



Project Identification Form (PIF) entry – Full Sized Project – GEF - 6

## Integrated and Sustainable Management of PONASI Protected Area Landscape

### Part I: Project Information

**GEF ID**

9764

**Project Type**

FSP

**Type of Trust Fund**

GET

**Project Title**

Integrated and Sustainable Management of PONASI Protected Area Landscape

**Countries**

Burkina Faso

**Agency(ies)**

UNDP

**Other Executing Partner(s)**

Permanent Secretariat for the Environment and Sustainable Development (SP  
CONEDD) under the Ministère de l'Environnement de l'Economie Verte et du  
Changement Climatique

**Executing Partner Type**

Government

**GEF Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Taxonomy**

**Rio Markers**

Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Adaptation

**Duration**

72 In Months

**Agency Fee(\$)**

501,548.00

## A. Indicative Focal Area Strategy Framework and Other Program Strategies

Objectives/Programs	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1_P2	GET	3,370,320.00	8,000,000.00
LD-1_P2	GET	550,000.00	3,350,000.00
LD-3_P4	GET	495,890.00	3,250,000.00
CCM-2_P4	GET	863,242.00	4,600,000.00
Total Project Cost (\$)		5,279,452.00	19,200,000.00

## B. Indicative Project description summary

### Project Objective

To safeguard critical wildlife habitat, biodiversity and ecosystem services in PONASI Protected Area Complex through integrated landscape management, generating multiple benefits for sustainable development.

Project Component	Financing Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
1.Integrate d manageme nt of the PONASI Landscape	Technical Assistan ce	Integrated management of the PONASI landscape covering 952,000 ha, indicated by: (i) existence of operational PONASI Complex Management Board; (ii) extent of landscape management plan implementation with application of ELUP tools for decision making resulting in set aside of HVCFs and establishment of wildlife corridors; and (iii) avoided GHG emissions by 4 million tCO <sub>2</sub> eq through integrated forest landscape management from decreased	1.1 The “PONASI Landscape Management Board” is established and operationalised as an integrated governance platform that serves as a joint decision mechanism for land use in the landscape. It will serve as a platform to ensure harmonisation of different management jurisdictions over specific management units within the landscape (e.g. SP/CONEDD, DGFF, OFINAP and DREDD) and the different levels of administration. 1.2 The Environmental Land-Use Planning (ELUP) tool is adopted and is in operation, both as a spatial planning methodology for governing land-use, and as a system to visualize the impacts of economic activities on the landscape with clear articulation of trade-offs, and put in place to facilitate land use decision making. 1.3 Carbon mapping, measurement and monitoring system is instituted within DGEF to be able to produce consistent, accurate and well documented estimates of carbon stocks in the PONASI Landscape and to inform the landscape management plan development and implementation. 1.4 PONASI Landscape Management Plan developed and approved by the Management Board for implementation, using the ELUP and carbon mapping tools to ensure protection of core wildlife habitats including corridors and	GET	420,000.00	2,350,000.00

deforestation rate over 436,057 ha of forest landscapes and restoration of 3,000 ha natural habitat; (iv) reduction in human wildlife conflict cases; (v) increase in available sustainable financing for landscape management. Indicators will be confirmed and baseline and targets will be determined during the PPG

maintenance of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and taking full account of emission reduction. The management plan will also include a financing plan, wildlife tourism development plan based on a clear concession system. 1.5 Clear management prescriptions for different land units and effective monitoring and enforcement mechanisms established, led by Réseau MARP including biodiversity and ecosystem monitoring system, a range of incentives and disincentives, compliance monitoring mechanism, supporting implementation of the PONASI Landscape Management Plan

2. Strengthening of PONASI PA System	Technical Assistance	Improved institutional capacity of the PA agency as measured by the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard Improved management effectiveness in 314,434 ha of core PAs and 88,691 ha of two wildlife corridors in PONASI Complex indicated by: (i) Increase in METT	2.1 Institutional and individual capacity of the PA agency increased through target capacity development interventions based on institutional capacity assessment (to be conducted during the PPG). This will entail institutionalisation of training programme, strengthening of staffing structure and staff profile to ensure scientific, enforcement and community engagement capacity among other things. 2.2 Management effectiveness of the 4 PAs in the PONASI Complex – PN Kabore-Tambi (161,956 ha), Nazinga (103,579 ha) and Sissili (38,153 ha) and Nazinon (10,746 ha) - strengthened through a series of technical support including, inter alia: establishment and institutionalisation of long-term PA management plans with 2-year action plan and annual operational plan, PA business plan, species management plan, community	GET	3,270,000.00	8,250,000.00
--------------------------------------	----------------------	--	---	-----	--------------	--------------

Scores for individual sites (PNKT, Sissili, Nazinga, Nazinon), including improved management; (ii) Biodiversity health index shows improvement in the biodiversity and ecosystem status in each PA; (iii) stable or increased elephant population in the PONASI Complex from the current estimated 600. Indicators will be confirmed and baseline and targets will be determined during the PPG

engagement plan. Site level support will also include basic management infrastructure consolidation. 2.3 Wildlife corridor governance and management regime established and operationalised for 2 corridors (OFINAP and DREDD) to link major forest blocks and conservation areas with focus on reducing the pressures generated by road infrastructure and human wildlife conflict and livestock grazing. Support will include development and implementation of zoning plans, improved grazing management, habitat restoration and enrichment (e.g. re-introduction of native plant species). 2.4 An effective landscape-level elephant protection plan is developed and operationalized for the entire PONASI Complex.

3. Sustainable Land Management and livelihood diversification	Technical Assistance	Increased land area under effective agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management practices or supporting climate-smart agriculture in 6,000 ha. Increased	3.1 Land management in Community Managed Hunting Zones (ZOVICs) and Community Managed Forests (CAFs) improved through collaborative natural resource management interventions, including: development of simplified zoning plans using the ELUP tool and their implementation; strengthening of hunting management; and implementation of human wildlife conflict management measures. 3.2 Sustainable land management (SLM) practices implemented by communities in the PONASI Landscape to reduce threats to PAs	GET	1,150,000.00	7,400,000.00
---	----------------------	--	--	-----	--------------	--------------

application of integrated natural resource management practices by communities in the PONASI landscape, evidenced by: a combination of metrics such as land productivity, vegetation cover, carbon sequestration, water quality and quantities, reduction of bush fires, etc. Diversified livelihoods of local communities as per participatory survey, indicated by increase in community income from wildlife based tourism ventures and the number of direct beneficiaries (gender disaggregated). Indicators will be confirmed and baseline and targets will be determined during the PPG

and to increase food security, agricultural productivity and resilience, including climate smart agriculture, sustainable harvesting of wood and biomass energy, forest restoration, fire management assisted natural regeneration and water management. 3.3 Sustainable community based tourism ventures are established under the PONASI tourism development plan, providing alternative livelihoods to the communities and incentives for conservation. This support will entail community training, facilitation of partnerships with the private sector and linking with international tourism market. 3.4 A community engagement and training programme operational with a focus on sustainable livelihoods and a capacity building.

4. Gender Mainstreaming, Knowledge Management and Learning	Technical Assistance	Gender Mainstreaming, Lessons learned by the project through participatory M&E are used to guide adaptive management, collate and share lessons, in support of upscaling.	4.1 Project gender mainstreaming strategy is implemented to guide project implementation, monitoring and reporting. 4.2. Knowledge, key experiences and lessons learned are compiled and widely disseminated for replication through a range of communication tools including the project website, project stories, issue papers, and scaling up of project results supported.	GET	188,000.00	300,000.00
Sub Total (\$)					5,028,000.00	18,300,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
GET					251,452.00	900,000.00
Sub Total(\$)					251,452.00	900,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)					5,279,452.00	19,200,000.00

**C. Indicative sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type**

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security	Grant	10,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Grant	5,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	SP CONEDD	In-kind	100,000.00
Civil Society Organization	DGM Coordination in BF	Grant	2,000,000.00
Civil Society Organization	AFAUDEB and NATURAMA	Grant	1,800,000.00
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	300,000.00
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>			<b>19,200,000.00</b>

## D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Biodiversity		No	3,370,320	320,180	3,690,500.00
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Land Degradation		No	1,045,890	99,360	1,145,250.00
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Climate Change		No	863,242	82,008	945,250.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)						5,279,452.00	501,548.00	5,781,000.00

## E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required



PPG Amount (\$)

200,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

19,000

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Biodiversity		No	100,000	9,500	<b>109,500.00</b>
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Land Degradation		No	50,000	4,750	<b>54,750.00</b>
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Climate Change		No	50,000	4,750	<b>54,750.00</b>
Total Project Costs(\$)						<b>200,000.00</b>	<b>19,000.00</b>	<b>219,000.00</b>

## F. Project's Target Contributions to Global Environmental Benefits

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectare	952,000.0 Hectares
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	6,000.0 Hectares
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basin	Number of freshwater basins
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	Percent of fisheries, by volume
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 millions tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e	4,000,000.0 Metric Tons
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	Metric Tons
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	Metric Tons
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks		ODP Tons
	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	Number of countries
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	Number of countries


## Core Indicators

## Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	354,781.00	0.00	0.00

## Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created






Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	33,000.00	0.00	0.00


Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
Corridor #2	n/a	Habitat/Species Management Area		33,000.00		

## Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	321,781.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Corridor #1	none	Habitat/Species Management Area		4,500.00			31.00		
Corridor #2	none	Habitat/Species Management Area		0.00					
Kaboré-Tambi National Park	1049	National Park		169,000.00			39.00		

Nazinga Game Ranch	none	Habitat/Species Management Area	91,300.00	75.00	
Nazinon Classified Forest/ Forest management site (Chantier d'aménagement Forestier)	none		0.00		
Sissili Classified Forest	28556	Habitat/Species Management Area	32,700.00	47.00	
ZOVICs (10 in all)	none	Habitat/Species Management Area	0.00		
ZOVICs Biéha (4)	none	Habitat/Species Management Area	10,002.00	55.00	

ZOVICs Guiaro- Pô (7))	none	Habitat/Species Management Area	14,279.00	55.00	
---------------------------	------	---------------------------------------	-----------	-------	---

## Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	11000.00	0.00	0.00

## Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

## Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

11,000.00

**Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

**Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

**Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

0.00	129678.00	0.00	0.00
------	-----------	------	------

**Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

**Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	200.00		

**Type/Name of Third Party Certification**

Ecocert

**Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems**

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	129,478.00		

#### Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

#### Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title	Submitted
-------	-----------

#### Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)	0	0	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)	0	5448924	0	0

## Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)		5,448,924		
Anticipated start year of accounting		2021		
Duration of accounting		20		

## Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

## Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

## Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

## Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		18,531		
Male		12,354		
Total	0	30885	0	0

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **1. Project Description**

## 2. Stakeholders

Will Program design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from civil society organizations?

And indigenous people?

If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in Program design/preparation:

### 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Are issues on gender equality and women's empowerment taken into account?

If yes, briefly describe how it will be mainstreamed into Program preparation (e.g. gender analysis), taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men.

#### 4. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the design (table format acceptable)

## **5. Coordination**

**Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives.**

## 6. Consistency with National Priorities

Is the consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assesments under relevant conventions

## 7. Knowledge Management

Outline the knowledge management approach for the , including, if any, plans for the to learn from other relevant s and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.

## 9. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification\*

PIF

CEO Endorsement/Approval

MTR

TE

--

### Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Provide preliminary information on the types and levels of risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and describe measures to address these risks during the project design.

### Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title

Submitted

**Part III: Approval/Endorsement By GEF Operational Focal Point(S) And GEF Agency(ies)****A. Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):**

<b>Focal Point Name</b>	<b>Focal Point Title</b>	<b>Ministry</b>	<b>Signed Date</b>
MR. PAMOUSSA OUEDRAOGO	MR. PAMOUSSA OUEDRAOGO	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT	10/27/2016

**B. GEF Agency(ies) Certification**

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Adriana Dinu,	3/1/2017	Saliou Toure		saliou.toure@undp.org