

Integrated and Sustainable Management of PONASI Protected Area Landscape

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9764

Countries

Burkina Faso

Project Name

Integrated and Sustainable Management of PONASI Protected Area
Landscape

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/29/2019

Review completed by PM

12/4/2020

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6-19-19

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6-19-19

Thanks for the submission of this very important project for the BD,LD and CCM in Burkina Faso. This project has the potential to deliver very tangible results.

There are two overarching issues that caught the attention of the GEF:

1) The number of pages that were used to describe the Components, Outcomes, Outputs and Activities (35 pages in the Project Document). For this, the GEF strongly suggest reducing the description surrounding the proposed activities and go to the point. While the background and information described in each of the outputs is important for the readers, the actual activities to be delivered by the project get totally diluted. The GEFSEC had to go back and forth between the text and the budget in the project document trying to understand what will be done. Consider trimming the descriptive text, and/or list the actual activities at the bottom of each output. Be as specific as possible and avoid at all cost to reduce a series of investments to acronyms like SLM and SFM. This is probably what STAP detected during the review of the PIF when they noticed that 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"? 2) What does a

"wildlife corridor governance management regime established and operationalized" look like? 3) 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?

4) 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. We are listing here the comments from STAP that relate to the point made above. Not to provide an answer (beyond citing the places where this was addressed in the Prodoc), but to reinforce the point (Note: The reading of STAP comments was made towards the end of the review so these issues look like have some ground)

2) The execution of the project and who is going to deliver. As stated in the detailed comments below, there is a regular question: "What institutions will deliver the activities and are responsible for the outputs and outcomes?" The Project Document describes almost an ideal scenario of interventions, with apparently little reflection on how and who will deliver them. Understanding that some of the consultants are to be hired through a competitive process, there are several activities for which it is necessary to know who the provider will be now and not as part of project implementation. The name of these providers should have emerged during the PPG and the GEF needs to know who they are.

The project has several investments related to important elements of the project (the "big ticket issues") for which the GEF has questions. Bear with the GEFSEC if the answer to the questions are somewhere in the Portal or in the Project Document. If that is the case, just provide a brief response and point to the page of the Project Document where that information is located. Thanks.

Component 2

2.1.2. i) What is the institution where these information systems are going to be placed? ii) Who is going to be responsible for the day-to-day and to pay the recurrent costs? iii) What is the experience and installed capacity (human and institutional) to set up and run the systems?

2.1.3. Fighting poaching (in this item and others). i) What are the BEST providers to offer these services in the region? This is a key issue that needs to be known not. We need the best in the region, not the ones that can deliver it for less.

2.2.2. The investment in the management of the target protected areas require clarification. Please boil down the proposed interventions to "manage hunting activities in ZOVICs, Nazinga Game Reserve and Sissili Classified Forest?". Are these hunting activities the source of bush-meat and/or trophy hunting (hunting tourism)? Both are very challenging and require special attention. Who is going to be responsible to deliver these interventions? Please refer to the BEST possible providers that have a proven record in management of hunting areas in the country or region, including establishing hunting quotas, monitoring and all other activities necessary to make these investments deliver GEBs. This information should be available as part of the the preparation of the project. Please re-write paragraph 166 to provide a transparent and convincing argument for these investments. Please elaborate on the measures and safeguards that are being proposed to finance activities that don't render GEBs. STAP made a relevant comment about trophy hunting. Please consider STAP comment on the issue as input for the

review of the CEO Endorsement: 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. Please consider this as additional input for the CEO Endorsement.

Not clear why Nahouri Safari is a co-financier when "the 350,000 FCFA / year share to be paid to the communities by the concession holder Nahouri Safari for their upkeep has been discontinued in recent years, due to their level of degradation" 1. Village hunting areas (ZOVIC) are community-based protected areas designed to generate benefits for the population through small game subsistence hunting and income sharing from small game hunting activities managed by a concession holder. However, due to the mismanagement of the ZOVICs on the outskirts of the Nazinga Game Ranch, the 350,000 FCFA / year share to be paid to the communities by the concession's holder Nahouri Safari for their upkeep has been discontinued in recent years, due to their level of degradation. The small game that should feed the subsistence hunting of local people has become scarce. By supporting improved management of ZOVICs and issues around fair benefit sharing, the project will seek to restore incentives for stakeholders to ensure the proper management of resources and habitats within ZOVICs.

2.2.4. Monitoring. What institution is going to be responsible to carry out the proposed monitoring? What is the proven experience in the subject, where is the data will be deposited and managed? This is a massive undertaking that requires special care.

2.2.5. What institution/ organization will provide the services for the training necessary for the *Surveillance and anti-poaching planned and implemented at the PONASI landscape scale*? Please provide the names of BEST the institutions/organizations that would be available to offer these services, including engaging the communities in the fight against poaching.

2.4.1. Human Wildlife Conflict. The IUCN has the SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force, and the GWP a community of practices about HWC. Has the project reach out to them? Was WWF informed about the use of SAFE in PONASI and what did they say? Who are the organizations with a proven record on addressing HWC going to deliver the interventions and make them effective?

2.4.2. How long has the laboratory of Animal Biology and Ecology carried out the research on the elephant populations? Will they be the executors of this intervention? Please consult the IUCN African Specialist Group now on the proposed research and potential investments on the ground beyond the proposed study. If not now, when?

Output 3.4. How many tourists visit PONASI on a yearly basis? The suggested interventions described in 6 pages of the project (48-53) appears to have been written in a vacuum without consideration of the number of visitors and the Risks associated with it and considered High. *An unstable socio-economic and increasing insecurity in the country could reduce the attractiveness of PONASI sites for international tourists.* The mitigation factors are not enough to counterbalance the impressions potential tourists have on visiting the country. While the GEF supports and encourages Nature-based tourism, we kindly request to reconsider some of the proposed interventions and resize them according to the immediate needs of the Parks. Shouldn't it make more sense to do basic investments for Tourism and more funding to protect the areas? If not well protected, there is going to be nothing for the tourist in the medium and long term. This relates to STAP comment at PIF stage: 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).

Component 4.

What is the budget for the three outputs?

9-26-19

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.

2.2.2 (a) The decision to go via Trophy Hunting appears to have been taken. On the one hand, there is the i) *Assessment of the sustainability of hunting management in ZOVICs, the NGR and Sissili CF with the support of a wildlife hunting expert* and on the other hand, there are 5 more activities that are already geared towards this type of tourism: ii) *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*; 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.

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"?

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

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

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?

(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.

(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 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? 2)

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?

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?

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?

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.

2-13-20

2.1.2 Cleared sorry the mistake about 2.1.3

2.1.2 thank you for the information provided. Cleared

2.2.2

(ii) cleared

(iii) Roster? Jaime sees with indicated experts

(iv) Cleared

(v) Law enforcement? to be more explicit

(b) Cleared

(c) Cleared

The argument in support of these investments is very weak:

1) Cleared

2) How to plan extractive activities if the terroir is degraded? How you plan to restore? what is the level of degradation?

3) Cleared

Conclusion: Governnt support big game hunting. Which species are focused by this project for hunting.

Parallel cofinancing: Cleared

3-16-20

The GEF requests the following changes in the timeline of the project in order to further consider this project for CEO Endorsement. 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. Because the natural assets in the ZOVICS are ?quite degraded? (or even if the status is in doubt) and ?under par? in NGR and Sissili CF, it is essential to ensure that the species populations are healthy before embarking in the assessment of the sustainability of hunting management in ZOVICS, the NGR and Sissili CF. 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. 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. 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.

June 12, 2020:

There is no response to the comment in the review sheet. Please explain how the comment has been taken into account, make clear the modification in the CEO Endorsement Request by highlighting the modified text and upload the updated Prodoc.

August 25, 2020:

Thank you for the adjustment of the project approach following the GEF Secretariat guidance. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

10Aug2019

Please see the Response matrix uploaded under the Road map documents

GEFSEC comments	Response
There are two overarching issues that caught the attention of the GEF: 1) The number of pages that were used to describe the Components, Outcomes, Outputs and Activities (35 pages in the Project Document). For this, the GEF strongly suggest reducing the description surrounding the proposed activities and go to the point. While the background and information described in each of the outputs is important for the readers, the actual activities to be delivered by the project get totally diluted. The GEFSEC had to go back and forth between the text and the budget in the project document trying to understand what will be done. Consider trimming the descriptive text, and/or list the actual activities at the bottom of each output.	Section IV revised to clarify actual activities where possible, but left where deemed important supplemented by bulleted activities as recommended actions and actors.

Be as specific as possible and avoid at all cost to reduce a series of investments to acronyms like SLM and SFM. This is probably what STAP detected during the review of the PIF when they noticed that

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"? (*comment on the PIF*)

Noted, changes have been made to GEF-Results and Partnerships, Outcomes 1, 2, 3. This also is relevant to the changes done to the PIF.

With respect to acronyms, it is difficult to refer to them. Acronyms on Page 4 can be referred for more information.

With respect to the question on capacity development interventions targeting specific beneficiaries, the PIF mentions that the project will develop and disseminate knowledge sharing material to be used by the project, as elaborated under component 4.

Under component 1, the project provides training to management stakeholders at all levels, in order to ensure optimal and open input from all stakeholders. Under component 2, the project provides capacity development structures concerned with the collaborative management to fulfil the role expected of them in the collaborative management, including involving them in decision-making and surveillance activities.

Under component 3, capacity development for users of natural resources will involve training in sustainable agro-silvo-pastoral practices in demonstration sites established as field schools, to promote resource management practices in various landscapes and forests, and to implement improved resource management areas, namely for decision-making and planning, and to capture against established quotas. Interventions will support the establishment of small enterprises producing sustainable forest products, including support to cooperatives, provision of technical training, collection of forest products, several training activities, marketing of the products, and technical support to sustainable community tourism enterprises, as well as existing ones, and to facilitate access to markets.

At the national level, the project's interventions will involve Government staff of the Ministry of Environment, Change and its regional decentralized Directorates, the Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for the Environment, the Directorate General of Waters and Forests, the Regional Directorates of Environment, their subdivisions, and local authorities (communes). At the landscape level, capacity development for these stakeholders will be on various aspects of the collaborative management process, including improving communication skills of PA management committees and other stakeholders concerning their capacities to implement ecological monitoring and ecoguards and rangers' capacities to implement interventions to fight poaching, improving the ability to assess and to generate, access and use data for collaborative management involving local stakeholders, so that the main groups of stakeholders are involved in the collaborative PA management process, and for key PA management tools to improve

2) What does a "wildlife corridor governance management regime established and operationalized" look like? (*comment on the PIF*)

Clarification has been added to GEF-UNEP and Partnerships, Outcome 2, output 2.2.

In summary, corridors will be managed for protected areas, with clear objectives, regarding possible resource uses, collaboration and related agreements, identifying local. Corridors are integrated under the output effectiveness of PAs as wildlife corridors Burkina Faso? Forest Code, and the same management with adjacent communities will be developed. Corridors #1 and #2 have been established. The creation could not be formalized before the Natadev is working in corridor #1 to formalize management with the collaboration of local focus on the corridor #2 and work in close institutions in charge of PAs to harmonize both corridors. For further details please see the Project Document.

4) 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.
(comment on the PIF)

This has been addressed in GEF-UNDP Partnerships, Outcome 3, output 3.1, and on Benefits related to improving land management

In summary, depending on site-specific soil conditions, the project will mainly promote the adoption of Natural Regeneration, namely for their conservation of techniques for soil and water conservation, such as stone bunds, compost use, improved fire prevention and management of bush fires. The effectiveness of the above-mentioned interventions has been recently demonstrated as part of the project in Mouhoun. The results illustrate the importance of management actions to increasing agricultural productivity, restoration, and water and soil conservation. Stone bunds, mounds, and the use of organic fertilizers, except maize and the development of other crops, yields from 1.7 T/ha to 5.2 T/ha.

Evolution of yields with SLM in Boucle du Mouhoun

Culture	Yield in T/ha
Rice	1 to 2 T/ha
Cotton	500 to 600 kg/ha
Maize	2.3 T/ha
Sorghum	600 to 800 kg/ha
Niebe	600 kg/ha

Source: Report of the CPP Boucle du Mouhoun

Also, ANR will be preferred over other approaches. It has been shown that ANR significantly reduces the cost of assisted natural regeneration in tropical regions, reaching at achieving the recovery of biodiversity at a cost of up to 95% of the cost of forest restoration. Forest regeneration can restore forest cover on degraded lands.

The project will support the establishment of demonstration sites with the support of local NGOs, in pilot sites where farmers, herders, and fishers will develop skills and knowledge on various agricultural practices, the adoption of sustainable and climate-adapted practices, established on the farms and managed by the farmers, to control the costs of implementation. Training, on-site field demonstration and by-doing and provision of customized advice to the farmer/she/he is established in her/his own field. The project will also demonstrate innovative climate-adapted practices in collaboration with existing private sector, for the implementation of the above-mentioned SLM interventions.

The project will also set up a small grant scheme for herders and forestry workers in the 15 pilot sites for agriculture, and sustainable agricultural / forestry practices, improved and more sustainable livelihoods, and the purchase of improved agricultural and forestry inputs and will be implemented in a series of value grants. The project will also support the hiring of temporary personnel to set up the demonstration sites, assist the Water and Forests regional and

<p>We are listing here the comments from STAP that relate to the point made above. Not to provide an answer (beyond citing the places where this was addressed in the Prodoc), but to reinforce the point (Note: The reading of STAP comments was made towards the end of the review so these issues look like have some ground)</p>	<p>The project team has worked to address t</p>
<p>2) The execution of the project and who is going to deliver. As stated in the detailed comments below, there is a regular question: "What institutions will deliver the activities and are responsible for the outputs and outcomes?? The Project Document describes almost an ideal scenario of interventions, with apparently little reflection on how and who will deliver them. Understanding that some of the consultants are to be hired through a competitive process, there are several activities for which it is necessary to know who the provider will be now and not as part of project implementation. The name of these providers should have emerged during the PPG and the GEF needs to know who they are.</p>	<p>In the project document, where the inform institutions involved have been clarified. known (and may be identified as part of p potential providers have been identified.</p> <p>For activities related to HWCs, WWF wa the SAFE system methodology in two pil Brookes who developed the approach), to PONASI landscape. Government membe participants to the Rapid Assessments in approach for addressing the HWC issue a</p>
<p>The project has several investments related to important elements of the project (the "big ticket issues") for which the GEF has questions. Bear with the GEFSEC if the answer to the questions are somewhere in the Portal or in the Project Document. If that is the case, just provide a brief response and point to the page of the Project Document where that information is located. Thanks.</p>	<p>As per responses below.</p>
<p>Component 2 2.1.2. i) What is the institution where these information systems are going to be placed? ii) Who is going to be responsible for the day-today and to pay the recurrent costs? iii) What is the experience and installed capacity (human and institutional) to set up and run the systems?</p>	<p>i) Currently, although institutions in char of this, monitoring is lacking or incons Forests ? DGEF, and Regional Directorat Climate Change - DREEVCC) or limited (National Office for Protected Areas - OF configuration for the management of PON workshop is planned for this purpose as p suggested during the PPG would be to en PONASI complex to OFINAP, which wo long-term ecological monitoring system.</p> <p>ii) The financial and operational accounta monitoring system will be derived from t under Output 2.1.1.</p> <p>iii) An adequate monitoring framework w which has a minimum required resource, the Project can rely. OFINAP clearly has monitors resources only sporadically. Alt monitoring and evaluation in the DGEF, data is insufficient for lack of adequate re set up a monitoring mechanism and finan Ministry level. It is expected that OFINA to ensure continuity. It was therefore requ achievements and support the institutiona</p>
<p>2.1.3. Fighting poaching (in this item and others). i) What are the BEST providers to offer these services in the region? This is a key issue that needs to be known not. We need the best in the region, not the ones that can deliver it for less.</p>	<p>Service providers for different elements v project either through a procurement proc analysis as per the UNDP rules and regul the SMART approach to monitor and rep and WCS</p>

2.2.2. The investment in the management of the target protected areas require clarification. (a) Please boil down the proposed interventions to "manage hunting activities in ZOVICs, Nazinga Game Reserve and Sissili Classified Forest?.

(b) Are these hunting activities the source of bushmeat and/or trophy hunting (hunting tourism)? Both are very challenging and require special attention.

(c) Who is going to be responsible to deliver these interventions? Please refer to the BEST possible providers that have a proven record in management of hunting areas in the country or region, including establishing hunting quotas, monitoring and all other activities necessary to make these investments deliver GEBs. This information should be available as part of the preparation of the project.

(a) A description of proposed interventions under Paragraph 169 and copied here for

Interventions to strengthen sustainable management of Nazinga Game Ranch and Sissili Classified Forest

i) Assessment of the sustainability of hunting in the Nazinga Game Ranch and Sissili CF with the support of a wildlife expert. Promote hunting should be made on a controlled basis to avoid exploited populations (those for which hunting has significant impacts, including socioeconomic ones.

ii) A workshop led by a consultant expert to develop a national consensus on the issue of shifting hunting from the NGR and the Sissili CF - based on the current management in ZOVICs, the NGR and the Sissili CF - and the disadvantages of maintaining hunting in the NGR and Sissili CF for biodiversity and socioeconomic benefits to local communities; information to support this assessment of the ecosystem goods and services provided by the landscape conducted as part of output 1.2.

iii) Participatory identification of conservation areas with the support of the wildlife expert;

iv) Determination of sustainable harvest levels based on available information;

v) Establishment of a monitoring system to provide a sound basis for adjusting hunting pressure;

vi) Development of guidance documents for hunting management actions.

(b) Legal big game /trophy hunting for tourists in the Nazinga Ranch and in the Sissili Classified Forest and small game hunting for tourists and subsistence hunting taking place in the ZOVICs surrounding the Nazinga Ranch concessionaires who manage the activity of trophy game hunting.

(c) A potential service provider to support hunting management include the International Game Fishers Association (IGFA). A procurement process will be determined on the service provider.

Please re-write paragraph 166 to provide a transparent and convincing argument for these investments. Please elaborate on the measures and safeguards that are being proposed to finance activities that don't render GEBs.

The context to justify investments in strengthening sustainable hunting management provided in the ProDoc, Section II Development of Sustainable Hunting Management. Information related to the context has been provided in paragraphs 26, 44, 45, and 68 (barriers).

ProDoc Section IV. Paragraphs 166 to 168.

Strengthening sustainable hunting management
allowed in partial wildlife reserves, game hunting is expected to generate benefits for local communities, hunting guides and trackers and the sharing of revenues. According to the Forest Code (2011), revenues from the valuation of wildlife reserves are distributed among local authorities. In the PONASI, big game hunting is allowed in the Nazinga Game Ranch (NGR) and in the ZOVICs. Hunting for tourists and subsistence hunting is allowed in the ZOVICs. When it was launched, the project was led by a Canadian NGO, the Association, and later co-managed by the Ministry of Environment from 1984 to 1990. The ZOVICs managed by village communities are a system in which the local populations were involved and shared the benefits. Revenues for the ranch were from international safari hunting, game hunting, and small game hunting for the local population, as well as small game hunting for the local population [1]¹. When the Canadian NGO quit in 1990, the management of the National Wildlife Reserves, the lack of effective capacity, experience, and the insufficient transfer of knowledge have led to a reduction in management effectiveness and inappropriate harvest levels through legal hunting targeting small species.

Now, the concession holder Nahouri Safari has taken over the Nazinga Game Ranch and has stopped allowing communities in recent years on the grounds of proper management and maintenance of the reserves degraded. In addition, the small game hunting for tourists and subsistence hunting for local communities no longer provide benefits to the local population. Nazinga GR[2]² over most of 30 years (the population of waterbuck and hartebeest) increased significantly (the population of oribis) decreased between 1981 and 2011. Hunting and poaching favoured by a reduction in hunting quotas are determined during the project. However, since monitoring of exploited species is not consistently and according to a protocol to determine sustainable yield thresholds for the species, rigorous science to ensure that hunting is consistent with conservation objectives.

Traditional small game hunting near PAs is a common activity, could have negative effects on small game hunting without sound knowledge-based regulation. Hunting has a negative cascading effect on the ecosystem services and assets for non-consumptive and consumptive species benefit local communities as they provide a source of income through the revenues from the concessionaires for small game hunting, and the provision of hunting, as ecoguards or trackers. The ownership of protected areas, reduce the revenues for local communities at the periphery of PAs and the habitats for these wildlife species and the

<p>STAP made a relevant comment about trophy hunting. Please consider STAP comment on the issue as input for the review of the CEO Endorsement: 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. Please consider this as additional input for the CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>Big game hunting is already taking place in the Sissili Classified Forest? vision tourism is not the only option but the cohabitation of the two types of tourism is also taking place in some of the areas. The project should consider banning trophy hunting to improve big and small game hunting management.</p> <p>The design of the tourism output 3.4 was developed during the PPG phase and it has been aligned with the needs of the tourists who come to BF for hunting or for eco-tourism. communities? capacities to offer products and services for tourism enterprises.</p>
<p>Not clear why Nahouri Safari is a co-financier when "the 350,000 FCFA / year share to be paid to the communities by the concession holder Nahouri Safari for their upkeep has been discontinued in recent years, due to their level of degradation" 1. Village hunting areas (ZOVIC) are community-based protected areas designed to generate benefits for the population through small game subsistence hunting and income sharing from small game hunting activities managed by a concession holder. However, due to the mismanagement of the ZOVICs on the outskirts of the Nazinga Game Ranch, the 350,000 FCFA / year share to be paid to the communities by the concession? holder Nahouri Safari for their upkeep has been discontinued in recent years, due to their level of degradation. The small game that should feed the subsistence hunting of local people has become scarce. By supporting improved management of ZOVICs and issues around fair benefit sharing, the project will seek to restore incentives for stakeholders to ensure the proper management of resources and habitats within ZOVICs.</p>	<p>The co-financing amount of \$429,649 is not a parallel co-financing ? Nahouri Safari will be responsible for capacity building and equipment for guiding and anti-poaching.</p>
<p>2.2.4. Monitoring. What institution is going to be responsible to carry out the proposed monitoring? What is the proven experience in the subject, where is the data will be deposited and managed? This is a massive undertaking that requires special care.</p>	<p>Currently, although institutions in charge of monitoring this, monitoring is lacking or inconsistent (DGEF) or limited to fauna surveys related to the Areas - OFINAP). It is foreseen that an output of 2.1.1 ? A likely scenario is to entrust OFINAP, which would be the institution in charge of the monitoring system.</p> <p>A monitoring framework is in place with the necessary resources, as well as staff in charge of monitoring. OFINAP clearly has more resources for scientific and technical attention and support resources only sporadically. Although a monitoring mechanism exists, the DGEF, the collection and capitalization of adequate resources. An ongoing project, the monitoring mechanism and finances monitoring at OFINAP is expected that OFINAP will take over the monitoring continuity. It was therefore requested that OFINAP achieve its achievements and support the institutionalization of the monitoring system.</p>

<p>2.2.5. What institution/ organization will provide the services for the training necessary for the Surveillance and anti-poaching planned and implemented at the PONASI landscape scale? Please provide the names of BEST the institutions/organizations that would be available to offer these services, including engaging the communities in the fight against poaching.</p>	<p>The SMART approach was previously identified in the Project Result Framework as a key approach for monitoring and reporting on poaching and wildlife crime under output 2.1.3, paragraphs 151 and 152. The Office informed us that they could provide the necessary support.</p>
<p>2.4.1. Human Wildlife Conflict. The IUCN has the SSC Human-Wildlife Conflict Task Force, and the GWP a community of practices about HWC. Has the project reach out to them? Was WWF informed about the use of SAFE in PONASI and what did they say? Who are the organizations with a proven record on addressing HWC going to deliver the interventions and make them effective?</p>	<p>Dr Ashley Brookes of WWF who developed the HWC was contacted from the start of the project. Mr Brookes on the SAFE Systems approach in his own and other countries, under the guidance of the PPG and conducted a mission to Boko 2 villages of the PONASI area that are stricken by HWC. Recommendations form the basis of outputs 2.1.3 and 2.1.4. He has been contacted and will be engaged during the implementation of the Force to facilitate engagement of the government and the Force to learn from lessons around the work and tools and approaches. (Please see ProDoc 2.1.3 and 2.1.4)</p>
<p>2.4.2. How long has the laboratory of Animal Biology and Ecology carried out the research on the elephant populations? Will they be the executors of this intervention? Please consult the IUCN African Specialist Group now on the proposed research and potential investments on the ground beyond the proposed study. If not now, when?</p>	<p>Dr Emmanuel Midibahaye HEMA did his PhD on the distribution of elephants in the Nazinga game ranch (1979) 'DISTRIBUTIONS DE L'ÉLEPHANT (Loxodonta africana) DANS LE RANCH DE NAZINGA (BURUNDI) ET IMPACT SUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT AFRICAINE: LE CAS DU RANCH DE NAZINGA (BURUNDI)'. He has published at least 2 papers on the distribution of savannah elephants (Loxodonta africana) within Nazinga game ranch, Southern Burundi, 2011, and <i>The seasonal distribution of savannah elephants (Loxodonta africana) in Nazinga Game Ranch, southern Burundi</i>, 2011. He is still active in this field as shown in 2018.</p> <p>One of the national PPG consultants, Mr. Jean-Baptiste Ndayishimiye, is a member of the BF Protected Areas Commission. During the project, he consulted with members of the IUCN African Specialist Group. Sawadogo and Dr Emmanuel Hema are members of the IUCN African Specialist Group. We had a specific meeting with Mr. Martin Lungren, President of the Coalition for Savanna in Africa, to discuss the question of the corridor. There was no consensus on the movement of elephants, particularly since the establishment of two national parks and changed movement patterns, and that there was an issue. Discussion continued with Dr. Hema. The research component be included in the project. The movement within and around the PONASI landscape.</p> <p>We also met with staff from the IUCN Regional Office for Central and West Africa project. Staff we met were Mr. Jacques S. MASUMBUKO, Mr. Alain LUSHIMBA (IUCN Regional Office for Central and West Africa) and the IUCN Office in KAMBOU.</p>

Output 3.4. How many tourists visit PONASI on a yearly basis? The suggested interventions described in 6 pages of the project (48-53) appears to have been written in a vacuum without consideration of the number of visitors and the Risks associated with it and considered High. An unstable socio-economic and increasing insecurity in the country could reduce the attractiveness of PONASI sites for international tourists. The mitigation factors are not enough to counterbalance the impressions potential tourists have on visiting the country. While the GEF supports and encourages Nature-based tourism, we kindly request to reconsider some of the proposed interventions and resize them according to the immediate needs of the Parks. Shouldn't it make more sense to do basic investments for Tourism and more funding to protect the areas? If not well protected, there is going to be nothing for the tourist in the medium and long term. This relates to STAP comment at PIF stage: 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).

The issue of increasing national insecurity to diversify local communities' livelihoods (V):

Para 265: "Because of security risks in the country, tourists initially look at domestic travel (including from Ouagadougou) (who want an add-on tour) from Ouagadougou and their entourage; people staying for elephants and other issues in the PONASI landscape will be interested in for additional support (e.g. tourism police).

A map presenting advice against travel in Burkina Faso (Figure 3. Security situation in Burkina Faso).

While the PONASI area has not seen any security risks, the security situation in some areas of the country has led to deter foreign tourists to travel to Burkina Faso. A 4-hour drive from the capital city and has not been supported along a coherent strategy for the management of the area as well as natural assets, as is proposed under the project. Efforts to counter terrorism be successful could have a positive impact on biodiversity and local communities.

The issue was discussed in the CEO ER (2017) and its alignment with the project design, table 1. The output of an additional livelihood output: "Output 3.4 Strengthened capacities for beekeeping and honey processing enterprises are established, producing a sustained income, especially for women and youth." This livelihood output, supported by the PRF, is a promising value chain based on the sustainable use of forest products, with women as beneficiaries, and sets the conditions for the development of sustainable use of forest products.

This output was not in the original PIF and was added to the strategy for the development of sustainable use of forest products.

We acknowledge that the formulation of the output for beekeeping enterprises was misleading and did not accurately reflect that was advocated considering the national strategy. ProDoc and CEO ER as follows:

Output 3.4 Strengthened capacities for beekeeping and honey processing in communities in the PONASI landscape. This output is intended to support existing enterprises and at the community level, and in the private sector.

Also, we feel that the project activities under Output 3.4 are in line with GEFSEC comments as shown in some examples.

Para 256: "a series of interventions to improve the tourism area, both by improving visitor facilities and by increasing the capacity of local people to provide tourism services."

Para 262: "Identification of attractions and the development of specific natural and cultural attractions. This includes the existing wildlife products in the protected areas, through the inventory on their improvement and promotion."

3.4.4 Tourism product development and marketing
develop small business plans where products are improved/promoted (e.g. training for beekeeping). Categories for support may include direct tourism (e.g. attractions, cafés, etc.) and indirect tourism (e.g. vegetable garden, transport/transfers, juice).

We believe that outputs 3.3 and 3.4 are essential to support conservation efforts under component 3.4 in the PONASI landscape. These threats are not limited to protected areas by local communities that are not in the budget allocated to Output 3.4 on tourism.

Component 4. What is the budget for the three outputs?	563,173\$ is the budget for the component been estimated as follows (Excel file attached) Output 4.1: 102,950 \$ Output 4.2: 291,273 \$ Output 4.3: 168,950 \$
---	--

[1] Portier, B., Lungren, C.G. (2007). La faune et le ranching au Burkina Faso. In: W. Delvingt, C. Vermeulen (Eds.), Nazinga. Région Wallonne, Presse Agronomique de Gembloux, Nature+, APEFE, Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie (Burkina Faso), Gembloux and Ouagadougou. pp 33-44.

[2] Bouché P., Lejeune P., Bailly V., Muyle M., Zinque M.H., Mercier A., Cornélis D., Lungren C., Portier B., Marchal A., Renault F., Yamogo D., Kafando P., Sawadogo P. and C. Vermeulen (2016) Conserving wildlife amongst the cotton fields. A third of a century of experience at the Nazinga Game Ranch, Burkina Faso. Environ. Monit. Assess. DOI 10.1007/s10661-016-5388-y.

Januray 13, 2020	
------------------	--

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-Burkinab? 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.

<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>ii) Who is going to be responsible for the day-to-day 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>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>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. Please see: ProDoc Chap. IV Results and Partnerships, Section IV Results and Partnerships output 2.2.2, parag. 170, 171 and output 2.3.2, para 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" " ProDoc Chap. IV Results and Partnerships, Section 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 Bouch? 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 Bouch? *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 ellipsiprimus*
Hartebeest *Alcelaphus buselaphus*
Bushbuck *Tragelaphus scriptus*
Warthog *Phacochoerus africanus*
Common duiker *Sylvicapra grimmia*
Oribi *Ourebia ourebi*
Baboon *Papio Anubis*

Information added as footnote to the ProDoc, Section IV Results and Partnerships - para 171.

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.

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).

(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 (ProDoc ? Section II Development Challenge - para 9).

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. (ProDoc ? Section II Development Challenge - para 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 Francois 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 Francois 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?

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

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.

Please see ProDoc Section IV-Results and Partnerships, parag 173, 174.

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.

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).

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.

Please see ProDoc Section IV-Results and Partnerships, parag. 170, 171, 199.

Response to Secretariat comments on June 12, 2020 (August 03, 2020):

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

First:

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. 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.

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.

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 effects to reduce the risk of opposition to the project during its implementation by both local people and the local and central authorities.

It is therefore suggested that the project addresses the issue of hunting sustainability in successive stages. Please see 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, where the following is described:

i) organizing a workshop early after the onset of the project, to build consensus around the need to alleviate pressures on game species, among the parties concerned, in particular the Government, the concessionaires and the local populations, based on 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, and to gain broad support for the suspension of hunting activities until the full recovery of affected populations;

ii) strengthening PA management, especially surveillance and enforcement, while ensuring a rigorous monitoring of animal populations throughout the first half of the project;

iii) at mid-term, recruiting of a third party to carry out a rigorous scientific assessment of the status of game populations and make recommendations regarding the resumption of hunting activities in the NGR, the Sissili CF and in the ZOVICs; and

iv) depending on the results of the assessment, 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.

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 under paragraphs 202 and 203.

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. Please refer to 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

Second:

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. Please refer to GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section III

Strategy p. 21, paragraph 89:

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.

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. Please refer to GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV Results and Partnerships. Output 2.1.2 - An information system for monitoring, analysis, mapping and dissemination of knowledge is implemented.

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 enforcement as detailed under Output 2.1.2, paragraph 158. The following text was added:

subject to a recommendation from the expert assessment of the status of game species that hunting activities may be resumed in a foreseeable future, the project will support capacity building for the stakeholders responsible for overseeing or implementing hunting management in line with related activities under the output 2.2.2 to strengthen the sustainability of hunting management: i) Government officers in the central and decentralized directions, namely the Department of Planning and Ecological Monitoring of the DFRC, and technical services in charge of wildlife, to fulfil the State's sovereign functions of monitoring and assessing resources and habitats to allocate areas, assign permits and licenses for sport and traditional hunting, defining regulations and quotas and monitoring captures against established quotas, planning and implementing surveillance, defining specifications for the management of concessions by concessionaires, assessing the observation of such specifications by concessionaires and the ability of concessionaires to manage concessions effectively, and assisting local communities in managing the ZOVICs; and ii) local community members involved in ZOVICs (namely village hunting management committees) to fulfil their role in the management of hunting activities, including monitoring and assessing resources and habitats to support management decision-making and determination of permissible activities within the ZOVICs.

Third:

Addressed jointly with the first comment.

Fourth:

Thank you for the recommendation. We totally agree. This scenario has been explicitly integrated in the step (iv) in the text above. Please refer to GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section IV Results and Partnerships. Output 2.2.2 ? as part of the paragraph 173:

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.

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6-18-19

The project is composed of GEF funding in the amount of \$5,279,452 and co-financing in the amount of \$22,339,851. A ratio of 4.4 to 1.0.

While the investments of GEF funds are clearly presented in the Total Budget and Work Plan (p.89 of Project Document) it is impossible to know if the co-financing is indeed co-financing or parallel financing. Since the LoC indicate the amount in support of the different components, is there a table that puts together the GEF and co-financing? This is important because the proposed interventions in 35 pages of the Project Document (21-56) are unlikely to be delivered with GEF funding only.

9-26-19

Parallel co-financing can not be used as co-financing. Please only include those sources that will co-finance (as in cover costs directly associated with the project).

3-16-20

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

10Aug2019

All co-financing except for UNDP resources is parallel co-financing as indicated in the following sections: Pls see summary table p.2, Section V. Project Management - paragraph 318, and Section IX. Financial Planning and Management - paragraphs 393 and 394. Under paragraph 394 a table presents the co-financing sources, estimated co-financing amounts and corresponding planned activities/outputs that will contribute to the project ? the project outputs to which these will contribute are indicated.

The Table Summary of funds on page 96 puts together the GEF funds and co-financing.

13Jan2020

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).	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 (p.2 ? Financing Plan, Chapter V Project Management para 318, Chapter IX Financial Planning and Management para 391 and 394). The designation ?parallel co-financing? had not been used in the CEO ER.
--	--

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6-18-19

Please address risks associated with some of the proposed activities under item 2.

Thanks

9-26-19

As requested additional text has been noted in the risk section of the CEO ER including an associated mitigation strategy.

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

10Aug2019

Increasing national insecurity due to terrorist attacks in the country and potential impact on tourism had been identified in the ProDoc (Section IV. Results and Partnerships) and rated as High, and in the UNDP Risk Log (Annex G of the ProDoc) strengthened as follows:

Two measures were included in the project to mitigate the risk of increased insecurity:

- Given the risk of lower attractiveness of Burkina Faso to foreign tourists, the project (output 3.4 on tourism) will initiate tourists who already visit Burkina Faso rather than attracting new categories of tourists from outside, including expatriates in Ouagadougou and existing visitors (e.g. hunters and their entourage; people staying for elephant viewing). A series of initiatives will be implemented to develop tourism attractions and products in the area, both by improving visitor facilities at existing attractions and improving the tourism products and services. Support will be provided to develop small business plans where products exist but require the entrepreneur to develop them). Categories for support may include direct tourism entities (e.g. homestay, tour guide 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 will develop value chains based on the sustainable use of NTFP, targeting mainly women as beneficiaries, and putting in place the Sustainable local forest products processing enterprises are established, providing livelihoods and generating sustainable income for vulnerable people. This addition allows to have a more diversified strategy for the development of sustainable livelihoods of forest products.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6-18-19

The LoC from UNDP is missing

The LoC from the Ministry of Mines and Quarries is for \$2,125,000 and \$102,769 in the Portal.

Please address these two issues.

9-26-19

In the Portal, we don't see uploaded the UNDP-Burkina Faso co-financing letter and the amount corrected of the letter of the Ministry of Mines and Quarry. Please ensure the requested information is uploaded in the Portal.

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.

3-16-20

Thank you for the clarification and for adding the UNDP-Burkina Faso co-financing letter. The letter from the Ministry of Mines and Quarries isn't signed. Please provide a signed letter.

June 12, 2020:

The comment isn't addressed. Please provide a signed letter from the Ministry of Mines and Quarries.

August 12, 2020:

Thank you for submitting the signed letter from the Ministry of Mines and Quarries. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

10Aug2019

- a) UNDP-Burkina Faso co-financing letter is now attached.
- b) The co-financing amount in the letter of the Ministry of Mines and Quarry had indicated the budget of the whole project which, for the most part, is not relevant to the PONASI project. A new LOC is provided with the appropriate amount of \$102,739 corresponding to the relevant activities contributing to the project.

13 January 2020

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. The UNDP cofinancing letter is included in the merged file of co-financing letters. The LoC from Ministry of Mines and Quarries is for US\$ 102,739 as stated in the Portal.

Response to Secretariat comments on June 12, 2020 (August 03, 2020):

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.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6-19-19

The table of indicators is provided.

It would be useful to provide a table with the funding that will be used for each of the Protected Areas listed in Indicator 1.2 That information is not available and could not be derived from the Detailed Budget. If there is more detailed budget in Excel where those amounts were calculated, please upload it to the Portal.

9-26-19

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.

03-16-2020

In the core indicators table of the Portal, the duration of accounting the GHG mitigation is still 10 years. In addition, the anticipated start year of accounting is 2029 which is in a far future. Please correct.

June 12, 2020:

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.

August 12, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Nevertheless, in the Portal, the Core Indicator table still says the duration of accounting the GHG emission mitigation is 10 years and the anticipated start year of accounting is 2029. Please correct this information as previously requested so that it is aligned with GEF guidelines and consistent with the Prodoc.

August 31, 2020:

Thank you for the correct adjustment. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

<p>6. Are relevant tracking tools completed? Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement 6-19-19</p> <p>The table of indicators is provided. It would be useful to provide a table with the funding that will be used for each of the Protected Areas listed in Indicator 1.2 That information is not available and could not be derived from the Detailed Budget. If there is more detailed budget in Excel where those amounts were calculated, please upload it to the Portal.</p>	<p>Based on an Excel table (file attached) where the budget amounts (technical assistance and investments) allocated to each protected area (the ZOVICs being lumped into one due to their small size) have been estimated, the funding will be used as follows:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Nazinga Game Ranch</td><td>\$ 432,521</td></tr> <tr> <td>Kabor?-Tambi NP</td><td>\$ 761,521</td></tr> <tr> <td>Sissili Classified Forest</td><td>\$ 440,921</td></tr> <tr> <td>Corridor #1</td><td>\$ 358,521</td></tr> <tr> <td>Corridor #2</td><td>\$ 363,521</td></tr> <tr> <td>ZOVICs</td><td>\$ 400,225</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total</td><td>\$ 2,757,230</td></tr> </table> <p>These figures are based on approximations. Within the same budget envelope, real costs are likely to be higher for state PAs and lower for corridors, particularly for corridor 1, which is small in size and supported by a national NGO, NATUDEV.</p>	Nazinga Game Ranch	\$ 432,521	Kabor?-Tambi NP	\$ 761,521	Sissili Classified Forest	\$ 440,921	Corridor #1	\$ 358,521	Corridor #2	\$ 363,521	ZOVICs	\$ 400,225	Total	\$ 2,757,230
Nazinga Game Ranch	\$ 432,521														
Kabor?-Tambi NP	\$ 761,521														
Sissili Classified Forest	\$ 440,921														
Corridor #1	\$ 358,521														
Corridor #2	\$ 363,521														
ZOVICs	\$ 400,225														
Total	\$ 2,757,230														

13Jan2020

<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 the revised figures for areas where a 20 year period instead of 10 years, a balance rather than 0.5% and a more conservative of the deforestation rate of 50%, instead of the entire 952,000 ha of the PONAS calculation, which corresponds to 35% of the protected areas, including corridors, large forests, 127 ha commune forests and improved management effectiveness.</p> <p>Over a period of 20 years, the result through the project's intervention, a 50% deforestation rate over 394,564 ha (the restoration of 11,000 ha of agroforests). The tool is uploaded, and the result sheet is attached. Estimated GHG emission values have been calculated in the Annex E, p.1, Section III-Strategy ? paragraph 1. Section VI-PRF Indicator 4, Annex E of GHG emissions mitigated) and in the Annex E, Indicator 6, Part II ? section A.1 Project Core Indicators ? Indicator 4 - p.40, Annex E ? Core Indicators.</p>
--	---

Response to Secretariat comments on June 12, 2020 (August 03 2020):

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 which was submitted for the 2nd revision. Therefore, calculations have been done for a 20-year period, as recommended and is reflected in the result sheet. No changes have been made to the FAO Ex-Act tool.

Also, in the GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet, *Duration of accounting (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.

UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments on 12 August 2020 (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.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6-19-19

Yes. Pages 57-58 of Project Document.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6-19-19

Yes. Pages 76-78 pf project document

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6-19-19

Yes. Component 4.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6-19-19

Yes.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6-19-19

Yes.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6-19-19

Yes.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not applicable.

Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6-19-19

No. Please address outstanding issues. The GEF is available for consultation via email or phone conference to clarify any doubts about this review. Thanks. JC

9-26-19

Not yet. Please address the important remaining issues raised above, particularly in Box 2.

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.

03-16-20

Not yet. Please address the comments above. Please also pay particular attention to the important comment in Box 2 which requires clear adjustments in the CEO Endorsement Request to allow the GEF Secretariat to further consider this project for CEO Endorsement..

In addition, the very last comment regarding the Executing Partner Type referred as "GEF Agency" doesn't appear to be addressed in the Portal. Please address it too.

June 12, 2020:

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).

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.

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.

September 22, 2020

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.

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.

November 2, 2020:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. Nevertheless, the new budget numbers have not been update in the Table B of the CEO Endorsement Request. Please update the table B so that the budget of each component is consistent with the budget presented in the Prodoc under section X.

November 23, 2020:

Thank you for the amendments. Nevertheless, further verifications in the provided package reveal the need to address the following issues (please apology for not having raised them before):

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.

BASELINE CO-FINANCING	
Ministry of Environment, Green Economy, and Climate Change	10,318,111 USD
Ministry of Agriculture and Hydro-agricultural Infrastructure	6,780,945 USD
Ministry of Animal and Fisheries Resources	1,500,000 USD
Tree Aid	1,198,840 USD
IUCN Burkina Faso	720,000 USD
Agence Pour la Promotion de la Petite et Moyenne Entreprise/Agriculture et Artisanat	719,505 USD
Nahouri Safari	429,649 USD
NATURAMA Foundation	164,036 USD
GA Mo Wiya Association	136,026 USD
Ministry of Mines and Quarries	102,739
(2) Total co-financing	22,069,851 USD

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

2- NIM Audit has to be removed from M&E and included in PMC.

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan: 6

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 Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies	UNDP Country Office	Total USD 20,000 - USD 4,000 per year starting year 2	None	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Manager	Paid through Component	USD 10,000	Annually

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.

Stakeholder Engagement Plan	Project Manager UNDP Country Office Community mobilization specialist	Paid through Component 2 (Comm. mobil. s p.) and 1 to 4 (PM)	None	On-going
Gender Action Plan	Project Manager Gender Specialist	Gender-based activities are included in the project budget of components 1, 2, 3 and 4	Budgeted as part of the co-financing to components 1, 2, 3, 4	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Manager	USD 32,400 ^[2]	None	On-going

December 3, 2020:

Thank you for the amendments. Nevertheless, it seems to be that when pasting from the Prodoc the updated M&E plan version in Portal, the Agency forgot to include part of it, so it is incomplete (see below) compared with the version in the ProDoc. Please provide in the Portal the complete M&E plan (under "C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:").

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 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 15,000 - USD 20,000 per year in year 2-3	None	On-going
Monitoring of Implementation of Gender Action Plan	Project Manager Gender Specialist	Total USD 15,000 - USD 20,000 per year in year 2-3	None	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Manager M&E/Safeguards expert UNDP Country Office	USD 32,400 ^[2]	None	On-going
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	None ⁷⁶	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]	USD 5,000	First year of the project

January 4, 2021:

Thank you for including the entire M&E Plan in the project description.

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response to GEFSec comments from 04 January 2021:

Please find included the duly filled out and signed Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template for the PONASI project.

UNDP Response to GEFSec comments on 03 December 2020:

We apologize for the oversight ? M&E plan version in Portal has been updated.

UNDP Response to GEFSec comments 23 November 2020:

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.

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.

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.

UNDP Response to GEFSEC comments 03 November 2020

We apologize for the oversight ? the Table B in the CEO ER has been updated.

13Jan2020

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 (ProDoc Section VIII Governance and Management Arrangements ? para 373 and diagram para 377).

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.

Response to Secretariat comments on June 12, 2020 (August 03, 2020):

Project Document Section VIII - Governance and Management Arrangements - paragraph 377: The following sentence was removed: *This role can be held by a representative from the Government Cooperating Agency.* The paragraph now reads as: Executive: The Executive is an individual who represents ownership of the project who will chair the Project Consultative/Dialogue Framework. The Executive is the representative of the Ministry of Environment, Green Economy and Climate Change, who is the President of the Project Consultative/Dialogue Framework.

UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments on 25 August 2020 (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".

UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments on August 31, 2020 (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 Kabor?-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 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, Kabor?-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, Kabor?-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 community mobilization assistants (50%) @ \$ 2,300 / motorcycle - Total cost for component 2: \$ 9,200 year 1

33 e) Purchase of 8 motorcycles for field trips related to the field activities of components 2 and 3, especially technical assistants and community mobilization assistants (50%) @ \$ 2,300 / motorcycle - Total cost per component: \$ 9,200 year 1

A brief justification for the purchase of the vehicle for the Kabor?-Tambi National Park and for the motorcycles for the 3 protected areas is provided in the paragraph 162, under the description of **Output 2.1 Institutional and individual capacities within PA agencies are enhanced through targeted capacity building interventions:**

paragraph 162: The basic equipment required for the management of protected areas, particularly for ecological monitoring and surveillance and anti-poaching activities, will be identified for each site, and the means of transport according to the extent of the area to monitor. This will involve acquiring the following equipment:

? Vehicles (a 4x4 vehicle for the PNKT management unit / motorcycles for the eco-guards of the 3 PAs);

|

The Government and the PPG team had requested 4 vehicles (one for the Project coordination unit, and one for each PA management unit) and many more motorcycles than what is provided for in the budget - but we limited the purchase of vehicles since the management units of two PAs already had vehicles, and limited the number of motorcycles to support project activities as these can be shared among staff to carry out the various tasks. The number of motorcycles dedicated to surveillance activities to fight poaching was increased to 24 in order to cover all areas of the PAs. During PPG, it was clear that the Government would not be in a position to support the purchase of vehicles to support the project activities and these are required to ensure delivery of project outputs.

|

In response to the last comment, we confirm the activities of the executing and implementing agencies will be fully separated. UNDP will handle only implementing functions as indicated in GEF policies and guidelines.

UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments on 02 November, 2020 (September 22, 2020):

[all changes in ProDoc and CEO ER are highlighted in blue]

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 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 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).

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/19/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/26/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/16/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/12/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/1/2020	

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Context:

Burkina Faso is an arid country covering 27.4 million ha with a population of 18.2 million growing at 3% per year. The main economic sector is agriculture and the country is facing many challenges to generate growth and distribute social goods to an income-deprived population with low levels of human development. The targeted area of the project is the PONASI landscape, which comprises a large area in southern-central Burkina Faso dominated by parklands and protected areas (PAs). One of the key features of the landscape is the presence of the country's second most important elephant range, along with a rich biodiversity including iconic species of mammals and birds. These species are threatened by habitat loss, poaching and unsustainable hunting activities.

With the fast population increase estimated to reach 35 million by 2040 in the country and the prevailing poverty, combined with the government plan to substantially increase intensive agricultural production, the PONASI Landscape's biodiversity and land and water resources are under increasing pressure. This pressure results in habitat loss and degradation, unsustainable agricultural practices, poaching and illegal wildlife trade, over-harvesting of natural resources and uncontrolled brushfires.

The project:

The project aims at safeguarding critical wildlife habitat, biodiversity and ecosystem services in the PONASI Protected Area Complex of Burkina Faso through integrated landscape management. Component 1 will work at the greater PONASI landscape level supporting establishment of institutional capacity and provision of tools for integrated landscape management, while component 2 will focus on strengthening management effectiveness of the protected area network within the PONASI landscape to secure core conservation areas. Component 3 focuses on sustainable land management and livelihood diversification with a view to enhance community livelihoods and reduce threats to ecosystem integrity and biodiversity such as over exploitation, habitat conversion and land degradation. The Component 4 will develop Gender mainstreaming and provide knowledge management and learning. During the first half of the project, a particular and strong attention will be paid on PAs management activities and the evaluation of the biodiversity status to adequately address and control the hunting activities currently being carried out in the project areas.

Country priorities:

The project strategy and proposed outputs are consistent with national development priorities, and notably with the national strategy for biological diversity the period 2001 to 2025 and its five-year action plans (sustainable use of biological resources, safeguarding of ecosystems and habitats of threatened species, land use planning, agroforestry practices and agro-silvo-pastoralism). The project also contributes to the objectives of the "10-year Strategic Framework Plan to strengthen the implementation of the Convention to Combat Desertification (2008-2018)", the National Plan for

Adaptation to Climate Change 2015 and the national plan for economic and social development for 2016-2020 (PNDES).

Global Environment Benefits:

Global Environmental Benefits will include the improved management of 952,000 ha of land, including 354,781 ha of protected areas, corridors and community-managed hunting zones and forest management worksites, 11,000 hectares of forested land restored, 129,478 ha under sustainable land management, and to avoid 5,4 million tCO₂eq emissions avoided. The project will also benefit to nearly 31,000 stakeholders including 60% female.

Innovation, Scaling up, & Sustainability:

The project introduces for the first time in Burkina Faso a landscape approach to biodiversity conservation and productive land management which includes bio-carbon conservation. This project will move from a site-focused conservation model towards an effective and integrated land and resource-use governance model at the landscape level. Furthermore, with the generation of revenue for local communities through eco-tourism, better soil productivity and viable diversification of income sources, the project should result in the reduction of pressures on biodiversity, including poaching. In addition to the comprehensive landscape approach, the knowledge management is expected to scale-up sustainable agro-sylvo-pastoral, SLM and biodiversity conservation practices. Finally, the sustainability of the project is expected to be ensured by the establishment an integrated governance platform, the design of a management master plan that includes financing aspects and, at community level, the strengthened capacities and incentives for conservation.

Co-financing:

The confirmed co-financing amount of \$22.3 million is provided as grants, mainly from 3 different ministries (82%), completed by funds from CSOs and UNDP.