developing and implementation of the plan. What are the suggested investments for this part of Component 2? This is particularly important if the project aims at stabilizing or increasing the elephant population. Is Ghana engaged in the</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>proposed activities? Do not include Ghana unless they know they are being cited in the PIF.</p> <p>12 April 2017</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>1) Stated that with a budget of \$1.56M, the project will produce a PONASI Landscape Management Plan that will result in a "solid foundation for wildlife tourism" plus "high-yield productivity in agriculture (increased food security, agricultural productivity and resilience) by developing climate smart agriculture, sustainable harvesting of wood and biomass energy, forest restoration, fire management assisted natural regeneration and water management". It is not clear why the project is requesting \$1.56M for Technical Assistance for the development of this plan, leaving no funding for investment (INV). Please reconsider budget allocation as none of the \$1.56M is likely to hit the ground.</p> <p>2) Thank you for the details and their inclusion in the PIF text. Cleared.</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>1) GEF recommendation nearly not followed by the agency. Can we clear with the provided justification?</p> <p>2) Cleared.</p> <p>3) It will be exceeding difficult (nearly impossible) to "Improved management effectiveness in 314,434 ha of core PAs and 88,691 ha of two wildlife corridors in PONASI" in 4 PAs, when all the funding is going to Technical Assistance (TA). In this case, more than in other instances, funding needs to be allocated to Investment. Please elaborate on potential investments.</p> <p>4) BF did a Zoning Plan 10 years ago, and was put to rest. There is a new request for the same activity with no indication that this time will get implemented. Why to do a Zoning Plan if it is not because the funding is readily available for implementation?</p> <p>There is also a proposal to work on 2 corridors (OFINAP and DREDD) but only with TA and no INV. How will activities be funded if all is going to pay consultants for documentation?</p> <p>5) The GEF requested information on</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the suggested investments for the "Elephant protection Plan" in BF. The response was an the overall structure of the Elephant protection Plan". What is the GEF funding going to be used for? Please be specific.</p> <p>Regarding HWC. The response was that "a holistic human-wildlife conflict management strategy using the Safe system approach, with a set of management actions that are guided towards making the target landscape safe". Please clarify if the GEF funding will be used for a Safe System study as carried out by WWF in other countries, or if the project will try to do something about HWC on the ground. There is significant information in the conservation literature on tackling this issues. Please elaborate.</p> <p>20 July 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the thorough revision of the budget towards more activities on the ground (INV) and for the complementary information provided. The comments component 1 /1 and component 2 / 1, 3 and 4 are cleared. As regard to component 2 / 5, the clarification doesn't seem to be added in the project document. Please,</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		ensure that this clarification be fully considered and clearly integrated at CEO endorsement. Cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	8 March 2017 Yes, cleared.	
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	8 March 2017 Yes, the proposed grant is \$6 million in total while the resources available are \$7,334,598. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	8 March 2017 No, the BD grant requested is \$3,370,320 while the available BD resources are \$2,000,000. Nevertheless, the country can utilize its marginal adjustment possibility up to \$2 million. In such a case, the Letter of Endorsement needs to mention it. Please, complete the Letter of Endorsement specifying the use of the marginal adjustment by a \$1,8 million increase of the BD Focal Area and providing the details of the amounts taken from the other Focal areas to cover this increase. 7 April 2017 Thank you for the new Letter of Endorsement. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of 	N/A	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>10 March 2017 Not yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>12 April 2017 Thank you for the clarifications provided. Nevertheless, some comments still need to be addressed and the proposal is not ready yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>20 July 2017 Yes, the PIF is recommended for clearance and PPG.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 13, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	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 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?		

Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ 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.