



**BURKINA FASO**  
**Unity-Progress-Justice**

## **FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT:**

**Generating global environmental benefits through better planning and decision-making systems  
at the local level in Burkina Faso (ANCR2)**

**UNDP PIMS ID: 4892**

**GEF ID: 4767**

**Final report**

## 1. Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1	Purpose of the evaluation .....	11
1.2	Scope and methodology .....	11
1.3	Methodology .....	11
1.4	Structure of the evaluation report .....	12
<b>2.</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1	Starting of the project and duration.....	14
2.2	Problems that the project aimed to resolve .....	14
2.3	Immediate and project development objectives .....	14
2.3.1	Project development objective.....	14
2.3.2	Immediate objectives .....	14
2.4	Basic indicators put in place .....	14
2.5	Main stakeholders .....	15
2.6	Expected outcomes .....	15
<b>3.</b>	<b>FINDINGS AND ANALYZES.....</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1	Project design / formulation.....	17
3.1.1	Analysis of the project's logical framework approach.....	17
3.1.2	Assumptions and risks .....	18
3.1.3	Lessons learned from other similar projects and integrated into the project design .....	19
3.1.4	Expected participation of stakeholders .....	19
3.1.5	Replication approach .....	20
3.1.6	Comparative advantage of UNDP .....	20
3.1.7	Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector .....	20
3.1.8	Management modalities.....	20
3.2	Project implementation .....	21
3.2.1	Adaptive management .....	21
3.2.2	Partnership agreements .....	21
3.2.3	Comment from Monitoring and Evaluation Activities Used in Adaptive Management .....	22
3.2.4	Project funding.....	23
3.2.5	Monitoring and evaluation: design at the start and implementation.....	24
3.2.6	Coordination at the implementation level of UNDP and the Executing Agency .....	26
3.3	Project outcomes.....	26
3.3.1	Overall outcomes.....	27
3.3.2	Relevance.....	32
3.3.3	Effectiveness and Efficiency.....	32
3.3.4	Ownership by the country .....	34
3.3.5	Integration .....	35
3.3.6	Sustainability and impacts .....	35
<b>4.</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1	Conclusions.....	37
4.2	Lessons learned.....	38
4.3	Recommendations .....	40
<b>5.</b>	<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
	<b>Appendix A: Terms of Reference of UNDP-GEF Final Evaluation .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
	<b>Appendix B: List of interviewees .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

**Appendix C : List of revised documents** ..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

**Appendix D : List of interview questions**..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

**Appendix E: Evaluation Consultant Acceptance Form** ..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

**Appendix F : Scoreboard**..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

**Appendix G : Evaluation Matrix** ..... Error! Bookmark not defined.**47**

## **FRONT PAGE**

**Project Name UNDP / GEF:** Project "Generating global environmental benefits through better planning and decision-making systems at the local level in Burkina Faso" (abbreviated ANCR2 Project).

**UNDP and GEF Project ID:** 00077402 / 4767

**Schedule of evaluation and date of the evaluation report:** December 1, 2018 to January 31, 2019 / March 11, 2019

**Regions and countries included in the report:** Burkina Faso

**GEF Operational Program / Strategic Program:** Multiple

**Implementing Agency and Project Partners:** Ministry of the Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change / Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development (SP / CONEDD), COGEL, IPE

**Members of the project evaluation team:** Geneviève Beaulac, international consultant

### **Acknowledgements:**

The evaluator would like to thank Mr. Norbert Sidibé, the project coordinator for his great availability and efficiency in organizing the interviews with such short notice. Mr. Sidibé's dedication to the project is inspiring. Also, the evaluator would like to thank the head of monitoring and evaluation, Ms. Marceline Yonli, for the frankness of the exchanges related to the challenges encountered and her kindness. Mr. Hama Traore from UNDP and Mr. Salifou Zoungana for their help and comments on the report. The consultant also thanks the positive comments and criticisms of the UNDP regional team. Finally, the evaluator thanks all the participants who traveled to make themselves available for the interviews.

## SUMMARY

**Table 1 : Project summary**

Project Title	Generating global environmental benefits through better planning and decision-making systems at the local level in Burkina Faso (abbreviated ANCR2 Project)			
GEF Project ID:	4767		<u>At the approval</u> (million US \$)	<u>Upon completion</u> (million US \$)
UNDP project ID:	PIMS : 4892 Atlas Output ID: 00088196	GEF financing	US\$ 970,000	US\$ 865,914
Country :	Burkina Faso	UNDP:	US\$ 125,000	US\$ 151,840
Region :	Africa	Government :	US\$ 100,000	N.D.
Focal area:	multiple			
Operational Program:	Strategy of Development of GEF cross-sectoral capacities			
Implementing Agency:	Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Environment and Sustainable Development (SP/CONEDD)	Total cost of Project:	US\$1, 195,000	US \$ 1,017,754
Other partners involved:	COGEL, IPE	Signing of Project Document		April 29, 2014 Effective start date: March 27, 2015
		Closing Date:	Planned : April 28, 2017	Current: November 28, 2018

### **Brief description of the project**

Since a few years, the Government of Burkina Faso has paid particular attention to strengthening local capacities for sustainable development, developing environmental information systems and incorporating environmental measures into socio-economic development. The project was developed to support national capacity building for more effective use of the existing National Environmental Management Information System (EMIS). It also aims to improve institutional capacities in planning for sustainable development.

**Table 2: Rating of the Evaluation**

Rating of the evaluation:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E)	Rating	2. Implementation	Rating
Model M & E design at the beginning	Moderately unsatisfactory	Quality of UNDP implementation	Moderately satisfactory
Implementation of the M & E plan	Moderately satisfactory	Quality of implementation – Implementing Agency	Satisfactory
Overall quality of M & E	Moderately satisfactory	Overall quality of implementation / execution	Satisfactory
3. Evaluation of the results	Rating	4. Sustainability	Rating
Relevance	Relevant	Financial resources	Likely
Effectiveness	Moderately satisfactory	Sociopolitical:	Moderately likely
Efficiency	Moderately satisfactory	Institutional framework and Governance:	Moderately likely
Overall rating of the result of the Project	Moderately satisfactory	Environmental :	Likely
		Overall probability of sustainability	Moderately likely

Source : Appendix F, Rating Scale

## Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

### Project performance

The performance of the project is appreciated considering the parameters below.

#### ***Coherence and relevance***

Despite significant weaknesses in the indicators, there is good consistency between the objectives and the results of the project. The means put in place to achieve the expected results have been sufficient. The project is consistent with the UNDP intervention strategy, as set out in the Burkina Faso Country Program, which aims to better inform and equip institutions for the sustainable management of natural resources and for the dissemination of best practices. Similarly, the project is aligned with GEF Strategic Objectives 2 and 3 for cross-cutting capacity development, namely, creation, access and use of information and knowledge, and capacity building for the development of policies and regulations for achieving overall benefits. ***The project is rated as relevant.***

#### ***Effectiveness***

The project suffered from a lack of effectiveness in the mobilization of financial resources at the start of the project. Given the resources available (including the required human resources that were underestimated), the project was moderately effective in achieving results. The Environmental Management Information System (EMIS) has been significantly strengthened. The capacity of the connectivity has been increased as well as IT support. Efforts to increase

collaboration agreements with different partners have been amplified. Nearly 40 active partners are now using and feeding the EMIS. The project also contributed to institutional capacity building by providing training to 374 people. These trainings have in particular made it possible to develop planning and evaluation capacities of local development plans. In addition, the project has made available to local stakeholders various tools and methodological guides to increase their knowledge of the obligations of the various Rio conventions. In short, the beneficiaries of the project were well targeted and there was good effectiveness in the awareness of the database as well as the training offered. The results of the project have been largely achieved. ***Effectiveness is rated moderately satisfactory.***

### ***Efficiency***

Several factors decreased the efficiency of the project. First, a number of activities were executed with some delay due to late disbursement by UNDP. At the government level, there was a delay in the formal creation of the project. Also, the appointment of the coordinator was delayed. Staff turnover did not help either, since two coordinators succeeded each other in leading the project. Secondly, human and logistical resources were underestimated in relation to the tasks to be performed. For example, PRODOC had provided a salary for a driver but the acquisition of a vehicle had not been budgeted. The project coordinator has several responsibilities because he is also the director of ONEDD and there does not seem to be an acting coordinator to help during busy periods. The steering committee had to authorize the hiring of consultants for the IT and training aspects although not initially budgeted in the PRODOC. What is more, the project was also penalized by a large turnover of staff. Since the beginning of the project, there have been 3 different program officers at the UNDP. This turnover has not always been followed by a transfer of knowledge and this has reduced efficiency. The slow administrative process of hiring local consultants also weighed on the efficiency of the project. The project lasted nearly 4 years, but it took an average of 8 to 12 months to hire a consultant or a consulting firm. Delayed disbursements also continued throughout the project. For 2017, the first disbursement occurred only in July. However, despite these pitfalls in efficiency, the project has achieved its objectives. ***Efficiency is rated moderately satisfactory.***

### ***Impact***

The impact of the project was maximized by the strong ownership of the project by the government and the importance given to the development of a sound environmental management system. The impact is, however, somewhat diminished due to the slowness / reliability of the Internet network which discourages several partners wanting to supply data to the EMIS. Nevertheless, the technical, institutional and IT capacities have been increased and these aspects will continue over time. Also, economies of scale have been achieved through the creation of a single data system that avoids duplicate efforts, for the various databases have been harmonized.

### ***Sustainability***

The institutional capacities of the main actors have been strengthened and the EMIS is consulted (365,599 visitors between January 2015 and December 2018). EMIS has gained notoriety among stakeholders and partners. The data recorded therein contribute to a better understanding of the impacts of activities on the environment. Over the years, the accumulated data will make comparative studies possible and thus help to better understand the environmental factors and impacts of climate change. For instance, the EMIS contains data on flood zones and erosion zones. Comparing these data over time can be a powerful tool to better prevent the impacts of climate change. Acquisitions of computer hardware, GPS, geographic information software (ARCGIS) are also tools that maximize sustainability. The Ministry of Environment has allocated a budget envelope to ensure the continuity and maintenance of the data system, which is an excellent sign for the sustainability of the project. The Ministry has made efforts to consolidate Burkina Faso's commitments vis-à-vis the Rio Conventions and the EMIS is seen as a central information tool. To date, 20 partnership protocols have been signed for the sharing of environmental data. Today there is better coordination between different government agencies. ***The sustainability of the project is considered moderately likely.***

### ***Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons***

#### ***Conclusions***

Despite the late disbursements and challenges associated with human, administrative and socio-political resources, the project played a very relevant role in positioning Burkina Faso better in terms of its commitments and obligations vis-à-vis the Rio Conventions. EMIS is used for Convention reporting and local authorities are better able to plan and make natural resources management decisions. Ownership of the project at the national level has been a crucial factor in achieving results.

#### ***Recommendations:***

**Recommendation 1:** The GEF should ensure that the PRODOC logical framework is available in the official language of the recipient country.

**Recommendation 2:** At the level of the public administration, efforts must be made to reduce the administrative slowness of hiring by limiting the number of non-objections required.

**Recommendation 3:** The project coordination team should set up a monitoring committee to continuously improve the data system.

**Recommendation 4:** The SP / CONEDD should define a capitalization plan to maintain the data system and ensure its dissemination to partners.

**Recommendation 5:** The SP / CONEDD should continue to sensitize partners for the use and feeding of the data system.



**Recommendation 6:** UNDP and the national counterpart should gain a better understanding of the reasons for women's low participation in activities and consider the need for financial support to facilitate their participation.

### ***Lessons learned***

This subsection highlights the strengths and weaknesses that impacted the project's performance, results and impact. All of these points highlight the lessons that need to be learned in case of replication of similar project.

#### ***Strengths***

- Strong ownership of the project by the country
- Dedicated project team
- Good synergy with partners
- Quality product (data system)
- Quality trainings offered

#### ***Weaknesses***

- Low representation of women in project activities
- PRODOC logical framework was not available in the project team's native language
- PRODOC shortcomings in the logical framework indicators
- Late disbursement by UNDP and slow administrative process of public authorities
- Staff turnover / loss of institutional memory
- Sociopolitical and security context

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ANCR	National self-assessment of capacities to build
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
CBD	Convention on Biodiversity
CC	Climate change
CONEDD	National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development
COFIL	Steering Committee
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Development
DCIME	Division for Strengthening Information Capacities and Monitoring of Environment
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPS	Global positioning system
JNE	<i>Notre Environnement</i> Newspaper
MEDD	Ministry of the Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change
ONDD	National Observatory of Sustainable Development
PCD	Community Development Plans
PLD	Local Development Plan
PNGIM	National Environmental Information Management Program
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
REEB	Report on the State of the Environment in Burkina Faso
SCADD	Strategy for the Accelerated Growth for Sustainable Development
LEIS	Local environmental information system
GIS	Geographic information system
EMIS	Environmental Management Information System
SP/CNDD	Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development
SP/CONEDD	Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Environment and Sustainable Development

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to:

- Evaluate overall performance against objectives as defined in the project document and other related documents;
- Assess the relevance of the project to national priorities, as well as the strategic objectives of UNDP and GEF;
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the project;
- Conduct critical analysis of project implementation and management measures;
- Assess the sustainability of project interventions and consider the impact of the project; and,
- Document lessons learned and best practices related to project design, implementation and management that could be useful for other projects in the country and around the world.

## 1.2 Scope and methodology

The evaluation covers the entire duration of the project (from February 2015 to November 2018) and all the actions carried out by the project or with the support of the project, whatever the funding body.

## 1.3 Methodology

The methodology used for this evaluation consisted essentially of four points: (a) from the project monitoring system, check how the performance and impact indicators were monitored by the project team and their degree of achievement; (b) review existing project reports and documents; (c) conduct interviews with individuals to study the opinions of stakeholders and project partners on performance; and (d) consider gender sensitivity (men and women) in project activities. Following the completion of the interviews, the information provided was checked with the project coordinator to triangulate the data as much as possible. The data obtained was also cross-checked with the information contained in the project documentation. The evaluation matrix in Appendix G provides a detailed picture of the issues that guided the evaluation.

The approach used can be summarized as follows:

### Kick-off meeting

The kick-off meeting was held in Ouagadougou at the UNDP office. It provided an opportunity for the UNDP program officer and the project coordinator to provide additional information to the evaluator on the status of the project and the realities of the field.

### Literature review

In order to know the project and its evolution context, its progress, its results, etc., the evaluator carried out a literature review (Appendix 3). This was related to PRODOC, the annual activity reports, the steering committee session reports, the financial implementation reports, the PIF, the PPG, the consultation and the review of the data system, the material delivered during

training such as the Methodological Guide for Local Development Plans.

#### Preparation of the interview schedule

The project coordinator has developed a schedule of interviews with various partners. All interviews took place in Ouagadougou. On the one hand, the security situation did not allow access to all of the project's intervention areas. On the other hand, the time allotted for the mission did not allow for travels to other locations.

#### Conducting interviews

Interviews were held with 17 actors. The interviews aimed at knowing the actions of the project which they benefited as well as the quality of these actions, their appreciation of the impact of the project on their structure in terms of capacity building, their appreciation of the strengths and weaknesses of the project, etc. These interviews were conducted on the basis of the SWOT method (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats). First, it's about discussing the perceived strengths / benefits of the project. Secondly, it is a matter of discussing the weaknesses, that is, what seems to have not worked in the project, what were the shortcomings. Thirdly, it is a question of identifying what are the opportunities of the project, that is to say what would be the improvements to be made if a similar project were replicated. Finally, the discussion focused on the threats that are in fact the obstacles encountered during the project that have reduced the scope of the benefits. This method of interview produces a wealth of information and allows to develop a critical vision of the project. The interviews with the partners were conducted entirely in Ouagadougou at the ONEDD office. It should be noted that only one of the focal points of the Rio Convention could be met (and this was his interim), the other focal points being in Poland at COP 24 during the week of the Evaluation.

#### Closing meeting

Following the completion of the interviews, the consultant presented the initial findings at a restitution meeting in the UNDP offices as a PowerPoint presentation. This meeting brought together the project coordinator who is also the Director of the National Observatory for Sustainable Development (ONDD) Mr Norbert Sidibé, the Project Manager, Mr Hama Traore of UNDP, Ms Marceline Yonli, Head of Monitoring and Evaluation project at ONDD, and Mr. Salifou Zoungrana, UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.

#### Reporting and feedback

At the end of the meeting, the evaluator took the time to review and analyze all the interviews carried out in order to have complete data to write a first project report, a preliminary report and then a final report. At each stage, the report was reviewed by the project team and the inputs incorporated.

### **1.4 Structure of the evaluation report**

The evaluation report is structured as follows:

- Summary
- Introduction
- Project Description and development context
- Findings and analyzes
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Appendices

## **2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT**

This chapter gives a description of the project, the problems it has tried to solve, its objectives, benchmarks, key stakeholders and expected results.

### **2.1 Starting of the project and duration**

Lasting four years, the project officially began on March 27, 2015 with the adoption of the joint decree for the creation of the project. The decision on the appointment of the project coordinator and the creation of the steering committee took place on May 18, 2015. The start-up phase of the project was initially planned for June 2014 but the time for the creation of the public administration's decision on the project combined with socio-political disturbances slowed down the start of activities. The project has therefore been extended until 28 November 2018 to compensate for the delay in the start-up phase.

### **2.2 Problems that the project aimed to resolve**

The problems that the project has sought to address are institutional and organizational, financial and lack of technical capacity.

***Institutional and organizational problems:*** lack of a single environmental database used by the Rio Convention Focal Points and lack of integration of multilateral environmental agreement obligations into local development plans.

***Financial problems:*** Insufficient State funding for information management and planning at the local level.

***Problems of insufficient technical capacity:*** lack of technical capacity in IT management system.

### **2.3 Immediate and project development objectives**

#### **2.3.1 Project development objective**

The overall goal of the project is to create benefits for the global environment through improved decision support mechanisms and better local planning and development processes in Burkina Faso. The project must enable Burkina Faso to fully contribute to its commitments under the three Rio Conventions through the building of technical and institutional capacities.

#### **2.3.2 Immediate objectives**

The first objective is to build Burkina Faso's technical capacity in terms of the availability of environmental information through the operationalization of a system for collecting, analyzing and storing data. The second objective is to improve institutional capacities in planning and decision making at the local, regional and national levels to generate global environmental benefits.

### **2.4 Basic indicators put in place**

According to the logical framework, thirteen basic indicators have been set up for project monitoring and evaluation; four of which for the overall objective; four for outcome 1; and

five for outcome 2.

The basic indicators<sup>1</sup> for the overall objective were:

1. Percentage of natural resource management projects by national structures and grassroots communities incorporating MEA guidelines.
2. Percentage of formulated / revised local development plans, incorporating environmental concerns and climate change as described in the Operational Manual.
3. Overall improvement of the baseline situation of the main stakeholders. (see capacity development scorecard)
4. The availability and coordination of the provision of better information for environmental planning at the central and decentralized level is ensured and confirmed.

The indicators for outcome 1 were:

5. ONEDD is recognized as the main source of information for environmental planning by a large number of national development partners.
6. Strategic funding exists for updating ONEDD from the national budget and PNIEDD.
7. Improvement of the quality of the reports as well as their timely submissions to the conventions.
8. Public institutions have a heightened level of awareness about environmental information products<sup>2</sup>.

The indicators for outcome 2 were:

9. The number of stakeholder representatives sensitized on best practices for responding to global environmental guidelines through decentralized environmental governance.
10. Number of Local Development Plans (PLD) that incorporate global environmental benefits.
11. Number of submissions of local environmental activities for PNIEDD and PNSR funding resulting from PLD.
12. Number of demonstration tests carried out at Community level.
13. Decentralized technical support structures and human resources are funded to ensure adequate operations.

## **2.5 Main stakeholders**

The main stakeholders in this project are the following: Ministry of the Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change including the Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development (CONEDD), UNDP and GEF.

## **2.6 Expected outcomes**

The project consists of two components, each with an expected outcome and expected outputs (table 3).

---

<sup>1</sup> The indicators are fully copied from the 2017 annual report produced by the project team. The translation of these indicators has been done using the logical framework of the project in English, see section 3.1.1

<sup>2</sup> Indicator # 8 was omitted from the translation from English to French by the coordination team, we added it here so that the document reflects the indicators contained in the PRODOC.

**Tableau 3 : Expected outcomes**

<b>Component 1:</b> Information systems for national and global environmental management	
<b>Outcome 1 :</b> A sustainable system of collection, analysis, storage and provision of reliable data and information related to the three Rio Conventions is functional and can be directly exploited by decision-makers.	
<b>Output 1.1:</b>	Revitalization of the Environmental Management Information System (EMIS) and the Local Environmental Information System (LEIS) of Burkina Faso.
<b>Output 1.2:</b>	Within EMIS, improved data collection protocols and standards leading to the harmonization and availability of effective CBD, CCD, UNFCCC and other MEA information are signed by the relevant partners and implemented.
<b>Output 1.3:</b>	As a key element of the EMIS, an Environment Observatory technically and materially strengthened to serve as a coordinated and sustainable mechanism for collecting and storing data / information and to enable effective national reporting to the conventions.
<b>Output 1.4:</b>	A set of cross-cutting global environmental knowledge materials covering the three Conventions (eg maps, indicator framework, Pressure-State-Response surveys) that each respond to a clear user need and are produced on a financially sustainable basis.
<b>Component 2:</b> Integrating the global environment into local planning for sustainable development.	
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Institutional planning capacities are strengthened for the implementation of development processes that contribute to the implementation of the Rio Conventions and generate benefits for the global environment.	
<b>Output 2.1:</b>	The sustainable development planning guide is updated with modules on previously unreported convention topics such as BD, IWRM, POPs.
<b>Output 2.2:</b>	An expanded network of experts, strengthened and trained in the use of the Guide and its new modules, with particular emphasis on achieving the objectives of the Rio World Conventions.
<b>Output 2.3:</b>	Practical application of the Guide in support of the development of local development plans to contribute to the implementation of the three Rio Conventions.
<b>Output 2.4:</b>	Global environmental benefits achieved through the implementation of modified plans and programs.
<b>Output 2.5:</b>	Legislation and sustainable financing mechanism to formalize the use of the Guide, prepared and presented to the government.



### **3. FINDINGS AND ANALYZES**

#### **3.1 Project design / formulation**

This is to consider here the important aspects of project design, that is, the coherence of the items of the logical framework of the project.

##### **3.1.1 Analysis of the project's logical framework approach**

In the first place, it seems important to highlight a substantial issue. The logical framework in PRODOC was developed in English which is not the official language of the local party. Many of the indicators in the English version have not been fully well translated into French and one indicator has even been forgotten (see section 2.4). Understanding the indicators is therefore difficult. In fact, even the title of the project has suffered from translation. The appropriate title in French should have read as follows: "Creating global environmental benefits through the establishment of better planning and decision-making systems at the local level in Burkina Faso". Incorrect translation explains why at the local level the project is known as ANCR2 by stakeholders.

##### ***3.1.1.1 Consistency of objectives and expected outcomes***

The logic of the project to achieve the objectives and outcomes was good. The overall objective has been clearly divided into two components. For each of these components, expected outcomes were established, which made it possible to structure the list of activities to be carried out. However, the targets are very numerous and ambitious in terms of the implementation schedule. Also, many of the targets developed could easily have been formulated as indicators. The logical framework also contains the sources of verification but there is a lack of clarity, are the sources for verifying indicators or targets? The project's strategy was to work at two levels in parallel both on the data system and capacity building of national and local actors, which was indeed done. The strategy foresaw in fact a significant participation of the actors of the PNGIM and the communes in order to reach the objectives. The coherence of the project is apparent in the logical framework.

##### ***3.1.1.2 Project indicators***

A significant number of logical framework indicators do not meet the quality criteria of a good SMART indicator, that is, specific, measurable, achievable and attributable and relevant, realistic and timebound, with deadlines that can be targeted over time.

For example, the first indicator (percentage of natural resource management projects by national structures and grassroots communities incorporating MEA guidelines) is not specific. Which national structures are we referring to? What are the grassroots communities? What is the definition of natural resources management project? The relevance of this indicator is also low. Indeed, the percentage of projects is relevant when compared to a given period in the past, but this is not specified. In addition, the measurability of this indicator is difficult because the projects to be included are not well defined. It would have been more practical

to define the indicator as follows: "Percentage of the members of the PNGIM using in their projects the guidelines foreseen in the multilateral agreements". Indicators 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 do not meet the SMART criteria. They all suffer from a weakness in terms of measurability. Moreover, they are not specific enough. For Indicator 4, for example, how is improvement measured at the coordination level? Which decentralized agencies do we refer to? Regarding indicator 5, quantitative parameters have not been defined to determine the level of recognition of ONEDD by partners, how many partners are we talking about? What is recognition threshold sought? For indicator 6, what does "strategic funding" mean? Is this funding available over several years? How many years? It would have been more relevant to develop the indicator in the sense of a budget target to be achieved over a certain period well defined in time. For Indicator 7, it is not defined how the quality of the reports submitted to the Conventions is evaluated. First, there is not a quality assessment that is systematically done with each report sent. How can an improvement be measured if no quality assessment has been done previously? What are the basics for measuring improvement? For indicator 8, how is the level of awareness measured? This indicator is extremely subjective and, moreover, its evaluation will vary over time according to the users of the environmental information products. For Indicator 9, here again an indicator with a quantitative target could have been defined. For example, the percentage of project partner stakeholders that benefited from training and outreach activities. For indicator 10, it is not specific enough, what global benefits are we talking about? In addition, it would have been more desirable to develop an indicator with a ratio. A more appropriate indicator would have been, for example, "More than half of local development plans include a module on biodiversity conservation".

In short, the indicators, in addition to having been incorrectly translated, are not focused enough and many of them lend themselves to subjectivity with respect to their evaluation. More precise indicators could have been developed such as the number of users of the data system at the beginning of the project versus the number at the end of the project, the number of data stored at the beginning of the project versus the number at the end, the number of partnership protocols signed, the number of participants in capacity building activities, etc. Furthermore, none of the indicators developed refer to gender equality and women's empowerment.

It should be noted that the project team included 42 performance indicators in the 2015-2018 activity report. These latter indicators were developed by the team in the course of the project in order to mitigate the weaknesses of the indicators presented in the logical framework, which proved to be unsuitable for assessing the actual situation of the project. This final evaluation follows the indicators developed in the logical framework. The gaps in these indicators make it more difficult to evaluate the outcomes.

### **3.1.2 Assumptions and risks**

PRODOC has identified four assumptions (below). Risks have not been identified.

1. The political will for decentralization and improved information management will

- weaken;
- 2. The Rio Conventions' focal points adherence to project may take a considerable period of time;
- 3. Coordination mechanisms between different government departments are not effective;
- 4. Stakeholders at the local level do not have the will to improve the environment at the global level.

**Source : PRODOC, p.102**

Assumptions 1 to 3 were realistic, the evidence being that these three aspects are still challenges at the moment. Assumption 4 is however questionable, on what basis was this last assumption founded? It would have been more appropriate to identify what were the risks and barriers that could reduce participation at the local level. The identification of possible barriers would have allowed to develop measures to maximize participation. A risk analysis is missing from PRODOC, this aspect was treated only in very vague terms. The risks of deteriorating safety and impacts on project activities have not been identified, although the political crisis of 2014 was hardly foreseeable during the development of PRODOC.

### **3.1.3 Lessons learned from other similar projects and integrated into the project design**

This project is aligned with the decentralization efforts undertaken in Burkina Faso in 2004. UNDP supported the Project Consolidation of Environmental and Local Governance (COGEL) from 2011 to 2015. It is during this program that the country's weaknesses as regards the implementation of the Rio Conventions have been identified. In addition, the local communities participating in this project have been selected on the basis of criteria that have already been established in COGEL. The COGEL activities that took place in the Boucle du Mouhoun, East and North-Central regions served as the basis for this project. With the UNDP / UNCDF Support Program for Rural Communities and Community Initiatives (ACRIC), it has been shown that decentralization is possible and that it benefits socio-economically local communities. The UNDP / UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative laid the foundation for integrating environmental aspects into local development plans. This project has benefited from the lessons learned in this area. The report on the inventory and analysis of existing data and information in Burkina Faso conducted in 2013 by a national consultant highlighted the weaknesses and dysfunctioning of the environmental information systems. The identification of these weaknesses has made it possible to target the activities to be undertaken to maximize the scope of the project.

### **3.1.4 Expected participation of stakeholders**

Stakeholders involved in the areas of environmental information management and environmental governance in decentralized planning were to play a central role in the project. Specifically, they are members of the PNGIM, consultative frameworks, ONEDD focal points, municipal agents responsible for the implementation of local development plans (LDPs). All

these stakeholders participated in the various activities of the project.

### **3.1.5 Replication approach**

The project did not develop a replication approach. Nevertheless, the approach that has been used in the intervention areas can be used in other areas of the country taking into account the lessons learned and recommendations made in this report as well as in the 2015 -2018 activity reports. The various capacity-building workshops can be easily repeated in other communes.

### **3.1.6 Comparative advantage of UNDP**

The comparative advantage of UNDP in the project is at four levels:

- Security of the funds, the UNDP appears to be a stable institution able to guarantee the security and the traceability of the funds made available to the project;
- Good knowledge of the issue of sustainable development in general;
- Excellent institutional network and can act as a neutral facilitator with several stakeholders;
- Long experience in capacity building of national actors.

### **3.1.7 Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector**

The project was conceived as part of the adoption of the National Program for the building of Capacities for the National Management of the Global Environment: Strategy and Action Plan 2008-2025. According to the ANCR action plan, this project is aligned with the strategic focus area 2: strengthening the operational and managerial capacities of the decentralized structures and the actors (CBO, private sector) involved in the management of the environment. It is also aligned with Strategic Focus Area 5: Strengthening and Improving Environmental Information, Communication and Monitoring Systems by Stakeholders. Some activities of this project were carried out jointly with the SAP-IC project under the aegis of CONASUR including the activities related to the development of an inventory document containing the new means of dissemination of information (green cards, interactive maps, cell phone alerts).

### **3.1.8 Management modalities**

The project management arrangements include:

- A steering committee (COPIL) which is responsible for providing guidance, general supervision and intersectoral coordination of the project;
- An implementing agency which is the Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Development (SP-CNDD former SP-CONEDD). Its role is to coordinate the implementation of the project and ensure that the outcomes and outputs are presented in a timely manner. It also provides administrative and technical support to the project;
- Project Management Unit (PMU): is responsible for the coordination and day-to-day management of project activities;
- UNDP, as GEF implementing agency, is responsible for guiding the implementation of project activities and providing administrative and technical assistance to the project

and the executing agency.

The management arrangements above have several advantages that reflect its relevance. First, they allow each organization involved in project implementation and monitoring to take over activities for which it has technical or institutional expertise. On a number of occasions, COPIL has made decisions that have had a direct positive impact on the project, including the hiring of local IT specialists. Secondly, through the COPIL sessions, they allow all the stakeholders to meet for discussions on the progress of the project and its difficulties. Thirdly, the management arrangements make it possible to involve the other ministries or public institutions involved in the implementation and monitoring of the project, which gives them the opportunity to add value to the project.

## **3.2 Project implementation**

The focus here is on adaptive management, financing, monitoring and evaluation, and partnerships developed during the project implementation.

### **3.2.1 Adaptive management**

The design and outcomes of the project have not known substantial changes. It can be emphasized that the impact indicators as developed in the PRODOC have been adjusted by the project team. The team has developed better indicators to measure performance and progress of activities. However, these have not been formally approved by the Project Steering Committee, a request to this effect has never been formally made. Instead, these indicators were used internally by the project team to facilitate the monitoring of the progress of their activities. From the beginning of the project, the team was also faced with a slow start due to the late creation of the project by the public administration. The first steering committee was to be funded by the State, but resources were not available. The security situation and political events since 2015 have also required adjustments. International experts refused to participate in the project for security reasons, so the COPIL used national expertise. In general, there has been a good adaptive management of the project given the external events.

### **3.2.2 Partnership agreements**

During the PRODOC design, several financial and technical partnerships were envisaged. At the financial level, the Austrian Development Agency was to collaborate but the project documents do not indicate that a financial partnership other than that between UNDP, GEF and Burkina Faso has taken place. The Austrian Agency contributed to the financing of the COGEL project. In terms of technical partnerships, the Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development (SP / CNDD) under the Ministry of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change is the main partner. COGEL and IPE are also listed as partners. It should be noted that the project has signed 20 collaboration protocols with the PNGIM partner structures for the collection and exchange of environmental data as well as the supply of the data system. The members of the PNGIM, particularly the focal points of the Conventions, are the key

stakeholders of the project. According to the 2015 -2018 annual activity reports, a total of 132 PNGIM members participated in the project activities. No specific data on the degree of participation of the focal points of the Conventions is available in the reports and only one focal point (acting) could be interviewed.

### 3.2.3 Comment from Monitoring and Evaluation Activities Used in Adaptive Management

Monitoring and evaluation activities for adaptive management were carried out at three complementary levels:

**Budget monitoring:** Mostly provided by the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. From 2014 to 2018, UNDP produced each of the annual CDRs (*Combined Delivery Report*). These financial reports show the expenses incurred for the project components and their source (Government, UNDP, and GEF). The annual activity reports from 2015 to 2017 contain more specific information on the financial status of the project.

**Reporting:** The annual activity reports for 2015 to 2018 have all been developed by the project. Each of these reports describes the problems encountered during the year and the solutions / adaptive measures to be undertaken.

**Meetings of the Steering Committee:** The planned meetings of the Steering Committee helped to analyze the progress of the project, the difficulties encountered and the alternative solutions. Synthesis reports were produced following each session of the COPIL. Each of these reports contains recommendations for next steps.

Table 4 indicates the nature of the problems encountered and the solutions decided.

**Table 4: Problems encountered and solutions adopted, extract from the annual activity reports**

Parts of the annual activity reports for the 2015-2018 period	
Problems encountered	Solutions adopted
Administrative slowness	Sensitization of the hierarchy on the absorption rate according to the established disbursement plan and attempt to strengthen monthly monitoring to better control the physical and financial progress
Challenges on the signing of collaborative protocols	Reinforcement of the lobbying of the managers of the PNGIM member structures
Failure to carry out certain activities related to international expertise	Use of national expertise
Insufficient competent staff to implement all project activities	- Recruitment of additional experts - Concurrent engagement of activities to fit in the schedule of execution
Insufficient time for implementation of project activities	Negotiating with the donor to extend the implementation period of the project activities without financial impact.
Parts of the COPIL session reports for the period 2015-2018	
Insufficient project staff, especially lack of a monitoring-evaluator	Request for the provision of a monitoring-evaluator to the Ministry of the Environment (who made available to the same evaluator

Parts of the annual activity reports for the 2015-2018 period	
Problems encountered	Solutions adopted
	assigned to the Early Warning System project in Burkina Faso).
Concerns with respect to the 2015 activity budget (recruitment of staff, responsibilities for activities)	Additional disaggregation of the 2015 program of activities and budget for greater clarity.
Overall delay in the implementation of the project and the schedule of activities.	Negotiation with the donor to extend the implementation time of the project activities without financial impact in order to complete them.
Activities related to the closure of the project that are not taken into account in the 2018 work program (AWP / B).	Inclusion in the 2018 AWP / B of activities related to project closure (audit, final evaluation of the project, termination benefits for agents, and vesting of project assets) with costs.
Insufficient financial resources to support the conventions	Inclusion of a budget line to support the conventions
The difficulties of internet connection in the communes to access the EMIS	Work has been done at the level of the six intervention communes of the project through the provision of their database and its connection with the LEIS database as well as the provision of IT equipment and solar energy equipment to counter the lack of electricity.

### 3.2.4 Project funding

The project benefited from a multi-donor funding. The GEF was to participate for US \$ 970,000, UNDP for US \$ 125,000, while the Government of Burkina Faso for US \$ 100,000. The total estimated cost of the project was US \$ 1,195,000.00. As of December 31, 2018, the reports (Combined Delivery Report-CDR, prepared in US dollars) from 2015 to 2018 indicates that a total of US \$ 865,914.00 was disbursed by the GEF, and US \$ 151,840.00 by UNDP. The information contained in the CDR does not make it possible to determine the financial contribution of the Government of Burkina Faso. According to the financial audit carried out by the firm SOGECA International SARL, the statement of expenditure for the project as of December 31, 2018 amounts to US \$ 1,017,754, which is consistent with the data of the CDRs. According to the findings of the audit, these expenses are: in accordance with approved project budgets; assigned to the approved goals of the project; comply with relevant UNDP regulations, rules, policies and procedures and; testified by properly approved receipts or other supporting documentation. No instances of non-compliance were identified by the firm. The firm has analyzed the internal control system of the project. The observations made in these respects are minor. For example, budget codes have not always been recorded on the vouchers and periodic evaluations of project staff have not always taken place.

Table 5 shows the expenditures made each year for both components as well as for the management of the project. The data in this table comes from the financial implementation



reports prepared by the project team. The amounts are expressed in FCFA since it is the currency used in the reports. According to these data, as of December 31, 2018, a total of FCFA 585,160,317 was spent. This amount with the current exchange rate (March 12, 2019) would be US \$ 1,004,306.00. This is consistent with the findings of the audit on the statement of expenditure. The minor variation is attributable to the exchange rate.

**Table 5: The 2015-2018 financial statement of the project**

	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
<b>Component 1: Information Systems for National and Global Environmental Management</b>					
Expenditures made	59 267 362	94 243 710	56 999 600	62 635 646	273 146 318
Budget	89 380 000	151 300 000	78 000 000	61 950 000	380 630 000
Performance rate	66 %	62%	73%	101 %	72 %
<b>Component 2: Integrating the Global Environment into Local Planning for Sustainable Development.</b>					
Expenditures made	2 693 968	83 524 232	67 000 000	28 975 000	182 193 200
Budget	42 500 000	246 770 000	85 000 000	29 661 446	403 931 446
Performance rate	6%	34%	79%	98 %	45%
<b>Project Management</b>					
Expenditures made	53 778 917	42 341 482	21 200 400	121 500 000	129 820 799
Budget	28 500 000	48 626 000	47 650 000	25 000 000	149 776 000
Performance rate	189%	87%	44%	49%	86 %
Annual performance rate	72%	49%	69%	89 %	63%

### 3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at the start and implementation

Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process or of the implementation of an activity, to determine the extent to which inputs secured, schedules, actions and outputs are consistent with established plans, so that remedial action can be taken in a timely manner if discrepancies occur.

The assessment of the implementation of monitoring and evaluation as designed at the beginning is given in Table 6.

**Table 6: Implementation status of planned monitoring and evaluation activities**

Evaluation Activities planned	Implementation status	Comments
Annual Report / Review of the implementation of the Project	Four annual reports have been completed	Annual reports from 2015 to 2018 have been completed. The situation of the financial performance is missing from the 2018 report.



Mid-term external evaluation	Not done	Not required for this type of project.
External final evaluation	The external Final Evaluation was conducted in December 2018	The final evaluation has been completed.
Final evaluation report	The final report was submitted.	Final report submitted on March 12, 2019.
Audit	- 2015 and 2016 financial years audited in 2017 -2017 and 2018 financial years audited in 2019	The findings of the audit for the entire project from 2015 to 2018 were submitted to the evaluator on March 11, 2019.
Lessons learned	They are contained in this final report as well as in the 2015-2018 activity report.	The lessons learned were to be formulated as the project was implemented and included in each of the annual reports, but this was not done.
Technical reports	Six reports have been completed	Minutes and synthesis reports have been produced following each session of the COPIL since 2015.
Project closure report	In course of drafting	Not received as of the date of submission of this final report.

The design of the monitoring and evaluation model at the beginning of the project suffered from some shortcomings. Although the various planned evaluation activities have been respected (see Table 6), the fact that many of the indicators do not meet the SMART criteria has made evaluation difficult in terms of performance. The annual reports contain performance indicators that are distinct from those presented in the logical framework and this is the main weakness. Similarly, there have been shortcomings in the gender approach. The essential element of the gender approach lies in the very fact of involving the female and minority populations in the project, whether in terms of its design or the preparation, implementation and evaluation of its actions. As previously mentioned, no indicators have been developed in the logical framework to mainstream gender equality and women's empowerment. In short, for the *design of the project monitoring and evaluation*, the evaluation is rated *moderately unsatisfactory*, the score would be higher if indicators corresponding to the SMART indicators were developed.

The quality of the *implementation of the monitoring and evaluation plan* is *moderately satisfactory*. Human resources have been poorly evaluated from the beginning. For example, a monitoring evaluator was not assigned at the beginning of the project but it was rectified quickly (see Table 4). During the course of the project there were delays in the original

schedule, but this is due to external factors beyond the control of the project team. The various COPIL session reports indicate discussions that took place between stakeholders and the project team. The discussions focused on the concerns and constraints encountered. Adaptive management measures were initiated as a result of the issues raised during these sessions (see Table 4).

Based on previous observations, *the overall evaluation of monitoring and evaluation is rated moderately satisfactory.*

### **3.2.6 Coordination at the implementation level of UNDP and the Executing Agency**

UNDP involvement in the implementation of the project has encountered some difficulties. Between 2014 and 2018, there has been 3 program officers responsible for the project. The knowledge gained on the project was lost with every turnover. Also, UNDP technical input was limited due to increased workload during the project validity period. The project also had a very slow start as the creation and appointment orders were signed after a long delay. As a result, UNDP made the first disbursements in late 2015. The annual reports indicate that UNDP has put appropriate emphasis on project outcomes. In terms of risk management, the issue is complex. Indeed, political risks have contributed to the deterioration of the country's security situation and project activities have been delayed. This, however, is not attributable to weak risk management by UNDP.

The SP / CONEDD Executing Agency project coordinator provided day-to-day management of the project on both technical and administrative issues (development of terms of reference for hiring, interviews, daily communication with partners, the focal points, organization of workshops etc.) A great emphasis was placed on the outcomes of the project and targets were set to better complement the logical framework indicators. However, it appears that the delay in 2018 disbursement is due to the fact that the project team has spent more than planned on the project management component. This indicates that budget monitoring by the project team has been weak. With regard to procurement, the SP / CONEDD has met the standards of the public administration, these standards are however demanding in terms of time. For example, the SP / CONEDD had quickly identified the IT consultant to hire but the process took several months. With regard to risk management by SP / CONEDD, the situation was the same as that experienced by UNDP.

From the beginning of the project, the coordinator and the monitoring and evaluation manager had to rework the PRODOC indicators in order to adapt them to the project. The Program Officer at UNDP made a great technical input at this level. The project coordinator is also the director of ONEDD, combining these two tasks he was able to cope brilliantly. The project partners have an excellent relationship with him and this has facilitated the success of the project.

## **3.3 Project outcomes**

The review of project outcomes and performance is based on the Project Document (PRODOC) approved by the Government of Burkina Faso, UNDP / GEF, UNDP Burkina Faso, the annual activity reports (including the financial statements) and the data collected by the evaluator during the interviews with the various actors.

### **3.3.1 Overall outcomes**

First, the achievement of the expected outcomes for the two project components (Table 7) and, secondly, the achievement of the overall project objective (Table 8) will be reviewed. ***The overall outcomes are rated moderately satisfactory.***

**Table 7: Overall Outcomes by Component**

<b>Component 1: Information Systems for National and Global Environmental Management</b>			
<b>Outcome 1: A sustainable system of collection, analysis, storage and provision of reliable data and information related to the three Rio Conventions is functional and can be directly exploited by decision-makers.</b>			
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Outcomes achieved</b>	<b>Impact indicators</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1.1</b> Revitalization of the Environmental Management Information System (EMIS) and the Local Environmental Information System (LEIS) of Burkina Faso.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obtaining a second IP address for the data system to improve its capacity and optimization of the server.</li> <li>- Finalization of the local information system (LEIS)</li> <li>- Build the capacities of the computer scientist in charge of the system.</li> <li>- Organization of five workshops with PNGIM members and ONEDD focal points and development of REEB4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ONEDD is recognized as the main source of information for environmental planning by a large number of national development partners.</li> </ul>	<p>122 people participated in training workshops on environmental management, data systems and indicators. These trainings were organized by ONEDD. Dissemination activities made visible the contribution of ONEDD. The evaluation of this indicator is difficult, but the presumption is that the workshops and activities have made positively the role of ONEDD known.</p> <p><i>The level of achievement of this indicator is satisfactory.</i></p>
<b>1.2</b> Within EMIS, improved data collection protocols and standards leading to the harmonization and availability of effective CBD, CCD, UNFCCC and other MEA information are signed by relevant partners and implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Report on the state of the Environment in Burkina Faso).</li> <li>- Equipment of 13 regional directorates with 13 desktops and GPS.</li> <li>- Dissemination activities on SP / CONEDD activities through the distribution of the <i>Journal Notre Environnement</i>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic funding exists for the updating of ONEDD from the national budget and PNIEDD.</li> </ul>	<p>During the interviews conducted for this final evaluation, the Secretary General of the Ministry of the Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change confirmed that budget arrangements had been made to ensure the operation and maintenance of the data system of ONEDD. Given this information, <i>the level of achievement of this indicator is considered satisfactory.</i></p>
<b>1.3</b> As a key element of the EMIS, an Environment Observatory technically and materially strengthened to serve as a coordinated and sustainable mechanism for collecting and storing data / information and to enable effective national reporting to the conventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training of ONEDD municipal agents on the management of the local information system database.</li> <li>- Building the capacity of ONEDD managers to update the ONEDD indicators and their use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvement of the quality of the reports as well as the punctuality of their submissions to the Conventions.</li> </ul>	<p>The available information does not allow to qualify the achievement of this indicator with precision. Nevertheless, during the interviews at the final evaluation, the focal point of the Ramsar Convention and Biodiversity pointed out that the data system helped him produce the reports for the Conventions.</p>

<p><b>1.4</b> A set of cross-cutting global environmental knowledge materials covering the three Conventions (eg maps, indicator framework, State-Pressure-Response surveys) that each respond to a clear user need and are produced on a financially sustainable basis.</p>		<p>- Public institutions have increased awareness of environmental information products.</p>	<p>A total of 20 collaboration protocols were signed with PNGIM partners for the use and feeding of ONEDD's environmental information data system. Several members of public institutions participated in training activities. Knowledge of the various environmental information products was confirmed during the interviews conducted as part of this final evaluation. <i>The level of achievement of this indicator is considered satisfactory.</i></p>
<p><b>Component 2:</b> Integration of the global environment into local planning for sustainable development</p>			
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Institutional planning capacities are strengthened for the implementation of development processes that contribute to the implementation of the Rio Conventions and generate benefits for the global environment.</p>			
Outputs	Summary of activities carried out	Impact indicators	Comments
<p><b>2.1</b> The decentralized sustainable development planning guide is updated with modules convention topics previously not taken into account such as BD, IWRM, POPs, etc..</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluation of the methodological guide for local planning with the help of 13 representatives (including 4 women) of the resource structures.</li> <li>- Evaluation of 9 local development plans with the help of 114 resource persons (including 9 women).</li> <li>- Training of actors to take into account multilateral agreements in local development plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The number of stakeholder representatives sensitized on best practices to respond to global environmental guidelines through decentralized environmental governance.</li> </ul>	<p>374 people including 39 women participated in training activities on the inclusion of multilateral agreements in local development plans. Of these, 59 are members of the Regional Council's consultation frameworks. These activities took place in all project areas. <i>The level of achievement of this indicator is satisfactory.</i></p>
<p><b>2.2</b> Broader network of experts, strengthened and trained in the use of the Guide and its new modules, with particular emphasis on achieving the objectives of the Rio Global Conventions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Testing and updating of new modules on biodiversity, desertification and persistent organic pollutants.</li> <li>- Development of thematic maps of natural resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of local development plans that incorporate global environmental benefits.</li> </ul>	<p>One of the planned activities was to train over 320 stakeholders (40% of them being women) to use the Methodological Guide for Local Planning. In fact, 160 people were trained of which only 10 women or 6%. In addition, periodic evaluation activities for the use of the Guide needed to be conducted, as these did not take place because of time constraints, the Guide was only distributed in the fall of 2018.</p>

			Nevertheless, 9 local development plans have been revised and incorporate global environmental benefits. <i>The level of achievement of this indicator is moderately satisfactory.</i>
<b>2.3</b> Practical application of the Guide in support of the development of local development plans to contribute to the implementation of the three Rio Conventions.		- Number of submissions of environmental activities for PNIEDD and PNSR funding resulting from PLD.	Information not available to evaluate this indicator.
<b>2.4</b> Global environmental benefits achieved through the implementation of modified plans and programs.		- Number of demonstration tests carried out at Community level.	New modules for the Guide needed to be updated and tested in 20 communes. In practice, this was done in only 6 communes or 30%. <i>The level of achievement of this indicator is unsatisfactory.</i>
<b>2.5</b> Legislation and sustainable financing mechanism to formalize the use of the Guide, prepared and presented to the government.		- Decentralized technical support structures and human resources are funded to ensure proper functioning.	A document on the adoption of the Guide as an official standard for local planning and allocation of sustainable funding was adopted by the National Assembly. <i>The level of achievement of this indicator is moderately satisfactory.</i>

**Table 8: Outcomes by Overall Objective**

Overall expected outcome: Creating global environmental benefits through better planning and decision-making systems at the local level in Burkina Faso	
Impact indicators	Comments

- Percentage of natural resource management projects by national structures and grassroots communities incorporating MEA guidelines.	This indicator is difficult to measure since no information on the number of projects used by national structures and communities is available. What is known, however, is that 90% of the PNGIM members benefited from the various capacity building activities, many of which focused on MEAs and the integration of environmental aspects. In addition, nearly 2,000 copies of activity bulletins and MEA baseline data were distributed to partners.
- Percentage of formulated / revised local development plans Incorporating Environmental Concerns and Climate Change as Described in the Operational Manual.	Only 15% of the revised local development plans incorporate environmental concerns and climate change. <i>The level of achievement of this indicator is unsatisfactory.</i>
- Overall improvement of the baseline situation of the main stakeholders (see capacity development scorecard).	All training activities on MEAs have improved the baseline situation. <i>The level of achievement of this indicator is satisfactory.</i>
- Availability and coordination of the provision of better information for environmental planning at the central and decentralized levels is ensured and confirmed.	A system for collecting, analyzing and storing environmental data is functional. The data system is accessible at commune level and there is collaboration between actors at national and regional levels. <i>The level of achievement of this indicator is satisfactory.</i>

### 3.3.2 Relevance

With regard to the major documents of Burkina Faso, the project was very relevant. Indeed, several programs, action plans and strategies have been adopted to achieve better environmental management and improve local governance. Among these, we can mention the Strategy of Accelerated Growth and Sustainable Development (SCADD). SCADD designs Burkina Faso's long-term strategic directions. Interventions revolve around environmental governance and capacity building. A national strategy and a capacity building action plan have been adopted. Burkina Faso also has a national environmental policy, a biodiversity strategy and action plan, and a national program for investing in the environment and sustainable development. All these initiatives are strongly aligned with the objectives of the project. The project is consistent with the UNDP intervention strategy, as set out in the Burkina Faso Country Program, which aims to better inform and equip institutions for the sustainable management of natural resources and for the dissemination of best practices. Similarly, the project is aligned with GEF Strategic Objectives 2 and 3 for cross-cutting capacity development, namely, creation, access and use of information and knowledge, and capacity building for the development of policies and regulations to achieve global benefits. ***The project is therefore considered relevant.***

### 3.3.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency

The analysis of effectiveness is the extent to which the objectives of the development action have been achieved, or are being achieved, given their relative importance. Thus, it was about assessing the extent to which the two expected outcomes and the project objective were achieved. Efficiency analysis is a measure of how resources (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into outcomes to ensure good value for money.

#### *Effectiveness: Achievement of project outcomes and objective*

The 2015-2018 Synthesis Report estimated the achievement rate of the two outcomes as follows: first, to simplify the calculation, it was assumed that both expected outcomes had the same weight; then, for each indicator in the project document, the rate of achievement was estimated by comparing what was planned and what was actually achieved); finally, to obtain the achievement rate of a given outcome, the achievement rates of all the indicators were summed and divided by the number of indicators of the outcome under consideration. In other words, it is the arithmetic average of the achievement rates of the indicators of a given outcome which constitutes the rate of achievement of this outcome. For outcome 1, the indicator achievement rate is 100% while for outcome 2 the achievement rate of the indicators is 63%. The average is therefore an achievement rate of 81% which indicates a high effectiveness. With regard to the overall objective, "Creating global environmental benefits through better planning and decision-making systems at the local level in Burkina Faso", the same arithmetic logic has been applied. The target achievement rate is 93% (see Table 9). However, as previously mentioned, the shortcomings of the indicators make them difficult to



measure and we question the validity of the 93% rate achieved. A more nuanced view of the achievement of the outcomes is provided in Tables 7 and 8.

**Table 9: Achievement rates of the overall objective**

Impact indicators	Baseline	Targets at the end of the project	Achievement rate
* Percentage of natural resource management projects by national structures and grassroots communities incorporating MEA guidelines	* Capacity of key stakeholders to use EMIS environmental information in decision-making is weak because dispersed (weakness due to poor coordination, insufficient information, technical inadequacy);	* 50% of PNGIM stakeholders benefited from the capacity building activity at the systemic, organizational and individual levels (PM: for a better use of technical competence and transfer technology of national and decentralized management to produce global environmental benefits (eg training and workshops);	100%
* Percentage of formulated / revised local development plans, incorporating environmental concerns and climate change as described in the Operational Manual	* Collection, updates and management of environmental data is irregular;	* 15% of formulated / revised local development plans, adequately integrate environmental concerns and climate change;	45%
* Overall improvement of the baseline situation of the main stakeholders	* Low integration of MEA guidance by natural resource management projects managed by national structures and grassroots communities (less than 5%);	* Part-time and full-time technical assistance and if possible, investments to ensure the stability of government decision-making structures and mechanisms at central and local levels, such as the National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development (CONEDD), the Regional Consultation Framework for Development (CCRD) and Communal Consultation Frameworks (CCC);	100%
* Availability and coordination of the provision of better information for environmental planning at the central and decentralized level is ensured and confirmed.	* No formulated / revised local development plan adequately integrates global environmental benefits as advocated by MEAs	* At least 30% of natural resource management projects managed by national structures and grassroots communities have integrated MEA requirements into at least 20 communities and three regions.	100%
		* Burkina Faso has an effective system to generate global environmental benefits at a	100%

		reduced cost and to provide timely and appropriate information for local conservation needs.	
		* Better access at the subregional level on best practices is ensured;	100%
		* Better coordination and collaboration exist between key stakeholders	100%
		* the delegation of responsibilities between key agencies and other important organizations is increased	100%
<b>Overall achievement rate</b>			93 %

#### *Efficiency: Resource utilization and value for money*

It is on this aspect that the project encountered most of the challenges. From the beginning of the project, the COPIL sessions and other documents highlight the concerns related to the tasks to be performed versus the available budgets and human resources. As noted by the project coordinator, the project was a category A project according to the government. Such a project has several advantages, because of its size, it is easier for the national party to take ownership of it. However, this project comes with smaller human resources and it is extremely difficult once the project starts to obtain additional financial resources, the possibilities being very limited. Both the project coordinator and the monitoring and evaluation officer shouldered concurrently two workloads during the life of the project. This is one of the primary difficulties of a Category A project as the implementation of activities is often in competition with the coordinator's own management activities. The team then had to work with limited resources as the budget was underestimated. The quality of the training offered as reported during the interviews testifies to the project's efficiency. The large number of training activities offered as well as the number of participants indicates (see Table 7) also indicate a good efficiency of the project.

#### *Assessment of the overall effectiveness and efficiency*

In the light of the above information, ***the effectiveness and efficiency of the project are considered moderately satisfactory.***

#### **3.3.4 Ownership by the country**

The project implementation structure was SP / CONEDD under the Ministry of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change. The chairman of COPIL was the Secretary General of this Ministry. The COPIL has followed the project well and its chairman has offered his support to counter the difficulties in terms of human resources, notably by authorizing the hiring of local

consultants unscheduled in the budget. The Secretary General of the Ministry reiterated in an interview<sup>3</sup> that a budget had already been planned to ensure the operation and maintenance of the EMIS. There is a willingness of the Government of Burkina Faso to make efforts to meet its commitments to the Rio Conventions. The project received support from the Ministry as it was perceived as a main tool to enable the Convention focal points to do their job well and meet the MEA obligations.

### 3.3.5 Integration

The UNDP strategic plan in Burkina Faso has been designed to eradicate poverty, promote structural transformation and build resilience. UNDP's work is built around six solutions: 1) eradicating poverty, 2) improving governance, 3) preventing crises and building resilience, 4) protecting the environment, 5) increasing clean and sustainable energy and 6) promoting women's empowerment and gender equality. In general, several aspects of the project were aligned with the priorities, particularly in terms of governance. Capacity building helps to increase the socio-economic conditions of participants. The revitalization of the EMIS contributes indirectly to the protection of the environment and the building of resilience. The only weak point where greater efforts would have been desirable is at the level of women's empowerment and gender equality. Indeed, a very small number of women participated in capacity building activities. Also, an activity aimed at promoting income-generating activities based on natural resources could not be carried out due to time constraints.

Since their entry into force in 2016, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have guided UNDP policies and funding. Each of the 17 goals has a series of targets to achieve. Project activities contributed to three goals as well as to some of their targets. Specifically Goal Five (5) on Gender Equality and Target 5.b: *"Strengthening the use of key technologies, particularly informatics and communications, to promote women's empowerment"*. Activities also supported Goal 16 on Peace, Justice and Effective Institutions. Within this goal, activities have been aligned with Target 16.8: *"Expanding and Strengthening the Participation of Developing Countries in Global Governance Institutions"*, and Target 16.10: *"Ensuring Public Access to information and protecting fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements"*. Finally, the project supported Goal 17 on Partnerships for Achieving Goals, in particular Target 17.9: *"Increasing support at the international level for effective and targeted strengthening of developing countries' capacities and thereby support national plans to achieve all the Sustainable Development Goals, particularly in the framework of North-South and South-South Cooperation for Triangular Cooperation"* and Target 17.14 *"Strengthening Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development"*

### 3.3.6 Sustainability and impacts

We agreed to combine the concepts of "sustainability" and "impacts" within a single evaluation parameter. What makes a project sustainable is the scope of the positive impacts that have

---

<sup>3</sup> Interview conducted in December 2018 with the Secretary General as part of this final evaluation.

been materialized in the structures and systems as well as in individuals. The sustainability analysis was done in two stages. At first, we studied whether the outcomes obtained are sustainable and secondly we analyzed the probabilities that the achievements and the benefits that were created by the project persist over time.

#### *Social and political sustainability*

At the social level, sustainability is visible through positive impacts on individuals thanks to capacity building activities. Each individual who has benefited from training can use his new knowledge and skills within his organization. This can eventually lead to an improvement in socio-economic living conditions. The various training activities also allowed professionals from various institutions to meet in the same location for a few days. Several interviewees also reported that collaboration and networking opportunities were increased as a result of participating in the activities. These activities laid the groundwork for the establishment of a community of practice experts in environmental management. Two aspects of sustainability for the individuals presented in the PRODOC "sustainability section" were not achieved. The aim was to lead directly to better living conditions for women through training (which should include 40% of them) and help them generate additional income for the household through the management of natural resources. In fact, of the total number of people who have received training, only 11% are women. The activity planned to generate the incomes did not take place. Positive impacts for this group are therefore limited.

#### *Sustainability in the institutional framework and governance*

The sustainability of the project for this aspect is shown through the revitalization of the EMIS, its computing capabilities have been increased and a new IP address has been purchased. All of this is a tangible achievement with the institution hosting the EMIS that will continue after the end of the project. Institutions in the communes and regions have been equipped with computers, GPS and GIS software. Local communities have benefited from training to use these tools. The acquisition of this computer equipment had the indirect impact of facilitating data collection by local communities. These data can then be integrated into the EMIS and increase environmental knowledge. The tools made available by the project are therefore exploited positively by the communities. Several thematic maps were also produced during the project. Such maps are powerful tools for communities to explain environmental problems, especially among illiterate communities. The revision of local development plans, although more plans should have been revised, is also a lasting achievement. These plans now incorporate the environmental obligations required when producing reports for the Rio Conventions. It is now easier to revise other local development plans in areas that the project has not reached. The methodology has been tested and can be replicated at a lower cost. Overall, governance is improved by the project.

#### *Financial sustainability*

In terms of financial sustainability, the Ministry of the Environment, Green Economy and

Climate Change appears to have made a commitment in terms of budgets to maintain the EMIS. Maintaining EMIS is obviously essential, but it is important to continue investing in capacity building.

#### *Environmental sustainability*

The nature of the project activities ensures that there are no physical impacts on the environment. In an indirect way, however, the project facilitates the conservation of the environment. The acquisition of environmental knowledge and the improvement of environmental management systems strengthen conservation activities.

*Given the above, the sustainability of the project is considered moderately likely.*

## **4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

As a first step, this section provides a summary of the main findings. In a second step, a set of lessons learned is discussed. And in the last moment, a list of recommendations is presented.

### **4.1 Conclusions**

In the light of the final evaluation, five major conclusions are necessary.

The first conclusion is that there were problems at the design stage that affected the duration of the project. The final evaluation identified that several logical framework indicators have suffered from deficient formulation that does not meet the SMART criteria. In addition to this weakness, the indicators were not made available in the mother tongue of the national counterpart, which limited understanding and resulted in an inaccurate translation of several indicators in the English version. We also identified that human resources were underestimated in the PRODOC, for example the hiring of a computer scientist was not planned.

The second conclusion is at the project implementation level, which did not benefit from an optimal support at the inception of the project. The final evaluation showed that there was administrative delay on the part of the public administration, which led to the late adoption of the creation orders the project, the COPIL and the appointment of the coordinator. Without these orders, the project could not operate officially. Also, the interviews revealed that there was a poor linkage between the PRODOC team and the coordination team to fully explain the logical framework and the project strategy. UNDP technical support for the project has been weakened by two factors: turnover at the program officer level (3 different individuals over a 4-year period) and the fact that the human resources working there have a high workload and could not support the project to the desired level.

The third conclusion is that the project's performance according to the indicators as presented in the logical framework is difficult to measure. The shortcomings of several logical framework impact indicators has made the evaluation of outcomes complex. The performance indicators developed by the project team are much more targeted with regard to measuring the outcomes. However, this final evaluation should be based on the PRODOC indicators

The fourth conclusion is that the project has been impacted by negative factors such as the deterioration of the security situation and the socio-political context. International consultants refused to participate in the project for these reasons. Political problems led to a delay in activities.

The last conclusion is that despite the difficulties encountered, the project performed well as a whole. This is directly attributable to two factors: the ownership of the project by the SP / CONEDD implementation structure and the quality of the coordination team that was able to combine several tasks at a time to achieve the outcomes.

## **4.2 Lessons learned**

Lessons learned are drawn from the strengths and weaknesses of this project. Strengths indicate where efforts should be targeted to maximize project impacts. Weaknesses or bad practices indicate what pitfalls to avoid in the event the replication of a similar project is considered.

### **Strengths**

#### ***Strong ownership of the project by the country***

The appropriation of the national counterpart is what makes the difference in the success of the project. A sense of belonging to the project goes hand in hand with a sense of accountability for the project. It also provides a solid foundation for project continuity when funders withdraw.

#### ***Dedicated project team***

The dedication of the team to the project is what allows to find creative solutions when difficulties are encountered such as late disbursements, slow administration process for hiring.

#### ***Good synergy between the executing agency and the partners***

The responsiveness of the project partners to the activities maximized the impacts and benefits. The executing agency has an excellent reputation with partners. It is important to choose an agency that knows how to effectively rally the various stakeholders.

#### ***Quality product (data system)***

In the framework of this project, the revitalization of the data system was central to achieving the objectives. The system is consulted, used and fed by the partners and ultimately a quality

system is offered to users and beneficiaries. Despite network constraints (slow and reliable internet service), the quality of the data system means that it will continue to be used in the future.

### ***Quality trainings offered***

Capacity building at the national and local levels was also a central aspect of the project. All the people interviewed during the evaluation emphasized the quality of the technical training offered both in terms of content and the trainers. The knowledge gained from these trainings remains a lasting asset for individuals' career progression that can help generate additional income.

## **Weaknesses**

### ***Low representation of women in project activities***

The logical framework had much more ambitious objectives than those achieved in strengthening women's activities. The causes of this low representativeness are not explained in the project documents. However, it is known that women have more responsibilities for children's care and suffer most economic difficulties, this probably limited their participation. We noted that the project missed two opportunities to increase women's participation since two of the activities affecting them could not be carried out due to time and budget constraints. These are missed opportunities that could easily have been avoided. Gender goals must be a priority.

### ***PRODOC logical framework was not available in the official language of the project team***

The logical framework contains the impact indicators and details the project strategy. It is therefore crucial to ensure that this key document is well understood by the national counterpart. In this project, the coordination team was confronted with a challenging exercise of translation of the impact indicators. In addition, weaknesses in the indicators themselves (not SMART), the translation was approximate. This has caused the fact that the project team did not fully take ownership of the indicators as presented in the PRODOC.

### ***Poor linkage between the team that produced the PRODOC and the project team***

There does not appear to have been technical support from the PRODOC development lead with the coordination team to clarify the logical framework. A linkage was to be made when starting the project. One of the tasks of the UNDP Program Officer could be to ensure that there is a transition between the PRODOC Officer and the Coordination Team.

### ***Late disbursement and administrative slowness of the public administration***

A combination of administrative and political constraints slowed disbursement. At the beginning of the project, it is not uncommon for this to happen. However, in 2017 as well as in 2018, financial resources were made available late to the project. The delay of 2018 is due to the fact that the project exceeded the amounts planned for the project management component. The UNDP regional office therefore requested an audit of the accounts before

making available new financial resources, which took some time. With regard to the administrative slowness of the public administration, this was experienced in the hiring process of the computer scientist and the consultant for local development plans. Indeed the number of no objections required by the public authorities is what has delayed the hiring and the beginning of certain activities of the project.

### ***Staff turnover / loss of institutional memory***

Staff turnover is an external factor that has affected project performance. There was turnover in UNDP but also with partner structures. At each rotation, there is a loss of institutional memory and the project as a whole suffers. At the UNDP level, the transfer of knowledge during staff turnover should be increased.

### ***Sociopolitical and security context***

The deterioration of the security context was not considered during project design. The situation at the time did not indicate such deterioration. Nevertheless, it may be beneficial to suggest that for future projects in Burkina Faso, an in-depth security context analysis constitute an integral part of PRODOC. This analysis should include a detailed list of potential impacts on the project and the proposed mitigation measures.

## **4.3 Recommendations**

Based on the lessons learned as well as the observations made during the project, a list of recommendations can be identified that affect the entire project, at the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation levels.

**Recommendation 1:** The GEF should ensure that the PRODOC logical framework is available in the official language of the recipient country.

Understanding the framework is crucial to maximize the effective work of the project coordination team. Should the project continue, the results framework should be revised.

**Recommendation 2:** At the level of the public administration, efforts should be made to reduce the administrative slowness of hiring by limiting the number of non-objections required.

For example, the COPIL could be the only body whose non-objection is required. To date, according to the project team, it seems that more than 4 non-objections are required at various levels.

**Recommendation 3:** The project coordination team should set up a monitoring committee to continuously improve the data system.

Most interviewees asked for such a type of committee. They expressed a desire to be part of the process.

**Recommendation 4:** The SP / CONEDD should define a capitalization plan to maintain the data system and ensure its dissemination to partners.

The sustainability of the data system is a concern for many interviewees who fear that the financial closure of the project will lead to the end of the data system.



**Recommendation 5:** The SP / CONEDD should continue to sensitize partners for the use and feeding of the data system.

A quality product has been created. Its durability depends on its use and its feeding by the partners so that the system continues to be recognized as being up to date and reliable.

**Recommendation 6:** UNDP and the national counterpart should gain a better understanding of the reasons for women's low participation in activities and consider the need for financial support to facilitate participation.

Family and socio-economic constraints seem to have a negative effect on women's participation. It would be advisable to consider that a financial support (whether to cover the cost of transportation or loss of income) should be provided to women participating in activities.