



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

Focal Areas, Climate Change, Climate Change Mitigation, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Sustainable Pasture Management, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Sustainable Agriculture, Income Generating Activities, Sustainable Livelihoods, Sustainable Fire Management, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Sustainable Forest, Forest, Forest and Landscape Restoration, REDD - REDD+, Biodiversity, Biomes, Tropical Dry Forests, Species, Threatened Species, Wildlife for Sustainable Development, Mainstreaming, Forestry - Including HCVF and REDD+, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Certification - International Standards, Tourism, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Productive Landscapes, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Influencing models, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Stakeholders, Civil Society, Academia, Non-Governmental Organization, Community Based Organization, Communications, Awareness Raising, Behavior change, Beneficiaries, Local Communities, Private Sector, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, SMEs, Type of Engagement, Information Dissemination, Partnership, Participation, Consultation, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender-sensitive indicators, Women groups, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Gender results areas, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Capacity Development, Access to benefits and services, Participation and leadership, Access and control over natural resources, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Learning, Indicators to measure change, Adaptive management, Knowledge Generation, Targeted Research

Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 0

Duration

72In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

501,548.00

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1_P2	Outcome 2.2:Improved management effectiveness of new protected areas	GET	3,370,320.00	14,297,504.00
LD-1_P2	Outcome 1.1: Functionality and cover of agro-ecosystems maintained	GET	550,000.00	2,301,005.00
LD-3_P4	Outcome 3.2 Intergated landscape management practices adopted by local communities based on gender sensitive needs	GET	495,890.00	2,099,946.00
CCM-2_P4	Outcome B: Policy, planning and regulatory frameworks foster accelerated low GHG development and emissions mitigation	GET	863,242.00	3,641,396.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			5,279,452.00	22,339,851.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To safeguard critical wildlife habitat, biodiversity and ecosystem services in the PONASI Protected Area complex through integrated landscape management, generating multiple benefits for sustainable development in the southern central Burkina Faso.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component/ Outcome 1 Framework for Integrated Landscape Management of PONASI with sustainable financing for its operation	Technical Assistance	<p>1.1 Updated, strengthened and operationalized PONASI landscape co-governance framework to ensure concerted, integrated and equitable management of land and resource use within the 952,000 ha landscape and to maximize environmental and socio-economic benefits, as indicated by:</p> <p><i>a) the degressive contribution of the GEF resources allocated to the operation of the co-governance mechanism for the PONASI landscape management relative to those of the State, Ministries through development aid and regional and communes authorities' own resources, fully supported at project start and aiming to 0% by end-of-project; and</i></p> <p><i>b) 952,000 ha corresponding to the total area of the</i></p>	<p>1.1 The "PONASI Landscape Co-Governance Mechanism" is updated, strengthened and operationalized as an integrated platform serving as a joint decision-making mechanism for land and resource uses within the landscape, including capacity building of stakeholders in landscape management at all levels to ensure optimal and open input from stakeholders</p> <p>1.2 The territorial planning tool is adopted as a spatial planning methodology allowing the visualization of the impacts of economic activities on the landscape with a clear articulation of trade-offs, to support the decision-making on a use of lands maximizing environmental and economic benefits, including the valuation of the ecosystem goods and services (ES) produced by the various units of the PONASI landscape and the establishment of a consolidated environmental information system to support the environmental land use planning process</p> <p>1.3 Accurate and well-documented estimates of</p>	GET	521,725.00	1,929,586.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component/ Outcome 2 Strengthening the PONASI Protected Area System	Investment	<p>2.1 Increased institutional capacity of protected area management agencies (OFINAP and DGEF) and of the 3 relevant DREEVCCs to manage knowledge and design rules for the use and development of natural resources, as measured through <i>the scores based on UNDP Capacity Development scorecard for capacities related to</i></p> <p><i>i) engagement from 67% to 89%; ii) generating, accessing and using information and knowledge from 40% to 80%; iii) strategy, policy and legislation development from 56% to 67%; iv) management and implementation from 50% to 67%; v) monitoring and evaluation from 17% to 67% by end-of-project</i></p> <p>2.2 Increased effectiveness of PA management over 354,781 ha including</p>	<p>2.1 Institutional and individual capacities within PA agencies are enhanced through targeted capacity building interventions, including an evaluation of the institutional structure to enable an effective, efficient and collaborative management of the PONASI protected areas, an information system for monitoring, analysis, mapping and dissemination of knowledge and a capacity development program developed and implemented</p> <p>2.2 The management effectiveness of the State-managed PAs of the PONASI complex - Kabore-Tambi (169,000 ha), Nazinga (91,300 ha) and Sissili (32,700 ha), including corridors # 1 (4,500 ha) and # 2 (33,000 ha) - is reinforced through the clarification/revision of the status and boundaries of the PAs of the PONASI complex, the development and implementation of management plans for Nazinga, PNKT and Sissili PAs, and for corridors # 1 and # 2, the development of collaborative management agreements for State PAs and support to collaborative management committees,</p>	GET	2,703,555.00	11,491,760.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component/ Outcome 3 Sustainable land management and livelihood diversification	Investment	3.1 Increased adoption of effective agri-silvo-pastoral integrated management of natural and agricultural resources, and climate-smart agriculture by local communities within the PONASI landscape, as indicated by <i>75% of target land area (total land area: 172,638 ha) under improved management practices, and climate-smart agriculture for each land use category including agro-pastoral land, communal and village forests and massif forest areas, pasture areas subject to consensual management tools, and forest management sites amounting to 129,478 ha; and Maintained or improved condition of resources in forest areas including Forest Management Sites (CAF),</i>	3.1 Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices are implemented by communities within the PONASI landscape to reduce threats to protected areas and increase food security, productivity and agricultural resilience through climate-smart agriculture, sustainable wood harvesting and biomass energy, forest restoration, assisted natural regeneration, and fire management. This will involve a participatory diagnostic of the condition of land resources (soils, water, biodiversity), the development of an intervention and investment plan, and support to producers and land and resource user groups. 3.2 The management of natural resources in forests and community pastoral areas is improved through the collaborative development of simplified zoning plans and their implementation, and the strengthening of the management of forests and pastoral areas 3.3 Sustainable local forest products processing enterprises are	GET	1,272,947.00	5,938,839.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component/ Outcome 4 Gender mainstreaming, and knowledge management and learning	Technical Assistance	<p>4.1 Increased opportunities for women to benefit from the sustainable management of natural resources and PA-related value chains within the PONASI landscape, as shown by: <i>a 30% representativeness of women in the collaborative governance arrangement and participating in decision making on land and resource use</i></p> <p>4.2 Appropriation of the knowledge developed in the PONASI project by the various actors within the PONASI landscape and in Burkina Faso, as indicated by: <i>80% of village groups / associations that apply knowledge shared through the project, outside the pilot intervention sites</i></p>	<p>4.1 Gender Action plan implemented, monitored and evaluated</p> <p>4.2: Technical knowledge and lessons learned from the project's experiences are compiled, assessed and translated into knowledge products that contribute to building the capacity of all actors in sustainable environmental management</p> <p>4.3. Learnings are disseminated through the project communication plan to enable their widespread adoption by women and men across the PONASI landscape and in Burkina Faso</p>	GET	534,673.00	2,079,666.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
				Sub Total (\$)	5,032,900.00	21,439,851.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
				GET	246,552.00	900,000.00
				Sub Total(\$)	246,552.00	900,000.00
				Total Project Cost(\$)	5,279,452.00	22,339,851.00

C. 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(\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	270,000.00
Government	Ministry of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change	Grant	10,318,111.00
Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Hydro-agricultural Infrastructure	Grant	6,780,945.00
Government	Ministry of Animal and Fisheries Resources	Grant	1,500,000.00
CSO	Tree Aid	Grant	1,198,840.00
CSO	IUCN Burkina Faso	Grant	720,000.00
CSO	Agence Pour la Promotion de la Petite et Moyenne Entreprise/Agriculture et Artisanat (APME.2A)	Grant	719,505.00
CSO	Nahouri Safari	Grant	429,649.00
CSO	NATURAMA Foundation	Grant	164,036.00
CSO	GA Mo Wiya Association	Grant	136,026.00
Government	Ministry of Mines and Quarries	Grant	102,739.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)			22,339,851.00

D. 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(\$)
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Biodiversity		No	3,370,320	320,180
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Climate Change		No	863,242	82,008
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Land Degradation		No	1,045,890	99,360
Total Grant Resources(\$)						5,279,452.00	501,548.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. 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(\$)
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Biodiversity		No	100,000	9,500
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Land Degradation		No	50,000	4,750
UNDP	GET	Burkina Faso	Climate Change		No	50,000	4,750
Total Project Costs(\$)						200,000.00	19,000.00

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)
Akula National Park Corridor #2	125689 n/a	SelectHabitat/Species Management Area		33,000.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

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)
Akula National Park Corridor #1	125689 none	SelectHabitat/Species Management Area		4,500.00			31.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Corridor #2	125689 none	SelectHabitat/Species Management Area		0.00					<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Kaboré-Tambi National Park	125689 1049	SelectNational Park		169,000.00			39.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Nazinga Game Ranch	125689 none	SelectHabitat/Species Management Area		91,300.00			75.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Nazinon Classified Forest/ Forest management site (Chantier d'aménagement Forestier)	125689 none	Select		0.00					<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Sissili Classified Forest	125689 28556	SelectHabitat/Species Management Area		32,700.00			47.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park ZOVICs (10 in all)	125689 none	SelectHabitat/Species Management Area		0.00					<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park ZOVICs Biéha (4)	125689 none	SelectHabitat/Species Management Area		10,002.00			55.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

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)
Akula National Park ZOVICs Guiaro- Pô (7))	125689 none	SelectHabitat/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 CO₂e (direct)	0	0	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (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 CO₂e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (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 CO₂e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (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

A. changes in alignment with the project design in the original pif[1]¹

A.1. Project Description.

1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed.

1. While the description of the global environmental problems and root causes have simply been described in more detail, one of the root causes has been formulated slightly differently. In the original PIF, barrier #3 refers to insufficient capacity of communities for SLM and livelihood diversification. While this barrier is still relevant, an analysis of the situation in the PONASI landscape stressed the importance of the lack of incentives related to the various types of management of land units within the landscape. While different management approaches have been designed to create incentives for local communities to support the sustainable use of natural resources, such as community hunting areas (ZOVICs), forest management sites (CAFs) and pastoral areas, local communities actually derive very little benefits from the management and use of these areas, and tend to resume unsustainable practices such as poaching, encroachment of livestock into protected areas, illicit logging and making charcoal. Barrier #3 has been reformulated as follows in the ProDoc:

Barrier # 3. Lack of incentives for the conservation and sustainable management of land and natural resources for stakeholders, including local communities, and insufficient capacity to sustainably manage resources and develop adequate incentives

2. CAFs in the PONASI landscape are areas that are managed by communities in accordance with the principle of public participation in forest regulatory instruments. However, the capacity of communities to ensure sustainable management of land and natural resources is insufficient. First, sustainable land management is not well understood by communities. Although most planning and management tools (zoning, divisions, rules, etc.) have been established for a long time (in the years 1985), it is necessary to closely supervise the communities to obtain their acceptance, and to provide up-to-date and practical measures, such as simplified zoning plans, enhanced hunting management measures and agreed management measures for conflicts between wildlife and livestock herds. Analysis of the evolution of CIFs over the last 20 to 30 years, including two CAFs in the PONASI area, shows that resources are better managed when the CAF is established on a state-owned forest and benefits from more rigorous monitoring of technical services. However, management practices in the CAF established in forests managed by communities fail to prevent a very significant degradation of forest resources to the point of questioning the viability of the development and management model established in Burkina Faso (PIF, 2018).

3. Current farming practices are not sustainable. Land grabbing by private individuals, accelerated clearing for agricultural, logging and charcoal production purposes, and excessive use of unregistered pesticides and herbicides provide very little or no benefit to the local populations while posing a serious threat to PAs in the PONASI landscape.
 4. The development of the ZOVIC natural resources poorly done in addition to the non-application of regulatory texts, particularly with regard to the distribution of products from the exploitation of ZOVICs and PAs, are increasingly affecting the motivation of the communities towards conservation.
 5. Compared to other land uses, communities derive very little revenue from protected areas: one (1) ha of food crops provides an annual income of about US\$ 1,100 (650,000 FCFA) to a household, while thousands of ha for fauna may yield about US\$ 600 (350,000 FCFA) to the entire community. The Order No. 96-022/MEE/MICA/MEF on the setting of taxes, royalties and titles for the exploitation of wildlife in Burkina Faso is the legal framework for the sharing of royalties from hunting in Burkina Faso. Article 2 of this order fixes the annual concession management fee by type of protected area and Article 3 sets the distribution of the annual management fees that the concessionaire is required to pay to the State at 50% for village wildlife management committees. This tax is the only one that could provide direct benefits related to the management of protected areas to local communities but in reality, it is not paid to the village committees in spite of planned arrangements. Currently, there is no incentive for communities to conserve and apply sustainable land and resource management practices. Income-generating activities related to protected areas, such as tourism, are lacking. Community training and viable partnerships with the private sector are needed to create alternative livelihoods.
 6. There is a need to highlight other ecosystem goods and services that benefit local communities as well as the value of conserving biodiversity as an asset for the development of income-generating activities, including sustainable value chains based on ecosystem goods and services and tourism activities. The link between biodiversity conservation, improved management of land and resources within protected areas and other landscape units, and improvement of their living conditions must be tangible and clearly perceived by communities, to encourage them to better protect resources in landscapes.
- 2) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects. NA
 - 3) The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area[2]² strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.
7. The project design is closely aligned to the original PIF and the structure of the project components closely resembles the PIF that was approved by the GEF. The description of the project components is included in ‘Section V – Results and Partnerships’ of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. Minor changes were made to the project outcomes and outputs, which do not represent a significant departure from the project strategy as defined originally in the PIF, nor will they have an impact on the use of the funds originally budgeted. These changes are described as follows:

PIF formulation	Project Document formulation
-----------------	------------------------------

PIF formulation	Project Document formulation
<p>Output 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).</p>	<p>Output 2.2 The management effectiveness of the State-managed PAs of the PONASI complex - Kabore-Tambi (169,000 ha), Nazinga (91,300 ha) and Sissili (32,700 ha), including corridors # 1 (4,500 ha) and # 2 (33,000 ha) - is reinforced by a series of technical support. Corridors are integrated under the output for the improvement of management effectiveness of PAs as wildlife corridors are part of the PAs according to the Burkinabé Forest Code, and the same management tools and collaborative processes will be developed for corridors as for other PAs. Both corridors #1 and #2 have been established under the PAGEN project but their creation could not be formalized before the closing of the project. A national NGO, Natudev is working in corridor #1 to formalize its status and operationalize its management with the collaboration of local communities. The project will mainly focus on the corridor #2 and work in close collaboration with Natudev and with institutions in charge of PAs to harmonize approaches and management tools for both corridors.</p>
<p>Output 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.</p>	<p>Output 2.3 The management of natural resources in village hunting areas (ZOVIC), community protected areas, is enhanced through collaborative management interventions, including the development and implementation of simplified zoning plans, strengthening of hunting management and the implementation of human-wildlife conflict management measures</p> <p>Village hunting areas (ZOVICs) are community-managed protected areas according to the Forest Code, and the output related to improving their management has therefore been included under Component 2 focusing on protected areas. The interventions and expected output remain unchanged.</p>
<p>Output 3.2 Sustainable land management (SLM) practices implemented by communities in the PONASI Landscape to reduce threats to PAs 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.</p>	<p>Output 3.1 Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices are implemented by communities within the PONASI landscape to reduce threats to protected areas and increase food security, productivity and agricultural resilience through climate-smart agriculture, sustainable wood harvesting and biomass energy, forest restoration, assisted natural regeneration, and fire management.</p> <p>Simple numbering change.</p>

PIF formulation	Project Document formulation
<p>Output 3.1 (as above, as regards forest management sites)</p>	<p>Output 3.2 The management of natural resources in forests and community pastoral areas is improved through the collaborative development of simplified zoning plans and their implementation, and the strengthening of the management of forests and pastoral areas</p> <p>This output as formulated focuses on community-managed natural resources outside protected areas, with no specific focus on biodiversity conservation. The three CAF in the PONASI landscape (total area: 73,969 ha) are mainly managed to produce firewood. Some forest areas besides CAFs also have significant value in terms of ecosystem services and goods, and carbon sequestration, and have been included under this output. These include three forest patches (<i>massifs forestiers</i>) outside PAs and CAFs (area: 38,891 ha), three commune forests (area: 127 ha) and several village forests which area amount to over 765 ha. While their significance in terms of carbon sequestration potential is limited due to their small area, the sustainable management of the latter type of forest is likely to enhance socioeconomic benefits for local communities, contribute to their livelihood and reduce their need to seek for forest products in PAs.</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>Output 3.3 Sustainable local forest products processing enterprises are established, providing livelihoods and generating sustained income, especially for women and vulnerable people.</p> <p>This output was not in the original PIF and was added to have a more diversified strategy for the development of sustainable livelihoods linked to PAs and to the sustainable use of forest products. While the PONASI area has not seen any incident and is considered as being safe, the security situation in some areas of the country is a cause for concern and is likely to deter foreign tourists to travel to Burkina Faso. The area is accessible within 2 hours drive from the capital city and has a real potential for tourism, provided it is supported along a coherent strategy for the whole landscape, and integrates cultural as well as natural assets, as is proposed under output 3.4. Should the government's efforts to counter terrorism be successful and the security climate restored, tourism could have a positive impact on biodiversity and the livelihoods of local communities after a certain period of time.</p> <p>In the meantime, it was decided, and supported by the PRF validation workshop, to add an additional livelihood output for the development of three promising value chains based on the sustainable use of NTFP, targeting mainly women as beneficiaries, and putting in place the conditions for sustainability.</p>

PIF formulation	Project Document formulation
Output 3.4 – A community engagement and training programme operational with a focus on sustainable livelihoods and capacity building	The activities to achieve this output are integrated under output 3.1 as 3.1.3 – <i>Support to producers and groups</i> . This output will involve i) supporting the establishment of multi-thematic demonstration or joint experimentation sites with the support of regional or commune technical services and relevant local NGOs, in pilot sites where farmers, herders, and other stakeholders will develop skills and knowledge on various agricultural and agroforestry topics for the adoption of sustainable and climate-adapted practices; ii) identifying and documenting appropriate SLM techniques and climate adapted species/varieties for demonstration and training, and developing a curriculum in agroforestry, assisted natural regeneration, climate-smart agriculture, agropastoralism, and microfinance, including the preparation of related courses and educational material; iii) a small grant program to help farmers, producers, herders and forestry workers in the 15 pilot sites to integrate climate-smart agriculture, SLM and sustainable agricultural / forestry / pastoral practices to provide improved and more sustainable livelihoods.
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.	Output 4.2: Technical knowledge and lessons learned from the project's experiences are compiled, assessed and translated into knowledge products that contribute to building the capacity of all actors in sustainable environmental management. Reformulated to focus on the collection and compilation of all learnings made through the project implementation to develop knowledge products as part of the project replication strategy
-	Output 4.3. Learnings are disseminated through the project communication plan to enable their widespread adoption by women and men across the PONASI landscape and in Burkina Faso. This output which is a reformulation of the output 4.2 in the PIF was added as a separate output to give a stronger and more specific focus on the replication and adoption of learnings across the PONASI landscape as part of the project replication strategy to reach target areas.
Outcome 4. 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.	Outcome 4.1: Increased opportunities for women to benefit from the sustainable management of natural resources and value chains related to PAs within the PONASI landscape Outcome 4.2: Appropriation of the knowledge developed in the project by the actors within the PONASI landscape and in Burkina Faso The Outcome 4 was reformulated into 2 outcomes to differentiate and outline the intended effect on women empowerment and benefits that are specific to them, from the intended effect resulting from the development and use of knowledge management systems implemented throughout the project in terms of replication of the solutions developed through their adoption by stakeholders across the PONASI landscape.

8. Direct Project (DPCs) costs were added to the budget to enable UNDP to provide the necessary support to the Government of Burkina Faso in the implementation of the project.

4) [Incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and [co-financing](#).

9. There is an increase in co-financing (3,650,809 USD) that does not imply changes in incremental/additional cost reasoning of the project. In addition, there were changes in the sources of the co-financing which will come primarily from the Ministry of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change as part of three grants to the Government of Burkina Faso for the implementation of the following projects: *Participatory management of classified forests for REDD+* funded by the African Development Bank; *Project to mitigate the effects of water stress on large fauna* funded by the Government of Burkina Faso through its Priority Investment Program; and Support for the sustainable management of forest resources; *Decentralized Management of Forests and Woodlands Project* funded by Luxembourg bilateral aid.

5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF).

10. Although there were no changes to the incremental/additional cost reasoning, there are some differences to the global environmental benefits to be delivered, related to the areas covered by each type of intervention.

Differences in the protected areas coverage – GEF-7 Core indicator 1:

Name of Protected Area	PIF	ProDoc / CEO ER
PNKT	161,956	169,000
Nazinga	103,579	91,300
Sissili	38,153	32,700
Nazinon	10,746	-
Corridor 1	19,246	4,500
Corridor 2	69,445	33,000
ZOVICs	32,932 (10)	24,281 (11)
Total	436,057	354,781

11. While differences in areas of the State protected areas are minimal and are likely due to different sources of information, the differences in areas of both corridors are more important. Also, the Nazinon Classified Forest was not included.

12. The ProDoc provides for the finalization of the creation of Corridor 2 and strengthening of the management of Corridor 1 over areas of 33,000 ha and 4,500 ha respectively for a total of 37,500 ha. The corridor areas announced at PIF stage was superior: Corridor 1: 19,246 ha, Corridor 2: 69,445ha, for a total of 88,691 ha. The areas used in the ProDoc are those reported in the Final Implementation Report of the PAGEN Project that created them: “Also, the negotiations with the local communities to which administrative officials, mayors, and traditional leaders were involved led to the creation and physical delimitation of the Nazinga-Kaboré Tambi National Park corridor and the PNKT-valley of the Red

Volta of Ghana with respective areas of 4,500 ha and 33,000 ha. The preliminary draft statutes have been drawn up and submitted to the competent authority for adoption.” These areas are consistent with national documents about protected areas and observations made in the field by the team of national consultants involved in the PPG. Also, the statutes of the corridors were submitted but were not adopted due to an early closure of the PAGEN project. The national NGO Natudev is currently working in Corridor #1 to formalize its status. The current project will therefore undertake the finalization of the creation of Corridor #2, and the corresponding area, 33,000 ha, is included under the core indicator 1.1 – Terrestrial protected areas newly created.

13. Although first designated as a classified forest, Nazinon is now a Forest management site (*Chantier d’Aménagement Forestier*) managed to produce fuel wood for Ouagadougou’s market and devoid of biodiversity that could justify investing in conservation efforts. The use of the Nazinon forest as a corridor for elephants has yet to be confirmed. The creation of the Corridors #1 and #2 has changed the patterns of elephant movements, while the establishment of new settlements or expansion of existing ones are creating new obstacles. Therefore, a small targeted research program is included under component 2 to understand and document elephant movements within and outside the PONASI landscape including in northern Ghana to understand elephant movements and habitat requirements that the current project design will not have addressed so far. Nazinon is therefore included as a Forest Management Site (*Chantier d’Aménagement Forestier*) under component 3 focusing on improving sustainable land and resource management, more specifically under the output 3.2 which will provide for a revision of the Forest Management Site model. The Nazinon forest area 27,889 ha, rather than 10,746 as stated in the PIF, is accounted for under the core indicator 4 on area of landscapes under improved practices, rather than under core indicator 1 related to terrestrial protected areas.

14. A major difference is in the evaluation of Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas) GEF-7 estimated at 129,678 ha – while the contribution to Corporate Results 2 in the PIF - Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes) - had been estimated at 6,000 ha which was reported as corresponding to one third of the area of Corridor #1. The area of 129,678 ha corresponds to 75% of the areas of Forest Management Sites (73,969 ha total - 55,477 ha for 75% of this area), Communal Forests (127 ha total - 95 ha for 75% of this area), Intercommunal Forests (38,891 ha total - 29,168 ha for 75% of this area), Village Forests (765 ha total - 574 ha for 75% of this area), Pastoral Areas (52,886 ha total - 39,664 ha for 75% of this area), and farming areas under climate-smart agriculture (6,000 ha total - 4,500 ha for 75% of this area) which management will be improved, and forest areas (200 ha) that will be certified under an international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations. It seemed realistic to target for a 75% adoption rate of improved practices in community-managed forest, pastoral and farming areas.

15. Also, the value of Core Indicator 3: Area of land restored (estimated at 3,000 ha at PIF stage, as part of Outcome 1, with no precise reference as to what area is targeted), is now estimated at 11,000 ha, corresponding to one third of the area of Corridor #2.

16. **Change of restored land area causes change in the** estimation of the expected value for Core Indicator 6 – Greenhouse gas emission mitigated – which increased from 4 million tCO₂e_q at PIF stage to 5,448,924 tCO₂e_q at endorsement. **The estimation of GHG emissions has been recalculated using the revised figures for areas where deforestation will be reduced, using a 20-year period instead of 10 years, a baseline annual deforestation rate of 1% rather than 0.5% and a more conservative subsequent (with project) reduction of the deforestation rate of 50%, instead of 100%. Conservatively, instead of the entire 952,000 ha of the PONASI landscape, 394,564 ha were used in the calculation, which corresponds to 354,781 ha of State and community protected areas, including corridors, and 39,783 ha of forests (38,891 ha of large forests, 127 ha commune forests and 765 ha village forests) where improved management effectiveness will reduce deforestation. Over a period of 20 years, the result is 5,448,924 t CO₂e_q of GHG sequestered through the project’s intervention, corresponding to a 50% reduction in deforestation rate over 394,564 ha (protected areas and forest landscapes) and restoration of 11,000 ha of agroforestry ecosystems.**

Core indicator	Indicator description	PIF	ProDoc / CEO ER
Core indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems (hectares)	6,000	129,478
Core indicator 4.2	Area under international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)	-	200
Core indicator 4	Total area of landscape under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)	6,000	129,678
Core indicator 3	Area of land restored (hectares)	3,000	11,000
Core indicator 6	Greenhouse gas emission mitigated (tCO ₂ e _q)	4,000,000	5,448,924

6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

17. A description of the project's innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling-up is included in Section V. Results and Partnerships of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

[1] For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF , no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

[2] For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

A.2. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

The successful implementation of the project will largely depend on the effective communication and coordination with the multiple project stakeholders and the implementation of mechanisms to ensure these stakeholders' participation. The project will work with key national and regional State actors including the Ministries in charge of environment, agriculture, livestock and water. These actors are represented at the local level through their regional, provincial and communal departments. Within the Ministry of Environment,

Green Economy and Climate Change, the National Office of Protected Areas (OFINAP) manages the Nazinga Game Ranch, and the Directorate General of Water and Forests (DGEF), through its technical services, manages the PNKT and Sissili CF.

At the local level, the most relevant stakeholders are the local communities and natural resource management groups (forest resource management groups, hunting areas management groups for ZOVICs, NTFP user groups, women’s groups) who will be involved in livelihood development based on agriculture, livestock and natural resource exploitation, who will contribute to SLM actions through soil and water conservation techniques / soil defense and restoration, the resource user groups who are responsible for the management of forest management sites (CAF), village hunting areas (ZOVIC), village and communal forests, and woodlands, and in PA monitoring and surveillance as supervisors, ecoguards and trackers. Throughout components 1 and 3, the project will work with local authorities (*collectivités*) at commune and regional levels in accordance with the General Code of Local Authorities which gives communes and regions the power to draw up and implement their development policies and plans in accordance with the guidelines of the State. In this respect, local authorities elaborate and implement regional development plans and communal development plans in which the sustainable management of land, forests and the environment and the development of livelihoods occupy an important place. The nine communes include Zabré, Zoaga, Guiaro, Pô, Toecé, Doulougou, Biéha, Sapouy, and Nobéré. The NGOs, foundation and associations such as NATURAMA, TREE AID, NATUDEV, IUCN, and Ga Mo Wigna, engaged in the management of protected areas, forests, wildlife, fish resources, and land, and in the development of livelihood for communities, will be involved and provide support in their own field of expertise including ecological monitoring (birds and mammals), development and implementation of management plans and participatory management of conservation areas, development plans and management charters of pastoral areas, promotion of good practices of sustainable land management- local governance of forest resources, development of value chains, research, and drawing up cross-border agreements related to elephant conservation. The private sector includes hunting concessionaires Nahouri Safari and Safari Sissili, to whom the Nazinga Game Ranch and FC Sissili have been licensed. They carry out activities in the areas of development of wildlife, silvicultural and fisheries productions and their development, the development of Nazinga, tourism and community mobilization. Private land owners or agrobusinessmen are important actors involved in agricultural production.

The project’s Stakeholder Engagement Plan in Annex F of the Project Document includes information summarizing the PPG participatory process. A list of people consulted during project development is included in Annex M of the Project Document.

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
Village communities adjacent to PAs				

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
<p>Main users of the natural resources of PA sites including: Farmers, herders, loggers, coalmen, hunters, women users (NTFPs, firewood, medicinal plants), craftsmen, carpenters</p>	<p>§ Actors and key beneficiaries § Permanent members (through representatives) of project teams during surveys and field missions § Community development organizations (associations, groups, cooperatives)</p>	<p>§ They will actively participate in the designation of community representatives on collaborative management committees (Output 2.2.2) and will be represented in the working sessions and negotiations regarding the definition of collaborative PA management arrangements for resource use, and monitoring in PAs (product 2.2.2); § Information and awareness activities will be carried out with local communities bordering protected areas in view of their participation (product 2.2) in the following activities: - signing of voluntary agreements concerning the establishment of PAs, - participation in the work for the final delimitation of Corridor # 2, - participation in regulatory negotiations (activities and permitted uses) within the different PA zones; § Local workers will be hired primarily for development and restoration work within and around the PAs (Output 2.1.4) § Local communities will be invited to participate in the development of NTFP-based value chains (Output 2.3) and the development of tourism activities related to PAs for the benefit of local communities (Output 2.4); § Local communities / resource users will be invited to participate in PA management effectiveness assessments planned during project preparation, mid-term and end of project, and will participate in monitoring and participatory research programs on biodiversity and to assessment of the impact of project interventions (Output 4.2).</p>	<p>Local communities and agricultural producers have been consulted, informed, trained and benefit from the implementation of sustainable land management practices and rangeland management systems, as well as biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3 and 4</p>

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
Community opinion leaders: village chiefs, religious leaders (Imam, priests, pastors), land chiefs	<p>Village chiefs, land chiefs and religious and customary chiefs enjoy a very high degree of legitimacy. Highly respected, they are heard by the people and can play the role of transmitting information to even the most remote villages.</p> <p>Land chiefs are the ones who rule on land issues. They are also involved in conflict management in the same way as the other authorities mentioned above.</p>	<p>§ They will be invited to participate in the local information meetings on the process of setting up the PA, the negotiations on the use of resources to delimit the zones (product 1.3.2), to contribute to the preparation of the PA Management Plan (Output 2.1.3), and formalize important events and festivities related to PAs;</p> <p>§ Religious leaders and notables will be invited to contribute to the identification of conflict management mechanisms (product 2.2), advise and intervene in conflict resolution regarding local resources related to PAs and their resources and, if necessary, in the application of the regulations.</p>	Achieve project results and outputs through effective communication, engagement and coordination of stakeholders.	1, 2
Community Organizations: Village Development Councils (CVDs) in the riparian villages of the PAs, women's associations and groups, farmers' organizations	CVDs are structures responsible for village development. As such, they will be represented in advisory bodies, contribute to the planning of development activities and will also serve as information relays. Women's associations and groups as well as farmers' organizations will serve as information relays and help mobilize their grassroots members.	<p>Village Committees will be invited to participate § to trainings on co-management of PAs and their resources and on the role of community structures in the processes involved (product 1.2.2)</p> <p>§ in the process of establishing PAs and co-management committees (outputs 1.3.2 and 2.1.6),</p> <p>§ negotiations on the use of resources to define zoning (product 1.3.2),</p> <p>§ to develop the PA Management Plan (Output 2.1.3),</p> <p>§ community mobilization with women's associations / groups as well as farmers' organizations for development works in PAs (reforestation, protection of water and soil resources, etc.) (product 2.1.4)</p> <p>§ to the land management board that will be installed</p> <p>§ assessments and territorial planning of biodiversity and livelihoods</p> <p>§ the management of their terroir and their zone of influence</p>	Community organizations and producer associations have been consulted, informed and trained in order to facilitate better management of protected areas and the conservation of biodiversity.	1, 2, 3 and 4
Local authorities				

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
<p>Mayors and technical services of the communes concerned</p>	<p>The town halls manage the communes as local authorities. The town halls will participate in the co-financing through the implementation of the communal development plans (PCD).</p> <p>They will also be able to contribute to the financing of integrated governance framework through dedicated budget lines.</p> <p>Finally, town halls are competent to mobilize local communities and conduct advocacy on specific themes.</p>	<p>§ Local elected representatives will be invited to receive training on the collaborative management of PAs (product 2.1.1), and to get involved in negotiations on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § the delimitation and zoning of protected areas, corridors and ZOVICs (Output 2.2.1, 2.3.1), § the definition and application of regulations in PAs and their resources, the use of resources and the sharing of benefits derived from them (product 2.2.2), § clarification of land and resource use rights (product 3.2.1), § and identification of landscape-level conflict management mechanisms (product 1.5.4) <p>§ They will participate in the planning and implementation of interventions at the local level, including the selection of intervention sites at local and community level (Output 3. 1.2);</p> <p>§ They will contribute to conflict management for issues related to project implementation, especially for potential conflicts over rights to use resources and land areas (product 1.5.4).</p> <p>§ They contribute to the identification and the provision of plots for the installation of production units for the benefit of women's cooperatives</p> <p>§ They contribute to the development of production units</p>	<p>Achieve project results and outputs through better communication, information, awareness and meaningful stakeholder engagement</p>	<p>1, 2, 3 and 4</p>
<p>Civil society</p>				
<p>NGOs and local environmental associations</p>				

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
NATURAMA, Natudev, Tree Aid, Ga Mo Wigna; Yékouma Dakoupa Association (AYDA)	The NGOs and environmental associations in the project will be mainly involved in capacity building activities (training), IEC activities (information, education, communication) and community mobilization. They are also competent to implement actions to improve the livelihoods of communities through the development of promising value chains. They will also contribute to the co-financing of the project	<p>§ Invited to get involved in information and awareness actions on PA co-management and community mobilization for development work in PAs (restoration and protection of water and soil resources) (product 2.1.1)</p> <p>§ Participation in monitoring on biodiversity (product 2.2.3)</p> <p>§ Participation in PA management effectiveness assessments planned during project preparation, mid-term and end of project and impact assessment of project interventions in PA sites (Output 2.2 .4)</p> <p>§ Contribution to awareness and community mobilization for all project interventions (Output 1.1.3);</p> <p>§ Environmental NGOs working in the PONASI area can contribute to capacity development for PA management actors and share best practices for biodiversity inventories, long-term monitoring and conservation activities (Output 2.1.2).</p>	Achieve project results and outputs through better communication, information, awareness and meaningful stakeholder engagement	1, 2, 3 and 4
International NGOs and environmental associations				
IUCN	IUCN will participate in the co-financing of the project. It will also be invited to provide technical support and training	<p>§ The project will seek to develop partnerships between the PONASI PA complex and IUCN to primarily support the capacity building of conservation stakeholders and the development of biodiversity knowledge for conservation and sustainable management (Output 2.1.2).</p> <p>§ IUCN will also contribute to the development of transboundary agreements, elaboration of texts and the study on elephant movement (Output 2.2.4)</p>	Better implementation of actions related to the protection of biodiversity and the management of the elephant	1, 2
WWF	WWF will be invited to play the role of coaching, technical support and will train the target actors in the project	§ Support and supervision of the application of the SAFE Systems approach to design and implement an action plan to prevent and mitigate human-wildlife conflicts within the PONASI landscape (product 2.4.1)	Achieving project results and products through better human-wildlife conflict management	2
Professional associations and unions				

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
Tourism Associations: Assoc. of National Tourist Guides; Assoc. of Travel and Tourism Professionals; Assoc. of Guides of Culture and Tourism	Tourism associations will play a role of coaching, technical support and training	§ Invitation to participate in the promotion of tourism in relation to protected areas (product 2.4), the development of economic activities and resource development of PA sites for the benefit of communities bordering PAs (product 2.4).	Achieve results and products related to the development of community tourism and the development of community livelihoods from tourism	2; 3
Media				
Local and national radio and television broadcasting in the project's intervention areas, including electronic newspapers and the written press	The media will be useful for informing, raising awareness and communicating the project's actions	§ Invitation to contribute to awareness campaigns and information on the major issues of the project, ie the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services for the livelihoods of local residents of PAs and all populations within the PONASI landscape, on the responsibility of ordinary citizens for the protection of the environment (product 1.5.3); § Dissemination of the main events of the project and according to the communication plan: launching of the project, formal approval of the creation text of corridor # 2, ceremonies and festivities related to PAs and biodiversity Burkina Faso, (eg Environment Day, etc.), information on the progress and key results of the project, invitations to tender and job offers, public encouragement to participate in biodiversity and environmental activities, broadcasting of programs, chronicles and thematic articles (product 4.3).	Achieve project results and outputs through better communication, information, awareness and meaningful stakeholder engagement	1, 2, 3 and 4
Academic and scientific institutions				

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
University Professor Joseph Ki-Zerbo (Former University of Ouagadougou); UFR SVT	The university will provide scientific support for research activities on the movement and estimation of elephant populations	<p>§ The University will be involved in the development and conduct of a targeted research project to document elephant movements within and around the PONASI PA complex, including transboundary movements to northern Ghana (Output 2.4.2);</p> <p>§ The University will contribute to the development of the capacity of ecoguards and rangers to monitor elephant populations as part of the establishment of a long-term ecological monitoring system (product 2.2.4)</p> <p>§ The University will support efforts to renew transboundary collaboration agreements with Ghana for elephant conservation, including a joint monitoring and anti-poaching program (Output 2.2.4)</p>	Research activities and products using different approaches and methods on movement and estimation of elephant populations	2
Center for Initiation and Vocational Training in Catering, Valba Vocational Training Center, Vocational School for Tourism, Cooking and Hospitality (Product 3.4.3)	Hotel training centers and schools will play the roles of coaching, technical support and will train the target actors in the project	The centers and schools of training in the hotel industry will frame the tourist reception centers in the tourist sites that will be developed in hotels, hygiene and sanitation. Technical support will also cover topics such as reception and management of guest houses (product 3.4.3)	Training activities and products using different learning approaches and different levels of literacy.	3
Public sector				
Government Institutions				
Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development (SP/CNDD) / MEGECC	§ As the official coordinator of the proposed PONASI Landscape Management Board, it has a pivotal role in implementing the landscape approach.	As the project implementation agency, SP/CNDD will be ultimately responsible and accountable for the results of the project and for the efficient use of the project resources in collaboration with counterparts at the regional and local levels, Senior Beneficiaries and UNDP; it will sit on the Review Committee, contribute to monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, and allocate adequate work space for the project management team.	Achieve project results and outputs through better coordination and implementation of project interventions	1, 2, 3; 4

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
<p>Directorate General of Environment and Forests (DGEF) / MEGECC</p>	<p>§ The mission of the DGEF is to design and coordinate the implementation of the national forest and wildlife policy. It ensures the application of the paramilitary status to which forest officers are subject and ensures the organization of the body as well as issues related to the equipment and military training of forestry agents. It will :</p> <p>§ Be responsible for reviewing technical reports, project progress and evaluation</p> <p>§ Contribute to project monitoring and evaluation, be responsible for technical and financial reporting to UNDP and for incorporating lessons learned into knowledge sharing networks</p> <p>§ Participate in the development and implementation of the monitoring and evaluation plan, including a contribution to the preparation of the Project Implementation Report (PIR).</p>	<p>§ DGEF will be kept informed of the activities and progress of the project on an ongoing basis;</p> <p>§ The DGEF will lead the institutional changes related to the management of the PAs of the PONASI complex (product 2.1.1)</p> <p>§ The DGEF will coordinate sustainable management actions of protected areas including the KTFN, forest resources and biodiversity</p> <p>§ It will be responsible for management actions in the PNKT</p> <p>§ The DGEF will contribute to the identification of the production sites for the NTFP sectors which will be developed in particular with regard to shea through the evaluation of the potential (product 3.3.5)</p> <p>§ It will coordinate anti-poaching actions (product 2.2.5)</p>	<p>Achieve project results and outputs through better coordination and implementation of protected area management actions</p>	<p>1, 2, 3; 4</p>

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
National Office of Protected Areas (OFINAP) / MEGECC	<p>OFINAP is responsible for the sustainable management of State forests and territorial communities; strengthen participatory management of natural and wildlife resources; to develop the partnership between the State, local authorities, civil society organizations and the private sector; promote all types of forest and wildlife resource management activities that can sustainably combat poverty; to set up a financing system adapted to conservation missions. In the project area, the Nazinga Game Ranch is under his responsibility. In this project it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Contribute to the review of project technical, progress and evaluation reports; § Contribute to the monitoring and evaluation of the project, § Participate in the development and implementation of the monitoring and evaluation plan, including a contribution to the preparation of the Annual Project Implementation Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § OFINAP will contribute to sustainable management actions of protected areas and coordinate actions at Nazinga (product 2.1.1) § OFINAP will contribute to anti-poaching actions (LAB) (product 2.2.5) § The Office will also contribute to the development of transboundary agreements, elaboration of texts and study on elephant movement (product 2.4.2) § OFINAP will sit on the Review Committee. 	Achieve project results and outputs through better coordination and implementation of protected area management actions	1; 2; 3; 4

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
National School of Water and Forests (ENEF) / MEGECC	<p>ENEF offers theoretical training programs organized in modules covering topics relevant to the training required in the project, the study of the natural environment, farming systems, development economics, pastoralism, forestry, and environment, develops research / development and experimentation in training units on topics including agro-forestry, apiculture, fruit production and agro-silvo-pastoralism, and practical training in school infrastructure (agroforestry experimental field, plant nursery, beekeeping unit).</p>	<p>The project will collaborate with ENEF for several trainings planned under the outputs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 where the expertise of the school will greatly benefit local community members, more specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § trainings and development of training material and the establishment of demonstration sites as part of output 3.1.3 to support producers and groups in agro-forestry and agro-silvo-pastoralism, § trainings on improved practices for rangeland and pasture management as part of output 3.2.2, § trainings on the sustainable use of non-timber forest products and on beekeeping as part of output 3.3.5. 	<p>More sustainable capacity development as training modules improved through the project will be integrated in the curriculum of the school.</p>	3, 4
National Observatory of the Environment and Sustainable Development / MEGECC	<p>ONEDD is a mechanism providing support to the SP-CNDD and its various divisions (DPCIE, DPE and DCIME) in terms of surveillance and monitoring-evaluation of the environment and sustainable development. As part of the project, ONEDD will provide direct support for monitoring and evaluation, support for the development of data collection tools and data capitalization. Its role will be coaching, technical support and training.</p>	<p>§ Participation in the project by sharing lessons learned on the development and management of a decision support system, and by providing data and technical inputs to the landscape information system (output 1.2) and baselines. GIS data for the PONASI PA system (product 2. 1.2)</p>	<p>Achieve project results and outputs through improved information availability to facilitate decision-making</p>	1; 2; 3; 4

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
National Directorate of Tourism, National Office of Tourism / Ministry of Culture and Tourism	The National Directorate of Tourism and the National Tourist Office will play the roles of supervision and technical support for the development of ecotourism	Contribution to the planning and implementation of ecotourism activities related to PAs (product 3.4.3).	Achieve results and products related to ecotourism development and livelihood development of communities from tourism	2; 3
Regional directorates of agriculture and hydro-agricultural development for the South Center, East Center and West Center regions	<p>§ The Directorates in charge of agriculture will be members of the Project Review Committee</p> <p>§ They will play the roles of coaching and technical support and training</p>	<p>§ The regional directorates responsible for agriculture will provide local support for producers (product 3.1.3). They will contribute to planning activities related to SLM, community livelihoods development and monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>§ The Regional Directorates of Agriculture will be kept informed of the activities and progress of the project on an ongoing basis;</p> <p>§ The Regional Directorates of Agriculture will be invited to receive training under component 1 for capacity building to lead the processes of planning, consultation, conflict management, negotiation (product 1.1.3), Collaborative management of PAs (product (2.1.1), and to get involved in planning negotiations, negotiations for the development of the PONASI Landscape Management Master Plan. They will participate in the planning and implementation of interventions at local level (product 3.1.1)</p>	Reaching results and products related to SLM and livelihood development of communities from agriculture	3

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
Regional Directorate for Livestock and Fishery Resources for the South Center, East Center and West Center Regions	<p>§ The directorates responsible for livestock and fishery resources will be members of the Project Review Committee</p> <p>§ They will play the roles of coaching and technical support and training</p>	<p>§ The regional directorates responsible for livestock and fishery resources will provide local support for herders (product 3.1.3). They will contribute to planning activities related to SLM, community livelihoods development and monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>§ The Regional Directorates responsible for livestock and fishery resources will be kept informed of the activities and progress of the project on an ongoing basis;</p> <p>§ The Regional Directorates responsible for livestock and fish resources will be invited to benefit from training under component 1 for capacity building to lead the planning, consultation, conflict management and negotiation processes (product 1.1.3), collaborative management of PAs (product (2.1.1), and involvement in planning negotiations, negotiations for the development of the PONASI Landscape Management Master Plan, and will participate in planning and the implementation of interventions at local level (product 3.1.1)</p>	Achieving results and products related to SLM and development of livelihoods of communities from livestock	3

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
<p>The Regional Directions of the Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change for the regions of South Center, East Center and West Center</p>	<p>§ The directorates responsible for livestock and fishery resources will be members of the Project Review Committee § They will play the roles of coaching and technical support and training</p>	<p>§ The Regional Departments of the Environment will be kept informed of the activities and progress of the project on an ongoing basis; § The Regional Departments of the Environment will be invited to benefit from training under component 1 for the development of capacities to lead the planning, consultation, conflict management and negotiation processes (product 1.1.3), in collaborative management of PAs (product 2.1.1.), and to engage in negotiations on: § Planning, negotiations for the development of the PONASI Landscape Management Master Plan § changes in the delineation of the GNR and zoning of protected areas (product 2.2.1), § the definition and application of regulations in PAs and their resources, the use of resources and the sharing of benefits derived from them (Output 2.2.3), § and identification of conflict management mechanisms (product 1.5.4). § They will participate in the planning and implementation of interventions at the local level (product (product 3.1.1) § They will be involved in the identification of production areas for the development of NTFP sectors and their management (product 3.3.5) § They will be involved in the definition of tourist routes and the management of these routes (product 3.4.1)</p>	<p>Achieve project results and outputs through better coordination and implementation of protected area management actions</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4</p>
<p>Directorate General of Budget / Ministry of Economy, Finance and Development</p>	<p>Project budget management related to the program</p>	<p>§ The Directorates and Services involved in the mobilization of in-kind contributions as co-financing of the project will be duly informed of the activities and progress of the project on an ongoing basis</p>	<p>Ensure budget management of the project</p>	
<p>National private sector: Private companies and investors</p>				

Stakeholders	Expected roles and responsibilities in project implementation	Activities	Results	Comp.
Hunting and Tourism Concessionnaires: Nahouri Safari, Sissili safari	Their role is coaching, training and supervision	Hunting and tourism concessionnaires will train and supervise ecoguards and trackers in protected areas. They will organize surveillance and anti-poaching actions in collaboration with other stakeholders. They will also be responsible for the organization of tourism in the project area. (product 2.2.5)	Ensure better conservation of wildlife biodiversity and a better tourist destination	1, 2, 3
Tourism operators and agencies Hotels and bungalows within and around PA sites	Their role is to ensure a better reception for tourists	§ Specific information and awareness-raising activities (product 3.4.2) will target companies and private investors operating in or likely to settle in PA sites, with a view to improving their services, mitigating the impacts of their activities on PAs and their resources and develop activities that respect PAs. § Tourism operators will be involved in consultations leading to the development of a strategy for the development of ecotourism in relation to PAs and will participate in its implementation (product 3.4.1)	Ensure a better tourist destination for the PONASI complex	3
Agrobusinessmen	Application of experiences and teaching on sustainable land management	Agribusinessmen will be in charge of implementing SLM actions initiated throughout the PONASI landscape (product 3.1.2)	Agribusinessmen who apply sustainable farming practices.	1 ; 2 ; 3

Documents

Title

Submitted

Annex F_Stakeholder Engagement Plan

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes

Co-financier; No

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

CONTEXT OF GENDER IN BURKINA FASO. The cultural and religious context in Burkina Faso includes factors that strongly influence and determine the access and control of men and women to resources, basic social services, activities in public and private life, and their participation in spheres of decision. Despite favorable legal provisions and policy measures for equal rights between men and women, the status of women has not fundamentally changed (Tree Aid, 2017). Despite this national position in favor of gender and efforts, inequalities and disparities between men and women are still very present in Burkina Faso society. They are partly explained by the resistance to gender both at national and local level, the persistence of the patriarchal system that advocates and ensures the domination of men over women, the difficulty of enforcing the laws, the tenacious sociocultural constraints that determine the low participation or marginalization of women in economic and public life. The roles and responsibilities of men and women in societies, which are fixed in advance by traditional culture and reinforced by certain religious beliefs, are used to explain and legitimize the existing inequalities and disparities between men and women qualified by some as normal, natural, even divine (Tree Aid, 2016).

Socio-economic situation of women in the PONASI landscape. The appreciation of the standard of living of women in the intervention zone is linked to their ability to meet their basic needs, to meet those of their children, to contribute to household expenses, and to be able to participate in social events. Other types of needs, including food, are covered by the household production under the responsibility of the family head, who is also in charge of housing. Now, the ability of women to contribute to these needs depends on the possibility of exercising an income generating activity (IGA). However, the revenues generated by these IGAs are low, for lack of investment and know-how for most of them. Women are mainly involved in IGAs in the fields of agriculture, livestock farming and the exploitation of forest resources including wood and non-wood products. Believing that, based on the benefits of their own activities, they have to cope with the needs of the household when their production does not allow it, women identify with the general standard of living of the household. Indeed, many women are responsible for the well-being of children (education, clothing, food) despite the presence of a man.

Women in the PONASI landscape derive most of their income from livestock products, agricultural products and forest resources. In relation to protected areas and adjacent terroirs, women also derive income from timber and non-timber forest products. Wood products include charcoal and wood energy. NTFPs most exploited for commercial purposes include shea butter, soumbala (spice made from néré seeds), shea almonds, tamarind, detarium, liane goïne, balanites, néré seeds and the flour of the pulp of néré. Shea butter is produced in all villages and yields an average of 61,800 FCFA per production cycle (shea nuts are collected between June and August). Néré seeds are much more produced in the Sissili classified forest, generating revenues of up to 80,000 FCFA per farmer and per production cycle. Processed products are produced by women's groups that are generally involved in several products (shea butter, shea butter soap, soumbala). Overall, processed products are those that generate the highest incomes. However, the means of transformation are artisanal (only a few groups that have benefited from the support of some NGOs have a semi-mechanized production system). The products are mainly sold in local markets but exporters are also potential customers, especially for néré seeds, shea butter, shea kernels and tamarind. The fruits of the vine goïne supply the juice production units at the national level. Shea butter and almonds are exported to Europe, Asia and America. Burkina Faso was ranked the world's sixth largest exporter of shea almonds in 2016, with a market share of 4.5%.

Women and land in the PONASI complex. In PONASI, women generally benefit from land plots granted by the head of household on household land. These plots exceptionally reach a hectare. However, since the household's fields are a priority, they do not have enough time to devote to their own field. Promoting improved seeds, with a short production cycle, could be promoted to women to allow them to harvest earlier and have more time to devote to household cropping fields. Women do not wish to have their own field as it would appear as a desire for independence from their husband, which is not their wish in fear of rejection. If general accessibility to land by women is not seen as a particular problem, it is different for sites developed for the purpose of intensive production. It was not possible to obtain data at the commune level, but in the Central-East region in 2016, women accounted for 40% of beneficiaries who had access to developed lowlands, compared with 60% for men. In the South-Central region, this distribution was 35% women and 65% men. In the Center-West region in 2016, only 27.8 irrigated perimeters were allocated to women compared to 72.2% to men. In addition, the factors of production are not controlled by women and are often inaccessible to them. For example, production techniques and technologies (CES/DRS techniques, improved seeds) are less practiced in female-owned plots. Plows, carts and other production tools when they are available in the household, are mostly used on family farms.

Women and access to forest resources. Women in PONASI benefit from the ecosystem services provided by forest resources in protected areas, village and communal forests and in other wooded areas (fields and fallows). Access to resources in fields and fallows is free for members of the household owner. In the field of others, the access requires the authorization of the owner. In areas rented for agricultural production or in the case of sharecropping, fruit trees are under the control of the landowner. However, women and men do not have equitable access to certain species even if they are located in the family field, especially shea and néré whose products processed and marketed generate higher incomes. The collection sites to which access is the least restrictive for women are the fields and fallow but the majority (73%) of collections of NTFPs take place in the fields. Being privately owned, these places are better controlled and more accessible. Outside the fields, village hunting areas (12%) and village forests (10%) are also important sites for collecting NTFPs. Other sites used to a lesser extent are fallow (4%) and forest in Kaboré-Tambi National Park (1%). Due to the progress of the agricultural front (extension of agricultural fields, creation of new fields), production areas of NTFPs are becoming more and more distant and it is often necessary to travel long distances to obtain them. This situation is detrimental to women who no longer feel safe because they are then exposed to all types of dangers (assaults of all kinds), in addition to significant distances to travel.

Women, information, and contribution to forest resource management. The communication strategies of some partners to transmit information in the PONASI complex usually involve information meetings, posters / posters, signs and local radios. The people interviewed, however, noted the limitations of these strategies because of (i) illiteracy, especially at the level of women for whom written documents are often inaccessible, and (ii) organization of information meetings and dissemination of radio broadcasts at times when women are not available, so that they reach only a small proportion of women in the communities. Unsustainable practices mainly attributable to women are the collection of immature fruits (shea, néré), the pruning of the branches of certain species such as kapokier, baobab and grapes for the collection of fruits or leaves for food or commercial purposes and inappropriate removal of bark and roots from medicinal plants. These practices take place when they are not able to access the desired products. On the other side, they play an active role in the rational management of natural resources through community actions, especially reforestation, especially with the support of development partners. Through this support, community-based organizations that involve women have been established or revitalized for the protection and sound management of some forests. In the commune of Po, the NGO Tree Aid helped organize the actors around the buffer zones of Bourou and Kampala in the PNKT as well as in the commune of Nobéré around the

buffer zones of Barsé and Soulougré. Organized into forest management groups, these organizations have created specific commissions for better management of these entities (commissions for reforestation, bushfires, firewood, NWFP management, monitoring, and conflict management). Forest management groups have received training in environmental protection, particularly in the areas of tree maintenance, reforestation and assisted natural regeneration. However, although women are present on these committees (24 out of 66 members of the Bourou and Kampala Buffer Zone Management Committees are women), they are poorly represented in the governing bodies of committees and other forest management structures. When they are members of these structures, they occupy positions considered to be of little importance (cash, assistant positions). This situation does not favor a real inclusion of women in the management and local governance of forest resources and the taking into account of their priorities. In view of the strong mobilization they demonstrate in community forest protection activities, according to the opinions gathered in the field, their presence in decision-making bodies should be strengthened.

Documents

Title

Submitted

Annex G_Gender Analysis and Action Plan

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

Gender Action Plan

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Component 1. Framework for Integrated Landscape Management of PONASI with sustainable financing for its operation					
Output 1.1 The "PONASI Landscape Co-Governance Mechanism" is updated, strengthened and operationalized					
Ensure the integration of regional and communal councils for the promotion of gender in the PONASI landscape co-governance mechanism through awareness	Number of regional gender promotion councils participating in the PONASI landscape co-governance mechanism	3	0	Year 1	Project Gender Expert Ministry of Women,

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
raising (output 1.1.3)	Number of municipal councils promoting gender that are part of the PONASI landscape co-governance mechanism	9		Year 1	National Solidarity and Family (MWNSF) Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for the Promotion of Gender (SP/CONEP gender) MSDHCD
Train regional and commune councils to master the gender concept and their role in the implementation of the national gender policy (output 1.1.3)	Number of regional councils trained in mastering the gender concept and their role in the implementation of the national gender policy	3	0 (regional and communal councils have not yet been trained on gender and do not really control their role in the implementation of the national gender policy)	Year 1	Project Gender Expert
	Number of municipal councils trained in the mastery of the gender concept and their role in the implementation of the national gender policy	9		Year 1	Project Gender Expert
Train regional and municipal councils in gender and development (output 1.1.3)	Number of regional councils trained in gender and development	3	0 (regional and communal councils are not yet trained in gender and development for better local ownership of the issue)	Year 1	Project Gender Expert
	Number of municipal councils trained in gender and development	9		Year 1	Project Gender Expert
Conduct training for the collection and analysis of gender specific data to build national and local capacity to mainstream gender issues in the environmental land use planning process for the PONASI landscape (output 1.1.3)	Number of training sessions for the collection of gender specific data in support of project activities	At least 4 training events: 2 national level (e.g. ministries in charge of Agriculture and the Environment) and 3 at the local level (1 in each region)	0	Year 1	Gender Expert Gender Bureau, Division of Gender and Family Affairs Ministry of Social Development, Housing, and Community Development (MSDHCD)

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Train regional and local councils to use the tools or reflection matrices designed to take into account the gender dimension in the project (output 1.1.3)	Number of regional councils trained on the use of tools or reflection matrices designed to take into account the gender dimension	3	0	Year 1	Project Gender Expert
	Number of municipal councils trained on the use of tools or reflection matrices designed to take into account the gender dimension	9	0	Year 1	Project Gender Expert
Output 1.2 The territorial planning tool is adopted as a spatial planning methodology					
Conduct a participatory gender responsive analysis of land use, biodiversity, natural resources management and ecosystem services use in project intervention areas	Conducting a study of gender responsive analysis completed of land use, biodiversity, natural resources management and ecosystems services benefits in project area	One (1)	Gender responsive analysis does not exist on the project area	Year 1	Gender Expert Ministry of Agriculture and Hydro-Agricultural Development (MAAH) OFINAP, DGEF, DREEVCC / MEGECC
Include sex disaggregated data for the nine prioritized communes into the project supported information management database (output 1.2)	Percent of sex disaggregated data by sage, diversity of women and men, community, income levels, social status, cultural factors, land tenure, natural resources and ecosystem uses	100% of data	0% (information management database has not been developed)	Year 1	Gender Expert MAAH OFINAP, DGEF, DREEVCC/ MEGECC
Develop gender responsive tools for the collection of relevant gender-specific data on land use, biodiversity, natural resources management and ecosystem services use in project intervention areas to inform a gender responsive analysis (output 1.2)	Availability of gender responsive tools for the collection of data	A suite of gender responsive data collection tools developed	No tool has yet been developed	Year 1	Gender Expert Land Use Division, MAAH
Output 1.4 Development of the PONASI Landscape Management Master Plan to guide the management of the PONASI landscape over the next 15 years					
Input gender responsive socioeconomic indicators into the environmental land use planning process (output 1.4.1)	Gender responsive Territorial Planning Tool addresses the different needs and vulnerabilities of women and men and with mechanism to promote their participation in its implementation	One tool	Territorial Planning Tool has not been developed	Year 1	Gender Expert DGEF, DREEVCC / MEGECC PA Planning Expert

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Include gender considerations and gender sensitive indicators in the PONASI Landscape Master Plan and related instruments (output 1.4.1)	Gender responsive Master Plan for the PONASI Landscape	Gender responsive Master Plan for the PONASI Landscape developed	Master Plan for the PONASI Landscape and related instruments has not been developed	Years 1 and 2	Gender Expert MAAH OFINAP, DGEF, DREEVCC / MEGECC
	Number of management plans for prioritized protected areas which address women and men, and other socially vulnerable groups' needs, and with mechanisms to promote women's participation (output 2.2.2)	One (1) gender-responsive protected area management plans	0 (protected area management plans have not been developed)	Years 1 and 2	Gender Expert OFINAP, DGEF, DREEVCC / MEGECC
Integrate NTFP production spaces dedicated to women's cooperatives into pilot sites (output 1.4.1)	Area of sites dedicated primarily to the exploitation of NTFPs for the benefit of women's cooperatives	200 ha	0	Year 2	DGEF, DREEVCC
Output 1.5 Management requirements for the units of the territory, support the implementation of the PONASI Landscape Management Master Plan					
Component 2. Strengthening the PONASI Protected Area System					
Output 2.1 Institutional and individual capacities within PA agencies are enhanced through targeted capacity building interventions					
Ensure adequate women representation when establishing the collaborative management committees for PAs. (output 2.1.1)	Level of women participation in collaborative management committees	A minimum of 60% female membership and female participation in leadership in protected area-level committees	Existing management committees (Zovic, CAF, village forests) do not take into account gender	Year 2	Gender Expert OFINAP, DGEF, DREEVCC / MEGECC
Support the development and implementation of a gender-sensitive capacity development plan (Output 2.1.3)	Existence of a gender-sensitive capacity development plan	1 plan	0 (there is not yet a gender-sensitive capacity development plan in the project area)	Year 1	Project Gender Expert MWNSF SP/CONEP gender MSDHCD

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Support the development of a gender-sensitive communication strategy (output 2.1.2)	Existence of a gender-sensitive communication strategy in the project area	1 plan	0 (there is not yet a gender-sensitive communication plan in the project area)	Year 1	Project Gender Expert MWNSF SP/CONEP gender MSDHCD
Strengthen the technical capacities of women's cooperatives in the management of NTFP production areas that will be delimited and granted for sustainable exploitation and management (output 2.1.2)	Number of training sessions conducted for the benefit of cooperatives on planting techniques and maintenance of plants in certified areas Number of participants in training sessions	04 training sessions for 04 cooperatives	0	Year 2-3	Forest Service
Involve women who run restaurants that sell wild meat in anti-poaching (output 2.1.2)	Number of women who run restaurants that sell wild meat involved in anti-poaching (output 2.1.2)	At least 50% of the women who run such restaurants	0	Year 4-6	Project Gender Expert Forest Service
Output 2.2 The management effectiveness of the State-managed PAs of the PONASI complex - Kabore-Tambi, Nazinga and Sissili, including corridors # 1 and # 2 is reinforced by a series of technical support					
Include gender considerations into the templates for management plans, collaborative management agreements, to ensure gender considerations will be integrated in the protected area management plans and especially in the village collaborative management agreements (output 2.2.2)	Number of PA management plans and of village collaborative management agreements that address women and other socially vulnerable groups' needs, and with mechanisms to promote women's participation and the sustainable use and conservation of forests	One (1)	No template for PA management plans and for village collaborative management agreement have yet been developed	Years 1 and 2	Gender Expert OFINAP, DGEF, DREEVCC / MEGECC

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Identify and develop gender indicators to monitor women's participation in the development and implementation of the management plans for Nazinga, PNKT and Sissili PAS, corridors #1 and #2, and for ZOVICs as well as for monitoring impact on women (output 2.2.2)	Number of management plans with gender responsive indicators	Three (3) for state PAs (Nazinga Game Ranch, Sissili Classified Forest, Kaboré-Tambi National Park), and at least 50% of village collaborative management agreements are gender-responsive	Existing management plans for Nazinga Game Ranch and the Kaboré-Tambi National Park are not gender responsive and no village collaborative management agreement has yet been developed	Years 1 and 2	Gender Expert OFINAP, DGEF, DREEVCC / MEGECC
Component 3. Sustainable Land and Resources Management and Diversification of Livelihoods					
Output 3.1 Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices are implemented by communities within the PONASI landscape					
Advocate for better representation of beneficiary women in the sites developed for agricultural production (output 3.1.3)	Rate of women beneficiaries of production plots in developed sites	At least 50% of the beneficiaries are women	40% of women had access to lowlands developed in 2016 in Central East; 35% in the South Center; 27.8% in Central West		Project Gender Expert MWNSF SP/CONEP gender MSDHCD
Provide training and outreach in communities that is conducive to women's participation (output 3.1.3)	Percent of training events in communities with child care assistance being provided if needed	A minimum of 50% of the training conducted in communities with childcare assistance if needed	Training not started	Years 1 to 3	Project Team Gender Expert MCAT

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Adopt a transformative gender approach to reduce women's workloads, enabling them to participate effectively in the project, such as access to improved seeds and small production equipment to alleviate their work in their own field (output 3.1)	Percentage of women reporting being alleviated in their housework and field work	More than 75% of women say they spend less time on firewood and water collection tasks	Almost all women in the PONASI complex devote a lot of time to household chores, field work and do not have access to equipment and production inputs	Year 2 - Year 4	Communication and Knowledge Management Expert Gender Expert
Ensure the attendance of women in the demonstration activities as part of the support to producers (output 3.1.3)	Number of women benefiting annually from demonstration activities and supply of climate-resilient crop varieties	200	Training not started	Years 1 to 3	MAAH
Capitalize and popularize women's know-how in environmental resource management	Existence of a compendium of women's know-how in the management of environmental resources	01 compendium of women's know-how in the management of environmental resources	0	Year 4-6	Project Gender Expert Forest Service
Output 3.2 The management of natural resources in forests and community pastoral areas is improved					
Capitalize and popularize women's know-how in environmental resource management	Existence of a compendium of women's know-how in the management of environmental resources	01 compendium of women's know-how in the management of environmental resources	0	Year 4-6	Project Gender Expert Forest Service
Output 3.3 Sustainable local forest products processing enterprises are established					

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Support the establishment of 04 women's or predominantly women's cooperatives for the exploitation of NTFP value chains (output 3.3)	Existence of (1) cooperative for producing creeper goïne juice in the commune of Nobéré, one (1) cooperative for the production of honey in the PONASI landscape area, and two (2) cooperatives for producing shea butter in the communes of Guiaro and Zabré-Zoaga, and proportion of women members of these cooperatives	04 cooperatives	0 (the groups of women encountered in the communes are not organized into cooperatives)	Year 2-3	Community Development Expert SP/CONEP gender MSDHCD
Support the organic and fair certification of production spaces and shea products managed by women's cooperatives (output 3.3)	Area of shea production sites with organic and fair-trade certification	200 ha	0	Year 2	Certification office SP/CONEP gender
Strengthen the technical and entrepreneurial capacities of women beneficiaries through training adapted to women and meeting their aspirations and needs, as appropriate fruit collection practices, prevention of adverse environmental impacts; good practices for reducing post-harvest and storage losses; processing techniques; health aspects, standards of quality and hygiene; equitable value chains, savings and microenterprise management (output 3.3.4)	Nature of technical training provided Number of beneficiaries	At least 75% of the beneficiaries master the training provided At least 90% of beneficiaries have been trained		Year 2	Project Gender Expert SP/CONEP gender
Ensure that the establishment of production units (buildings and equipment) (output 3.3.6) is adapted to the women who will use them and take their needs into account	Number of production units installed	04	No production unit for organic shea butter or goïne liana juice production unit	Year 2	Expert in entrepreneurship SP/CONEP gender

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Ensure that the partnership with a microfinance institution in the PONASI region does not discriminate against women in order to ensure that financial products and services are adapted to the needs of women in production units and processing enterprises (output 3.3.6)	Existence of a partnership with a microfinance institution offering innovative financial products and services tailored to the needs of women in production units and processing enterprises	01	0	Year 2	Financial Expert SP/CONEP gender
Provide training to men and women in microcredit and microenterprise development (output 3.3.4)	Percent of women benefiting from training	75% of beneficiaries of trainings in microcredit and microenterprise development are women	Training not started	Years 1 to 3	Company providing training services with support from project Gender Expert
Support the implementation of a gender-sensitive communication strategy related to the marketing of the various products of goine liana juice, quality honey, shea butter and support the participation of cooperatives in fairs and other national events promoting NTFP (output 3.3.4)	<p>- Existence of a gender-sensitive communication strategy in connection with the marketing of the different products of goine liana juice, quality honey, shea butter, which highlights the participation of women in these sectors</p> <p>- Number of women's cooperatives participating in fairs and other national events promoting NTFP s</p>	<p>One study</p> <p>04</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>	Year 4	Expert in marketing of forest products SP/CONEP gender
Conduct a market analysis and develop an action plan to ensure that women have access to incentives to promote sustainable forestry practices, including collection of NTFP (output 3.3.7)	Proportion of women with access to microcredit, and markets	Women represent a minimum of 40% of the beneficiaries of incentives and access to markets to promote NTFP, and of conservation-oriented agriculture practices	Access to incentives and markets for NTFP as a result of the project yet to commence	Years 2 to 4	Company providing certification-related services Financial Expert

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Provide training to men and women in microcredit and microenterprise development (output 3.3.4)	Percent of women benefiting from training	At least 75% of beneficiaries of trainings in microcredit and microenterprise development are women	Training not started	Years 1 to 3	Company providing training services with support from project Gender Expert
Capacity building and support for women-owned NTFP processing and ecotourism small business receiving technical assistance in production, labeling, and marketing (output 3.3.4)	Number of women-owned NTFP processing and ecotourism small business receiving technical assistance	4	0	Years 1 to 4	Company to improve the competitiveness of small community-based businesses Gender Expert
Output 3.4 Strengthened capacities for better sharing of tourism benefits with local communities in the PONASI landscape.					
Establish a gender-sensitive sustainable tourism development strategy for the PONASI landscape (output 3.4.1)	Existence of a gender-sensitive sustainable tourism development strategy for the PONASI landscape	01 strategy	0	Years 2 to 3	MCAT
Develop a gender-sensitive capacity building and training program in tourism and hospitality (output 3.4.3)	Existence of a gender-sensitive capacity building and training program in tourism and hospitality	01 strategy	0	Years 2 to 3	MCAT
Grants are allocated to tourism-related small and micro-businesses owned by women (output 3.4.4)	Proportion of grant beneficiaries who are women	75%	0	Years 1 to 3	Multi-stakeholder group selection committee
Ensure that the selection of attendees for tourism training includes women (output 3.4.3)	Percent of women participation in all training	70% of the training recipients are women	Recipients not yet selected	Year 1	Project Team Gender Expert MCAT
Component 4: Gender mainstreaming, and knowledge and learning management					
Output 4.1 Gender Action plan implemented, monitored and evaluated					
Integrate women's experiences into knowledge products that will incorporate institutional strengthening and capacity building initiatives, for continued institutional and private sector learning and activity implementation	Percent of knowledge products reflecting women's portrayal and lessons learnt featuring women's experiences	100%	No knowledge products developed	Years 1 to 4	Communication and Knowledge Management Expert Gender Expert

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Establish a monitoring system to learn from the SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation interventions, including gender-based indicators	Monitoring system to learn from the SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation interventions	Monitoring system includes gender-based/SMART indicators	Monitoring system not developed	Year 1	Communication and Knowledge Management Expert Gender Expert
Develop materials to document women experiences and to raise public awareness about women/s needs expectations regarding SLM, biodiversity conservation and CSA (output 4.1)	Percent of training and public awareness materials and curricula produced that include women's experiences and information disaggregated by gender	A minimum of 80% of all training and awareness materials, and curricula developed in SLM, BD conservation, and CSA include women experiences and gender sensitive information	Training materials not yet developed	Year 1	Communication and Knowledge Management Expert Gender Expert
Provide Gender equality sensitization training to major project stakeholders including regional and commune-levels authorities and and local level stakeholders for gender mainstreaming in the project (output 4.1).	Level of understanding among regional and commune-levels authorities and local level stakeholders of gender issues	100% of participants achieve a 75% score in the post training test as a demonstration of their understanding of gender aspects of land and NRM and conservation of BD and ES	0%	Year 1	Project Gender Expert MWNSF SP/CONEP gender Housing, and Community Development
Output 4.2: Technical knowledge and lessons learned from the project's experiences are compiled, assessed and translated into knowledge products					
Monitor indicators in the project results framework, including gender related indicators data disaggregated for men and women (output 4.2)	Level of women participation in monitoring and evaluation activities	100 % of project M& E activities with women participation	None, project M&E activities have not started	Years 1 to 6	Gender Expert M&E Expert
Ensure a proportionate representation of women among respondents are included in the project surveys and baseline data collected (output 4.2)	Level of women participation in monitoring and evaluation activities	100 % of project M& E activities with women participation	None, project M&E activities have not started	Years 1 to 6	Gender Expert M&E Expert

Gender-related activity	Indicator	Target	Baseline	Timeline	Responsibility
Establish during the mid-term and final evaluations and other M&E activities, differentiated spaces for consultation and dialogue, only with female referents on the one hand and male referents on the other (output 4.2)	Level of women participation in monitoring and evaluation activities	100 % of project M& E activities with women participation	None, project M&E activities have not started	Years 1 to 6	Gender Expert M&E Expert Independent Evaluators
Output 4.3. Learnings are disseminated through the project communication plan to enable their widespread adoption					
Ensure that the materials produced encourage the use of inclusive gender-neutral language and that women are depicted (output 4.3)	Percent of materials produced use inclusive language with depictions of women	100%	Media products not produced	Years 1 to 4	Communication and Knowledge Management Expert Gender Expert

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

A.5. Risks

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being, achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

20. Key project risks and related mitigation measures are presented in the following table.

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
National socio-political-economic context	An unstable socio-economic context and increasing insecurity in the country could undermine the emergence of environmental awareness among the population who would not be willing to change their unsustainable uses of natural resources and adhere to the requirements of the Integrated Landscape Management Framework.	High	<p>This risk is rated as high despite the fact that the communes in the PONASI area have not been the scene of violent acts, because of the increasingly worrying situation in other parts of the country, due to expanding terrorism and crime.</p> <p>The early stages of the participatory process to develop the PONASI Landscape Management Master Plan will involve a comprehensive campaign to raise awareness on current environmental status and recent degradation trends, on related impacts on their quality of life and livelihoods, and on the urgency to halt this degradation. A project communication specialist will support communication and awareness activities throughout the project implementation to maintain alertness about the local and national benefits to be derived from tackling priority environmental issues.</p> <p>Nonetheless, should the level of security worsen including in the PONASI area, the project will take measures so as not to increase stakeholders, staff or consultant's exposure to any danger of any kind.</p>

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
	<p>An unstable socio-economic context and increasing insecurity in the country could reduce the attractiveness of PONASI sites for international tourists.</p> <p>Should the government's efforts to counter terrorism be successful and the security climate restored, the PONASI area has a real potential for tourism; it is accessible within 2-hour drive from the capital city and, provided it is supported along a coherent strategy for the whole landscape that integrates cultural as well as natural assets, as proposed under output 3.4. However, while the PONASI area has not seen any incident and is considered as being safe, the security situation in some areas of the country and in the region is a cause for concern and is likely to deter foreign tourists to travel to Burkina Faso, which would in turn reduce benefits for local communities and incentives for conservation and sustainable management of resources.</p>	High	<p>Two measures were included in the project to mitigate the risk of increased insecurity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Given the risk of lower attractiveness of Burkina Faso to foreign tourists, the project (output 3.4 on tourism) will initially focus on tourism products targeting tourists who already visit Burkina Faso rather than attracting new categories of tourists from outside, including expatriates, and business travelers from Ouagadougou and existing visitors (e.g. hunters and their entourage; people staying for elephant viewing). A series of interventions will take place to improve tourism attractions and products in the area, both by improving visitor facilities at existing attractions and improving the capacity of local people to provide tourism products and services. Support will be provided to develop small business plans where products exist but require improvement/promotion (e.g. training for the entrepreneur to develop them). Categories for support may include direct tourism entities (e.g. homestay, tour guide, attractions, café, etc.) and indirect tourism businesses (e.g. poultry farm; organic vegetable garden, transport/transfers, juice manufacturers) - A new livelihood output has been included and supported by the Project Result Framework validation workshop. This output aims at developing three promising value chains based on the sustainable use of NTFP, targeting mainly women as beneficiaries, and putting in place the conditions for sustainability: Output 3.3 Sustainable local forest products processing enterprises are established, providing livelihoods and generating sustained income, especially for women and vulnerable people. This addition allows to have a more diversified strategy for the development of sustainable livelihoods linked to PAs and to the sustainable use of forest products.

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
Stakeholders involvement	Lack of local stakeholders buy-in or adherence to biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource and land management measures identified in the integrated landscape management master plan would seriously limit the project impacts.	Low	<p>The early stages of the participatory process to develop the PONASI Landscape Management Master Plan will involve a comprehensive campaign to raise awareness on current environmental status and recent degradation trends, on related impacts on their quality of life and livelihoods, and on the urgency to halt this degradation.</p> <p>A project communication specialist will support communication and awareness activities throughout the project implementation to maintain alertness about the local and national benefits to be derived from tackling priority environmental issues.</p>

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
	Land-use conflicts related to the occupation of corridor # 2 and the use of its resources could also create obstacles to its gazettement and protection	Medium	<p>To restore movement of elephants within the PONASI Protected Area Complex and between the complex and adjacent areas, particularly those in northern Ghana, the PAGEN project delineated two corridors: corridor no. 1, linking the PNKT to the Nazinga Game Ranch, covering an area of 4,500 ha, and Corridor No. 2, connecting the south-east of the PNKT to northern Ghana, covering an area of 33,000 ha. The delineation and physical delimitation of the two corridors was done through negotiations with the local communities and involving administrative officials, mayors, and traditional leaders. Local communities agreed to leave the areas voluntarily. The draft statutes were drawn up and submitted to the competent authority for adoption. However, the texts formalizing the creation of the corridors have never been adopted, leaving the adjacent communities in an ambiguous situation regarding land and resource use in these areas which is now threatening the ecological integrity of the corridors.</p> <p>After the decision to establish the two biological corridors within the PONASI, 2,697 people were resettled from within to outside the borders of the Kaboré-Tambi NP-Nazinga GR corridor. A Mitigation Plan identified 2,697 people affected by the creation of the corridors and proposed compensation measures. However, because the risk of involuntary resettlement was not adequately assessed during project design, the project resources were not sufficient to be reallocated to cover the proposed mitigation measures. New land was provided, CFA francs 46,000,000[1] was paid to 1,764 people (65% of the 2,697 occupants) for their resettlement, and 5 boreholes were drilled in the reception areas for a total value of about CFA francs 30 million (about US\$ 65,000) as a form of compensation, and new land was allocated to the 770 producers who illegally occupied the banks of the river. The decision to support micro-projects (US\$ 325,000) through the project was also taken to provide an additional form of compensation to local communities. Overall, the total compensation provided to displaced communities is significantly lower than that suggested in the Mitigation Plan (CFA francs 245,740,000). The fact that no formal complaints were received on how the resettlement was handled, suggests that undertaken measures and compensation provided were satisfactory[2]. However, among the major difficulties that affected the implementation of the PAGEN project[3]³, the final evaluation report by the Government emphasizes that the support measures for those affected by the creation of corridors were not up to their expectations.</p> <p>The project will resume the process, building on past achievements and working closely with the NGO Natudev who is pursuing parallel objectives in Corridor #1, and will follow the steps described under the Output 2.2.1:</p> <p>The formalization of the status of Corridor # 2 south-east of PNKT linking the</p>

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
Financial	Local authorities could be reluctant or unable to allocate adequate resources for the operation of the collaborative management platform and to implement the landscape management plan	Moderate	<p>The co-governance mechanism of the PONASI landscape will be set up by a decree of the Minister in charge of Local Authorities on the creation, composition, responsibilities and operation of the said mechanism. The missions, the composition and the operation of the "PONASI Landscape co-governance mechanism" will integrate the fact that the PONASI landscape extends over 3 Regions (inter-regional platform). It is proposed that the mechanism be chaired by the Chairman of the South-Central Regional Council, assisted by the other two Chairs of Regional Councils as Vice-chairpersons who will then be in a position to invest the required resources in the planning process from the regional budget for planning, and to channel funds from partners and donors for the implementation of the Landscape Master Plan. (Output 1.1.2)</p> <p>The project will recruit an international expert on land use planning to, among other tasks, consult with concerned parties, consider/analyse past experiences and propose operating rules for the mechanism to ensure that it can adequately fulfil its missions, including the identification of the financial needs necessary for its autonomous operation (operational budget), the mobilization of the required resources, and its articulation with the management committees of the various land units (PA co-management committees, ZOVIC wildlife management committees and unions, CAF management committees, groups, cooperatives or forest management committees of communal and village forests as provided for under local charters and development and management plans). (Output 1.1.2)</p>

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
Institutional capacities	Difficulties in recruiting the necessary staff within OFINAP and DGEF to perform the essential functions of PA management due to limited financial resources and insufficient resources allocated to surveillance (staff, equipment, logistics) could hinder the effectiveness of management improvements brought by the project. Inter-institutional staff mobility could reduce the relevance and impact of the trainings provided by the project.	Moderate	Preliminary discussions with these institutions and information collected during the participatory capacity assessment (using UNDP's capacity development scorecard – Annex Q) indicate that human resources are not a limiting factor for all protected areas. Besides, under output 2.1.1, the project will support an analysis of the institutional structures in charge of protected areas within the PONASI complex to elaborate proposals aiming at enhancing cost-effectiveness and developing better synergies between the different units. The issue of staff mobility among different units will be raised to ensure that trainings gradually build up institutional capacities and effectiveness of specialized operations in protected areas. Finally, one of the activities under this output, the project will support advocacy with the MEGECC authorities for the assignment of additional staff to ensure adequate surveillance of PAs and update of biodiversity monitoring and surveillance databases.
	Low delivery risk due to insufficient capacity of stakeholders involved in project implementation including UNDP CO	Moderate	The project budget provides adequate resources for the recruitment of national consultants, international experts and service providers with a high level of expertise. The project organization structure involves a three-tier project assurance including UNDP regional and global levels to provide adequate technical and managerial supervision and guidance.

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
Social	<p>Under component 2 focusing on Protected Areas, the project provides for capacity building of ecoguards and rangers as part of the surveillance program for the protected areas of the PONASI complex.</p> <p>Strengthening anti-poaching measures could possibly lead to human rights abuses. However, the project will mitigate such risk through including rules in the trainings (output 2.1.3) and in the enforcement guidance documents (output 2.2.5) to prevent abusive and unjustified use of force to control poaching.</p>	Moderate	<p>Clear guidelines and procedures for enforcing regulations will be identified and communicated to all stakeholders involved in surveillance and enforcement of regulations for all PAs. These guidelines and procedures will include stringent rules on the violation of human rights to prevent any community member, ecoguard or ranger directly or indirectly involved in surveillance activities under the project from being implicated in a case of violence against vulnerable local populations, including nomadic Peul herders.</p> <p>Also, under the output 1.5.4 establishing a mechanism to monitor compliance and prevent/manage conflicts, the project will establish a project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), in line with mandatory Social and Environmental Standards (SES) for all of UNDP's projects and programmes, and with UNDP's corporate Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM)[4]⁴. A GRM is designed for collaborative problem solving, as a "first line" recourse for situations in which, despite proactive stakeholder engagement, some stakeholders have a concern about the project's potential impacts on them. A GRM is intended to be accessible, collaborative, expeditious, and effective in resolving concerns through dialogue, joint fact-finding, negotiation, and problem solving. To increase the likelihood that the GRM will be effective in providing resolution of stakeholder grievances, it will be designed following these guiding principles: legitimate (enabling trust from the stakeholder groups); accessible (known to all stakeholder groups); predictable (clear and known procedure); equitable (aggrieved parties have reasonable access to sources of information, advice and expertise necessary to engage in the grievance process on fair, informed and respectful terms); transparent (parties informed about progress); rights compatible; enabling continuous learning ; and based on engagement and dialogue. The steps in a grievance resolution mechanism include i) communicating grievances through a variety of channels and register grievance; ii) acknowledging the grievance communicated; iii) assessing eligibility of the issue for the GRM; iv) assigning responsibility to the most appropriate institution or individual; v) developing a proposed response; vi) communicating the proposed response to complainant and seeking agreement on the response; vii) implementing the response to resolve the grievance; viii) reviewing the response if unsuccessful; and ix) closing out if the response has been successful or referring the grievance if the grievance has not been resolved.</p>

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
Gender	Due to socio-cultural constraints, the lack of securing women's rights to access and use of land and resources would limit their benefits related to the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources and their financial vulnerability and restricted access to credit reduce their chances to benefit from the schemes put in place by the project, and such risks may be exacerbated in certain ethnic groups, thus worsening women's vulnerability to face risks.	Moderate	<p>Gender issues will be taken into account at each stage of project implementation, especially for components 2 and 3. Component 4 is specifically designed for the mainstreaming of a gender perspective. An analysis of gender-specific issues was carried out and a gender-specific project integration plan developed during project development.</p> <p>In line with the principles of support for the most vulnerable, gender equality and women's empowerment, and that of not doing conservation at the expense of the poorest, the project will ensure, with the support of traditional and identification of those segments of the population who are negatively affected by project interventions, including the loss or reduction of access to resources through enhanced access rules to corridors and protected areas, as well as respect a male-to-female ratio of 40-60 for all beneficiaries.</p> <p>The project will support the identification and delimitation of production areas in corridors 1 and 2, the development of agreements and specifications to secure access to resources for members of the cooperative, supervise activities and ensure their sustainability. Production areas will be negotiated with the local authorities (village chief, chief of land), demarcated and certified for the production of organic shea for the benefit of the groups of women involved.</p>
Economic	Falling market prices for products developed by the value chains could reduce the benefits to the local communities involved.	Low	Under Output 3.3, the project will support the development of sustainable value chains, focus on three promising value chains whose potential in the PONASI landscape has been recently highlighted (Naturama, 2016). The Output 3.3.1 – <i>Market studies for the three non-timber forest products value chains</i> will ensure that a market assessment is conducted for each product to reduce uncertainties and risks and to know the chances of success before generating hope and engaging local communities. These market studies will have to be based on existing and recent data, supplemented as necessary by the search for additional information in the field. Studies should focus at a minimum on the analysis of supply for these products throughout the PONASI landscape and in the rest of the country, and the analysis of demand by a market study at national, sub-regional (Mali, Ivory Coast, Ghana, Niger, Togo, Senegal) levels for goine liana juice and honey) and international (for organic shea butter).

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
Economic	The possibility of the temporary closure of hunting in the RGN, Sissili CF and ZOVICs will result in short-term loss of income for concessionaires and the Government and the loss of a subsistence activity and source of income for local communities.	High	Under Output 2.2.2, a comprehensive review of the management of wild game hunting in the RGN, Sissili CF and ZOVICs since their creation will document the socio-economic impacts and the status of game populations. This study will document the costs and benefits for the various stakeholders, i.e. the Government, the concessionaires and the local populations, and will thus allow predicting the socio-economic consequences of a possible closure of hunting in these sites. The decision to close the hunting will be based on the recognition of the unsustainability of hunting as currently managed and the inability of game populations to withstand the pressure of hunting due to a worrying decline in populations. Observations in the last decade indicate that local communities now derive little benefits from hunting activities and would therefore experience little short-term impact from a hunting closure. A decrease in game populations will affect the revenues of the Government and the concessionaires in the medium and long term, so that the impact of the closure of the hunting will only negatively affect them in the short term, while all stakeholders will benefit from a medium-term closure by avoiding a permanent loss of the resources that support this activity. The project will support various projects that will allow a diversification of sources of income for local populations, which will help to alleviate the effects of the closure of hunting in ZOVICs.
Environmental	Unsustainable use of the NTFP supporting value chains could lead to the degradation of these resources	Moderate	To ensure that the activities supported by the project will not result in the degradation or depletion of the natural resources that communities depend on for their livelihood and well-being, the project (i) provides for the collection of NTFPs in forests to be preceded by an assessment of the sustainable production capacity of the resource used, and (ii) will provide technical training to build the capacity of both male and female beneficiaries to ensure the sustainability of harvested resources. The project will raise awareness of members of local communities on the fact that the sustainability of their benefits will largely depend on the avoidance of potential adverse effects of value chain development on harvested biological resources. The planned trainings will include, among other things, good practices for fruit collection (liane goïne and shea) respectful of the resource and which does not compromise its regeneration in a natural environment; prevention of adverse environmental impacts; and compliance with laws, regulations and agreements regarding access to protected areas and the use of their resources.

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
	<p>The effects of climate change could intensify the seasonal water scarcity in protected areas and corridors.</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Through supporting the development and implementation of long-term ecological monitoring in the PONASI complex of protected areas (Output 2.2.4), the project will increase the capacities of PA management authorities to monitor the status of critical habitats and resources for elephants and other wildlife, which will enable them to devise and implement appropriate management measures such as repairing or maintaining existing dams that were built in the Nazinga Game Ranch and Sissili Classified Forest . Also, one of the main purposes of the corridors is to allow wildlife movements to do seasonal movements from one area to another in search of favorable habitats. By strengthening the conservation and management effectiveness of the corridors (Output 2.2.2), the project will contribute to significantly mitigate this environmental risk.</p>

Type of risk	Risk	Risk level	Mitigation measures
	The presence of barriers to elephant movements could cause local overload of critical habitat.	Moderate	Under output 2.4.2, the project will support a tightly focused research project on elephant movements within and outside the PONASI landscape. Knowledge of seasonal movements and use of different habitats is essential to limit disruption and encroachment on elephant habitat by exploitations (forestry, agriculture, mining and hunting) and adopt measures to reduce human-elephant conflicts. In addition to corridors #1 and #2, elephants have been observed to frequent other areas and some previously identified corridors are no longer in use today because of the barriers created by human settlements. Also, habitats extending from Corridor # 2 on the Ghanaian side are not effectively protected so that poaching is carried out without restraint. Before making investments to secure other routes, it is necessary to conduct systematic surveys to be able to confidently determine the regular patterns of movement of this elephant population in Burkina Faso and Ghana. The project will support a highly targeted research project, to clarify whether additional corridors need to be secured to protect the elephant population that frequents the PONASI PA complex and to avoid comprising the efforts made there. Where appropriate, the corridor will be identified as well as the issues and obstacles to overcome in order to implement the required protection measures. The research will be carried out in collaboration with Ghana to clarify the spatio-temporal characteristics of movements between the Burkina Faso and Ghana, the threats to animals during these movements, assess the relevance of habitats to meet the vital needs of elephants and threats along these routes, including Human-Wildlife conflicts, identify needs in terms of habitats to be restored to ensure elephant safety and identify opportunities for collaboration in view of implementation.

Summary analysis and project implications/opportunities for COVID-19

Covid-19 implications have been built into the proposal and addressed in several sections throughout this document. The tables below summarize the risks and opportunities. The overarching ecological perspective of the project is that the rehabilitation of intact, well-managed production landscape, where wildlife harvest is done in an ecologically sound manner, healthy wildlife populations are protected, and as the more intact landscape develops over time, the possibility of zoonoses will be substantially reduced.

Risk category	Potential Risk	Risk level	Mitigations and Plans
Availability of technical expertise and capacity and changes in timelines	Continued or renewed efforts in COVID-19 containment are likely over the course of project development and possibly into implementation	Medium	The project development work plan and team will be built with this in mind, for example, maximizing experts in country. However, if the number of COVID19 cases increases beyond the currently low numbers and is not effectively contained, project start-up and implementation could be delayed. Methods for biosecure implementation will be needed, such as increased use of remote communication, use of PPE, etc.
	Limited capacity for remote work and interactions in Burkina Faso	Medium	<p>The rural areas of Burkina Faso are not well equipped for remote work, in terms of wifi availability. The project will attempt to hold consultations in halls or open spaces, and taking advantage of the cell network for connectivity, other than by observing government safety protocols.</p> <p>Availability of international personnel on-site will depend on working in a post-pandemic scenario. However, if the pandemic persists, experience in Burkina Faso and elsewhere to date indicates that remote video training modules can be developed and that planning work can be accommodated in this manner at halls and offices where wifi is available.</p>
Difficulties of implementing community engagement activities	Depending on the development of the pandemic in-country, it may be difficult to do community-level consultations	Medium	Local level consultation will comply with government guidelines and UNDP-CO guidelines. For example, it is likely that teams for field visits and consultations will be small, and they will likely meet and consult with small group sizes (under 50 people or per local guidelines). Additionally, COVID protocol will be developed and followed, such as testing, and supply of sanitizer and masks. In any case where either party is not comfortable to engage in discussions, it will not proceed. As much as possible, remote connections will be sought, for example via local government offices visiting communities.
Stakeholder engagement process	Government may be too occupied with COVID issues to deal with regular business	Medium	At the national level, Government has its protocols in place for staff, and is requiring a full normal workload. Meetings are being conducted in small groups and via video. Unless there is a major increase in the pandemic, the risk is considered medium to low.
Enabling environment	Impacts on co-financing could result	Medium	The availability of co-financing could be affected by changes in government fiscal priorities and exchange rates. Methods for safe implementation will be needed, such as increased use of remote communication, use of PPE, limited meetings. Government is, however, fully supportive of the project.

Travel by tourists	Lack of tourists as a result of covid reduces livelihood options	High	The project will assess the potential for recovery of the tourism market and to identify specific disease risk mitigation/prevention measures for a post-Covid19 recovery of the tourism industry.
Future zoonoses	Potential for adverse impacts that might contribute to future pandemics, for example, there will be no focus on increasing the human-wildlife interface or any actions that cause degradation	Medium	The project will proactively work to reduce risky human-wildlife interface, towards reducing the risk of future pandemics, while over the long-term promoting an intact landscape with healthy wildlife populations.

Opportunity Category	Potential	Project Plans
Can the project do more to protect and restore natural systems and their ecological functionality?	High	The project has been designed to ensure the long-term integrity, conservation and sustainable use of its target landscape and its ecosystem functions. Reducing encroachment of human land uses and fragmentation of ecosystems will also contribute to reducing the risk of future zoonoses.
Can the project regulate the consumption and trade of wildlife?	High	The project will reduce unregulated hunting and trade of wildlife / wild meat in the target area by strengthening the management of protected areas and promoting alternatives to hunting. Where controlled hunting for tourism is permitted, the opportunities for veterinary control is much greater than is the case for uncontrolled and illegal hunting and therefore the risk of the spread of zoonoses is reduced.
Can the project include a focus on production landscapes and land use practices within them to decrease the risk of human/nature conflicts?	High	The project focuses on the PONASI landscape as a mosaic of various protected areas of different categories, wildlife corridors and the surrounding production landscape. Its objective is to ensure the sustainable management of both protected and surrounding areas. Reducing human-wildlife conflict (here mostly related to elephants) is one of its objectives. Another key objective is to reduce or prevent the encroachment of human land uses (agriculture, pastoralism) into protected areas which results in their fragmentation and increased risk of human-wildlife conflicts with negative impacts for both sides.
Can the project promote circular solutions to reduce unsustainable resource extraction and environmental degradation?	High	The project will ensure sustainable procurement, careful waste management, avoidance of contribution to POPs (eg by reducing the use of pesticides including unauthorized ones in and around the target landscape) and GHG emissions (through forest conservation and restoration). Landscape planning will contribute to recovery of the natural vegetation and enhanced landscape connectivity and carbon storage.

Short-term opportunity to support Covid economic recovery	High	The promotion of sustainable agriculture (129,678 ha under improved practices), agroforestry (11,000 ha restored land) and use of non-timber forest products in and around the target landscapes, as well as sustainable tourism in the protected areas, will all contribute to income generation and the recovery of the local economy. All alternative livelihoods activities are intended towards green growth models and a circular economy by focusing on business models and land uses that incorporate climate, biodiversity and sustainability.
Can the project innovate in climate change mitigation and engaging with the private sector?	High	A large part of the project involves working with local communities to mainstream climate mitigation and biodiversity into their land uses. Under the agro-forest aspects, increased carbon sequestration in agro-forests on what would be otherwise degraded lands, will increase climate mitigation aspects. The project will mitigate the emissions of 5,448,924 metric tons of CO ₂ e.

[1] This amount was equivalent to about US\$ 100,000, amounting to US\$ 55 per individual.

[2] WB. 2008 Implementation Completion and Results Report for the Partnership for Natural Ecosystem Management Project.

[3] MINISTERE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET DU CADRE DE VIE. 2007. Rapport final d'exécution du projet PAGEN - Opinion du Burkinabé.

[4] SRM ensures individuals, peoples, and communities affected by projects have access to appropriate grievance resolution procedures for hearing and addressing project-related complaints and disputes.

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the Institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Institutional arrangements are described in Section IX: Governance and Management Arrangements of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. In addition, a description of the coordination with other relevant initiatives is included in Section V. Results and Partnerships of the UNDP-GEF Project Document.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptaion benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

22. The project will provide monetary and non-monetary benefits to the local stakeholders, including community members, small-scale farmers, herders and forestry workers, users of non-timber forest products and individuals and small businesses owners involved / interested in tourism. These benefits will include: a) implementation of sustainable agro-silvo-pastoral practices including CSA and SLM practices, implementation of improved rangeland, pasture and forest management in the selected pilot sites, implementation of improved resource management in village hunting areas, including a revision of the governance of community-managed areas to ensure a fair and equitable sharing of the benefits related to resource use, and an increase in the income level of participating households; b) technical and financial support and training to members of local communities to implement improved land and resource management practices; c) support for the establishment of small enterprises involved in sustainable forest products processing, including support for their organization into cooperatives, provision of technical training and equipment, securing access to the resources that support the value chains and the sustainability of their use, including through the certification of forest areas where women collect the shea fruits that are processed as part of the shea butter value chain, and providing support for the marketing of the products, and an increase in the income level of participating women and men; d) technical and financial support to establish sustainable community tourism enterprises related to protected areas or to improve existing ones, including trainings for local community members interested in getting involved in tourism activities or existing small enterprises related to tourism, support for the development or improvement of tourism products and to facilitate access to markets, and an increase in the income level of participating women and men; e) capacity building for community / village structures concerned with the collaborative management of PAs to enable them to fulfil the role expected of them in the collaborative PA management process. These benefits will translate in supporting the achievement of global environmental benefits through increasing forest, pasture and farming areas under improved and sustainable practices.

23. At the national level, the project is contributing to institutional capacity building that will benefit Government staff from the Ministry of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change and its regional decentralized directions, including the staff from the Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development (SP/CNDD), the Directorate General of Waters and Forests (DGWF), the National Office of Protected Areas (OFINAP), the Regional Directorates of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change and their subdivisions, and local authorities (collectivités locales). The capacity development of these stakeholders will focus on the environmental land-use planning process at the landscape scale and on various aspects of protected area management, including collaborative management involving local communities adjacent to protected areas, so that the main groups of stakeholders are able to fulfil the role expected of them in the collaborative PA management process. These benefits will translate in supporting the achievement of global environmental benefits through increasing the management effectiveness of the protected areas and the conservation of biodiversity.

24. Through the conservation and sustainable use of land and natural resources and habitats (e.g., non-timber forest products, forests, pastures and rangelands, agroecosystems,), ecosystem services will be enhanced (soil, habitat for biodiversity, carbon stocks, nutrient cycling, climate regulation, and natural assets for tourism) with a positive impact on the well-being of the local communities across the PONASI landscape. The project is expected to directly benefit 18,531 women and 12,354 men.

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the Knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

25. To support the collaborative planning process across the landscape, the project will establish a management system for collecting technical knowledge and relevant lessons learned from the project experiences, and identified through participatory monitoring and evaluation as part of the project annual planning process. Monitoring systems will be established to identify good practices and learn from the implementation of PA and landscape collaborative management, including SLM, forestry, pasture and climate-smart agriculture, and mainstreaming gender, and to measure progress made, based on the project indicators. Lessons learned and good practices will be systematically identified by the Project Coordinator, the M&E expert, the Project Consultation/Dialogue Framework, and key project stakeholders, including local community members participating in the project, as part of the participatory annual review, reporting and planning of the project. The project's Communication and Knowledge Management Expert will collate these learnings and develop knowledge products designed for specific audiences and different purposes.

26. New knowledge will be compiled, disseminated and integrated to allow for adaptive management at the landscape level, units of the landscape and village terroirs. Knowledge on climate-smart agro-sylvo-pastoral practices, establishment of value chains based on sustainable use of NTFP, PA-related tourism development to benefit local communities, and collaborative management of PAs will be presented as technical sheets for relevant technical services in forestry, agriculture and pastoralism and as simplified and accessible learning papers in practical formats and translated in local languages for local beneficiaries. The project will also support the collation of documentation and knowledge products to support institutional capacity building for continued institutional and private sector development. The project will contribute to develop curriculum and training material in various fields related to PA management (output 2.1), including anti-poaching operations (output 2.4), and tourism development (output 3.4).

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

27. Burkina Faso has developed and adopted a national strategy for biological diversity the period 2001 to 2025 and five-year action plans, the most recent one covering the period 2011-2015. The strategy / action plan is being revised to incorporate the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The project is especially relevant to several actions identified in the action plan 2011-2015 and contributes to implement it, namely for the following priority actions: Action 1 under conservation and sustainable use of biological resources which aims to improve the involvement of local populations in the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, especially that of women as main users; Action 2 / Conservation related to awareness of beneficiaries on conservation issues; Action 5 / Conservation promoting the development of climate change-adapted agro-silvo-pastoral systems; Action 7/ Conservation for the registration and delimitation of classified areas and conservation areas; Action 8/ Conservation promoting the safeguarding of ecosystems and habitats of threatened species; Action 10/ Conservation related to strengthening processes for the planning and management of territories; Action 14/ Conservation which aims to develop sub-regional cooperation for the management of shared ecosystems; Action 2/ Sustainable use to better develop and enhance the value of biological resources; Action 4/ Sustainable use to strengthen agroforestry practices and agro-silvo-pastoralism; Action 10/ Sustainable use related to the sustainable management of wildlife and protected areas; Action 14/ Sustainable use for increasing income from the development of biological resources. This project also supports Burkina Faso's commitments to the RAMSAR Convention, by improving the management of the PONASI landscape which has been designated as a RAMSAR site in November 2018.

28. The project contributes to the objectives of the "10-year Strategic Framework Plan to strengthen the implementation of the Convention to Combat Desertification (2008-2018)", related to the UNCCD, specifically the objectives to improve the state of degraded ecosystems, and generate global benefits from the effective implementation of the Convention in synergy with the other two major environmental conventions such as the conservation of land and biodiversity resources and carbon sequestration. The project contributes to implementing Burkina Faso's National Action Programme (NAP 2000) under UNCCD, which highlighted that the country is facing massive desertification and actions such as better land use planning and climate smart agriculture have to be promoted. Outcome 1 is setting up a governance framework and tools to involve stakeholders from multiple sectors in the integrated planning, implementation and monitoring of the PONASI landscape management plan. Through this, the project will address an important challenge identified in the NAP in 2000, namely the compartmentalization of the multiple institutions involved in rural development which complicates the coordination of actions and causes confusion to local communities due to sometimes contradictory discourse among various actors. Through providing a unified framework and supporting local communities in the implementation of sustainable agricultural, rangeland and pastoral practices, this outcome and the outcome 3 are addressing most other national challenges related to lack of community participation, natural resource exploitation and management methods that are increasingly inadequate to the current environmental conditions, the anarchic occupation of space aggravated by large population migrations giving rise to numerous conflicts, disordered movements of livestock transhumance and the exacerbation of competition for the use of natural resources, which are sources of social tensions.

29. In all of its components, the project includes several actions that contribute to implementing the National Plan for Adaptation to Climate Change 2015 which objectives in the environment and natural resources sector include increasing the resilience of ecosystems, improving biodiversity conservation, strengthening ecological research and monitoring, and mitigating GHG emissions.

30. The project supports Burkina Faso's national plan for economic and social development for 2016-2020 (PNDES), the main planning document at the national level, which allows the implementation of priority actions based on the Burkina 2015 foresight document and taking into account the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Through its interventions, the project will contribute more specifically to the following strategic objectives: SO 1.3: Strengthen decentralization and promote good local governance; SO 2.4:

Promote decent work and social protection for all, especially for young people and women; SO 3.1: Sustainable development of a productive and resilient agri-silvo-pastoral, fauna and fisheries sector, more market-oriented and based on the principles of sustainable development; and SO 3.5: Reverse the trend of environmental degradation and ensure sustainable management of natural and environmental resources. The project is in line with the 2025 Vision which stresses the importance of climate risks to sustainable development and economic growth, outlining the linkages with natural resource management and ecosystem services.

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

The budgeted M&E plan is included in Section VIII: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget:

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Inception Workshop	UNDP Country Office	USD 5,000	USD 3,500	Within two months of project document signature
Inception Report	Project Manager	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Risk management	Project Manager Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	Project Manager M&E/Safeguards expert	Paid through Components 1, 2, 3 and 4	USD 5,000 (Gov. contribution /staff time)	Annually before PIR

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Manager Communication / KM expert	Paid through Components 1, 2, 3 and 4	USD 10,000	Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Manager UNDP Country Office M&E/Safeguards expert	Paid through Components 1, 2, 3 and 4	None	On-going
Monitoring of implementation of Stakeholder Engagement Plan	Project Manager UNDP Country Office Community mobilization specialist	Total USD 10,000 - USD 2,000 per year in years 2-5	None	On-going
Monitoring of implementation of Gender Action Plan	Project Manager Gender Specialist	Total USD 10,000 - USD 2,000 per year in years 2-5	None	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Manager M&E/Safeguards expert UNDP Country Office	USD 32,400[2]	None	On-going

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Project Consultation/Dialogue Framework meetings	Project Consultation/Dialogue Framework UNDP Country Office Project Manager	USD 3,000 (Per year: USD 500)	USD 6,000 (Per year: USD 1,000)	At minimum annually
Supervision missions	UNDP Country Office	None[3]	None	Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team	None76	None	Troubleshooting as needed
GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits	UNDP Country Office and Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	To be determined.
Evaluation of missing baseline values for the project indicators in the Project Result Framework	Monitoring and Evaluation/Safeguards Expert With support of other project staff and consultants	USD 18,500[4]	USD 5,000	First year of the project
Development of an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) and monitoring its implementation	Monitoring and Evaluation/Safeguards Expert with support of an ESMP consultant	USD 30,500[5] ⁵	USD 5,000	First year of the project

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Mid-term GEF Core Indicators and GEF Tracking Tools to be updated by the Monitoring and Evaluation/Safeguards Expert with the support of the Forest Engineer/ REDD+ specialist and Expert in PA Management	Project Manager Monitoring and Evaluation/Safeguards Expert With support of other project staff	USD 10,000	USD 6,000 (Per year for years 1, 2, 3: USD 2,000)	Before mid-term review mission takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 30,000	USD 7,500	Between 2 nd and 3 rd PIR.
Terminal GEF Core Indicators and GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by the Monitoring and Evaluation/Safeguards Expert with the support of the Forest Engineer/ REDD+ specialist and Expert in PA Management	Project Manager Monitoring and Evaluation/Safeguards Expert With support of other project staff	USD 10,000	USD 6,000 (Per year for years 4, 5, 6: USD 2,000)	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 35,000	USD 6,000	At least three months before operational closure
Translation of MTR and TE reports into English	UNDP Country Office	USD 10,000 (USD 5,000 / report)	None	As required. GEF will only accept reports in English.
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		USD 204,400	USD 60,000	

[1] Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

[2] Estimated at 5% of Project Manager total time and 20% of Monitoring and Evaluation / Safeguards Expert total time

[3] The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

[4] Estimated at 50% of Monitoring and Evaluation / Safeguards Expert total time in the first year of the project, and additional provision of USD 8,000 for the estimation of missing baseline values in components 2 and 3

[5] Estimated at 50% of Monitoring and Evaluation / Safeguards Expert total time in the first year of the project, and additional provision of USD 20,000 for the preparation of the project ESMP

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, UNDP GEF Executive Coordinator	5/29/2019	Penny Stock, Regional Technical Advisor RBA		penny.stock@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): *Goal 1 – End poverty in all its forms everywhere; Goal 2 – End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture; Goal 5 – Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls; Goal 6 – Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all; Goal 8 – Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all; Goal 12 – Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns; Goal 13 – Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts; and Goal 15 – Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss*

This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document: *Outcome 3.2 – By the end of 2020, populations, especially young people and women in intervention areas (urban/rural), increase their income, adopt sustainable production and consumption patterns, and improve their food security*

This project will be linked to the following results of the UNDP strategic plan: *Output 1.4.1: Scaled-up solutions for the sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and ecological and inclusive value chains*

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	End of project target	Methods of Data Collection and Risks / Assumptions
--	----------------------------------	----------	-----------------	-----------------------	--

<p>Project Objective: To safeguard critical wildlife habitat, biodiversity and ecosystem services in the PONASI Protected Area complex through integrated landscape management, generating multiple benefits for sustainable development in the southern central Burkina Faso.</p>	<p>Mandatory indicator 1 (from the IRRF): Natural resources that are managed under a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime:</p> <p>a) Area of terrestrial habitat under (new) protection (hectares) (ref indicator 8b) b) Area of existing protected area under improved management (hectares) (ref indicator 8a) c) Area under sustainable forest management (hectares) d) Land area devoted to sustainable practices of pastoral management or climate-smart agriculture within pilot sites</p>	<p>a) 0 ha b) 0 ha c) t.b.d in 1st year d) 0 ha</p> <p>(the project has not started yet)</p>	<p>a) 0 ha b) 91,300 ha (Nazinga) c) 28,438 ha d) 0 ha</p> <p>(planning and capacity development stage, implementation not sufficiently advanced to measure areas under sustainable practices)</p>	<p>a) 33,000 ha (corridor 2) b) 321,781 ha (Nazinga, Sissili, PNKT, ZOVICS, corridor 1) c) 85,314 ha (CAF, forest massifs, commune and village forests) d) 39,664 ha of pastoral areas and 4,500 ha under climate-smart agriculture in pilot site lands</p>	<p><i>Data collection source / method</i></p> <p>a) Ref indicator 8b b) Ref indicator 8a c) Annual multi-stakeholder reports prepared by the Project Management Unit with technical support from AP PONASI's Landscape Co-management Platform Technical Core d) Annual multi-stakeholder reports prepared by the Project Management Unit with technical support from AP PONASI's Landscape Co-management Platform Technical Core. The area of farmland managed according to climate-smart practices in other villages in the project area and financed by other stakeholders will be followed by the platform</p> <p><i>Risks:</i> An unstable socio-economic and security context undermines the emergence of environmental sensitivity among the population who are not ready to change their unsustainable use of natural resources and adhere to the requirements of the Integrated Landscape Management Framework.</p> <p><i>Assumption:</i> The preservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services is a priority for regional authorities and local governments who agree to participate in the planning of land and resource use within the landscape and to mobilize the necessary co-financing for its implementation</p>
	<p>Mandatory indicator 2: Number of direct beneficiaries of the project (men and women farmers, forest and</p>	<p>0 (the project has not started yet)</p>	<p>8,095 with 60% women overall a) 90 men in CAFs</p>	<p>30,885 with 60% women overall a) 365 men in</p>	<p><i>Data collection source / method:</i> Household surveys conducted in the project intervention sites at project start, midterm and end.</p>

	<p>agricultural labourers / herders, men and women in value chains and tourism activities), benefiting from livelihoods created or improved in relation to sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystem services within the PONASI landscape, disaggregated by sex. (GEF-7 Core indicator 11)</p>		<p>b) 1600 men and women in pastoral activities c) 300 men and women in climate-smart agriculture activities –<i>terroirs</i> d) 5,100 men and women in communal and village forests (other than PAs and CAFs) e) 50 men and 155 women in non-timber forest products value chains [honey VC: 50 men, 50 women) shea VC: 75 women liane goïne VC: 30 women] f) 15 men and 35 women in tourism g) 375 men and 375 women - paid work (opening of trails, opening and maintenance of firebreaks, management of early fires, rehabilitation of corridor # 2, etc.)</p>	<p>CAFs b) 6400 men and women in pastoral activities c) 1,200 men and women in climate-smart agriculture activities - <i>terroirs</i> d) 20,400 men and women in communal and village forests (other than PAs and CAFs) e) 200 men and 620 women in non-timber forest products value chains honey VC: 200 ho, 200 women) shea VC: 300 women liane goïne VC: 120 women] f) 60 men and 140 women in tourism g) 750 men and 750 women - paid work (opening of trails, opening and maintenance of firebreaks, management of early fires, rehabilitation of corridor # 2, etc.)</p>	<p><i>Risks:</i> Lack of local stakeholder buy-in on biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management measures proposed in the integrated landscape management framework The lack of securing women's rights to access and use of land and resources limits their benefits related to the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources <i>Assumption:</i> Enhanced awareness of environmental degradation trends and their impact, as well as strengthened capacities and institutional framework, lead to increased adoption of sustainable land and natural resource management practices and their effective implementation</p>
--	---	--	---	--	---

	<p><i>Indicator 3:</i> Statistically significant trend in elephant population size in the PONASI landscape</p>	<p>Baseline to be determined during first year of project implementation</p>	<p>No decrease</p>	<p>No decrease</p>	<p><i>Data collection source / method:</i> Annual estimate, during the peak of the dry season, of the density of elephant dung along permanent transects following the methodology of Hedges and Lawson (2006) presented in Hema <i>et al.</i> (2013) Elephants or excrements? Comparison of the power of two survey methods for elephants in West African savanna. <i>Environment and Pollution 2</i>: 14-24.</p> <p><i>Risks:</i> The presence of barriers to elephant movements causes local overload of critical habitat The effect of climate change intensifies the seasonal water scarcity in protected areas and corridors</p> <p><i>Assumption:</i> Ongoing efforts by the Government and its partners have significantly reduced the encroachment of Corridor # 1 by agricultural and pastoral activities and thus ensure security for elephant movement.</p>
--	--	--	--------------------	--------------------	---

	<p><i>Indicator 4:</i> GHG emissions avoided by an integrated landscape management by reducing the rate of deforestation in forest landscapes and restoring natural habitats</p> <p>(GEF-7 Core indicator 6 – Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent))</p>	0 (the project has not started yet)	---	<p>5,448,924 tCO₂eq of GHG corresponding to a 50% reduction in deforestation rate over 394,564 ha (protected areas and forest landscapes) and restoration of 11,000 ha of agroforestry ecosystems</p>	<p><i>Data collection source / method:</i> Updated FAO Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool (EX-ACT) on the basis of area of habitat restored and area where deforestation is reduced.</p> <p>The carbon sequestration estimate has been computed using the Ex-Ante Carbon-Balance Tool (EX-ACT) Tier Standard Edition, developed by FAO. The forest-type selected for the calculations is Tropical Dry Forest, building on a baseline of degraded land in a Dry Tropical climate. The soil-type generally consists of fertile Low Activity Clay loams derived from a basaltic substrate, albeit highly degraded through prior deforestation activity and subsequent over-grazing/agriculture. The annual deforestation rate used is 1%. The project involves a 50% reduction of the deforestation rate over 394,564 ha and the restoration of 11,000 ha of agroforestry ecosystems using indigenous species. Conservatively, instead of the entire 952,000 ha of the PONASI landscape, 394,564 ha were used in the calculation, which corresponds to 354,781 ha of State and community protected areas, including corridors, and 39,783 ha of forests (38,891 ha of large forests, 127 ha commune forests and 765 ha village forests) where improved management effectiveness will reduce deforestation. Over a period of 20 years, approximately 5.4 million tCO₂eq will be sequestered through the project's intervention.</p> <p><i>Risks:</i> Lack of stakeholder buy-in to the measures advocated in the landscape management master plan</p> <p><i>Assumptions:</i> Environmental variability is within normal ranges</p>
<p>Component/ Outcome 1 Framework for Integrated Landscape Management</p>	<p><i>Indicator 5:</i> PONASI landscape area effectively managed in accordance with the</p>	0 (the project has not started yet)	354,781 ha corresponding to the areas of	952,000 ha corresponding to the total area of the	<p><i>Data collection source / method:</i> National Observatory for Sustainable Development, Regional Directorates for the Environment</p>

<p>of PONASI with sustainable financing for its operation</p> <p>1.1 Updated, strengthened and operationalized PONASI landscape co-governance framework to ensure concerted, integrated and equitable management of land and resource use within the 952,000 ha landscape and to maximize environmental and socio-economic benefits.</p>	<p>landscape management master plan</p>		<p>Nazinga, PNKT, Sissili, corridors # 1 and # 2 and ZOVICs</p>	<p>PONASI landscape</p>	<p><i>Risks:</i> Stakeholders have different priorities than conservation and sustainable management of land and natural resources and do not adhere to the landscape management master plan</p> <p>Insufficient resources to implement the landscape management plan</p> <p><i>Assumptions:</i> Regional and communal authorities have adequate capacities to mobilize the resources necessary to implement the landscape management plan and its prescriptions</p>
<p>Component/ Outcome 2</p> <p>Strengthening the PONASI Protected Area System</p> <p>2.1 Increased institutional capacity of protected area management agencies (OFINAP and DGEF) and of the 3 relevant DREEVCCs to manage knowledge and design rules for the use and development of natural resources</p> <p>2.2 Increased effectiveness of PA management over 354,781 ha including State protected areas, community protected areas and wildlife</p>	<p><u>Indicator 6:</u></p> <p>Change in institutional capacity of protected areas management agencies, as measured by the UNDP Capacity Development scorecard for GEF projects:</p> <p>1: Capacities for engagement 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge 3: Capabilities for strategy, policy and legislation development 4: Capacities for management and implementation 5: Capabilities to monitor and evaluate</p>	<p><i>Scores assessed during PPG for OFINAP and DGEF:</i></p> <p>1 : 67% 2 : 40% 3 : 56% 4 : 50% 5 : 17%</p>	<p><i>n.a.</i></p>	<p><i>Scores assessed at end of project for OFINAP and DGEF::</i></p> <p>1 : 89% 2 : 80% 3 : 67% 4 : 67% 5 : 67%</p>	<p><i>Data collection source / method</i></p> <p>Participatory assessment involving concerned stakeholders, using the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard for GEF Projects at the end of the project</p> <p><i>Risks:</i> Inter-institutional mobility of training beneficiaries</p> <p>Difficulties in recruiting the required staff within OFINAP and DGEF due to limited financial resources</p> <p><i>Assumptions:</i></p> <p>All stakeholders including OFINAP and DGEF commit to the capacity building objectives of PAs in the PONASI landscape</p> <p>The Government allocates adequate resources (staff and operational budget) to ensure the effective management of all State PAs in the PONASI landscape</p>
	<p><u>Indicator 7:</u></p> <p>a) Protected area management effectiveness as evidenced by the evolution of METT scores (GEF-7 Core indicator 1.2)</p>	<p>a) <i>Scores assessed during PPG</i> PNKT (39) Sissili (47) Nazinga (75)</p>	<p>a) <i>Scores assessed at midterm</i> reaching a minimum of 50</p>	<p>a) <i>Scores assessed at end-of-project</i> reaching a minimum of 70</p>	<p><i>Data collection source / method</i></p> <p>a) Assessment of changes in PA management effectiveness based on the GEF BD METT score applied at mid-term and end of project</p> <p>b) Decree for gazetting corridor # 2</p>

corridors within the PONASI complex	b) b) Area of newly created protected area (Corridor # 2) (GEF-7 Core indicator 1.1)	corridor #1 (31) ZOVICs Bieha (36) ZOVICs Guiaro and Po (55) b) 0 (the project has not started yet)	b) 0 ha	b) 33,000 ha	<p><i>Risks:</i> Difficulties in recruiting the necessary staff to perform the essential functions of PA management Conflicts related to the occupation of corridor # 2 and the use of its resources are obstacles to its gazettelement and protection</p> <p><i>Assumption:</i> Commitment of stakeholders (local populations and authorities, OFINAP, DGEF, technical services, private concessionaires) to the objective of improving PA management The gazettelement of corridor # 2 is a priority on the agenda of the Legislative Assembly</p>
	<u>Indicator 8:</u> Annual number of human-wildlife conflict cases in hotspots (identified in the first year through the SAFE Systems rapid assessment) including Mantoingo, Zerboko, Yougoudri, Saro, Sia, Natiédougou, Boissa and Boala villages	List of human-wildlife conflict hotspots to be confirmed and reference value of the indicator to be determined in the first year of the project	<i>Decrease in conflicts by 30%</i>	<i>Decrease in conflicts by 70%</i>	<p><i>Data collection source / method</i> Activity report of the management structure of the PONASI complex</p> <p><i>Risks:</i> Insufficient financial resources to implement the human-wildlife conflict reduction strategy</p> <p><i>Assumptions:</i> Commitment of stakeholders and especially local communities to the SAFE Systems approach and to identify and implement solutions to reduce human-wildlife conflicts</p>
	<u>Indicator 9:</u> Average annual number of direct and indirect indications (evidence) of	To be determined during the 1st year of the project	20% reduction	50% reduction	<i>Data collection source / method</i> SMART reports (Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool) of PA surveillance patrols

	illicit activities recorded per patrol outing, including carcasses, snares, visual encounters and arrests of poachers				<p><i>Risks:</i> Insufficient resources allocated to surveillance (staff, equipment, logistics) hinders its effectiveness</p> <p><i>Assumptions:</i> The frequency and coverage of surveillance patrols is adequate to provide the information necessary for effective control of poaching activities. Poachers arrests are followed by appropriate legal action as provided for in the law.</p>
	<p><u>Indicator 10:</u> Condition of Resources in Protected Areas, Including State Protected Areas, ZOVICs, and Corridors</p> <p>a. Relative abundance of large and medium mammals, including Bushbuck <i>Tragelaphus scriptus</i> and Bohor Reedbuck <i>Redunca redunca</i>;</p> <p>b. Relative abundance of small game, including Turtledoves (various species), Guinea fowl (<i>Numida meleagris</i>), and Francolin (<i>Francolinus bicalcaratus</i>);</p> <p>c. Invasion level of PAs by domestic livestock</p>	<p>a. To be determined during the first year of the project</p> <p>b. To be determined during the first year of the project</p> <p>c. To be determined during the first year of the project</p>	<p>a. No decrease</p> <p>b. No decrease</p> <p>c. 20% decrease</p>	<p>a. No decrease</p> <p>b. No decrease</p> <p>c. 50% decrease</p>	<p>Field surveys of target natural resources in intervention sites conducted in the first year, at mid-term and at end of project:</p> <p>a. Relative abundance of medium and large mammals per km² or IKA, namely for Bushbuck <i>Tragelaphus scriptus</i> and Bohor Reedbuck <i>Redunca redunca</i>;</p> <p>b. Kilometric index (numbers of observed birds per covered kilometre) along ecological monitoring transect for Turtledoves (various species), Guinea fowl (<i>Numida meleagris</i>), and Francolin (<i>Francolinus bicalcaratus</i>);</p> <p>c. Level of invasion of PAs by livestock, determined by the average depth of encroachment within the PA.</p>
Component/ Outcome 3 3. Sustainable land	<p><u>Indicator 11:</u> Land area under improved agri-silvo-</p>	0 (the project has not started yet)	25% of the areas targeted for each	75% of the areas targeted for each	<p><i>Data collection source / method</i> Annual reports of the co-governance system</p>

management and livelihood diversification 3.1 Increased adoption of effective agri-silvo-pastoral integrated management of natural and agricultural resources, and climate-smart agriculture by local communities within the PONASI landscape. 3.2 Diversified livelihoods of local communities related to tourism development and value chains based on forest products	pastoral management practices, and climate-smart agriculture) including: a) area of developed agro-pastoral land (total area: 6000 ha within pilot sites) b) communal and village forests and massif forest areas (total area: 39,783 ha) c) pasture areas subject to consensual management tools (total area: 52,886 ha) d) forest management areas (<i>Chantiers d'Aménagement Forestier</i>) whose model is evaluated, revised and implemented (total area: 73,969 ha) (GEF-7 Core indicator 4)		land use category: a) 1,500 ha b) 9,946 ha c) 13,221 ha d) 18,492 ha totaling 43,159 ha	land use category: a) 4,500 ha b) 29,837 ha c) 39 664 ha d) 55,477 ha totaling 129,478 ha	<i>Risks:</i> Lack of stakeholder buy-in to the measures prescribed in the Landscape Management Master Plan <i>Assumptions:</i> Effective mobilization of co-financing to ensure the implementation of the master landscape management plan Men and women stakeholders' willingness to adapt their practices and to adopt improved and more sustainable production schemes
	<u>Indicator 12:</u> Average annual individual income in local communities and number of direct beneficiaries (disaggregated by	a) Reference situation on income and number of direct	a) No significant change expected mid-term (training stage)	a) Revenues increased by 30% for 200 direct beneficiaries (60	<i>Data collection source / method</i> Participatory surveys on household income in intervention sites conducted in the first year and at end of project

	<p>sex) from employment in NTFP value chains and tourism</p> <p>a. from tourism related to protected areas</p> <p>b. from the shea, liane goïne and honey value chains</p>	<p>beneficiaries to be determined in the first year of the project</p> <p>b) Reference situation on income and number of direct beneficiaries to be determined in the first year of the project</p>	<p>b) No significant change expected mid-term (training stage)</p>	<p>men - 140 women)</p> <p>b) Increased income for 820 direct beneficiaries (200 men, 620 women), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - shea value chain: revenues increased by 20% for 300 women - liane goïne value chain: increased revenues by 50% for 120 women - honey value chain: increased revenues by 20% for 200 men and 200 women 	<p><i>Risks:</i></p> <p>Falling market prices for products developed by the value chains</p> <p>Increasing level of insecurity in the country reduces the attractiveness of PONASI sites for international tourists</p> <p><i>Assumptions:</i></p> <p>Stakeholders' willingness to adapt their practices and adopt improved and more sustainable production schemes</p>
	<p><u>Indicator 13:</u></p> <p>Condition of resources in:</p> <p>a. Forest areas including Forest Management Areas (CAF), communes and village forests</p> <p>b. Pasture areas</p>	<p>To be determined in the 1st year of the project</p>	<p>Maintaining or improving values</p>	<p>Maintaining or improving values</p>	<p><i>Data collection source / method</i></p> <p>Field surveys of target natural resources in intervention sites conducted in the first year, at mid-term and at end of project:</p> <p>a. Forest inventories: forest cover, species composition and vegetation structure</p> <p>b. Annual fodder balance to ensure the right balance between stocks and needs</p>

					<p><i>Risks:</i> Lack of stakeholder buy-in to the measures prescribed in the Landscape Management Master Plan</p> <p><i>Assumptions:</i> Effective mobilization of co-financing to ensure the implementation of the master landscape management plan</p> <p>Stakeholders' willingness to adapt their practices and adopt improved and more sustainable production schemes</p>
<p>Component/ Outcome 4</p> <p>4. Gender mainstreaming, and knowledge management and learning</p> <p>4.1 Increased opportunities for women to benefit from the sustainable management of natural resources and PA-related value chains within the PONASI landscape</p> <p>4.2 Appropriation of the knowledge developed in the PONASI project by the various actors within the PONASI landscape and in Burkina Faso</p>	<p><u>Indicator 14:</u></p> <p>Representativeness of women in the collaborative governance arrangement and participating in decision making on land and resource use</p>	<p><i>n.a.</i></p> <p>(the project has not started yet)</p>	30%	30% (Corresponding to the national women representation quota)	<p><i>Data collection source / method :</i> Attendance records of the meetings of the consultation frameworks</p> <p>Updated Action Plan on Gender</p> <p>Project Progress Reports</p> <p><i>Risks:</i> Socio-cultural constraints within certain ethnic groups may limit women's participation and increase their vulnerability to face risks</p> <p>The financial vulnerability of women and the difficulty of accessing credit are a hindrance to their participation in the implementation of project proposals</p> <p>The lack of securing women's rights to access and use of land and resources limits their benefits related to the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources</p> <p><i>Assumptions:</i> Continued interest of women to participate in the project</p> <p>Each structure represented in the consultation framework encourages the participation of women in the consultation framework for the integrated management of the PONASI landscape and has the possibility of proposing one or more women</p>
	<p><u>Indicator 15:</u></p> <p>Proportion of village groups / associations that apply knowledge</p>	<p>0% (the project has not started yet)</p>	20%	80%	<p><i>Data collection source / method :</i> Survey reports covering the entire PONASI landscape, including village communities outside pilot intervention sites</p>

	shared through the project, outside the pilot intervention sites			<p><i>Risks:</i> Lack of stakeholder buy-in of knowledge generated by the project and of the measures recommended in the landscape management master plan</p> <p>Insufficient financial resources to implement the landscape management master plan</p> <p><i>Assumptions:</i> Each group / association is able to mobilize resources for knowledge translation and implementation of the measures recommended in the landscape management master plan</p>
--	--	--	--	--

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference in CEO Endorsement Document
GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS - THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND July 24th, 2017		

3) The project is proposing far too many plans: "PA management plans, action plans, operational plans, business plans, species management plans, community engagement plans. With that "paper-based" activities there is going to be no funding for improving the effectiveness of the 4 target PAs. Please reconsider all these TA activities and concentrate more in INV. May want to reconsider the number of PAs so more resources become available for the priority areas.

The project is working on 3 state PAs (Kaboré-Tambi National Park, Nazinga Game Ranch, Sissili Classified Forest), 1 corridor (Corridor #2, as Corridor #1 is supported by Natudev with FFEM funds) and is no longer working in Nazinon as a protected area but as Forest Management Site (*Chantier d'Aménagement Forestier*) as explained in Part 2, section A. "Paper" management tools will include management plans that will be translated into annual operational plans, one integrated business plan for the complex of protected areas, and collaborative management agreements with neighbouring villages/communities. PA management plans will include sustainable management measures for the species used, namely hunted ones. One landscape-level conservation plan will be developed for elephants.

To facilitate the development of management tools and ensure consistency and quality standards, the project will develop templates and guidance material. These materials will alleviate the work during the project and also outside the project intervention area and for updating these plans in the future.

Furthermore, the project will build on the existing draft or outdated management plans for Kaboré-Tambi National Park and for the Nazinga Game Ranch, which already contain a lot of contextual information that will only need to be updated.

Section 2.1.3 of the Project Document "Capacity development program developed and implemented" provides for significant investments in capacity building and the consolidation of infrastructure and essential management equipment, including the construction of a new building for the Kaboré-Tambi National Park to provide adequate space for PA management unit offices, common workspaces and visitor reception desk/office; equipment for monitoring and surveillance, demarcation, signage, acquiring a 4x4 vehicle and motorcycles, establishing long-term ecological monitoring with permanent transects and routes, communication equipment for field activities and office equipment.

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 2, outputs 2.1 and 2.2.

5) Please elaborate on the Elephant protection plan (p.13). The PIF suggest developing and implementation of the plan. What are the suggested investments for this part of Component 2? This is particularly important if the project aims at stabilizing or increasing the elephant population. Is Ghana engaged in the proposed activities? Do not include Ghana unless they know they are being cited in the PIF.

The elephant protection Plan rests on the resolution of human-elephant conflicts in the PONASI landscape using the SAFE Systems approach, on the results of a tightly targeted research project to document elephant movements within and around the PONASI PA complex, including transboundary movements to northern Ghana, on the renewal of transboundary collaboration agreements with Ghana for the conservation of shared natural resources, and on securing essential habitats across the State and community protected areas and corridors. The research program will identify any gap that need to be integrated in the conservation/protection efforts.

The SAFE System Approach aims at making an area safer for people and their assets, and for wildlife and their habitats. The key feature of the SAFE Approach is that it captures an initial SAFE baseline for each component through a Rapid Assessment of HWC established through a workshop gathering relevant stakeholders (local decision makers and people involved in livestock, agriculture, forestry, community development, police, health, education and protected areas). The rapid assessment workshop allows discussing conflict, historical trends and identifying gaps and actions. The results of the assessment are then developed into a SAFE Strategy for the area.

Under the Output 2.2.4, the project will seek to establish a formal collaboration with the Ghana Government i) to contribute to the research program to document/understand elephant movements in Northern Ghana as part of their potential westward migration route from the PONASI landscape, before moving back north, ii) to coordinate monitoring, surveillance, and anti-poaching programs conducted on both sides of the border, and iii) to renew transboundary collaboration agreements between Burkina Faso and Ghana Governments for the conservation of shared natural resources, namely elephants.

During the PPG process, a consultant had informal meetings in Northern Ghana with three (3) officers of the Wildlife Division, the Director of the local NGO Organization for Indigenous Initiatives and Sustainability (ORGIIS) providing support to local communities for the sustainable management of Community resource management areas (CREMAs), and with the President of the Center for the Development of Wildlife Production and of the West African Elephant Corridors Coalition. In Ghana, the Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission is responsible for the protection and management of wildlife protected areas. The three officers were the Regional Director of Wildlife, the Wildlife Manager in charge of corridors and CREMAs and the Regional Manager of Wildlife Management Planning. CREMAs in Ghana are protected areas managed under a community-based governance regime, similar to ZOVICs in Burkina Faso. One hypothesis is that after crossing the

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 2, output 2.4

Comments from the US - 21 November 2017

1. Can this project focus more explicitly on supporting local communities getting economic value from improved environmental practices as part of the effectiveness and sustainability planning?

The monetary and non-monetary benefits that the local stakeholders will derive from improved practices are presented in the section A.7 on Benefits.

CEO ER A.7 Benefits

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships

2. Can the project more clearly link to UNCCD? Or perhaps greater clarity is needed to clearly explain and layout the link to UNCCD, which is not apparent in the current PIF.

The project contributes to the objectives of the "10-year Strategic Framework Plan to strengthen the implementation of the Convention to Combat Desertification (2008-2018)", related to the UNCCD, specifically the objectives to improve the state of degraded ecosystems, and generate global benefits from the effective implementation of the Convention in synergy with the other two major environmental conventions such as the conservation of land and biodiversity resources and carbon sequestration. The project contributes to implementing Burkina Faso's National Action Programme (NAP 2000) under UNCCD, which highlighted that the country is facing massive desertification and actions such as better land use planning and climate smart agriculture have to be promoted. Outcome 1 is setting up a governance framework and tools to involve stakeholders from multiple sectors in the integrated planning, implementation and monitoring of the PONASI landscape management plan. Through this, the project will address an important challenge identified in the NAP in 2000, namely the compartmentalization of the multiple institutions involved in rural development which complicates the coordination of actions and causes confusion to local communities due to sometimes contradictory discourse among various actors. Through providing a unified framework and supporting local communities in the implementation of sustainable agricultural, rangeland and pastoral practices, this outcome and the outcome 3 are addressing most other national challenges related to lack of community participation, natural resource exploitation and management methods that are increasingly inadequate to the current environmental conditions, the anarchic occupation of space aggravated by large population migrations giving rise to numerous conflicts, disordered movements of livestock transhumance and the exacerbation of competition for the use of natural resources, which are sources of social tensions.

CEO ER B.1 Consistency with National Priorities.
GEF-UNDP Project Document – Section II Development Challenge,
Consistency with national priorities

3. How will members of the land management board will be chosen, and what will be the general breakdown of affiliations (local, governmental, etc)? What will be the requirements for participation, if any?

The project will build on the foundations of a multi-stakeholder management body that was set up as part of the EU-funded *PONASI* project implemented by Naturama/GRET/AFAUDEB from 2014 to 2017 for the concerted management of the PONASI protected area complex. As described in the Project Document, the multi-stakeholder management body will be updated and its membership revised through the following tasks: i) identification of the mission of the co-governance mechanism; ii) analysis of stakeholders in landscape management at all levels, including local and community actors and proposal of composition and identification of roles of each party in the process; iii) participatory confirmation / validation of the proposed composition, iv) identification of the selection criteria for the members of the mechanism (apart from the representatives of the institutions, the participants in the mechanism will be identified by the representative organizations of the stakeholders, ensuring that they take into account geographic representation and gender), v) consultation mechanism with local communities to ensure integration of their priorities and concerns into management decisions, and vi) conflict resolution mechanism within the landscape.

The composition of the PONASI landscape management board will be dictated by the need to harmonize the different management jurisdictions on the specific management units within the landscape, such as State protected areas, wildlife corridors and ZOVICs as community protected areas, forest massifs as well as village and communal forests, forest management sites (CAFs), pastoral areas, transhumance corridors, and agro-sylvo-pastoral lands. A preliminary identification of the members of the management board, to be revised in the early stages of the project, includes: DGEF, OFINAP, and DREEVCCs, devolved technical structures in charge of Planning (DREP) and rural sector departments (Agriculture, Livestock, Water); local authorities (communes and regions); Regional Councils for Gender Promotion; representatives of resource users: Regional Chambers of Agriculture, Forest Management Unions, Hunters' Associations and Hunting concession holders; projects and public development programs in the rural sector involved in the PONASI landscape; national and international NGOs active in the field of conservation and sustainable land and resource management in the PONASI landscape.

To support their commitment to the landscape management plan, local communities and stakeholders must be placed at the heart of the decision-making process, allowing them to understand land use options and decide on priority actions, including associated costs and benefits. Private sector participation is important to provide a stable market for products of local communities from forests and resources that are sustainably managed. Ecotourism and other private sector

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 1, Output 1.1

A significant number of generalities are provided with little or no explanation of what will actually be done, nor any reference to any scientific or technical support on the effectiveness and costs of these approaches. For example:

What are "target capacity development interventions"?

Capacity development interventions targeting specific beneficiaries are planned under components 1, 2 and 3, and knowledge sharing material to be used for capacity building will be elaborated under component 4.

Under component 1, the project provides capacity building for landscape management stakeholders at all levels, including local communities' representatives, to ensure optimal and open input from all categories of stakeholders. Under component 2, the project provides capacity building for community / village structures concerned with the collaborative management of PAs to enable them to fulfil the role expected of them in the collaborative PA management process, including involving them in decision-making, planning, and monitoring and surveillance activities.

Under component 3, capacity development interventions targeting local communities users of natural resources will involve trainings for the implementation of sustainable agro-silvo-pastoral practices including CSA and SLM practices through demonstration sites established as field schools, and for improving, land and resource management practices in various ecosystems including rangelands, pastures and forests, and to implement improved resource management in village hunting areas, namely for decision-making and planning management, and for monitoring captures against established quotas. Interventions will also comprise training to support the establishment of small enterprises involved in the processing of sustainable forest products, including support for their organization into cooperatives, provision of technical training and equipment, training on sustainable collection of forest products, several trainings on various aspects of processing and marketing of the products, and technical training to support the establishment of sustainable community tourism enterprises related to protected areas or to improve existing ones, and to facilitate access to markets.

At the national level, the project's interventions for building capacities will target Government staff of the Ministry of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change and its regional decentralized directions, including the staff from the Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development, the Directorate General of Waters and Forests, the National Office of Protected Areas, the Regional Directorates of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change and their subdivisions, and local authorities (*collectivités locales*). As part of component 1, capacity development for these stakeholders will focus on the environmental land-use planning process at the landscape level. As part of component 2, capacity development will be on various aspects of protected area management, including improving communication skills of PA managers to facilitate negotiations with local

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 4.

What does a "wildlife corridor governance management regime established and operationalized" look like?

Corridors will be managed following the same participatory approach as for protected areas, with clear objectives, management rules, zoning and rules regarding possible resource uses, collaboration with neighboring local communities and related agreements, identifying local communities' responsibilities and benefits. Corridors are integrated under the output 2.2 for the improvement of management effectiveness of PAs as wildlife corridors are part of the PAs according to the Burkinabé Forest Code, and the same management tools and collaborative processes with adjacent communities will be developed for corridors as for other PAs. Both corridors #1 and #2 have been established under the PAGEN project but their creation could not be formalized before the closing of the project. A national NGO, Natudev is working in corridor #1 to formalize its status and operationalize its management with the collaboration of local communities. The project will mainly focus on the corridor #2 and work in close collaboration with Natudev and with institutions in charge of PAs to harmonize approaches and management tools for both corridors.

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 2, output 2.2.

What does the phrase "operationalizing a landscape approach" mean, and where has this worked (or failed) before? Landscape Management Boards seldom work. Why would this area be different? Where is the community buy-in and participation?

The project is building on the lessons learned through the GEF-UNDP Country Partnership Program (CPP) for Sustainable Land Management and its sub-programs in multi-stakeholder partnership for the local governance of natural resources and at the landscape scale, namely the consultation platform for planning.

The establishment of a functional regional partnership platform for sustainable land management (PRP-GDT) has been the key strategic tool for the conduct of CPP projects. According to the evaluation reports of the CPP sub-programs, this framework appears to be a pioneering initiative in Burkina Faso that has even influenced national thinking on the coordination and improvement of the synergies of interventions in the rural sector in general and in rural areas and that of sustainable land management in particular. For most of the stakeholders met by the evaluation missions, the partnership at regional level is the greatest comparative advantage of projects whose impacts (actual or potential) in terms of good governance of natural resources in the regions are highest: significant changes in mentality and the way of doing things, greater openness of actors to collaboration, the sharing of actions and even means, changes in methods and operational strategies of rural development projects and programs, improvement of the capacities of institutions and actors to understand and integrate SLM into planning tools and local development strategies

The design of the framework for integrated management of the PONASI landscape rests on lessons learned from these projects. According to the evaluations and stakeholders of these projects, establishing partnerships at the regional level was key to their successful achievements. These partnerships have led to greater openness and collaboration, and even sharing of actions and resources, thus leading to changes in the methods and operational strategies of rural development projects and programs that previously had a tendency to work in silo and improved the capacity of institutions and actors to understand SLM and integrate it into planning tools and local development strategies.

The experience gained by the Ministry of Environment, Green Economy Climate Change in the context of the CPP program and in the framework of the PONASI project supported by the EU and Naturama has shown that the sustainability of consultation and partnership mechanisms for sustainable land management depends closely on the continued funding of the platform and its autonomous operation. Another lesson from the CPP program is that the collaborative planning process, by making transparent the resource planning mobilized by the stakeholders in the partnership, significantly improves the funding of natural resource management and acts as an incentive to technical and financial partners to

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 1 and Section VIII. Governance and Management Arrangements

Under Component 3 regarding Sustainable Land Management (SLM), a large number of interventions are mentioned, including the following: improving agricultural productivity and resilience, climate smart agriculture, sustainable harvesting of wood and biomass energy, forest restoration, fire management-assisted natural regeneration, assisted natural regeneration and water management. However, no technical case is made for any of these interventions, nor is the viability of undertaking this large range of activities with 30,000 people and \$200,000 a year discussed.

The project mainly promotes the adoption of SLM, agro-silvo-pastoralism and ANR, namely for their cost-effectiveness and multiple benefits. The effectiveness of SLM for improving production have been recently demonstrated as part of the CPP Subprogram in the Boucle du Mouhoun. The results illustrate the important contribution of sustainable land management actions to increasing agricultural yields. Through soil defense and restoration, and water and soil conservation (DRS/CES) activities, including zai, stone bunds, mounds, and the use of organic manure, yields have doubled for most crops except maize and the development of lowlands for rice cultivation tripled rice yields from 1.7 T/ha to 5.2 T/ha.

Evolution of yields with SLM in Boucle du Mouhoun

Culture	Yield in traditional culture	Yield with SLM
Rice	1 to 2 T/ha	4 to 5 T/ha
Cotton	500 to 600 Kg/ha	900 to 1000 kg/ha
Maize	2.3T/ha	2.5 to 3T/ha
Sorghum	600 to 800 Kg/ha	1 to 1.5 T/ha
Niebe	600 kg/ha	1 T/ha

Source : Report of the CPP Boucle du Mouhoun sub-programme, 2018

Also, ANR will be preferred over other approaches to restore forest habitats as it has been shown that ANR significantly reduces the cost of restoration. Spontaneous and assisted natural regeneration in tropical regions are more effective than tree planting at achieving the recovery of biodiversity and forest structure and could help save 50 to 95% of the cost of forest restoration. Furthermore, it has been shown that natural regeneration can restore forest cover on its own within a few years.

The project will support the establishment of multi-thematic demonstration or joint experimentation sites with the support of devolved technical services and relevant local NGOs, in pilot sites where farmers, herders, and other stakeholders will develop skills and knowledge on various agricultural and agroforestry topics for the adoption of sustainable and climate-adapted practices. These sites will preferably be established on the farms and managed by local "innovative" labourers, in order to control the costs of implementation. Training will be provided through theoretical instruction, on-site field demonstration and trainings, supervised learning-by-doing and provision of customized advice through visits to the farms and demonstration sites. The project will also support the

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 3, output 3.1.3, annex L

<p>The introduction of hunting, especially safari hunting, is very sensible and possibly one of the few viable tourism activities. But tourism is not an entry level business for communities, and most community-based tourism initiatives fail unless linked to successful private sector tourism businesses. STAP recommends that project proponents consider investing in tourism activities to provide jobs, regardless of whether this is community-based tourism or not.</p>	<p>We welcome this suggestion and have taken it into account for the development of output 3.4.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 3, output 3.4.</p>
<p>In addition, a major gap in the project relates to the understanding of community land tenure and governance. In the absence of a resolution of what looks like an open access problem, the current tragedy of the commons is likely to continue. More than 80% of the population depends on working the land for food and other needs. How will land tenure and land governance issues affect implementation of this project? What is the situation in Burkina Faso and in this area in particular?</p>	<p>The PONASI Protected Area Landscape is a patchwork of recognized land units that have been relatively well delineated and fall under different jurisdictions. The boundaries, although known, are not always well demarcated or respected, and not all authorities have the means to enforce the regulations governing the use of these lands and resources. Governance arrangements have been established and include provisions for revenue sharing arising from the use of resources within these units. These units have been identified, described and their condition assessed under the PNGT2-3 project. The project will contribute to revise these arrangements, confirm boundaries with the participations of concerned stakeholders wherever required, and ensure that measures to ensure fair and equitable sharing of revenues from the use of land and natural resources are integrated and implemented.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcomes 2 and 3</p>

In terms of the implementation mechanism, STAP is somewhat skeptical that a planning tool alone will solve the problems, especially given little or no description of how this tool works. The application of the Environmental Land-Use Planning (ELUP) tool for spatial planning and decision-making based on an assessment of trade-offs is a strong initial step in terms of generating buy-in from stakeholders and for setting the stage for implementing actions including improved management. However, it is not clear from the PIF why this particular model was selected and how it compares to the multitude of tools and methods currently available (Bagstad et al., 2013). And this tool seeks to accomplish many complex objectives including carbon mapping, what type of capacity is needed to use the tool effectively? Will there be training to ensure that capacity is developed in-country to ensure future utilization once the project is complete? Is this included in Output 2.1 related to institutional capacity of the PA Agency?

Environmental land use planning will be based on the valuation of the ecosystem goods and services (ES) produced by the various compartments of the PONASI landscape with a view to optimizing them at the scale of the PONASI protected area landscape. The identification of the most appropriate tool for environmental land use planning has been facilitated by consulting the recommended paper by Bagstad *et al.*, 2013, and of the following collection of tools for measuring, modelling and evaluating ecosystem services (ES) developed by IUCN (Neugarten, R.A., Langhammer, P.F., Osipova, E., Bagstad, K.J., Bhagabati, N., Butchart, S.H.M., Dudley, N., Elliott, V., Gerber, L.R., Gutierrez Arrellano, C., Ivanić, K.-Z., Kettunen, M., Mandle, L., Merriman, J.C., Mulligan, M., Peh, K.S.-H., Raudsepp-Hearne, C., Semmens, D.J., Stolton, S., Willcock, S. (2018). *Tools for measuring, modelling, and valuing ecosystem services: Guidance for Key Biodiversity Areas, natural World Heritage Sites, and protected areas*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. x + 70pp.). This documented compilation made it possible to identify a tool that can be easily managed, including by the actors in the field, the Toolkit for Ecosystem Service Site-based Assessment.V.2.0 (TESSA). According to this document, capacity requirements for using this tool are low, but the process will be guided by an environmental land use planning expert, and the project includes a specific output 1.1.3 to build capacity of the various stakeholders - who are not necessarily directly involved in PA management- to fulfil their role in the land use planning process at all levels and to ensure their optimal and open input. The capacities of the multi-stakeholder management body will be strengthened in terms of abilities to lead the processes of planning, negotiating with competing interests, and decision-making on the land and resource development and planning priorities at landscape level to reduce conflicts of interest between different users. Lead agencies in the planning process (governmental and non-governmental organizations) must have the ability to engage with a broad range of stakeholders, facilitate the process, generate and disseminate key data or information, and connect with the private sector and development partners within the landscape and beyond, to provide the financial resources and support needed to implement the master plan for the development of the landscape and generate benefits from natural resources and ecosystem services. The environmental land use planning expert will coordinate the identification of capacities to be developed for the different actors involved in the collaborative management process and will develop a targeted training plan which he will implement for the most part, with the support of environmental NGOs working with local communities in the PONASI area.

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 1, Output 1.1.

It might assist in solving problems if the tool is tied to a well-managed stakeholder planning process that involves the relevant authorities at meso-level, and the local communities at micro-level. Tools that include such processes are the Logical Framework Approach and the RAPTA Guidelines (See <http://www.stagef.org/rapta-guidelines>) (O'Connell et al., 2016).

The project provides for a stakeholder planning process involving stakeholders at all levels, including local authorities (*collectivités*) at the regional and commune levels that already have budget resources for land use planning and development which could be mobilized to ensure the sustainability of the landscape-scale planning process. The project is building on the achievements of previous projects to avoid the multiplication of structures and increase cost-effectiveness.

The foundations of an alliance between the Government and the local groups and institutions for a concerted management of the PONASI protected area complex were set up within the framework of the *PONASI* project implemented from 2014 to 2017 by Naturama/GRET/AFAUDEB and funded by the EU. The project will build on the lessons learned from this project and the experience gained through the GEF-UNDP Country Partnership Program (CPP) for Sustainable Land Management and its sub-programs in multi-stakeholder partnership for the local governance of natural resources and at the landscape scale, more particularly the consultation platform for planning and the National Observatory of the Environment and Sustainable Development for the monitoring the state of the environment based on indicators.

The multi-stakeholder management body will be updated and its membership revised with the following tasks: i) identification of the mission of the co-governance mechanism; ii) analysis of stakeholders in landscape management at all levels, including local and community actors and proposal of composition and identification of roles of each party in the process; iii) participatory confirmation / validation of the proposed composition, iv) identification of the selection criteria for the members of the mechanism (apart from the representatives of the institutions, the participants in the mechanism will be identified by the representative organizations of the stakeholders, ensuring that they take into account geographic representation and gender), v) consultation mechanism with local communities to ensure integration of their priorities and concerns into management decisions, vi) conflict resolution mechanism within the landscape.

To support their commitment to the landscape management plan, local communities and stakeholders need to be placed at the heart of the decision-making process, allowing them to understand land use options and decide on priority actions, including associated costs and benefits. Private sector participation is important to provide a stable market for products of local communities from forests and resources that are sustainably managed. Ecotourism and other private sector companies that are compatible with conservation goals can contribute to sustainable management and restoration efforts.

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 1

In addition, the project is hoping to develop a wildlife-based economy based on tourism. However, some travel sites warn tourists against traveling to Burkina Faso due to "regional insecurity and social unrest." If this is a legitimate risk, it should be noted in the risk section including an associated mitigation strategy. And building a tourism-based economy will rely not only on the existence of elephants but also on tourism-based infrastructure such as dedicated roads, housing, guides, etc. It is not clear what the potential for tourism is in this part of Burkina Faso. One possible tool that can be used to assess potential benefits of tourism is the Tourism Economic Model for Protected Areas (TEMPA) under development by STAP, perhaps in Nazinga, where some level of tourism has already been established, but which is increasingly under threat from illegal logging and agriculture expansion (Diombe et al., 2017).

Regional insecurity is indeed a legitimate risk and is likely to affect the development and implementation of a tourism strategy in the PONASI landscape, even though the area is still reported as safe. While the PONASI area has not seen any incident and is considered as being safe, the security situation in some areas of the country is a cause for concern and is likely to deter foreign tourists to travel to Burkina Faso. The area is accessible within 2 hours drive from the capital city and has a real potential for tourism, provided it is supported along a coherent strategy for the whole landscape, and integrates cultural as well as natural assets, as is proposed under output 3.4. Should the government's efforts to counter terrorism be successful and the security climate restored, tourism could eventually have a positive impact on biodiversity and local communities' livelihoods and ownership of protected areas and natural assets for vision tourism such as the presence of elephants and other mammals. Because of security risks in the country, the project will initially look at domestic travel (including from expatriates) and business travelers (who want an add-on tour) from Ouagadougou and existing visitors (e.g. hunters and their entourage; people staying for elephant viewing). As part of the establishment of a sustainable tourism strategy for the PONASI landscape, a solid analysis of the current supply and market demand, including a financial analysis of the current flow of revenues within the system and of benefit sharing mechanisms with local communities will be conducted, which could not be done as part of the PPG phase.

As a mitigation measure, it was decided, and supported by the Project Result Framework validation workshop, to have a more diversified strategy for the development of sustainable livelihoods linked to PAs and to the sustainable use of forest products, and include an additional livelihood output for the development of three promising value chains based on the sustainable use of NTFP, targeting mainly women as beneficiaries, and putting in place the conditions for sustainability: "Output 3.3 Sustainable local forest products processing enterprises are established, providing livelihoods and generating sustained income, especially for women and vulnerable people."

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 3, Outputs 3.4 and 3.3

The project lists many existing projects and past GEF projects that will be consulted and coordinated with. GEF/UNDP project 4221 (Protected Area Buffer Zone Management in Burkina Faso) received several unsatisfactory ratings, so there are probably lessons to be learned that can be applied to this proposed project.

The terminal evaluation conducted in 2018 rated this project as satisfactory. The main conclusions underlined the fact that results were visible and tangible which led to indications of change in behavior of local populations who got involved in surveillance, reforestation and fight against forest fires to support the management of protected areas. Best practices are mainly related to providing support to local communities. Main learnings from the project are that i) tangible and visible actions in favor of local communities contribute most to develop their ownership of the project, ii) support to village communities (such as women groups and hunters) led to reduced workload, enhanced quality and productivity, diversified production and improvement of the quality of life and schooling of children, which, in return, was an incentive to foster their involvement in the management of protected areas and buffer zones, iii) support to beekeeping results in a better protection against fires in the forests where beehives are installed. Furthermore, negative points pointed at the absence of a communication specialist which prevented the dissemination of the project results, the need to strengthen the capacities of communes on biodiversity and environmental concerns, and the importance that agreements/charts developed with communities are available in local and accessible language.

These learnings have been integrated in outputs under the project component 3 which provides for support to improved production practices in forestry, pastoralism and agriculture, establishment of three sustainable value chains based on non-timber forest products (including beekeeping), and establishment of sustainable community tourism enterprises linked to protected areas.

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships, Outcome 3

2.1.2. There was not an appropriate respond to this question. What were the findings of the PPG regarding this matter? This is a critical point that should have been addressed during the project preparation. If no provider was identified, it is not clear why one would appear during the first year of the project. This is a matter that cannot be resolved with a Tender. And SMART is just a tool that indeed IUCN and WCS can assist in its deployment.

Thank you. It seems that this comment is about the service provider for trainings under the output 2.1.3 Capacity development program developed and implemented - rather than 2.1.2.

Possible providers for training on the SMART approach to monitor and report on poaching occurrences include IUCN regional office (based in Ouagadougou) and WCS (without representation in the BF, the nearest office being located in Cameroon). Another potential provider for technical training is Wildlife Angel (wilang.org), a French-Burkinabé Non-Profit Organization specialised in organizing natural and wildlife parks protection, especially in Africa. The NGO has a multidisciplinary team with expertise in wildlife, legal and medical aspects, and communication with local populations. Among their 4 commitments: conduct effective actions to reduce poaching in areas under their responsibility, and enforce anti-poaching teams' compliance with human rights regulations, especially those of poachers. Wildlife Angel has a permanent branch in Burkina Faso since 2017 to intervene throughout West Africa. This branch is under the responsibility of Mr. Benjamin Bassono, who is also the private concessionaire operating the Nahouri Safari camp in the Nazinga Game Ranch. The NGO's operations are taking place in Nazinga and in the Pama Reserve in western Burkina Faso. On their website, they report having trained over 100 ecoguards for the protected areas Arly and W, and approximately 40 for the Nazinga GR. Trainings in Nazinga were supported by the Brigitte Bardot Foundation. Their approach is technical and military but also includes involving local communities and traditional authorities in the fight against poaching to establish an information network to anticipate poachers' presence and adapt response. (Please see ProDoc Section IV Results and Partnerships, output 2.1.3 Capacity development program developed and implemented, parag. 156)

The Director General of Water and Forests at the Ministry of the Environment ensures that the Wildlife and Hunting Directorate (DFRC) is adequately qualified to train ecoguards, rangers and other actors in the field for the effective conduct of anti-poaching activities. Given the capacity level generally observed, it would be preferable that training be planned and provided by the international expert, with the collaboration of the DFRC.

GEF-UNDP Project Document - Section IV Results and Partnerships, output 2.1.3 Capacity development program developed and implemented, parag. 156

<p>2.1.2. i) What is the institution where these information systems are going to be placed?</p>	<p>i) Within the Directorate General of Water and Forests, ecological monitoring is under the supervision of the Department of Planning and Ecological Monitoring of the DFRC which includes 3 officers and 1 engineer. It can provide support to OFINAP and concessionaires as needed. They are supported in the field by seven (7) forest stations and brigades set up specifically for PAs, four for the RGN and three for the PNKT, with respectively 10 (RGN) and 11 (PNKT) forest agents.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document - Section II Dev. Challenge, Barriers to implementing the long-term solution, parag.58</p>
<p>ii) Who is going to be responsible for the day-today and to pay the recurrent costs?</p>	<p>Thank you. The financial and operational accountability of the long-term ecological monitoring system for the PONASI PAs will be borne by the DFRC and the institution that will be identified from a decision taken during the workshop under Output 2.1.1. At this stage, it is not possible to provide a definitive answer.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document - Section IV Results and Partnerships, Output 2.1.1</p>
<p>iii) What is the experience and installed capacity (human and institutional) to set up and run the systems?</p>	<p>Ecological monitoring will be conducted with the support of the Department of Planning and Ecological Monitoring of the DFRC supported in the field by seven (7) forest stations and brigades dedicated to PAs (4 for the RGN and 3 for the PNKT) with respectively 10 (RGN) and 11 (PNKT) forest agents. A monitoring framework with resources is in place within OFINAP, with a minimum of required resource, which enabled the monitoring of medium and large mammal species in the Nazinga Game Ranch over approximately 30 years. An ongoing project (ending end of November 2019), PAPSA, supported the setting up of a monitoring mechanism at OFINAP and at the Ministry level.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document - Section IV Results and Partnerships, Output 2.1.2 (information system implemented) parag. 147</p>

<p>2.2.2 (a) The decision to go via Trophy Hunting appears to have been taken. On the one hand, there is the i) <i>Assessment of the sustainability of hunting management in ZOVICs, the NGR and Sissili CF with the support of a wildlife hunting expert</i> and on the other hand, there are 5 more activities that are already geared towards this type of tourism: ii) <i>A workshop led by a consultant expert in wildlife hunting in year 2 to develop a national consensus on the issue of shifting hunting tourism for vision tourism in the NGR and the Sissili CF</i>; iii) participatory identification of conservation objectives for exploited species with the support of the wildlife expert; iv) Determination of sustainable harvest thresholds; v) Establishment of a monitoring system to collect hunting statistics and vi) Development of guidance documents to facilitate annual updating of management actions. Regarding these activities.</p>	<p>i) The text has been reworded and clarifications added to clarify that the suite of activities related to strengthening the management of hunting activities will flow from the decision made at the workshop.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document - Section IV Results and Partnerships, output 2.2.2, parag. 170, 171 and output 2.3.2, parag. 199.</p>
<p>ii) Do the project proponents believe that it is possible to obtain a “national consensus” on the issue of shifting hunting tourism for “vision tourism”?</p>	<p>ii) “to obtain a national consensus” was used as opposed to a project-driven decision – however, for better clarity as to the purpose of the workshop, this has been reformulated as “to support decision-making by relevant national actors”</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document - Section IV Results and Partnerships, Output 2.2.2, parag. 171</p>

iii) What is the roster of potential “wildlife expert identified at PPG stage that can deliver this and the the above-mentioned activity?

Based on consultations during the PPG, it appears that the pool of service providers in Burkina Faso with expertise in wildlife conservation vs hunting is very limited. Recent consultations with the General Director of Waters and Forests pointed to the identification of 2 international experts in hunting management who previously worked in Burkina Faso:

- Mr Geoffroy Mauvais, who worked for IUCN / BRAO in Burkina Faso (now based in South Africa)
- Mr Philippe Chardonnet who also worked in Burkina Faso (now based in France)

Philippe Chardonnet is specialized in wildlife and livestock in several tropical countries especially in West and Central Africa. His work focuses on wildlife management and rural development, community-based wildlife management, sustainable use of wildlife, conservation of threatened species with particular focus on antelopes, buffalo, and lion. In BF, he worked on the WAP ecosystem, studied elephant movements in the W park – and is co-author of several papers with the late Philippe Bouché who published several papers on Burkina Faso’s wildlife, namely in the PONASI. He authored Conservation of the African Lion: Contribution to a Status Survey, 2002 which is reported the most exhaustive study of any large cat in the world.

During the PPG, we had the opportunity to discuss with Mr Clark Lungren who established the Nazinga Game Ranch in the 70’s and supervised its management until the ‘90s. He is still based in BF and the Founder/President of the Center for the Development of Wildlife Production. Discussions with him showed that his approach was essentially focused on the management and development of an entire ecosystem (eg. Construction of dams, creation of salt pans, using controlled fires in pastures to improve forage quality, etc.) for the purpose of increasing the production of medium and large mammals to support lucrative hunting activities - which is the model of the Nazinga Game Ranch. Although this approach has had some success for large mammals in the ranch for a few years, there is concern that this is to the detriment of the overall biodiversity present in the ecosystem. The paper by Bouché *et al.* illustrates it well.

iv) What is the best available information? For what species, how many years, and who holds the data?

As reported by Bouché *et al.* 2016, monitoring mainly focused on 12 medium and large mammal species in the NGR over approx. 30 years. Monitoring took place every dry season (between January and May) from 1981 to 2011, except between 1991 and 1993 and in 1999. Original data are likely to be with the manager of the Nazinga Game Ranch under OFINAP, although this could not be confirmed. The paper published by Bouché *et al.* 2016 confirms that data are from various sources and unpublished:

“In order to plan ahead and optimize management (i.e. annual off-take quotas), the NGR authorities implemented wildlife surveys (foot counts) almost every year since 1981 (Cornélis 2007). The NGR is thus a noticeable exception in West Africa, in that it is the only protected area that has been almost yearly monitored for 30 years using the same method. Surveys were designed to assess the population trends of medium and large mammals and to assess and locate occurrences of illegal activities such as poaching (Frame GW & Herbison-Frame L. 1990. Large-mammal Biomass Estimates 1983 to 1989 and an Estimate of Ecological Carrying Capacity at the Nazinga Game Ranch, Burkina Faso. Rapport Spéciaux Nazinga, Série C, N° 65. A.D.E.F.A., Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso). Most of these survey results have been produced in locally distributed unpublished reports. The aim of this paper is to analyse long-term wildlife trends in relation to the rainfall pattern and human pressure dominated by the increasing demand for land notably to cultivate cotton.”

Data were analysed and reported in Bouché *et al.* 2006 for the following 9 species:

Elephant *Loxodonta africana*

Roan antelope *Hippotragus equinus*

Waterbuck *Kobus ellipsiprimnus*

Hartebeest *Alcelaphus buselaphus*

Bushbuck *Tragelaphus scriptus*

Warthog *Phacochoerus africanus*

Common duiker *Sylvicapra grimmia*

Oribi *Ourebia ourebi*

Baboon *Papio Anubis*

Besides the monitoring in the Nazinga GR, there is no regular biodiversity-monitoring program in the PONASI PAs. An inventory was conducted in 2014 in the Sissili FC and the PNKT financed by the Bolgatenga-Ouagadougou Power Line Connection Project as part of a protocol with the National Electricity Company of Burkina Faso.

GEF-UNDP Project Document - Section IV Results and Partnerships - para 171.

v) The guidance document and the monitoring systems are as good as the capacity not only to develop the guidance and collect the data, but also to enforce the law. What are the institutions in charge of these functions?

Since the pool of experts in these fields is small in Burkina Faso, it is planned that international experts will develop the guidance document for hunting management and the ecological monitoring system and strengthen enforcement capacities in PAs. An expert in anti-poaching and enforcement of PA regulations, an ecological monitoring expert, and a wildlife and hunting expert will be recruited for these tasks.

The expert in anti-poaching and enforcement of PA regulations will be in charge of developing an anti-poaching and surveillance strategy and action plan for the PONASI landscape and in collaboration with Ghana, and to prepare, organize and deliver trainings for the institutions in charge of the PAs on the planning anti-poaching strategies at national and regional scales, and for rangers and eco-guards intervening in the PAs of the PONASI complex including the ZOVICs (output 2.2.5). A \$ 70,000 budget is planned in years 3 and 4.

The ecological monitoring expert will be responsible for the design of the ecological monitoring system, including plans for all PAs, siting and mapping of sampling sites (output 2.2.4), planning and delivering related trainings for institutions in charge of PAs, especially forest rangers and eco-guards, and developing training materials. A \$ 50,000 budget is planned in years 2 and 3.

The Wildlife and Hunting expert will be requested to assess the sustainability of hunting management in PAs and ZOVICs and lead the workshop to examine the relevance of continuing hunting tourism in the Nazinga Game Ranch, the Sissili Classified Forest and in the ZOVICs (outputs 2.2.2 and 2.3.2); make recommendations on the conservation objectives for exploited species, determine sustainable harvest thresholds (quotas), support the establishment of a monitoring system to collect hunting statistics and make recommendations to adjust hunting pressure on the main species exploited; develop guidance documents for the annual updating of management measures. A \$60,000 budget is planned in the 2nd year.

These experts will work closely with the General Directorate of Water and Forests - more specifically with the Department of Planning and Ecological Monitoring of the DFRC, the Directorate for Wildlife and Hunting (for hunting issues) and OFINAP (for monitoring issues), and with the relevant Regional Directorates of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change (for enforcement and monitoring as they are in charge of the forest stations and brigades dedicated to PAs).

GEF-UNDP Project Document – Section X Total Budget and Work Plan, budget note 13 b, c, e

Section IV Results and Partnerships outputs 2.2.5, 2.2.4, 2.2.2 and 2.3.2

b) What are the private concessionaires that were identified at PPG stage? As stated before, this can't be settled with a tender during the first year of the project.

The private concessionaire who operates hunting tourism in the Nazinga Game Ranch and in the ZOVICs around the NGR is Nahouri Safari <http://nahourisafari.com/> managed by Mr Benjamin Bassono.

After the death in December 1998 of the private concessionaire of the Sissili CF, the late Mr Norbert Zongo, to whom the management of the Sissili CF was granted in 1996, the management was taken over by his family, though unsatisfactorily. Family friends are willing to take over the concession and revive the Sissili Safari, which will require new legal arrangements.

GEF-UNDP Project Document – Section II Development Challenge – parag. 9

(c) Please provide a link or additional information on the International Foundation for the Conservation of Wildlife (IGF) and explain why it is necessary to do a procurement process to make the final determination on the service provider. What is the name of the other service providers in country? Please elaborate on their track record in Burkina Faso.

The IGF Foundation was identified as a potential service provider for its fields of expertise relevant to guide the analysis of hunting costs and benefits in the PONASI area, but mainly because of the expertise of its Director, Mr. Philippe Chardonnet. However, recent enquiries have revealed that he is no longer associated with the Foundation, which reduces the relevance of involving the IGF Foundation in supporting the project. Nevertheless, the requested information on the foundation is provided for your information:

The International Foundation for Wildlife Management (IGF Foundation) was created in 1976 and has been under the aegis of the François SOMMER Foundation since 2016 under the name of FFS - IGF. Its mission is to act on the ground to help States and local actors to conserve and use biodiversity and natural ecosystems sustainably. This mission is carried out primarily in developing countries, with projects in 38 African countries, currently mainly in Mozambique and Tanzania. A link to the presentation of the foundation is: <https://fondationfrancoissommer.org/nature/ffs-igf/>. At least 2 members had worked in Burkina Faso, including Philippe Chardonnet then Director of FFS-IGF and co-chair of IUCN's Antelope Specialist Group and François LAMARQUE, an expert in wildlife conservation in Africa and Europe for forty years and based for five years in Burkina Faso.

Please see answer provided above for point 2.2.2 (iii) for other potential service providers. A procurement process will be required to make the final decision of the service provider as no service provider with the appropriate expertise was identified during the PPG process and no commitment could be made regarding this selection at this stage.

The argument in support of these investments is very weak:

1) If *'In the PONASI, big game /trophy hunting for tourists takes place in the Nazinga Game Ranch (NGR) and in the Sissili Classified Forest and small game hunting for tourists and subsistence hunting for local communities are taking place in the ZOVICs'*, who is managing these "concessions" and who is the concessionaire?

Thank you. Please see answer provided above under point (b) What are the private concessionaires that were identified at PPG stage?

GEF-UNDP Project Document – Section II Development Challenge – parag. 9

2) Why is this project supporting the idea of hunting inside the ZOVICs if these are now “quite degraded? Does not this call for conservation and rehabilitation of the populations before thinking about extractive activities?

Thank you. ZOVICs were created in the context of the communalisation process which devotes a part of the rural communes to village areas for the conservation of fauna and flora and to provide incentives for local communities related to the conservation of wildlife by entrusting them with game management in their terroir and enabling them to benefit from wildlife hunting. ZOVICs, along with forest management sites (CAF) and grazing areas, are part of an integrated concept of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, and equitable sharing of related benefits around PAs through entrusting natural resource management rights to local communities, which provide access to resources, jobs and financial benefits, thus reducing the need to use PA resources illegally.

Improving the sustainability of the management of ZOVICs, CAFs and other wooded areas will improve and diversify the livelihoods of local communities through increased availability of wood and non-wood resources and the development of value chains from these resources. In addition, strengthening the enabling conditions and potential of local people to benefit from the tourism activities taking place in the PONASI landscape and improving the management of human-wildlife conflicts will encourage local populations to protect wildlife.

Please note that the project is not necessarily supporting hunting in ZOVICs, especially not as currently practiced. Before making recommendations for their improvement, such as banning or suspending hunting activities, it is essential to verify the assertion of the degraded condition of the ZOVICs, understand the underlying factors, assess the sustainability of resource use management including through hunting, and assess the benefits and disadvantages of tourist and traditional hunting and how these are shared. (Please see ProDoc Section IV Results and Partnerships, parag. 199)

Should the conclusions be to maintain some or all types of hunting, the project will focus on strengthening the capacities of concerned stakeholders to fulfil their role in the management of hunting activities to improve their sustainability, preserve biodiversity, and promote greater equity in the sharing of related benefits, thus safeguarding a system that provides adequate incentives to local communities to support PAs. It is imperative to build the capacities of all concerned stakeholders, including immigrants, for the sustainable management of hunting activities, the maintenance and restoration of suitable habitats for wildlife, the provision of solutions to minimize HWC, and for addressing benefit sharing issues, to contribute to restore incentives for stakeholders to ensure the proper management of resources and habitats within ZOVICs and reduce encroachment and poaching in core PAs.

GEF-UNDP Project Document – Section II Dev. Challenge – parag. 10; Section IV – Results and Partnerships Output 2.3.2, parag. 199

3) How is the project planning on determining the quotas or sustainable yield thresholds for the main exploited species if the data since monitoring of exploited species and captures is not carried out consistently and according to a protocol to produce statistically valid data? (In the response: *However, since monitoring of exploited species and captures is not carried out consistently and according to a protocol to produce statistically valid data, the quotas or sustainable yield thresholds for the main exploited species are not based on rigorous science to ensure that hunting activity does not adversely affect conservation objectives.*)

This statement conflicts with the one saying that “Indeed, monitoring data in the Nazinga GR[2] over most of 30 years has shown that large species (elephants, waterbuck and hartebeest) increased significantly while small species (duikers and oribis) decreased between 1981 and 2011”
Is there data after 2011?

Based on information reported in the paper by Bouché *et al.* 2016, annual surveys have allowed collecting data for 12 mammal species in the Nazinga Game Ranch between 1981 and 2011 (with a few gaps). OFINAP reported that surveys were still conducted on a yearly basis, but the PPG team could not access such data.

Should the workshop assessing the sustainability of hunting activities conclude that hunting tourism will be maintained in the Nazinga Game Ranch and the Sissili Classified Forest, the project will support measures to strengthen the management of hunting management, namely the systematic monitoring of level of effort and captures following standardized methods across the PONASI landscape, conducting regular biodiversity inventories based on rigorous and standardized methodology, monitoring the condition of critical habitats of the main wildlife species, monitoring critical environmental parameters, and providing feedback of assessments to the actors concerned, including local populations involved in the ZOVICs, concessionaires, national institutions involved in PA management, technical services at the level of the local authorities (communes and regions) and the decentralized structures, the NGOs involved, and the scientific community. The project will support the establishment of an annual process to collect the necessary data that, compared to the data collected in the Nazinga Game Ranch and sporadic data in the PNKT and Sissili Classified Forest, will allow for the assessment and explanation of observed animal population trends.

GEF-UNDP Project Document – Section IV-Results and Partnerships, parag 173, 174.

<p>Conclusion: Based on the outstanding questions and comments made above, in addition to the fact that the change from Photographic Tourism to Trophy hunting from PIF to CEO Endorsement is a major deviation from the project approved by Council, the GEF Secretariat considers that the project needs to be restructured leaving behind the idea of supporting Trophy hunting. There is simply no data and institutional and expertise in-country to consider this project as is. The GEF Secretariat is available for consultation to determine what courses could be taken with this project. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you. Please note that no decision was made to shift from Photographic Tourism to Trophy Hunting during the PPG. Given the support of national stakeholders for continued hunting in the PAs where it is currently permitted, it was deemed prudent or acceptable to keep both options open and to support a comprehensive analysis of the impacts and benefits associated with hunting to guide participatory and informed decision-making. It was not possible within the PPG, to perform the analyzes required to support either approach to value PAs. Big Game Hunting in the Nazinga Game Ranch is still seen in the country, and namely within the Ministry of Environment, as the sustainable solution to the problem of PA funding and it is unlikely that the option to stop sport hunting gets a general assent. The importance of hunting in ZOVICs is discussed under point 2 (above).</p> <p>It is important that a well-documented and rigorous analysis of all aspects of the activity (socio-economic and biodiversity impacts and benefit-sharing) assesses whether hunting in the core PAs and in ZOVICs actually contributes to funding the management of PAs and whether it constitutes a real incentive for conservation, and that this review supports a reflection involving all stakeholders to allow an informed decision in a workshop dedicated to this issue.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document – Section IV-Results and Partnerships, parag. 170, 171, 199.</p>
<p>Parallel co-financing cannot be used as co-financing. Please only include those sources that will co-finance (as in cover costs directly associated with the project).</p>	<p>Co-financing contributions have been estimated exclusively based on the costs of activities directly related to the project results, concomitant in space and time. The word “parallel” had been used to identify funds that will not be managed by the project, but that will be managed by other projects/interventions to contribute to the project results. Now, the designation “parallel” has been replaced by “baseline” in the ProDoc. The designation “parallel co-financing” had not been used in the CEO ER.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document – page 2 Financing Plan, Section V Project Management parag. 318, Section IX Financial Planning and Management parag. 391 and 394</p>

<p>In addition, the CEO ER presents all the co-financing as grant. Nevertheless, it appears in the response to the review sheet that not all co-financing elements are actually grants (such as from Nahouri Safari as presented in the Box 2 response above). Please clarify and adjust the CEO ER accordingly, making sure that the kind of investment as declared in the Portal is also consistent with the Letters of co-financing.</p>	<p>Thank you. Although the co-financing letters do not clearly state that the type of the co-finance is cash/in kind, they are all cash co-finance given that all contributions are through projects. Therefore, no change was made to the CEO ER regarding this aspect.</p>	
<p>As per GEF guidance, the period for considering the GHG emissions avoided should be 20 years (instead of 10 in the proposal), unless a strong justification is provided. Please reconsider the period. In addition, the results in the CEO Endorsement Request (7,328,391 tCO₂e) differs from the annex P of the project document (7,401,912 tCO₂e). Please ensure all numbers are consistent throughout the information provided. Finally, we understand from the EX-ACT summary table in annex P that with the project the deforestation will be totally eliminated. Please explain or consider a more conservative (maybe realistic) approach. Please upload the entire EX-ACT tool.</p>	<p>Thank you. The estimation of GHG emissions has been recalculated using the revised figures for areas where deforestation will be reduced, using a 20-year period instead of 10 years, a baseline annual deforestation rate of 1% rather than 0.5% and a more conservative subsequent (with project) reduction of the deforestation rate of 50%, instead of 100%. Conservatively, instead of the entire 952,000 ha of the PONASI landscape, 394,564 ha were used in the calculation, which corresponds to 354,781 ha of State and community protected areas, including corridors, and 39,783 ha of forests (38,891 ha of large forests, 127 ha commune forests and 765 ha village forests) where improved management effectiveness will reduce deforestation.</p> <p>Over a period of 20 years, the result is 5,448,924 t CO₂eq of GHG sequestered through the project's intervention, corresponding to a 50% reduction in deforestation rate over 394,564 ha (protected areas and forest landscapes) and restoration of 11,000 ha of agroforestry ecosystems. The entire FAO EX-ACT tool is uploaded, and the result sheet is attached in Annex O of the ProDoc. Estimated GHG emission values have been corrected in the ProDoc and in the CEO ER.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document - Project Descr. page 1, Section III Strategy – parag. 100 on GEB, and TOC diagram page 24, Section VI-PRF Indicator 4, Annex B-Core indicator 6, Annex O Calculation of GHG emissions mitigated</p> <p>CEO ER (Part I - section E Indicator 6, Part II – section A.1 Project description para 16, Annex A – PRF Indicator 4 - p.40, Annex E – Core Indicator 6 – p.62 and 63)</p>

In addition, please address the following:

- The Executing Partner Type is presented to be GEF Agency while we understand it is a national institution. Please adjust accordingly.
- The project document explains that "a management unit will be set up within the GEDD program for the implementation of the project. This management unit includes the staff assigned by the State and the staff recruited by the project" and that UNDP staff is part of the Dialogue Framework, which has executing functions. As implementing agency, UNDP can't undertake executing functions. Please confirm that UNDP will not have executing functions in this project and the budget of the project will not be used to pay UNDP staff or tasks implemented by UNDP.

Thank you. Corrections were made to avoid confusion and ensure UNDP does not have executing functions in this project. UNDP has been removed from the executive of the Dialogue Framework.

The role of the Project Steering Committee is shared between a Review Committee set up under the Ministry's budget program, and the Dialogue/Consultation Framework where UNDP only serves as an observer. The role of the Dialogue/Consultation Framework is to ensure a continuous consultation with all stakeholders to ensure the effectiveness of strategies and the relevance of technical and financial means to implement to achieve the intended results (ProDoc Section VIII Governance and Management Arrangements – para 362).

Direct Project Costs (55,750\$) have been cancelled and reallocated to consolidate the Project Management Unit's capacity and staff through the recruitment of a full-time Financial and Procurement Specialist for the three first years. Please see ProDoc Section X. Total Budget and Work Plan, and Budget Notes 52 and 55. Budget note 58, which was about the DPCs was removed.

The Endorsement Letter for provision of project support services by UNDP CO has been removed.

GEF-UNDP Project Document – Section VIII Governance and Management Arrangements – parag. 373 and diagram parag. 377
Section X Total Budget and Work Plan, and Budget Notes 52 and 55

First, the project needs to concentrate all its financial and technical resources during the first 3-4 years to carry out the necessary PA management activities, including law enforcement in all target areas, to allow the population of the target species to increase and be sustainably harvested if the decision is to continue with this line of work.

Thank you for these recommendations. The following changes were made to address them.

Rescheduling activities under outcome 2 to support PA management: Support from several international consultants and training workshops are rescheduled and concentrated in the early years of the project to ensure that surveillance, enforcement and monitoring activities are strengthened and optimally implemented as early as possible.

Rescheduling the assessment of the sustainability of hunting activities. In order to increase chances that the populations of game species are healthy before carrying out an assessment of the sustainability of hunting management in the ZOVICs, the NGR and the Sissili CF, it is proposed to convince concerned stakeholders of the need to suspend hunting activities initially while strengthening the management of PAs, and then, after 3 years, to carry out the assessment by an independent third party.

Please refer to GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section X. Total Budget and Work Plan and Annex A – Multi Year Work Plan for changes made under Outcome 2.

Interviews conducted during the PRODOC development phase have shown that the RGN experience is largely perceived among national stakeholders as a success story that has enabled the maintenance of populations of large mammal species thanks to infrastructures, especially hydraulic works, and hunting activities that generate revenue to finance them. Somewhat diverging findings, such as the analysis published by Bouché *et al.* 2016, and the lack of respect for equitable benefit sharing rules, are little disseminated, known or acknowledged by concerned actors. Although the project will definitely, from the start, strengthen capacities to ensure more effective surveillance and enforcement in order to counter poaching and any non-regulatory hunting practice, it is difficult, if not impossible, to envisage that it may unilaterally impose a ban on hunting in the areas currently open to this activity. Such a situation would jeopardize the acceptability of the whole project by all stakeholders. Without sharing and disseminating a thorough and rigorous review of the management of hunting in the RGN, the Sissili CF and the ZOVICs since their creation and an assessment of impacts against agreed objectives in terms of biodiversity conservation and socioeconomic benefits, the project will face great difficulty in getting actors within the Government, the private sector and local populations to accept the closure of hunting activities. We remain convinced that it is necessary to develop a common understanding of the current situation in areas open to hunting, on rigorous and scientific basis, in particular by exploiting the databases that were used by Bouché *et al.* 2016, to share it with all concerned actors, including those likely to be affected by decisions regarding the management of hunting in core PAs and ZOVICs, and to develop a shared vision of the measures to be adopted to ensure the recovery of animal populations in these PAs (taking as a reference the population levels recorded at the time of the creation of the PAs, whenever available). This workshop on the impacts of hunting activities would allow the project to demonstrate and justify the need to close hunting until affected animal populations have recovered. Based on a common understanding of the health of animal populations in the PONASI PAs where hunting is practiced, the workshop participants would be able to develop a shared vision - optimally consensual - of the path to follow to meet the biodiversity conservation objectives linked to the creation of this PA. This path will necessarily involve lessening the pressures on the populations of small and medium mammals, namely poaching and hunting. It will be essential to ensure the active participation of all parties likely to be affected by decisions concerning the management of hunting in core PAs and ZOVICs or to be involved in their implementation (enforcement) and in the monitoring of their socioeconomic and biodiversity conservation objectives.

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV. Results and Partnerships, Output 2.2.2. Management plans for Nazinga, PNKT and Sissili PAs, including corridors, paragraph 173 - Avoiding the impacts of unsustainable hunting pressure

The third-party independent assessment of animal populations identified above under item (iii) and described in more detail under the Output 2.1.2 regarding the information system, will take advantage of the recent data collected during the first 3 years assessments to analyse population trends for game species. An independent expert will be recruited to carry out this assessment in the third year of the project so that its recommendations are taken into consideration and supported by the project Mid-Term Review. Recommendations will be formulated regarding the capacity of game species populations to withstand hunting pressure. The management capacities of the structures responsible for hunting management within the Government, the concessionaires and the village hunting management committees will also be assessed.

Should the assessment conclude that efforts to improve the management effectiveness for the Nazinga Game Ranch and the Sissili CF, including strengthened surveillance and enforcement, have not led to an improvement of the status of game populations and that hunting activities cannot be resumed, the project will cease funding activities in support of hunting and reallocate remaining technical and financial resources to activities focused strictly on conservation, excluding hunting.

Should the conclusions support the resumption of hunting activities in the ZOVICs and in one or both core PAs (Nazinga GR and Sissili CF) in a foreseeable future, the project will implement activities to strengthen the management of game and/or subsistence hunting and the capacities of relevant stakeholders, i.e. government and technical services, and local communities (village committees for wildlife management), to fulfil more effectively their respective roles in the management of the activity in line with the assessment's recommendations. By improving sustainable hunting management in core PAs and in ZOVICs, and addressing benefit sharing issues, the project would seek to restore the optimal scheme which provided incentives for stakeholders to ensure the proper management of resources and habitats in ZOVICs, thus preserving biodiversity.

The approach has also been integrated in the description of Output 2.3.2 on the development of simplified zoning plans for ZOVICs.

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV. Results and Partnerships, Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.2.2

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV. Results and Partnerships, Output 2.3.2, paragraphs 202 and 203

<p>The short-term loss of income for concessionaires and the Government and the loss of a subsistence activity and source of income for local communities due to the temporary closure of hunting in the RGN, Sissili CF and ZOVICs has been added as a project risk.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV Results and Partnerships, risk table under Risks and Assumptions; Annex D. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (separate file); and Annex G, UNDP Risk Log, and CEO ER: Part II Project Justification - A.5 Risk</p>
<p>As part of the project strategy, the following text was added to underline the importance of monitoring and assessment of the sustainability of the various resource uses to monitor their sustainable use:</p> <p><i>All of this must fundamentally rely on the sustainability of natural resource uses by local communities, tourists, hunters, gatherers, and lumberjacks and will involve strengthening or establishing monitoring systems to provide complete, rigorous and long term information required to support scientific assessments of wildlife and flora populations and their habitats, and decision-making regarding their sustainable use.</i></p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section III Strategy p. 21, paragraph 89</p>
<p>Also, the project provides for the strengthening of monitoring capacities within protected areas as part of this output and a few precisions were added in paragraph 152 to add specificity and underline the importance of including monitoring data for exploited species.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV Results and Partnerships, Output 2.1.2 - Information system for monitoring, analysis, mapping ...</p>

Second, the investments in protection (including the use of SMART as appropriate) should be accompanied by the monitoring of the populations. A solid, scientific and third party monitoring on the status of the populations would be a conditions Sine qua non to move forward.

As recommended, a third-party independent assessment is integrated and described under output 2.1.2, paragraph 155:

A third-party independent assessment of animal populations will be undertaken to analyse population trends for big and small game species, and for other key species that are not targeted by hunting activities. This assessment will take advantage of the recent data collected during the first 3 years assessments through the monitoring system strengthened with the project support and will cover all PAs, including the PNKT where hunting is forbidden, to enable comparisons of populations that have been differently subjected to hunting pressure. Environmental parameters, including water and green pasture availability throughout the year, should be taken into account in the analyzes as explanatory factors. Also, as these protected areas are located close to large cotton cultivation areas where excessive use of pesticides is reported, hunting may not be the only pressure factor involved. This assessment should lead to the formulation of recommendations regarding the capacity of game species populations to withstand hunting pressures and will be accompanied by an assessment of the management capacities of the structures responsible for hunting management within the Government, the concessionaires and the village hunting management committees. Ideally, this assessment would take place in the third year of the project so that its recommendations are taken into consideration and supported by the project mid-term review. The project will recruit an independent expert, i.e. not engaged in any other activity of the project, and with experience in the country, to assess population's health of game species and provide a professional opinion on the viability of the proposed activities including the proficiency of the concessionaires to manage the areas.

The following text was added to emphasize the need to strengthen monitoring programs in all PAs to support scientific assessments of wildlife populations and decision-making for their sustainable management. Please refer to GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV Results and Partnerships. Output 2.2.4 Long-term ecological monitoring system at the landscape and individual PAs levels - Monitoring program and protocols, paragraph 187:

The project will strengthen the monitoring program in the NGR and adapt it for the Sissili CF, ZOVICs to ensure collected information quality, coverage and comprehensiveness are adequate to enable a rigorous assessment of wildlife populations' status and of pressure factors, and extend it to encompass ZOVICs and the Sissili CF where hunting activities are allowed and the PNKT where it is forbidden.

In the event that hunting activities could resume following the recommendations of the third-party assessment, the project provides for capacity building to increase the effectiveness of surveillance and

GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV. Results and Partnerships, Output

Third, using the information gathered during the first 3-4 years, the project should consider whether or not to proceed with the assessment, workshop and the rest of activities listed under 2.2.2. An international consultant, not engaged in any of the activities listed before and with experience in the country, should evaluate the information gathered during the first 3-4 years and provide a professional opinion on the viability of the proposed activities including the proficiency of the concessioners to manage the areas.

This issue is jointly addressed under the first comment.

|

<p>Fourth. If the investments in PA management (including law enforcement) don't work as expected, the project should continue using the remaining technical and financial resources for conservation activities in the target areas excluding hunting.</p>	<p>Thank you for the recommendation. We totally agree. This scenario has been explicitly integrated in the step (iv) in the text above.</p> <p><i>Depending on the conclusions of the assessment, the project will maintain the focus on strengthening PA management with remaining resources of the project, or strengthen capacities to ensure the sustainable management of hunting and equitable sharing of its benefits. i) Should the assessment conclude that efforts to improve the management effectiveness for the Nazinga Game Ranch, the Sissili CF and the ZOVICs, including strengthened surveillance and enforcement, have not led to a significant improvement of the status of game populations and that hunting activities cannot be resumed, the project will cease funding activities in support of hunting and reallocate remaining technical and financial resources to activities focused strictly on conservation, excluding hunting. ii) Should the conclusions support the resumption of hunting activities in the ZOVICs and in one or both core PAs (Nazinga GR and Sissili CF) in a foreseeable future, the project will implement the activities described hereafter to strengthen the management of game and/or subsistence hunting and the capacities of relevant stakeholders, i.e. government and technical services, and local communities (village committees for wildlife management), to fulfil more effectively their respective roles in the management of the activity in line with the assessment's recommendations. By improving sustainable hunting management in core PAs and in ZOVICs, and addressing benefit sharing issues, the project would then seek to restore the optimal scheme which provided incentives for stakeholders to ensure the proper management of resources and habitats in ZOVICs, thus preserving biodiversity.</i></p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV Results and Partnerships, Output 2.2.2 – as part of the paragraph 173:</p>
<p>June 12, 2020: The comment isn't addressed. Please provide a signed letter from the Ministry of Mines and Quarries.</p>	<p>The revised letter from the Ministry of Mines and Quarries dated 21 May 2019 and signed by Mr Oumarou Idani had been submitted as part of a previous revision. It is submitted again for your convenience.</p>	<p> </p>

<p>June 12, 2020:</p> <p>The comment isn't addressed. As already requested, please consider a 20 years period for the calculation of the GHG emission mitigation and revise the anticipated start year of accounting which should be 2021.</p>	<p>The total period for the calculation of GHG emission mitigation was corrected in the Ex-Act Tool (under the "Description" sheet) in the last version that was submitted for the 2nd revision. In this version, calculations had been done for a 20-year period, as was recommended, which is reflected in the result sheet. No changes have been made to the FAO Ex-Act tool.</p> <p>Also, in the GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet, <i>Duration of accounting</i> (in years) at PIF stage was already indicated as [10] and at CEO ER as [20] (estimations had been made for a 10-year period in the PIF). Please refer to the values provided for the indicator 6.1 Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use, in the Project Document, Annex B: GEF-7 Core Indicators and the CEO ER - Annex E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet. However, under the same indicator 6.1, anticipated year at PIF stage is now corrected as [2018] and at CEO ER as [2021] These corrections do not affect the calculation of the GHG emissions mitigated.</p>	<p>Project Document, Annex B: GEF-7 Core Indicators CEO ER - Annex E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet</p>
<p>June 12, 2020:</p> <p>Not Yet. Please address the remaining comments. In addition, the Executing Partner Type is still referred as "GEF Agency". As already requested in the previous review, please correct it (it should be Government).</p>	<p>Under the Governance and Management Arrangements, the following sentence was removed: <i>This role can be held by a representative from the Government Cooperating Agency.</i></p> <p><i>(It seems that the issue is with the portal)</i></p>	<p>Project Document Section VIII - Governance and Management Arrangements - paragraph 377</p>

Also, the following references to Direct Project Costs have been removed:

- CEO ER, Part II - Project Justification – Section A. Changes in alignment with the project design in the original PIF: the paragraph indicating that DPCs had been added to the budget was removed.

- Project Document Section VII - Governance and Management Arrangements, paragraph 440: Text removed: In addition, the Government of Burkina Faso may request UNDP direct services for specific projects, according to its policies and convenience. The UNDP and the Government of Burkina Faso acknowledge and agree that those services are not mandatory and will be provided only upon Government request. If requested the services would follow the UNDP policies on the recovery of direct costs. These services (and their costs) are specified in the Agreement (Annex H). As is determined by the GEF Council requirements, these service costs will be assigned as Project Management Cost, identified in the project budget.

CEO ER, Part II - Project Justification – Section A. Changes in alignment with the project design in the original PIF

Project Document Section VII - Governance and Management Arrangements, paragraph 440

August 25, 2020:

Thank you for making the important adjustment of the project approach following the GEF Secretariat guidance about the necessary hunting management prudential measures. Nevertheless, there is one minor comment that still need to be addressed regarding the GHG emission mitigation result. In addition, again, the Executing Partner Type in the Portal (at the beginning of the project description) is still referred as "GEF Agency" instead of "Government" (as already mentioned in the 2 previous reviews). Please address these remaining comments or, in case of any doubt, consult the Program Manager of the Project to ensure the comments are actually addressed as expected.

UNDP Agency Response (August 27, 2020):

As requested, in the Portal the Core Indicator table the duration of accounting the GHG emission mitigation is updated as 20 years and the anticipated start year of accounting is updated as 2021, to be aligned with GEF guidelines and consistent with the ProDoc. In addition, the Executing Partner Type in the Portal (at the beginning of the project description) is now updated as "Government".



August 31, 2020

Thank you for addressing the comments.

Nevertheless, we noticed that the project plans to purchase vehicles (4x4 and motorbikes) for a significant budget and the justification is not provided. Please note that the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged as per GEF guidelines (GEF/C.59/Inf.03). Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financing. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program. Please provide full details on all the vehicles needed including their total number and cost, their specific contribution to the project and justify the need to use the GEF project resources to purchase and maintain them. The Secretariat will then assess this request and decide whether to approve it.

In addition, the total separation of the activities between the executing and implementing agencies is unclear in the information provided. Please confirm UNDP will handle only implementing functions as indicated in GEF policies and guidelines, indicate if UNDP will carry out any activities or use resources charged to the project budget and if so, what are these activities and their cost.

UNDP Agency Response (September 18, 2020):

The project budget provides for the purchase of two 4x4 vehicles:

- One 4x4 vehicle for the Project Coordination Unit to support all project activities, including moving equipment and material to project sites and supporting national and international consultants' missions - cost is split among the four components for a total cost of \$52,000 (see budget notes 5 (comp 1), 19i (comp 2), 33d (comp 3), 46 (comp 4) . The alternative is to rent a car + driver @ 200\$ per day

- One 4x4 vehicle for the management unit of the Kaboré-Tambi National Park @ \$52,000 (see budget note 19a)

The total cost for the purchase of these 2 vehicles (\$104,000) represents 1.97% of the GEF contribution and 1.87% of the project total budget

The project budget also provides for the purchase of 8 motorcycles for for travel related to the field activities of components 2 and 3 (cost is split among components 2 and 3, see budget notes 19j and 33e), especially technical assistants and community mobilization assistants in the 3 protected areas, and of 24 motorcycles specifically to strengthen monitoring and surveillance activities for 3 PAs (Nazinga Game Ranch, Sissili Classified Forest, Kaboré-Tambi NP; output 2.1.3). The decision to increase the number of motorcycles for this last purpose was made during the 2nd revision, following GEF recommendation to strengthen surveillance activities in the PAs.

The total cost for the purchase of motorcycles is \$18,400 + 55,200 = 73,600. In the budget, this represents 1.39% of the GEF contribution and 1.33% of the project total cost

Budget notes:

19 b) Equipment for monitoring and surveillance activities for 3 PAs (Nazinga Game Ranch, Sissili Classified Forest, Kaboré-Tambi NP; output 2.1.3), including 12 cameras with integrated GPS @ \$ 600, 12 Garmin GPS @ \$ 250, 24 binoculars @ \$125, 24 compasses @ \$ 40, 24 aluminium clipboards @ \$30, 24 motorcycles @ \$ 2,300 = 55,200 12 tents @ \$ 300, 48 personal equipment (uniform, sleeping bag, sleeping pad, backpack, torch, water bottle, mess tin, first aid kit) @ \$ 365, 24 long-range VHF-UHF dual band walkie-talkie radios @ \$ 200, 6 first-aid kits for office @ \$50, etc. in year 1 Total cost: \$ 100,000

19 j) Purchase of 8 motorcycles for travel related to the field activities of components 2 and 3, especially technical assistants and

budget notes 5 (comp 1), 19i (comp 2), 33d (comp 3), 46 (comp 4)

budget note 19a

budget notes 19j and 33e

budget note 19f

budget note 19j

budget note 33e

paragraph 162

September 22, 2020

1) Thank you very much for the clarification regarding the necessity of purchasing vehicles. As such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financing, please consider a contribution from the co-financers. We suggest this contribution be the half of the total vehicles needed.

2) COVID-19: In addition, considering the current and lasting situation about the Covid-19 crisis, please address the risks that COVID-19 poses for all aspects of the CEO endorsement providing information on the impacts of the pandemic on the project and the measures envisioned to mitigate them. Also, conduct an opportunity analysis, particularly considering if the project can help in reducing the risk of emerging infectious diseases in the future, while increasing the resilience of the ecologic and socio-economy systems to weather them. We suggest to add specific paragraphs on this COVID-19 analysis after the risks analysis table under the Risk section of the CEO Endorsement Request. As needed, please refer to the GEF informal guidance on COVID-19 response sent to the GEF agencies on September 14th and do not hesitate to contact the PM of this project at the GEF Secretariat for any further clarification. Thank you very much in advance for your understanding and consideration on that important matter.

UNDP responses 08 Oct 2020

1) Co-financing of vehicles: Responding to your request to cofinance 50% of the cost of each of the two project vehicles, we have made the following change in the project budget: One of the two vehicles will be fully funded from UNDP co-financing (\$52,000 which are included in the total cofinancing of \$270,000) while the other one is still included in the GEF budget. Correspondingly, the GEF budget lines 5, 19, 33 and 46 have been reduced by \$13,000 each (= \$52,000 total), whereas the UNDP co-finance has been redistributed among years with an increase by \$52,000 of the first year. The \$52,000 of GEF funding have been added to budget line 49 (Gender/knowledge management) resulting in a budget of \$75,498 for gender related activities and knowledge management over the entire 6-year project period.

2) Risks and opportunities from COVID-19: Despite the number of COVID cases still being relatively small in Burkina Faso, we have revised the ProDoc taking in consideration of the risks that the crisis may pose to the project and the country more broadly (see ProDoc paragraphs 4,6,14,30,45,83,113,127,140,144,161,173,181,262,281,292,306,308). Tables summarizing and assessing the risks and opportunities resulting from the pandemic have been added under the risk table in both the ProDoc and the CEO ER. It is important to emphasize that the project design already emphasizes the restoration and sustainable management of intact landscapes, reducing the encroachment of human land uses on natural ecosystems and their resulting fragmentation, as well as the promotion of alternatives to unsustainable and uncontrolled use of wildlife and consumption and trade of wild meat. These project objectives are fully in line with GEF guidance on COVID response and contribute to UNDP's own emphasis on "building back better" with the promotion of environmental sustainability and green and circular economy. The project also makes a significant contribution to mitigating climate change. Therefore, no changes in project design were needed. However, more emphasis was put on restrictions that the crisis may cause for travelling and meetings with stakeholders, including local communities, and the consequences this may have for the implementation of project activities. The project will ensure that all activities will be in compliance with Government and UNDP's own policies with regard to COVID. For example, community meetings will be held in small groups in locations that provide sufficient space (possibly in the open) and make careful use of hygiene measures (hand washing, distancing).

All changes in ProDoc and CEO ER are highlighted in blue

see ProDoc paragraphs 4,6,14,30,45,83,113,127,140,144,161,173,181,262,281,292,306,308). Tables summarizing and assessing the risks and opportunities resulting from the pandemic have been added under the risk table in both the ProDoc and the CEO ER.

<p>23 November 2020</p> <p>1- Total co-financing differs from ProDoc and Portal – please amend accordingly ensuring the information provided is consistent and do reflect exactly the co-financing letters.</p> <p>2- NIM Audit has to be removed from M&E and included in PMC.</p> <p>3- As presented in the budgeted M&E Plan, it looks like the Gender and Stakeholder Engagement Plan’s preparation is being charged to M&E, which is not allowed. However, if what is intended is to charge the monitoring of Gender and Stakeholder Engagement, this needs to be explicitly mentioned, the corresponding costs included in the Project’s components have to be removed and included in the M&E Budgeted Plan. Please clarify and amend accordingly.</p>	<p>UNDP responses of 24 November 2020</p> <p>1 – Cofinance amount: Please note that the cofinance amount of 22,069,851 USD on page 2 also the amount of UNDP TRAC funds of 270,000 USD needs to be added; the total then gives 22,339,851 USD. It is normal practice in UNDP prodocs that we list the cofinance provided by UNDP separately from the other cofinance. No change has been made in this regard. There was however a mistake in paragraph 398 on baseline cofinance amount that has been corrected.</p> <p>2 – NIM audit costs: The NIM audit costs (\$20,000) have been moved from budget line 47 (M&E) into a new budget line 60 under PMC. To keep PMC constant, the same amount has been removed from budget line 54.</p> <p>3 – Stakeholder engagement plan and Gender Action Plan: These two lines in the M&E Plan should indeed refer to the costs of monitoring of the implementation of those two plans. This has been clarified and the budget relating to this monitoring activity by an external consultant (\$4,000 per year in years 2 to 5, \$20,000 total) has been added to budget line 47 so that this budget line remains constant.</p>	<p>All changes in the PRODOC are highlighted red</p> <p>1 – paragraph 398</p> <p>2 – Budget lines 47, 54 and 60</p> <p>3 – M&E Plan</p>
--	--	---

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$ 200,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Preparatory technical reviews & studies and stakeholder consultations	200,000	123,871.14	76,128.86
Formulation of the UNDP-GEF project document, GEF CEO Endorsement Request, and mandatory and project specific annexes			
Conduct the validation workshop and report			
Total	200,000	123,871.14	76,128.86

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 200,000 \$			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Preparatory technical reviews & studies and stakeholder consultations	200,000	123,871.14	76,126.86
Formulation of the UNDP-GEF project document, GEF CEO Endorsement Request, and mandatory and project specific annexes			
Conduct the validation workshop and report			
Total	200,000	123,871.14	76,126.86

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

GEF Core Indicators at [PIF / CEO ER / MTR / TE]

[PIMS 5938] [Burkina Faso]

[April 2019]

CORE INDICATOR 1: TERRESTRIAL PROTECTED AREAS CREATED OR UNDER IMPROVED MANAGEMENT FOR CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE (HECTARES)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
436,057	354,781		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the two sub-indicators (1.1 and 1.2) for that stage.

1.1 Terrestrial protected areas newly created

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
-	33,000		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
Corridor #2	none	IV		33,000		

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE
Corridor #2	31		

1.2 Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)

436,057	321,781	
---------	---------	--

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
Nazinga Game Ranch	none	IV	103,579	91,300		
Sissili Classified Forest	28556	IV	38,153	32,700		
Kaboré-Tambi National Park	1049	II	161,956	169,000		
Corridor #1	none	IV	19,246	4,500		
Corridor #2	none	IV	69,445	-		
ZOVICs Guiaro- Pô (7))	none	VI	-	14,279		
ZOVICs Biéha (4)	none	VI	-	10,002		
ZOVICs (10 in all)	none	VI	32,932	-		
Nazinon Classified Forest/ Forest management site (<i>Chantier d'aménagement Forestier</i>)	none	n.a.	10,746	-		
Total			436,057	321,781		

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE
Nazinga Game Ranch	75		
Sissili Classified Forest	47		
Kaboré-Tambi National Park	39		
Corridor #1	31		
ZOVICs Guiaro-Pô	55		
ZOVICs Biéha	36		

CORE INDICATOR 3: AREA OF LAND RESTORED (HECTARES)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
3,000	11,000		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the four sub-indicators (3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4) for that stage.

3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)

6,000	Effective agricultural, rangeland and pastoral practices or supporting climate-smart agriculture	129,478	Improved management practices over 55,477 ha in Forest management sites, 95 ha in communal forests; 29,168 ha inter-communal forests; 574 ha village forests, 39,664 ha of pastoral areas, and 4,500 ha of area under CSA				
-------	--	---------	---	--	--	--	--

4.4 Area of High Conservation Value forest loss avoided

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
n.a.			

Name of HCVF	Ha (expected at PIF)	Counterfactual at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Counterfactual at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
n.a.						

TOTAL AREA UNDER IMPROVED MANAGEMENT (IN PIF AND CEO ER TABLE F)

Million Ha (expected at PIF)	Million Ha (expected at CEO ER)
445,057 ha	484,459

Calculate the total by summing Core Indicators 1-5. Ensure that there is no double-counting.

CORE INDICATOR 6: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS MITIGATED (METRIC TONS OF CARBON DIOXIDE EQUIVALENT)

GHG emission type	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at PIF)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at MTR)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ -e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ -e (indirect)	4,000,000	5,448,924		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the first two sub-indicators (6.1 and 6.2) for that stage.

6.1 Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use

GHG emission type	Ha (expected at PIF)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (expected at MTR)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at MTR)	Ha (expected at TE)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ -e (direct)								
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ -e (indirect)	reduced deforestation: 436,057 ha, restoration: 3,000 ha	4,000,000	reduced deforestation: 394,564 ha, restoration: 11,000 ha	5,448,924				
Anticipated year	---	[2018]	---	[2021]	---	[2018-2100]	---	[2018-2100]
Duration of accounting	---	[10]	---	[20]	---	[1-30]	---	[1-30]

6.2 Emissions avoided outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use)

GHG emission type	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at PIF)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at CEO ER)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at MTR)	Metric tons CO ₂ -eq (expected at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ -e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ -e (indirect)				
Anticipated year	[2018-2100]	[2018-2100]	[2018-2100]	[2018-2100]
Duration of accounting	[1-20]	[1-20]	[1-20]	[1-20]

6.3 Energy saved (megajoules)

Total MJ (expected at PIF)	Total MJ (expected at CEO ER)	Total MJ (achieved at MTR)	Total MJ (achieved at TE)

Type of Intervention	MJ (expected at PIF)	MJ (expected at CEO ER)	MJ (achieved at MTR)	MJ (achieved at TE)
n.a.				

6.4 Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology (megawatts).

Type of Renewable Energy	Capacity (MW; expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW; expected at CEO ER)	Capacity (MW; achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW; achieved at TE)

n.a.

CORE INDICATOR 11: NUMBER OF DIRECT BENEFICIARIES DISAGGREGATED BY GENDER AS CO-BENEFIT OF GEF INVESTMENT

Total number (expected at PIF)	Total number (expected at CEO ER)	Total number (achieved at MTR)	Total number (achieved at TE)
not specified	30,885		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of female and male, as in the table below for that stage.

Gender	Number (expected at PIF)	Number (expected at CEO ER)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)
Female	not specified	18,531		
Male	not specified	12,354		

[1] Restoration will take place within the corridor #2 which will be gazetted as part the component 2. This area is not counted in the total area under improved management to avoid double-counting.

ANNEX F: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Influencing models			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Transform policy and regulatory environments		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Convene multi-stakeholder alliances		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate innovative approaches		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Deploy innovative financial instruments		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Sector		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Capital providers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Financial intermediaries and market facilitators	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large corporations	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SMEs	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individuals/Entrepreneurs	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Grant Pilot	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Project Reflow	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Communities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academia	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions and Workers Unions	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type of Engagement		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Dissemination	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communications		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness Raising	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Education	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Public Campaigns	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Behavior Change	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity, Knowledge and Research			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Generation and Exchange		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Theory of Change	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indicators to Measure Change	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge and Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Management	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development	

		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex-disaggregated indicators	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender-sensitive indicators	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender results areas		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access and control over natural resources	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation and leadership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access to benefits and services	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge generation	
<input type="checkbox"/> Focal Areas/Theme			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Programs		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Commodity Supply Chains (‘‘Good Growth Partnership’’)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodities Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Screening Tools
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Conservation Value Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Carbon Stocks Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Soybean Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Oil Palm Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Beef Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Resilience (climate and shocks)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Production Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agroecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land and Soil Health
			<input type="checkbox"/> Diversified Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Land and Water Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small and Medium Enterprises
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Genetic Diversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Gender Dimensions
			<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-stakeholder Platforms
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Restoration
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodity Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Land Use Planning
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Landscapes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Cities	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated urban planning
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban sustainability framework
			<input type="checkbox"/> Transport and Mobility
			<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings
			<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal waste management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Green space
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Biodiversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Resilience

			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Protected Areas
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal and Marine Protected Areas
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Productive Landscapes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Productive Seascapes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Natural Resource Management
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Extractive Industries (oil, gas, mining)
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forestry (Including HCVF and REDD+)
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tourism
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & agrobiodiversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries
			<input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure
			<input type="checkbox"/> Certification (National Standards)
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certification (International Standards)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Species	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Illegal Wildlife Trade
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threatened Species
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife for Sustainable Development
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Wild Relatives
			<input type="checkbox"/> Plant Genetic Resources
			<input type="checkbox"/> Animal Genetic Resources
			<input type="checkbox"/> Livestock Wild Relatives
			<input type="checkbox"/> Invasive Alien Species (IAS)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mangroves
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sea Grasses
			<input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands
			<input type="checkbox"/> Rivers
			<input type="checkbox"/> Lakes
			<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical Rain Forests
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tropical Dry Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Temperate Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Grasslands
			<input type="checkbox"/> Paramo
			<input type="checkbox"/> Desert
		<input type="checkbox"/> Financial and Accounting	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Payment for Ecosystem Services
			<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting
			<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Trust Funds
			<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Finance
		<input type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Protocol to the CBD	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety
			<input type="checkbox"/> Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forests		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest and Landscape Restoration	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REDD/REDD+
			<input type="checkbox"/> Amazon
			<input type="checkbox"/> Congo
			<input type="checkbox"/> Drylands
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Land Management	

			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Pasture Management
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Fire Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Drought Mitigation/Early Warning
		<input type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation Neutrality	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land Productivity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land Cover and Land cover change
			<input type="checkbox"/> Carbon stocks above or below ground
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security	
	<input type="checkbox"/> International Waters		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ship	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Aquifer
			<input type="checkbox"/> River Basin
			<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Basin
		<input type="checkbox"/> Learning	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances	
		<input type="checkbox"/> SIDS : Small Island Dev States	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pollution	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances
			<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from Wastewater
		<input type="checkbox"/> Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan preparation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Action Plan Implementation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large Marine Ecosystems	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Aquaculture	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Marine Protected Area	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mangrove
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
			<input type="checkbox"/> Seagrasses
			<input type="checkbox"/> Polar Ecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Constructed Wetlands
	<input type="checkbox"/> Chemicals and Waste		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Mercury	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Artisanal and Scale Gold Mining	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Power Plants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Industrial Boilers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cement	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Ferrous Metals Production	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ozone	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sound Management of chemicals and Waste	

	<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Eco-Efficiency	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Pesticides	
	<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Vector Management	
	<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Other	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Emissions	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Open Burning	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Best Available Technology / Best Environmental Practices	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Green Chemistry	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance
		<input type="checkbox"/> Least Developed Countries
		<input type="checkbox"/> Small Island Developing States
		<input type="checkbox"/> Disaster Risk Management
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sea-level rise
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Resilience
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate information
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem-based Adaptation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
		<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Programme of Action
		<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming Adaptation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector
		<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Complementarity
		<input type="checkbox"/> Community-based Adaptation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Livelihoods
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land Use
		<input type="checkbox"/> Energy Efficiency
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Urban Systems and Transport
		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer
		<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Energy
		<input type="checkbox"/> Financing
		<input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities
	<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Endogenous technology
		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Needs Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
	<input type="checkbox"/> United Nations Framework on Climate Change	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Nationally Determined Contribution
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paris Agreement
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Development Goals
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance (Rio Markers)	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 1
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 2
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 1

ANNEX G: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.