

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
IDENTIFICATION / CONCEPT STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSC14976

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 21-Aug-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Burkina Faso	Project ID:	P157034
Project Name:	LSMS-ISA Burkina Faso Panel Surveys		
Team Leader(s):	Diane E. Steele		
Estimated Date of Approval:	24-Aug-2015		
Managing Unit:	DECSM	Lending Instrument:	Lending Instrument
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (25%), General education sector (25%), Health (25%), Other social services (25%)		
Theme(s):	Other social protection and risk management (20%), Gender (20%), Other social development (20%), Other human development (20%), Other urban development (20%)		
Financing (in USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	2.2	Total Bank Financing:	0
Financing Gap:	0		
Financing Source			Amount
Free-standing Single Purpose Trust Fund			2.2
Environment Category:	C - Not Required		

B. Project Development Objective(s)

Two nationally representative multi-topic integrated household surveys and two experiments in survey methodology.

C. Project Description

The first motivation for the development of this program of surveys results from the strong demand from the Government of Burkina Faso to have a comprehensive system that permits the production of indicators to monitor the SCADD and the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The system must be designed in such a manner that the indicators produced are comparable and harmonized using the international standards.

The second motivation for putting in place a comprehensive system is to consolidate the statistical system to monitor poverty. The brief description of the system in the previous section has shown the problems in the system for monitoring poverty, in particular the difficulty in over time comparisons

because of changes in the methodology of the collection of the data. The principal ingredient to measure poverty is household consumption and the methodology used to collect these data changed several times. As mentioned earlier, the data on household consumption in the EICVM 2009/10 were collected in four passages with six visits per passage where five were dedicated to the collection of data on household consumption. For the earlier surveys, this information was collected in one single passage and one single visit. In the EMC, while the data are collected in four passages like the EICVM, each passage had only one single visit. In other words, the period for the collection of data has not been the same for the different surveys and the content of the questionnaire, in terms of the consumption items has also seen important changes. All these elements are far from being neutral in effecting the poverty figures which are produced. In the new system, the survey will be designed under a model that facilitates future comparisons in using harmonized tools, notably surveys similar to the LSMS-ISA survey from the World Bank.

A third motivation for developing a system of surveys is to supplement the surveys with light surveys designed to produce monitoring indicators and which can be fielded more often than the larger surveys. These light survey can be designed to provide relevant data in a timely manner as inputs for better evaluation of public policies. In-depth analysis work can be conducted in a number of areas, to better understand the impact on poverty of certain phenomena.

A fourth motivation is to provide the data for the dynamic analysis of poverty, through panel surveys. Panel survey offer a unique opportunity to monitor the socio-economic development of households over time and permit a more in-depth analysis that can be done with multiple surveys in cross section. It is often interesting to study the characteristics of vulnerable households, that is those with a strong probability of falling into poverty, because of an exogenous shock for example. Panel survey are useful for this type of analysis. In addition, panel surveys offer the unique ability to rigorously evaluate the impact of specific projects and programs.

D. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

E. Borrower's Institutional Capacity for Safeguard Policies

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

II. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	No	The project is considered an environmental risk Category C because there are no civil works or other investments which would have any environmental or social impacts. Likewise, no safeguard policies are triggered since there are no aspects of the project which will have implications for these policies.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	

Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

III. SAFEGUARD PREPARATION PLAN

Appraisal stage ISDS required?: No

IV. APPROVALS

Team Leader(s):	Name: Diane E. Steele	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Glenn S. Morgan (SA)	Date: 21-Aug-2015
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Michael M. Lokshin (PMGR)	Date: 21-Aug-2015

¹ Reminder: The Bank's Disclosure Policy requires that safeguard-related documents be disclosed before appraisal (i) at the InfoShop and (ii) in country, at publicly accessible locations and in a form and language that are accessible to potentially affected persons.