



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TF

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Community-based Rural Development Project 3 rd Phase (with Sustainable Land and Forestry Management)			
Country(ies):	Burkina Faso	GEF Project ID:	
GEF Agency(ies):	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	P130568
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture Ministry of Environment	Submission Date:	20 November 2012
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area for GEF	Project Duration (Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sahel and West Africa Program in support of the Great Green Wall Initiative	Agency Fee (\$):	592,592

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

FA Objectives	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
LD-3	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities	Output 3.2. INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested Output 3.4. Information on INRM technologies and good practices guidelines disseminated	GEFTF	2,638,889	28,192,000
CCM-5	Outcome 5.1 Good management practices in LULUCF adopted both within the forest land and in the wider landscape	Output 5.2: Forests and non-forest lands under good management practices	GEFTF	1,319,445	14,096,250
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	Output 1.1. Protected areas and coverage of unprotected ecosystems.	GEFTF	989,584	10,572,188
BD-2	Outcome 1.2: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 1.2: National and sub-national land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem service valuation	GEFTF	329,861	3,524,562
SFM/REDD-1	Outcome 1.2: Good management practices applied in existing forests	Output 1.2: Forest area under sustainable management	GEFTF	1,759,259	18,795,000
Subtotal				7,037,038	75,180,000
Project management cost				370,370	22,170,000
Total project costs				7,407,408	97,350,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: to enhance the capacity of rural communities and decentralized institutions for the implementation of local development plans that promote sustainable land and natural resources management and productive investments at commune level.						
Project Components	Grant type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1. Strengthening Capacity for Decentralized Rural Development	TA	1.1 Commune, regional and central institutions trained in mainstreaming NRM and SFM in local development	1.1.1. Training delivered at commune, regional, central and local level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutions trained in SFM/SLWM (650), of which 302 rural municipal councils, 13 regional Councils, 150 land tenure services, 150 Technical services and 35 NGOs Number of training topics delivered (30), of which 20% in SFM/NRM 	GEFTF	600,000	7,856,842
		1.2. Knowledge generated and disseminated	1.2.1 Development of a communication strategy on SLWM/SFM with information concerning technologies and approaches 1.2.2. Development and dissemination of guides and toolkits on SLWM and SFM/NRM practices and environmental screening and mitigation measures for investments	GEFTF	350,000	4,583,158
Component 2. Rural land tenure reform	TA	2.1 Strengthened rural land security	2.1.1. Rural land tenure units operational at commune level 2.1.2 Attestation of land possession delivered (7000) 2.1.3. Local land charters approved (50)	-	0	5,500,000
Component 3: Local development investments	INV	3.1 Strengthened infrastructure in development sectors	3.1.1 Local investments for better management of land, and water resources and Sustainable Forestry Management (450 micro-projects)	GEFTF	2,500,741	36,791,344
		3.2 Strengthened capacity and awareness on SLWM and SFM at commune and department level	3.2.1 SLWM/SFM practices disseminated in targeted zones (5-10) at community level to increase sustainable land and water management land productivity and water-use efficiency and other practices (2000 ha) linked to community micro- projects 3.2.2. Land-use plans (5) that incorporate biodiversity, SFM and ecosystem service valuation	GEFTF	908,000	13,358,656
Component 4: Sustainable land and forestry	INV/ TA	4.1 Sustainable forest management practices and LULUCF introduced in targeted protected areas	4.1.1. Sustainable conservation and management for 13,000 forest ha in the targeted zones <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One overall ecosystem management plan developed 3 protected area management plans implemented 	GEFTF	1,500,000	3,852,384

Project Objective: to enhance the capacity of rural communities and decentralized institutions for the implementation of local development plans that promote sustainable land and natural resources management and productive investments at commune level.						
Project Components	Grant type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
management						
		4.2 Protected areas more effectively and sustainably managed	4.2.1. Business financing plans developed (3) and sustainable financing mechanism proposed for protected areas with forests	GEFTF	428,297	1,171,423
		4.3 Sustainably managed landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation and LULUCF	4.3.1. ZOVICs (community hunting areas) and 2 wildlife corridors are protected and sustainably managed 4.3.2. Community income-generating activities compatible with conservation and sustainable use of forests and landscape in targeted zones and forests	GEFTF	750,000	2,066,193
Subtotal					7,037,038	75,180,000
Component 1. Project management, monitoring and evaluation	TA	For the project to be effectively implemented, project management functions including fiduciary management, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), technical supervision, reporting and audits, will be covered under this component		GEFTF	370,370	22,170,000
Total project costs					7,407,408	97,350,000

A. SOURCE OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF (\$)

<i>Sources of Co-financing</i>	<i>Name of Co-financier (source)</i>	<i>Type of Cofinancing</i>	<i>Cofinancing Amount (\$)</i>
GEF Agency	World Bank – IDA – CBRD3	Soft Loan	70,000,000
GEF Agency	World Bank – IDA – PACT	Soft Loan	4,650,000
National Government	Government – CBRD3	Cash/In-kind	8,000,000
Other	Beneficiaries – CBRD3	In kind	8,000,000
GEF Agency	World Bank – IDA – PAPSA	Soft Loan	6,700,000
Total Co-financing			97,350,000

B. GEF/LDCF/SCCF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name / Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
WB	GEF TF	Land degradation	Burkina Faso	2,777,778	222,222	3,000,000
WB	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Burkina Faso	1,388,889	111,111	1,500,000
WB	GEF TF	Climate Change	Burkina Faso	1,388,889	111,111	1,500,000
WB	GEF TF	Multifocal area	Burkina Faso	1,851,852	148,148	2,000,000
				7,407,408	592,592	8,000,000

C. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Estimated Person Weeks	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants*	2748	12,400	4,100,000	4,112,400
International consultants*	0	0	0	0
Total	2748	12,400	4,100,000	4,112,400

* Details to be provided in Annex C.

D. PROJECT MANAGEMENT COST

Cost Items	Total Estimated Person Weeks (GEF)	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants*	135	202,370	6,000,000	6,202,370
International consultants*	0	0	500,000	500,000
Office facilities, equipment and vehicles		105,000	7,670,000	7,775,000
Travel*		63,000	5,000,000	5,063,000
Other ** (cadre de concertation)			3,000,000	3,000,000
Total	135	370,370	22,170,000	22,540,370

* Details to be provided in Annex C. **For others, to be clearly specified by overwriting field * (1) and *(2).

E. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO

F. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

Since the Project is based on earlier phases of the CBRD and the associated GEF project (SILEM GEF ID 1178), the Project's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) will benefit from lessons learned and already established M&E systems, as well as baselines. Specifically, this includes (a) updating the existing computerized management information system (MIS) to monitor basic data on investments, financing and outputs; (b) audits including ex-post economic analysis on a sample of the portfolio (currently underway); (c) use and enhancement of existing participatory M&E tools and M&E committees at commune and village level; and (d) application of the well functioning information system and GIS database for watersheds from SILEM with the Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD). The full blend of the GEF and CBRD activities will allow GEF to rely on extensive existing M&E systems, indicators and budget.

Evaluation of results is scheduled to be especially rigorous, and based on a series of earlier evaluations, surveys and assessments, and in close collaboration with local universities. In addition to regular midterm review and completion report, This includes (a) an annual ex-post evaluation of intermediate effects of completed sub-projects which investigates technical quality, utilization, and sustainability of the infrastructure created; (b) an Impact Evaluation of Local Capacity and Social Capital, based on robust evaluation methodologies and the engagement of local government representatives, the impact evaluation; (c) an Impact Evaluation of Living Conditions, based on household and community surveys, to measure access to infrastructure and services, effects on income and poverty, changes in labor market and migration patterns, and household outcomes in critical welfare areas; and (d) taking account of the lessons learnt from SILEM's impact evaluation with regard to adequate budgeting, timely planning and establishment of baselines at site level; as well as integration of household surveys into reporting and supervision. Given that the GEF funds are fully blended, the evaluations of effects will include the intended environmental results and indicators and reported in the broader CBRD M&E system and in relevant evaluations.

Responsibilities for M&E and reporting will be shared between actors at the national, regional, communal and village levels. At the national level, the existing National Coordination Unit (NCU) includes an M&E unit and team, responsible for coordinating the monitoring system, analyzing the data and disseminating information. At the national level the focus will be on methods of data collection and analysis as well as on database management, and on inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms to review progress (see Part III of this Memo).

Each of the 13 Regional Coordinating Units (RCU) will be staffed with an M&E specialist whose main role will be to reinforce the capacity of permanent structures at the regional level (*Direction Régionale de l'Economie et de la Planification*). Locally, different actors will assist communes and villages to analyze the data collected, and ensure timely submission of data to the national level. The other baseline project PACT, will use the same structures as CBRD and reinforce them by providing resources to communes to enable them to recruit a local staff member to work part-time on M&E, and in addition strengthen the ability of both central and local governments, as well as citizens, to collect data and monitor results. External CBRD project evaluations will be led by the unit responsible for M&E within the Ministry in charge of Agriculture (*"Direction des études et de la planification"*).

The M&E will include environmental monitoring indicators to determine (i) the use of the environmental screening for subprojects and investments; (ii) the effectiveness of environmental mitigation measures implemented; (iii) the extent to which subprojects are maintained in an environmentally and socially sustainable manner, and (iv) environmental results. The MEDD with the NCU will be responsible for the collection on GEF-related data and Tracking Tools at inception, midterm review and closing. The project indicators collected are consistent with the country's SCADD monitoring indicators and form a core part

of national poverty monitoring. Data will be gender-disaggregated whenever possible, including the GEF indicators, the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) of the Sahel and West Africa Program in support of the Great Green Wall Initiative (SAWAP) and the set of indicators of the Result Framework of the proposed project. The Head of the CBRD M&E Unit will also serve as coordinator for the GEF-funded support, and ensure continuity and lessons learnt, having been the coordinator for the GEF SILEM project that accompanies CBRD Phase 2.

Most of the monitoring and evaluation will be covered by the IDA financing. The budget for M&E from the GEF is estimated to US\$ only 0.37 million. The Monitoring and Evaluation plan is based on World Bank and GEF standards (see details in the Project Document Annex 1: Results Framework and Monitoring, and section 3.E in PAD annex 3 on implementation arrangements).

Further, the Project will be able to liaise closely with the regional project *Decision Support Services Project* (DSSP) that will promote knowledge exchanges for managing risks to environmental and food security from climate variability among the 12 SAWAP country projects, and ensure program-level coordination and tracking the delivery of SAWAP's program-level outcomes and results. The regional project will be executed by the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS), based in Ouagadougou. Monitoring of environmental indicators will also be supported by the upcoming forest inventory and FIP support to the national MNV system and carbon sequestration monitoring tools.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

A.1.1. The GEF focal area/LDCF/SCCF strategies:

The proposed project is a multi-focal area operation combining several of the GEF strategic goals, namely:

- To contribute to arresting and reversing current global trends in land degradation, specifically desertification and deforestation.
- Contribute to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services.
- Achieve multiple environmental benefits from improved management of all types of forests, and carbon sequestration from the above activities.

The proposed project will directly address land degradation challenges in the targeted area by promoting community-based sustainable land and water management practices to reduce pressure on natural resources from competing land uses (LD-3 - Outcomes 3.2., Outputs 3.2. and 3.4). Resources from biodiversity and SFM focal areas are being combined into the introduction of sustainable forest management practices in targeted zones, through a landscape approach to combat deforestation, biodiversity loss (plant /animal) and soil degradation, which implies the reduction of carbon sequestration. Forming part of an integrated landscape management approach, the SFM incentive full allow the entire project to incorporate good management practices in forests, by embedding these in organized community management of forest areas within both reserve and comprehensive land use planning of community lands, along SLWM investments in agricultural lands surrounding forested areas, as well as the development of sustainable livelihoods, (including forest-based) that will provide a long-term incentive for natural resource management. For cost-effectiveness, resources have been focused on four zones which were selected based on the existing forest resources and threats and pressure points for these, such as firewood extraction, livestock management, and watershed basins and agricultural expansion. For example, the investments in PONASI complex recognize the critical wildlife corridors (West-Africa

largest elephant population) in this area, linking protected areas, biodiversity and tourism base of surrounding areas with community buffer zone management.

The proposed project will thus also address BD-1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas; mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of landscapes (BD-2 - Outcomes 2.1. and Output 2.2.) as well as SFM-1 to reduce pressure on forest resources (SFM-1 - Outcomes 1.2. and Output 1.2) and CC-M5 on LULUCF. Table A of this CEO Endorsement Memorandum details the GEF focal area linkages of this project.

Linkage to SAWAP and the Great Green Wall Initiative

The proposed project is part of the Sahel and West Africa Program (SAWAP) in Support of the Great Green Wall Initiative approved by the GEF and LDCF/SCCF Councils in May, 2011. The SAWAP Program addresses major issues related to land degradation, including food security, climate change mitigation and adaptation, to support sustainable development in 12 countries: Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sudan, Benin, Chad, and Ghana. The proposed project is consistent with the Program objective *to expand sustainable land management (SLM) in targeted landscapes and in climate vulnerable areas*. The project goal is to enhance the capacity of rural communities and decentralized institutions for the implementation of local development plans that promote sustainable land and natural resources management and productive investments at commune level. Burkina Faso is an official member of the pan-African Agency for the Great Green Wall. The project is consistent with the World Bank's Strategy for Africa (2011), *Africa's Future and the World Bank's Support to It*, and the new *African Region Strategy for Making Development Climate Resilient*.

A.1.2. For projects funded from LDCF/SCCF: the LDCF/SCCF eligibility criteria and priorities : n/a

A.2. National Strategies / Plans or Reports / Assessments under relevant conventions if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, etc:

Following the implementation of the **Poverty Reduction Strategy** (*Cadre Stratégique de Lutte contre la Pauvreté* (CSLP)), the Government of Burkina Faso introduced the Strategy for Accelerated Growth and Sustainable Development 2011-2015 (*Stratégie de Croissance Accélérée et de Développement Durable* (SCADD)). The **SCADD** is the main policy vehicle for the country to tackle weak economic performance and better link poverty reduction and human development with economic growth. One of its objectives is the protection of a sustainable environment. Further, the recently adopted National Programme for the Rural Sector (Programme National du Secteur Rural (**PNSR**), May 2010) draws from the SCADD and the Rural Development Strategy (SDR, 2003) and provides a reference framework for all actors with regard to rural development planning. To increase coherence and effectiveness, this framework document was signed by the three Ministers of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock. The objective of the PNSR is to sustainably contribute to food and nutritional security, accelerated economic growth and poverty reduction through (i) sustainable national production of food; (ii) decreased malnutrition; (iii) increased agricultural GDP; (iv) reduced rural poverty; (v) sustainable access to drinking water and sanitation; and (vi) protection against the degradation of vegetation cover. The proposed project is one of the core elements of implementation of rural development in Burkina Faso.

The SCADD and PNSR build on a solid legal and regulatory framework. Burkina Faso has ratified all of the major environmental conventions. The Government has developed strategies and plans for several international conventions. The Government of Burkina Faso ratified the UNCBD in 1993. The Environmental Action Plan (1992) integrates the National Plan for Anti-Desertification (PNLCD) and the National Program for Community Land Management (PNGT), in order to design a policy strictly associating development with environment (PANE, 1991). The goal of the National Biodiversity Strategy

Action Plan (NBSAP) is to ensure that populations manage biodiversity in a sustainable manner by 2025. The proposed Project is fully in line with the NBSAP, which emphasizes the need to involve populations and giving them a sense of responsibility in regard to natural resources, motivate the population to preserve species and restore habitats, and to manage natural resources in a dynamic and sustainable manner. An updated UNFCCC National Communication document is currently in draft and expected to be submitted by December 2012.

The Government of Burkina Faso signed the UNCCD in 1996 and adopted an updated National Action Plan (NAP, 2000) to combat desertification (Plan d'Action National de Lutte Contre la Desertification) in 1986. The NAP aims to improve national capacity, update legislation and regulation, data management, environmental monitoring and evaluation, environmental education and communication. As in other Burkinabé policies and strategies, it aims to promote capacity building for local authorities and ensure active participation from populations, local administrations and local groups.

The legal framework of the **forest** sector includes: *National Forest Policy* (1995), *National Land Use Development Policy* (2007), *National Policy for Management of Forest Reserves*, *National Program for Management of Forests and Wildlife*, the *2006-2015 MEDD 10 Year Development Plan*, the *National Anti-Desertification Strategy*, the *Action Plan for Integrated Water Resource Management*, the *National Biodiversity Action Plan*, the *National Program for the Management of Natural Forests*, the *National Environmental Action Plan*. The *Forest Code* of 1997, updated in 2011, recognizes the strong role of local governments in forest and woodland management, which is supported by the proposed project.

The project activities have been coordinated with relevant priorities in the country's GEF National Portfolio Formulation Document. The Government, led by the OFP/CONEDD, conducted a broad consultation which generated requests for a number of smaller initiatives from various proponents (NGOs, institutes, departments). It was agreed that these would be embedded into this Project to the extent possible, depending on GEF eligibility and requirements, complementarity with other initiatives and priorities at community level, which is the driving force for natural resource management based on Burkina Faso legal decentralization framework. The NFPD requests have guided the selection of zones of focus in the proposed Project.

B. PROJECT OVERVIEW:

B.1. Description of the baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The current situation

Burkina Faso is a landlocked, low-income, Sub-Saharan country with a population of approximately 14 million inhabitants that are predominantly rural-based, reliant upon agriculture and affected by high levels of poverty. Since 1997, Burkina Faso's growth rate average of 5.5 percent per year has exceeded the sub-regional average. However, positive growth has not had a significant impact upon poverty reduction or development outcomes. With a per capita income of USD550, Burkina's poverty rate is estimated at 43.9 percent.

In a country in which **agriculture** represents 40 percent of GDP and employs 80 percent of the population, the rapidly expanding population¹ relies precariously upon a very narrow and diminishing natural resource base. Recent droughts, floods and desertification, area expansion and agricultural and livestock practices are placing a significant pressure on available natural resources.

Land degradation. The area is largely wild bush country with a mixture of grass and small trees in varying proportions, with forests to the south. The savanna region is mainly grassland in the rainy season

¹ The 2006 population growth rate in Burkina Faso was 3.1 percent.

and semi desert during the harmattan period. Local rural populations depend heavily upon the country's steadily depleting soil, water and vegetation resources. Situated in the Sahel-Sahara region, Burkina Faso is particularly affected by soil erosion due to wind and water, loss of soil nutrients and bush fires. It is estimated that 34 percent of the territory has deteriorated as a result of anthropogenic factors, continuing at a rate of 105,000 to 250 000 hectares each year, while 74 percent of arid and semi-arid areas are affected by desertification or land degradation.

Deforestation rate estimates range from about 0.2 percent per year to 1.5 percent per year, mainly caused by expansion of agricultural land, bushfire, as well as grazing and over exploitation of forest resources (timber and non-timber products). Burkina Faso possesses interesting biodiversity sites such as the Pics de Sindou, the Karfiguela Waterfall, the Sacred Dafra Pond, and the Tengréla Lake. The Hippopotamus Pond (UNESCO Biosphere reserve and bird reserve) and the Oursi Pond have been established as Ramsar sites. To ensure conservation and preservation of the wildlife of Burkina Faso, four national parks have been established, including the Pô (or Kaboré Tambi) National Park in the south-centre of the country, Arli National Park in the southeast, W of the Niger National Park, a transfrontier park in the east bordering Benin and Niger; and the Deux Balés Park in Mouhoun region. In addition there are numerous classified forests and four faunal reserves. Fauna is diverse and includes elephant, hippopotamus, buffalo, monkey, lions, crocodile, giraffe, various types of antelope, and a vast variety of bird and insect life. Some of Burkina Faso's threatened species include panthers, elephants, crocodiles, and pythons. The dominant endemic plant species are shea tree and the baobab (hibiscus tree).

Between 1992 and 2002, all forest areas have been reduced by an annual average of 110,500 ha, or 4.04%, corresponding to an annual decline in carbon stock of 17 680 tons. In terms of climatic and anthropogenic factors, the areas occupied by natural areas have seen a downward trend, with the most apparent change being the growth of agriculture in all regions of the country, also for rangelands and forests. The major factors of forest degradation are bush fires, wood excessive, overgrazing, natural mortality of the species and uncontrolled agricultural clearings. An estimated 50 000 ha of forest disappear each year for energy needs. The deforestation is accompanied by the loss of biodiversity (plant and animal) and degradation of soil productive capacity, which implies the reduction of carbon sequestration by vegetation and soil and thus generates the release of large quantities of carbon into the air.

National data on **carbon sequestration and GHG emissions** is relatively outdated (a new forest inventory and national communication to UNFCCC are underway). Yearly national emissions amount 1,512 (in thousands ton CO₂) (Source: National Institute of Statistics and Demography 2009). While emissions from conversions of forests and grasslands amounted to 1,559 mt CO₂, carbon stock sequestered amounted to 1,324 mt, with net emissions of 235 mt. Estimations from carbon sequestration from biomass vary depending on source and local context, from 52t/ha (FAO 2011) or ranging from 23 - 83t/ha depending on plant density/type and annual rainfall (Agrhymet 2005). (See annex F in this memo).

The baseline projects

The baseline projects are based on a cohesive government framework designed to address historic overlapping interventions and priorities. By combining objectives from three Ministries (Environment, Agriculture and Livestock) in the the National Rural Development Strategy, there is a better foundation for integrated landscape manageemnt. The National Rural Sector Development Plan has become the framework for planning and coordination of rural development and will provide a coherent platform for addressing the causes of deforestation, biodiversity loss and soil degradation.

The GEF resources will have foundation of a strong baseline of initiatives in Burkina Faso, including the (i) Local Government Support Project (*Projet d'Appui aux Collectivites Territoriales – PACT*); (ii) the Productivity and Food Security Project (*Projet d'Amélioration de la Productivité et de la Sécurité Alimentaire (PAPSA)*); and (iv) the Community-Based Rural Development Project (CBRD3). The GEF resources will be fully blended with the latter. Without GEF support, the baseline projects are:

The World Bank **Community-Based Rural Development Project** (CBRD3, IDA 70M\$) is the third phase of a series of operations supporting the National Program for Decentralized Rural Development, aiming to consolidate the accomplishments of the first and second phases of the Program and establish a sustainable basis for decentralized rural development. It covers all the 302 rural municipalities with local capacity building initiatives in planning, financial management and development, and participatory planning and implementing local development activities and investments. The CBRD3 originally had four components: (a) Strengthening capacity for decentralized rural development; (b) Support to the implementation of rural land tenure reform and enhanced local dispute resolution; (c) Funding local development investments at the rural commune and region levels, using a demand-driven approach; and (d) Project management, monitoring and evaluation.

In the Business-as-usual scenario, the CBRD (and the PACT, below) are aiming at furthering local development and investment. The CBRD development scenario is to increase social wellbeing and empower communities to make decisions regarding their economic development. The PACT supports the objective of the CBRD by focusing on fiscal decentralization and transfers of funds from central governments to communes. PACT and CBRD support the implementation of the General Code for Local Government (*Code Général des Collectivités Territoriales, CGCT*), which foresees devolution to local governments of 11 competencies. These eleven functions are (i) land, (ii) communal development and physical planning; (iii) environment and natural resources management; (iv) planning and economic development; (v) health and hygiene; (vi) education, literacy, and vocational training; (vii) culture, sports, and leisure; (viii) civil defense, assistance, and social protection; (ix) funeral services and cemeteries; (x) water and electricity; and (xi) marketplaces, slaughterhouses, and fairs. However, based on earlier phases, the focus has been on the social functions, and land and environment and natural resources management are lagging behind. Both projects are targeting capacity building at all levels that mainly focus on empowerment and management skills, without specific modules for sustainable use. The PACT and CBRD will have the same management structures in 6 of the 13 regions. Without GEF support, the project would not address natural resource management, sustainable forestry management or Land-use and land-use change in the local communes, and no specific support to biodiversity conservation. Capacity building and investments would be geared towards social and economic investments and capacities for investment planning. The support, capacity building and tools provided by the GEF support related to SFM and SLM can be deployed across all communes depending on local needs, to be integrated into local development planning. In addition, the GEF support will fund more in-depth activities in select ecosystems and forests and protected areas, which would not be covered otherwise.

In complement to the CBRD3, the World Bank **Local Government Support Project** (PACT, \$60M IDA) will support the implementation of critical aspects of fiscal and administrative decentralization in six of the 13 regions of Burkina Faso, by strengthening the central government's capacity for decentralization and the institutional capacities of municipalities ("*communes*") in six regions, and to improve accountability linkages between local policy makers and citizens in said municipalities. CBRD3 and PACT will have the same management structures in the six regions.

PACT will work provide a platform of support for the decentralization process – the PACT will provide national level technical support to advance fiscal and administrative decentralization and will also provide resources to rural and urban communes in 6 of the 13 regions to strengthen their administrative capacity and to enhance their accountability towards citizens. It is also expected that the extensive financial and

technical support that the two projects will catalyze decentralization processes and create an environment that is conducive to further policy reform.

The PACT will target critical accountability failures related to the process of decentralization in order to achieve improved service delivery outcomes and enhance accountability and good governance in public resource allocation. However, based on past experience, public resource allocation and demand from communes are focused on basic social services and tend to under-estimate and de-prioritize natural resources and their sustainable use and conservation. The projects have a very demand-driven approach based on commune development plans, with limited awareness-raising on NRM. For both projects, the various investments and construction at local level may cause some negative impacts to arise during implementation, such as negative impacts on soil, air, water, noise environments and surrounding communities.

The Productivity and Food Security Project (Projet d'Amélioration de la Productivité et de la Sécurité Alimentaire (PAPSA)) aims to improve producers' capacity to increase the production and to ensure year-round availability of cereals and livestock products in rural areas. The project engages the Ministry of the Environment in monitoring of project environmental impacts and safeguards, as well as capacity building and technical assistance. PAPSA will develop and disseminate enhanced farming technologies that will also be used under other development projects. The project intends to support agriculture and livestock productivity, along the supply chains that are most critical for improving food security, i.e., food crops (prominently cereals) and livestock production (prominently milk, swine and poultry production). Increase in agricultural productivity coincides with land clearing which in turn can lead to land degradation, forest degradation and biodiversity loss. In zones with a structural food deficit, project activities will essentially be geared toward improving productivity through the development of the voucher-for-work system. In surplus zones, priority will be given to strengthening the production-market linkages, particularly through the development of a warehouse receipt scheme. The environmental sustainability dimension of increased rural productivity could be limited.

Limited support is being provided to local communities adjacent to the selected protected areas to update and implement their development plans, by the National Office for Protected Areas (OFINAP). While the project intends to work around some protected areas in Burkina Faso related to earlier project of PAGEN (Sustainable Wildlife and Biodiversity Project, *Projet de Partenariat pour l'Amélioration du Partenariat pour la Gestion des Ecosystèmes Naturels*), and some activities will be executed by OFINAP, the support is too limited and scattered to adequately address SFM. The project will not develop sustainable land management plans, but work with existing community development plans as will CBRD and PACT. The support to these communities will be limited to technologies for valorization of non-timber forestry products. As designed the project scope and financing does not allow adequate support to counter the ongoing trends in biodiversity loss and land degradation around the protected areas of Burkina Faso.

The GEF support will be able to introduce a coherent landscape approach to generate global environmental benefits, based on the above baseline efforts. Sustainability is promoted through a number of efforts; technical support, organization and strengthening of capacity of local communities, funding protected area management activities (fight against bush fires, maintenance of internal roads or tracks in the area, wildlife inventory, maintenance of water points for wildlife, etc.) are funded through the budget of OFINAP itself. MEDD staff is deployed in all locations that surround the complex and the staff is paid on MEDD's own resources. Further, buffer zone populations are generally aware of the benefits of good management of the complex, and participate in certain high labor intensity activities and work carried out and derive income from this. Community organizations draw value from NTFPs through associations and groups producing shea butter and honey; Po is the main reference point in Burkina Faso for quality of shea butter.

B.2. Incremental / Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund) activities requested for GEF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund):

A more comprehensive analysis is available in Annex 7 on incremental costs in the Project Document.

The proposed project's combined PDO and Global Environmental Objective is to enhance the capacity of rural communities and decentralized institutions for the implementation of local development plans that promote sustainable land and natural resources management and productive investments at commune level. The proposed project will support activities through five defined components:

- a. Strengthening capacity for decentralized rural development;
- b. Implementing rural land tenure law and enhancing local dispute resolution;
- c. Local development investments at the rural commune and region levels;
- d. Sustainable land and forestry management; and
- e. Project management, monitoring and evaluation.

The proposed project will have five components that are mutually reinforcing. Component 1 will strengthen capacity at commune, province, regional and national across a range on themes necessary for decentralized rural development- and with GEF support include capacity and tools on SFM and LULUCF. Capacity building (financed by IDA only) specifically on land tenure and local dispute resolution (Component 2) at commune and regional level nation-wide is a necessary condition for the sustainability of NRM/SFM investments under component 3 and SFM, LULUCF and natural resource management in component 4. The enhanced capacities will be applied to manage investments that will further promote local economic development in tandem with activities to make those investments environmentally sustainable as well as investments in SFM, SLM and LULUCF (component 3), especially in vulnerable zones requiring sustainable land and forestry management (component 4). Component 5 will provide project management, monitoring and evaluation for all the other components.

Component 1: Strengthening Capacity for Decentralized Rural Development (US\$ 4.96 M GoBF; US\$ 7.48 M IDA; US\$ 0.95 M GEF). The first component of Phase 3 aims to enhance local governance and improve local development planning and management by local governments at all levels. Under the GEF scenario, NRM and SLWM will be incorporated in capacity building to mainstream environmental concerns at all levels, namely Rural Communes; Regional Councils; and local stakeholders. The GEF resources will contribute to strengthen institutions and capacities to promote and upscale SLM and SFM practices nationwide through the provision of training and tools. Burkina Faso will be assisted to promote and disseminate sustainable agricultural practices such as land and water management in communal investment planning. This component will finance costs associated with collection of key information on SLM, advocacy and communication activities, training, organization and/or participation in regional workshops and other knowledge sharing events.

Under the GEF increment, the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) would also receive support. The GEF funds will support capacity building in MEDD, in other relevant line ministries, in regional government agencies, and at commune level on land planning processes, ecosystem management, and sustainable use of natural resources. Technical assistance in these areas will be directly linked to the planning and implementation of investment activities supported under Components 4 and 3, as well as training, awareness-raising, and capacity enhancement of national and local-level institutions, and communities in the target zones. Activities will be coordinated under a framework on information, education, and communication (component 1.4) with development of a knowledge base on SLM/SFM with key information concerning SLM technologies and approaches.

Sub-Component 1A. Capacity Building for Rural Communes: The objective of the sub-component is to consolidate the capacity of local governments to conceive and manage local development activities independently or with limited and temporary support from service providers (NGOs, private and public agencies). The GEF support will expand the experience of SILEM in integrated ecosystem management (IEM) and planning to communes where capacity building for ecosystem management is particularly essential. The PCD communal management plans will take account of NRM in planning and prioritization. A focus on sustainability will be added by enhancing the knowledge of natural resource management.

Sub-Component 1B. Capacity Building for Regional Councils: This sub-component seeks to strengthen regional Council capacity to oversee the harmonious and strategic development of the region. The actors targeted by this sub-component include: the 13 regional Councils and their specialized commissions, the Regional Procurement Commission and regional administrative staff. Regional councils are currently not equipped to address ecosystem management issues that transcend each commune. The GEF Increment will help Regions address such transboundary issues and reconcile conflicts through the regional consultation fora, which will be supported in understanding of NRM and forestry issues. Specific modules will be developed to address training in integrated ecosystem management and planning that transcends commune and community level, particularly in regions with watershed and protected area issues.

Sub-Component 1C. Capacity Building for local stakeholders: The objective of this sub-component is to strengthen the capacity of non-state actors, including civil society and the private sector, to accompany the rural local and regional communes in effectively and efficiently carrying out their mandates, working closely with the PACT. The GEF funds will allow the projects to offer training modules on SLWM and SFM practices, based on the extensive body of lessons, good practices and experiences from SILEM and related projects, thus building a cadre of local expertise including locally-based civil society organizations. Thematic training sessions will be added on natural resource management and training on environmental and social safeguard processes. The GEF support will ensure that service provision goes beyond efficiency aspects to address environmental sustainability.

Sub-Component 1D. Collaboration and Communication: This sub-component seeks to strengthen communication flows at the commune level, enhance the visibility of project activities and disseminate the results of the project. The GEF Increment will help develop and integrate a system of knowledge acquisition and management, and a communication strategy to support environmental and natural resources management. It will also support integration of NRM in the existing institutional fora for collaboration and dialogue between stakeholders, namely the Provincial Collaborative Groups and the Regional Collaborative Groups (CCP, CCR).

Component 2: Implementing rural land tenure law and enhanced local dispute resolution (US\$ 5.41 M IDA; US\$ 0.48 M GoBF). Component 2 will enhance the functioning of the communal rural land tenure services by strengthening their capacity with human resources and equipment. While no GEF funds are envisaged for this component, Capacity building specifically on land tenure and local dispute resolution (Component 2) at commune and regional level nation-wide is a necessary condition for the sustainability of investments under component 3 and natural resource management in component 4. While GEF funds will not be allocated to this component, since GEF support is fully embedded in the project, the lessons from SILEM and from the planned project activities related to land use plans for natural resource management, protected areas and SLWM, will be able to positively influence the application and implementation of land tenure law. Further, the support will help address conflict traditionally related to the land management of agriculture, livestock and the environment. Without GEF support, ecosystem, forest and land management issues would not be taken adequately into account in land tenure and related conflict resolution.

Component 3: Local development investments at the rural commune and region levels (US\$ 42.15 M IDA; US\$ 4.09M GEF; US\$ 8 M Community contribution) is the major component for activities on the ground, to promote socio-economic growth and sustainable development through the financing of strategic local development investments with emphasis on investments to promote local economic growth and revenue generation. The GEF support will help shift from an historic focus on social investments (wells, schools, health) and infrastructure, which may also affect the environment negatively, to more NRM/environmental investments which are needed to ensure sustainable rural development.

The project will pay special attention to promoting revenue generating and natural resource management activities where women are active, in order to foster their economic empowerment and reduce gender-related vulnerabilities. The GEF funds will address the imbalance of the under-representation of NRM project in the micro-project portfolio, and ensure that micro-projects are conducted in an environmentally sound manner. GEF will help address priority issues raised in the NPFDD related to sustainable management of land use, land-use change, and forestry with biodiversity in forested areas; agro-ecosystem services or forest ecosystem services in drylands sustaining the livelihoods of local communities, and integrated landscape management with sustainable land and water management practices. The priority activities will depend on local demand and needs as indicated by the ecosystem base in the region or province. For example, microprojects funded by component 3 in the Eastern Region will focus on activities related to degraded lands, to complement the Country Program Partnership initiative for Sustainable Land Management (CPP/SLM in line with the NPFDD). In relevant regions in the Southern band of the country, activities to combat and manage bush fires and clearing of land will be integrated into agricultural development and the CVDs (also in line with the NPFDD). Areas with livestock issues would address integrated crop-livestock systems, management of domestic animals or manure management. The GEF increment will help focus additional environment investments on ecologically important zones, and avoid dissipation of funds.

In addition to microprojects for social or economic investments and vital infrastructure, the component will finance environmental and NRM investments to slow down, stop and eventually reverse the process of natural resource degradation. Since communities gave greater priority to social investments during the first two Phases of CBRD, Phase 3 will particularly focus on investments to promote local economic growth and NRM/environmental investments which are needed to ensure sustainable rural development. Phase 3 will pursue this through awareness-raising at commune level, better analysis of investment priorities, including economic assessment of microprojects, and careful monitoring of the composition of the microproject portfolio. In so doing, the project will pay special attention to promoting revenue generating and natural resource management activities where women are active, in order to foster their economic empowerment and reduce gender-related vulnerabilities. In addition to funding communal micro-investments, research/action activities will be undertaken to support women associations with the financing of production, transformation, and commercialization of non-timber forest products.

The GEF funds would help where needed to accompany investments by support of technical applied research institutions to refine or upgrade SLWM and SFM technologies used, such as support related to improved management of grazing land and livestock management; upgrading technologies to improve livestock feed in the Sahelian area of the country; or approaches for recovery of degraded land which is particularly noted in the Sub-Saharan and Sahelian areas of Burkina Faso (ref. NPFDD).

In order to secure the sustainability of the investments from component 3, as well as other investments supported by the project, appropriate social and environmental screening and mitigation measures will be incorporated for micro-project design. For this purpose, the technical staff of the Ministry of Environment (MEDD) will be called upon to participate in micro-project identification, preparation, and implementation.

Component 4: Sustainable Land and Forestry Management (US\$ 2.0 M GEF, 6.7M PAPSA) has been added to the CBRD3 to support restoration and protection of natural resources, forest and biodiversity in the larger ecosystem landscape related to agricultural expansion. The GEF increment will ensure that agricultural productivity and livestock management are pursued sustainably in the context of ecosystems, protected areas and biodiversity reserves. Funds from GEF focal areas will incorporate integrated ecosystem management planning, appropriate management and sustainable technologies, and community and government capacity building.

The GEF funds will be deployed strategically through component 3 and 4 in select zones based on ecological needs and priorities. The Government and the Project have identified four target zones of intervention: (a) the PONASI (Pô-Nazinga-Sissili) ecological complex; (b) the Nazinon (Red Volta) watershed; (c) Region *Est* watershed in Kouritenga and Guenaga provinces; and (d) Region *Plateau Central*. The enhanced capacities from component 1 will be applied to manage investments that will further promote local economic development (component 3) in tandem with activities to make those investments environmentally sustainable, especially in vulnerable zones requiring sustainable land and forestry management (component 4). The management plans of protected areas of the complex will be developed, updated and implemented, with specific attention to several village hunting areas and wildlife corridors in the PONASI area, under an overarching planning of the ecosystem to bring together the management of the three parks with surrounding areas and the forests contained in these parks and surroundings.

For example, the Kaboré Tambi National Park (earlier Pô National Park) has a varied topography with geological formations of granite outcrops, lateritic plateaus and several isolated high mountains, and includes vegetation types of northern Sudan savanna, shrub savanna, tree-savanna and gallery forests. The park is home to lion, elephant, buffalo and a number of antelope species. Poaching and deforestation activities remain challenges, and the main road from Ouagadougou to northern Ghana runs across the park. Within this ecosystem are also more than 20 village protected hunting areas known as *Zones Villageoises d'Intérêt Cynégétique* (ZOVICs); wildlife corridors; Nazinga Game Ranch and the Sissili Hunting Concession. The Sissili Province is one of the two important centres of shea butter production in Burkina Faso, which contains the largest number of indigenous shea trees in the sub-region. The project will therefore promote LULUCF and SFM activities in this area. Ownership by the State of the sustainable management of these Protected Areas is evident and reflected in the institutional establishment of OFINAP, whose mission is to ensure a more active presence at local level, based on a more dynamic consultation and engagement of a broad range of actors and stakeholders in the management of a number of Protected Areas of primary interest to the government.

In other areas, such as The Nazinon (Red Volta) watershed, north of PONASI, containing the second largest permanent river in the country, has heavy pressure on the riverbanks and flora and fauna, with emergence of erosion. It is also an area of livestock husbandry and one of the main areas of fuelwood extraction to supply Ouagadougou. In *Plateau Central* Region, human and animal pressures accentuate desertification by overexploitation of plant resources; bush fires, excessive cutting of firewood; deforestation; and overgrazing. However, ecosystem protection is essential for temporary streams upstream of the Nazinon and Nakambé watersheds. In such zones the project will focus on limited forest restoration such as : natural regeneration in degraded natural forests, Natural restoration with native seed sources will be the most cost- effective and has been long tested in Burkina Faso, including standard forest restoration techniques such as "assisted" or "accelerated" natural regeneration (ANR) and the planting of framework tree species to restore degraded areas. Also, tree planting/ revegetation will be related to the land degradation activities and sustainable land management and community micro-projects, such as land stabilization such as contour planting on slopes and hills with indigenous species.

Activities will ensure that agricultural productivity and livestock management are pursued sustainably in the context of these ecosystems, forests, protected areas and reserves to reduce pressure on land in the wider landscape. Funds from the GEF will incorporate integrated ecosystem management planning, appropriate management and sustainable technologies, and community and government capacity building. Buffer zone management activities will be introduced, in close coordination with component 3 supporting commune SFM/NRM and other investments in surrounding areas of the national parks. Capacity will be enhanced of the Ministries of Agriculture, of Animal Resources, of Territorial Administration, OFINAP, the communities themselves, local artisans, private contractors, and non-governmental organizations. See Map in annex 7 of the PAD.

Component 5: Project Coordination and Management (GEF 0.37M\$, PACT and CBRD3 22.17M\$) will support project implementation activities, communication and M&E. The baseline project will cover the operating costs of an existing National Coordination Unit (NCU) with 13 regional coordination units (RCUs). The IDA funds will cover extensive baseline and various impact studies and surveys. The GEF increment will enable the project and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development to manage its support and incorporate monitoring and knowledge sharing on sustainable land management practices and SFM. It will build on earlier mechanisms in measurement of environmental degradation from SILEM regarding monitoring of GEF indicators. The four Tracking Tools will be completed as required.

Global environmental benefits: The GEF support will contribute to safeguarding the ecosystem services provided by natural production systems, generating both global and local environmental benefits. Global benefits will cut across the different GEF focal areas to result in (i) improved SLM practices reducing negative trends in land degradation in areas in the targeted zones; (ii) increase in biodiversity conservation through mainstreaming in targeted landscapes and protected areas; and (iii) increase in carbon stocks in vegetation as a result of better managed forest and improved soil conservation and avoided deforestation in the project area. The benefits are detailed in the PAD Annex 1: Results Framework and the GEF Tracking Tools.

B.3. Description of the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund). As a background information, read *Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF*:"

The socioeconomic benefits will be extensive. The project will mainly target the 302 rural communes nationwide, and is expected to indirectly benefit a population of over 6.5 million inhabitants. For the beneficiaries, see section on key stakeholders.

At local level:

Through its support to commune and village level, the benefits will include: (a) social capacity of villages and local governments to manage local development and investments; (b) empowerment of rural communes to take responsibility for local planning; (c) reduced conflicts related to poor land management of agriculture and livestock husbandry; (d) improved rural land security; (e) social cohesion and collaboration between different actors through consultation fora, required for synergies and complementarity within local development.

A number of physical infrastructure investments will enhance the wellbeing of the population, such as (a) schools improved access to education, with priority for girl enrollment; (b) water and sanitation, with drinkable water with positive effects on women's workload; (c) health clinics with access to health services; (d) other communal infrastructure. The productive investments will lead to infrastructure as well

as improved income for communes (from public investments such as transport stops, markets etc.) Other economic benefits will be provided by investments in economic activities and infrastructure, for community groups in income-generating activities, resulting in increase in yields of basic food and cash crops, and increase in household incomes. Evolution is expected in the diversity, quality and cost of services provided at local level, by training private contractors, NGOs, and decentralized government institutions.

At regional and national level:

The project will work at several levels. Nationally, the entire system of ministerial services will be empowered and equipped to undertake their mandates. Regions are responsible for delivering specific services, including secondary schools and second-level health centers. Regionally, the project will strengthen regional Council capacity to oversee the harmonious and strategic development of the 13 regions, as well as provide regions with skills, knowledge and necessary systems. It will enable functioning of the 13 regional Councils and their specialized commissions, the Regional Procurement Commissions and regional administrative staff. Socio-economic benefits will derive from training modules related to local planning and participatory budgets, local governance, citizen participation, negotiation techniques, procurement, effective communications and community dialogue. This in turn will benefit rural communes and provinces.

Gender. The project will address the gender-specific needs of its beneficiaries and seeks to: (i) increase women’s participation in the investment decision-making process; (ii) contribute to a more gender-balanced access to land and financing; and (iii) reduce gender-related vulnerabilities. Capacity Building activities will aim at equipping women and marginalized groups with skills, knowledge and tools necessary for their effective participation in municipal councils, village development councils and/or other decision-making bodies while continuously sensitizing men to the importance of female participation in the decision-making process. Dissemination of the new Rural Land Tenure law will increase women’s and illiterates’ awareness about their ensuing and equal rights; thereby pave the way for a more gender-balanced access to land. The component on local development investments will pay special attention to mainstreaming gender concerns in the local development Plans and promoting research/action activities that support women associations with the financing of production, transformation, and commercialization of non-timber forest products. The project will involve women in the development of ecosystem management plans given their key role in the protection and management of natural resources.

B.4. Risks indication, including climate change risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design

Overall, the Project risk is assessed as *moderate*. The main risks can be summarized as follow: (i) irregular supply of financial resources to communes including slow implementation of fiscal decentralization; (ii) procurement procedures causing delays in executing local investments; and (iii) environmental risks and natural disaster such as change in rainfall leading to drought and deforestation. Annex 4 provides the full risk framework which is summarized as follows:

Stakeholder Risk	Moderate
Implementing Agency Risk	
- Capacity	Low
- Governance	Low
Project Risk	

- Design	Low
- Social and Environmental	Moderate
- Program and Donor	Low
- Delivery Monitoring and Sustainability	Moderate
Overall Implementation Risk	Moderate

The Operational Risk Assessment Framework is available in Annex 4 of the Project Document, and key risks are summarized in the table below.

Table 1. Risks assessment and potential mitigation measures

Risks	Risk rating*	Risk mitigation measures
Stakeholder: Overlapping mandates between some stakeholders (government agencies) and poor definition of each stakeholder role and mandate can hamper project implementation.	M	The Project Steering Committee will be able to address such issues. The Government is giving very high priority and great importance to this project and has been very keen on looking for solutions. The project will ensure consultation with stakeholders and define clear criteria and selection process at local level.
Design: Inaccessible or inappropriate scientific methods and tools might lead to unsustainable outputs and outcome in reference to Natural Resource Management	M	Burkina's scientists and technicians have access to the most recent scientific and technical tools and acquired a very good knowledge and experience over the last twenty years. This is a third phase of a program that has been designed and implemented successfully. Lessons from previous operations are informing the design, and methodological support and tools will also be provided by the SAWAP regional project and the FIP.
Social & Environmental: Climate change may undermine the gains of management practices. Low-priority concern among communities about resource degradation. Low community demand to implement or sustain NRM/SLWM and production technologies.	M	The NRM and Environmental Management investment (co-funded by IDA and GEF) will be focusing on mitigation measures. The SLWM and soil management techniques reduce negative effects of climate variability. Rural communities are well aware of the impacts of resource degradation on agriculture yields and production; nonetheless, training and awareness campaigns will continue to be provided under the project.

* *Risk rating* – H (high risk), S (Substantial risk), M (Moderate risk), and L (low risk).

As the last phase of a 3-phase APL, the CBRD3 pays specific attention to sustainability (see Section IV.C in the PAD and the ORAF), including government commitment; capacity; community engagement and ownership; local investments; capacity to generate their own revenue; land security; environmental sustainability; and social cohesion. These sustainability principles governing the local investment plans will also be carried over to the activities in SFM and NRM. Implementation of management plans will be undertaken in the context of the project (already indicated Table A) with support from OFINAP. Further, all the forest activities are accompanied by other community investments and development planning; due to blend with CBRD the SFM and NRM activities will be integrated in the local development planning. Carbon benefits should be treated as other benefits in the context of providing incentives for good

practices in SFM, SLM and NRM. Further, the future FIP will scale up and provide additional support as needed (see section B6 below).

For example, the Government of Burkina Faso, in order to consolidate its Investment Strategy under the FIP, is further strengthening its Readiness for REDD+, based on and lessons learned on managing forest and savanna landscapes, as well as on integrated national strategies (including CNRD and PNSR). The Government intends to strategically adopt a synchronized approach combining analytical work, REDD+ enabling activities (development of the institutional framework, broad consultation mechanism, definition of the REDD+ strategy for the country, the reference level and MRV processes) and investments to achieve REDD+ Readiness.

A large amount of lessons have been learnt on efficacy and sustainability aspects for NRM operations and plans for sustainable use of land and forests in Burkina Faso over the last decades. First, the effectiveness of past NRM and GEF-funded support (PAGEN, SILEM) in the country has been highly rated in terms of reversing biodiversity trends, by helping to strengthen the capacity of the village and inter-village committees to promote enhanced natural resource management and community management of protected areas. An IEM approach focusing on inter-village cohesion built on a common interest in the protection of shared watersheds is a successful model (SILEM ICR). Other lessons pointed to the importance of relevance and sustainability of capacity building beyond a focus on investments only, and the need for both formal and informal mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the investment, which will be replicated in the proposed project, and include:

- Securing political commitment at local level. Through the local development planning processes of the CBRD, the mayors of neighboring municipalities of the PONASI complex have expressed their expectation of moving towards a more sustainable development process that better integrates sustainable management and use of the Protected Areas, especially in terms of tourism.
- Community participation in activities to ensure sustainability of improved infrastructure, and integration into formal planning processes and LDPs, as envisaged in component 1 and 2.
- Maintaining the sites by improving land tenure (i.e., granting titles and creating land usage tools), approved by all key local authorities, which is embedded in component 2, together with implementation of Forestry Code and the National Program for the Management of Wildlife and Protected Areas the associated Action Plan.
- Assessment of environmental impact assessment (EIA) capacity at the village and inter-village level, including both capacity for assessment and capacity to mitigate harm (technical and financial capacity).
- Proper valuation of livelihoods and sufficient project costing for the restoration of livelihoods are essential and for this GEF projects are better equipped to finance the costs of restoring livelihoods if other means of finance are woven into the project design.

B.5. Identify key stakeholders involved in the project including the private sector, civil society organizations, local and indigenous communities, and their respective roles, as applicable:

The project has been prepared through extensive public consultation. A national-level stakeholder workshop was organized by the National Coordination Unit, involving relevant project stakeholder groups in government agencies, the private sector, representatives of professional organizations, farming organizations; civil society; and NGOs. Regional consultations were held in each of the 13 regions during preparation, with identification of needs and feedback on previous support. Safeguard instruments were prepared in a broad consultation involving all relevant stakeholder groups, consistent with the approach followed by the project preparation. This participatory approach will be carried on throughout implementation, maintenance, supervision and evaluation of the project. An inter-ministerial steering committee has guided formulation and appraisal.

Beneficiaries. The project will target the 302 rural communes nationwide, and is expected to indirectly benefit a population of over 6.5 million inhabitants in the 13 Regions of the country. The regions comprise both (i) territorial collectivities managed autonomously by regional councils comprised of elected councilors; and (ii) administrative entities which house the majority of deconcentrated public services. Specifically, groups of beneficiaries will include regional authorities and councils; local communities, village populations and households, municipal councilors, Commune Development Committee (CVD) representatives, civil society, service providers and deconcentrated technical services, as well as private contractors, NGOs, and Ministry staff.

At the national level, key stakeholders for the project are united in the Project Steering Committee (PSC) with representatives from government ministries and agencies involved in implementation, civil society, and donors. The PSC will oversee overall project implementation, provide guidance, ensure programmatic coherence, and make decisions. It includes the following departments that will also be involved through their decentralized services: Ministry of Agriculture and Hydraulics; Ministry of Animal Resources; Ministry of Economy and Finance; Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Land Administration, Decentralization and Security; and Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development.

The management of all components will be conducted in close collaboration with the concerned technical ministries. Specifically, Component 4 will be implemented in close collaboration with OFINAP and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development.

Specific entities will support monitoring and evaluation, or research and studies needed, including the University of Ouagadougou; Ministry in charge of Agriculture (*Direction des études et de la planification*) and the National Institute for the Environment and Agricultural Research (Institut de l'environnement et de recherché agricoles - INERA).

At regional level, Each RCU will be staffed with an M&E specialist whose main role will be to consolidate the capacity of permanent structures at the regional level (*Direction Régionale de l'Economie et de la Planification*). The regions include both (i) territorial collectivities managed autonomously by regional councils comprised of elected councilors; and (ii) administrative entities housing the majority of decentralized public services. The Project will engage technical support from the Ministries of Agriculture, of Animal Resources, of Territorial Administration, and Communication and Scientific Research as needed.

At local level, the main stakeholders of the project are communities and communes, through their Local Development Councils, who will be fully empowered during the identification and preparation of micro-projects. Other local actors include municipal council and municipal councilors, CVD representatives, civil society, service providers and decentralized technical services. Component 3 will be implemented directly by the rural local communes and Regions, with the support of the RCUs and NCU.

Burkina Faso has a number of national and international NGOs active in CDD and natural resource management (such as NATURAMA, the ARP/Burkina Faso Network, Amicales des Femmes Forestières du Burkina Faso/AMIFOB), TREE AID, AZN/Terre verte, Association de promotion d l'Agroforesterie et Foresterie/APAF, SOS Sahel, New Tree Tipalga, Fondation mains Unies pour le développement communautaire, Comité Baoré Solidarité, etc.). NGOs will be included in service provision to communes and the execution of specific investment activities and/or M&E. For donor coordination, see section below.

B.6. Outline the coordination with other related initiatives:

Since the GEF support is blended with the nation-wide CBMP3, the Project will benefit from strong synergies and coordination with extensive national and regional level initiatives related to rural development, natural resource management and the decentralization process.

Coordination mechanisms between projects and donors involved in local development, decentralization and NRM will be reinforced for optimal synergies. Protocols exist or will be developed between the project units to ensure complementarity and to formalize coordination arrangements, and joint supervision missions by the relevant World Bank project teams will facilitate synergies and cost-effectiveness. The concerned World Bank projects are:

- the Local Government Support Project (PACT) (2012-2017)
- the Agricultural Diversification and Productivity Project (PAFASP);
- the Agricultural Productivity Project for West Africa (WAAPP)
- the Productivity and Food Security Project (PAPSA).

The project will also ensure linkages with the Burkina Faso Forest Investment Program under the Climate Strategic Fund (SCF) which presents a set of projects that will support transformational changes to protect forests and manage woodland, with the support of the World Bank and the African Development Bank. The AfDB is planning an investment of \$30 million, and World Bank \$30 million. The CBRD3/GEF appraisal mission and FIP identification mission were conducted in a synchronized manner at the same time in Burkina Faso. The World Bank is planning a Decentralized Forest and Woodland Management project (M\$18) under the Forest Investment Program (FIP) that will work nation-wide and support the design of a REDD+ strategy, finance local development initiative aiming at improving land use plan and securing tenure rights, improve economic activity by promoting the production of timber and non timber forest products, and prepare further scaling up in the country and in the sub-region by establishing guidance, best practices and structuring knowledge management. The FIP will undertake different activities than the GEF support, or at a larger scale. For example, FIP will support the implementation of the MNV system (including forest reference base; assess potential carbon sequestration; deepening the MNV methods); and improve forest governance (upgrade the whole country's forest legislation; mechanisms for intersectoral coordination; study distribution royalties etc.). A good part of FIP will focus on valuating forest products and value chain development. These activities will thus not be covered by the GEF. Further, the FIP will be able to use the innovative experiences and results of the GEF project related to management of ZOVIC, community forests and state forests and to appropriate technologies for sustainable forest management adapted to agro-ecological zones of the country, for a larger scaling-up at nation-wide level. A new Forest Inventory is also under development (with the CBRD project as member of the Scientific and Technical Committee). These activities will also address carbon sequestration of forest management, related to carbon finance as was also requested in the NFPD.

In addition to the coordination at the level of the PSC, component level coordination mechanisms will be established for other donor projects, such as with the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) and *l'Agence Française de Développement (AFD)* regarding Component 2 on land tenure and rural land security. There is a clear delineation of responsibilities, by which this project will undertake most of the commune support.

Coordination will also be facilitated by the fact that MEDD, through the National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development (CONEDD) and OFINAP, executes a number of related projects and can ensure technical supervision and integration of lessons and synergies. For example, OFINAP executes a number of projects for protected areas.

Activities in land degradation are already well coordinated within the GEF Country Partnership Program for Sustainable Land Management (CPP/SLM). Consistent with the NFPD request, the proposed project

will cover SLWM activities in the East region, as well as in the Northern region; where it will coordinate with the IFAD/GEF *CPP Burkina Faso: Sub-programme of the Northern Region-under Partnership Programme for Sustainable Land Management*.

By focusing on specific zones, this Project will complement and avoid duplication with other GEF projects in the country. For example, GEF funds will not be deployed in the *Boucle du Mouhoun* Region, where a number of GEF/UNDP projects are planned or under implementation. This includes *Reducing vulnerability of natural resource dependent livelihoods in two landscapes at risk of the effects of climate change in Burkina Faso: Boucles du Mouhoun Forest Corridor and Mare d'Oursi Wetlands Basin* (UNDP/LDCF); the UNDP/UNCDF ACRIC (*Support to Rural Communities and Inter-Community Initiatives*); GEF/UNDP *Protected Area Buffer Zone Management in Burkina Faso (in Boucles de Mouhoun)*; and *GEF/UNDP Partnership for sustainable land management in Boucle du Mouhoun* under the SLM Country Partnership Programme (CPP). This also applies to the regional GEF/UNDP (in South-East Burkina Faso, Benin, Niger) project *Enhancing the effectiveness and catalyzing the sustainability of the W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) protected area system*.

The Forest Legislation and Rule of Law includes a clear statement on the objective of the country to practice sustainable forestry and it recognizes traditional and indigenous rights, and gives stakeholders formal opportunities for input in the creation of all of forest policies and public forest management plans. The proposed project CBRD3 forms part of national programs that aim to strengthen the enabling conditions for local populations to fully participate in the planning and in the implementation of sustainable forest and woodland management initiatives and SML. A full range of local authorities and departments are involved in implementation and supported by various donors, depending on a regional/zone focus as described above. ,

C. GEF Agency's comparative advantage to implement this project:

C.1. Confirm the co-financing amount the GEF agency brings to the project:

The World Bank is bringing more than \$97 million as co-financing as per Table C of this CEO Endorsement Memorandum.

C.2. How does the project fit into the GEF agency's program (reflected in documents such as UNDAF, CAS, etc.) and staff capacity in the country to follow up project implementation:

Burkina Faso's long term vision focuses upon human security (economic, health, food, environmental, individual and political) and poverty reduction (Sustainable Human Development Policy of 1995 and the national prospective 'Burkina 2025' of 2001). The proposed project is aligned with both strategic pillars of the current Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) and with the cross-cutting issue of governance. These two pillars are (1) minimizing economic vulnerability and promoting growth through economic transformation and (2) promoting shared growth through effective social service delivery, and two cross cutting issues related to governance and demography. Environmental protection is embedded in the first strategic theme of the CAS, whereby Burkina Faso will be assisted in sustainable growth and increased employment and income generating activities, while supporting the emerging areas of environmental management and spatial development.

In the case of environmental conservation, the CAS seeks to target measures that will enhance agricultural productivity, secure the population's access to natural resources and ensure that environmental risks associated with the drives of growth - agriculture and mining - are actively addressed. The 2013-2015 CAS, which is under preparation, will be closely aligned to the SCADD (2011-2015) and therefore cover themes supposed by the proposed project. The proposed project is an essential building block of the Bank's rural and environmental portfolio in Burkina Faso.

The World Bank has a large office in Ouagadougou with long Bank engagement in agricultural sector and community-based development and NRM. The overall task team for the Project is mainly locally based and has in-depth knowledge of the country and the sector. Given the multi-sectoral nature of the project, the team includes Rural Development Specialists, Agricultural Economists, several Monitoring and Evaluation Specialists, Social Development Specialist, Environmental Specialist, as well as Finance Officer, Procurement Specialist, and Financial Management Specialist and experts on information and communication. Continuity and application of lessons learnt are assured, as the Task Team Leader is the same as for the CBRD2 and SILEM.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. Institutional arrangement:

A **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** with representatives from government ministries and agencies involved in implementation, civil society, and donors will oversee overall project implementation and provide overall strategic guidance, approval, and decision making at the national level. This committee will also ensure the project's consistency with the programmatic goals and provide advice on re-orienting activities where necessary to remain consistent with the national and regional action plans and investment frameworks. The Permanent Secretary of the National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development (Conseil national de l'environnement et du développement durable – CONEDD; GEF Operational Focal Point) and the Director of Forestry (Focal Point for the Great Green Wall initiative) will be invited to participate.

Overall responsibility for the project will be with the Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources. The management of certain sub-components in the project will be undertaken within the current line function responsibilities of relevant government departments and agencies (notably the Ministry of Justice, and the Ministry of Environment). The Forest Department in the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development will be associated with the implementation of the GEF-supported activities.

An existing **National Coordination Unit (NCU)** will continue to be responsible for overall management and coordination of this project, geared toward ensuring the technical and fiduciary quality of activities financed by the project. It will consist of a Direction, a Technical Assistance Unit, a Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. The project will benefit from the extensive and well-managed Administrative and Financial Unit of the CBRD Program, for project financial management, audits of accounts, accounting and reporting, with six Administrative and Financial Controllers to each cover two regions in order to ensure fiduciary aspects of the project's activities at decentralized levels.

Regional Coordination Units (RCU) in each of the 13 regions will continue to support on-the-ground capacity building and will be staffed by a Regional Coordinator, a Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, and a Capacity Building Specialist. At the **regional level**, the project will work in close collaboration with the Regional Councils, with the decentralized technical staff at the regional level, and the *Cadre de Concertation Régional (CCR)*, comprised of members of the Regional Council in addition to civil society, non-governmental organizations, and projects.

At municipal level, the **Village Development Councils** will play a key role at village level in ensuring the timely, efficient, and effective follow up of both implementation and maintenance of investments under their responsibility. The rural communes themselves will be responsible for the process of identifying (through participatory diagnosis, local development planning, and annual investment programming) and implementing investments to be financed by the local development financing (LDF). Within each commune and province, the project will support consultative for a *Cadre de Concertation Communal or Provincial* to guide the support provided by sectoral ministry extension workers based at departmental level.

B. Project Implementation arrangement:

The implementation arrangements will be further negotiated as per the PAD Annex 3, the implementation support plan (annex 5 of PAD) as well as the Financial Agreement and the Grant Agreement for the GEF funds and the IDA funds. In practice, there will be a protocol agreement between the NCU and different executing entities, with Work Plans and budget in the first months of the project. The Head of the M&E Unit will also serve as coordinator for the GEF-funded support.

The Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) will be involved mainly for component 4 and in support of components 1 and 3, though several of its departments, such as the General Directorate of Forest and Wildlife (DGFF) of the Directorate of Forestry. Implementation will be under the responsibility of the National Agency for Protected Areas (Office National des Aires Protégées, OFINAP) through a protocol with the NCU. Some activities would be implemented through subcontracts depending on scale and complexity. Contractual implementation of works will be done by OFINAP, the communities themselves, local artisans, private contractors, and non-governmental organizations.

Specifically, MEDD will be called upon to (a) provide technical assistance to the NRM investments in component 3 through its decentralized services; (b) support development of IEM land use plans and updated protected area management plans in targeted zones; (c) implement the plans on the ground; (d) contribute to the development and delivery of training packages in component 1; and (e) support monitoring of the environmental impact and GEF Tracking Tools.

PART IV: ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF

This project was approved by the GEF and LDCF/SCCF Councils in May 2011 as part of the SAWAP. In line with GEF streamlined procedures, there was no formal PIF submission, but the project was described in Annex C of the SAWAP Program Framework Document (PFD). The project is fully consistent with the original description in the PFD:

- **Project objective:** The objective is derived from the SAWAP GEO: “To expand sustainable land management (SLM) in targeted landscapes and in climate vulnerable areas”. With the addition of GEF support, the initial CBRD project development objective (PDO): “ was “*to consolidate the accomplishments of the first and second phases and establish a sustainable basis for decentralized rural development.*” was reformulated to “to enhance the capacity of rural communities and decentralized institutions for the implementation of local development plans that promote sustainable land and natural resources management and productive investments at commune level,” thus better capturing environmental sustainability.
- **Project design.** The project encompasses the elements mentioned in the PFD, including pilot innovations and SFM tools, strengthening SFM efforts, preparation and implementation of protected area management plans. The establishment of new wildlife corridors was found during appraisal to be less of a priority; rather the existing corridors are functional but will be integrated in larger management plans of the ecosystem complex of PONASI. The baseline project was initially planned with four components. In order to simplify management and implementation roles, a component on sustainable land and forestry management was added, while the component on land tenure remains IDA-funded only.
- **Project financing.** No change was made to the project financing.
- **With respect to the baseline investment,** marginal changes have been made. The PFD indicated three baseline projects in Burkina of a value of 44 M\$, while baseline cofinancing now amount to more than \$97 million. While the PFD envisaged that the GEF support would be blended with the Community and Private Forest Investment Project (CFIP), the project is now blended with the *other*

original baseline project in the PFD (i.e. the CBMP3). This adjustment was made since the range of GEF-supported activities could be better integrated into the broader nation-wide CBMP, rather than for a specific forest focus. The GEF increment will be more effectively deployed when associated with the CBMP, as well as benefit from timely scheduling, as the CFIP is still under development. Additional baseline projects have also been secured; namely PACT and PAPSA.


PART V: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):

(Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template.

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE <i>(MM/dd/yyyy)</i>
Mr. M. Honaida	GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	9 May 2011
Pr Jean Kouliadiati	Minister		2 July 2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Karin Shepardson GEF Agency Executive Coordinator		11/20/2012	Paola Agostini	(202) 473-7620	pagostini@worldbank.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Development Objective (PDO): <i>The Project Objective of Phase 3 is to enhance the capacity of rural communities and decentralized institutions for the implementation of local development plans that promote sustainable land and natural resources management and productive investments at commune level.</i>												
PDO Level Results Indicators*	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values**					Frequency	Data Source/ Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection	Description (indicator definition etc.)
				YR1(2013)	YR2 (2014)	YR3 (2015)	YR4(2016)	YR5 (2017)				
Indicator One: Direct project beneficiaries (number), of which female (percentage) Indirect project beneficiaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	Number	0	10 000	30 000	300 000	1 000 000	2 000 000 Target Year	Twice yearly		CBRD3	Core indicator
Indicator Two: Approved Annual investment plans executed more than 50%	<input type="checkbox"/>	%	0	No plans available	10%	50%	70%	80%	Yearly	CBRD	CBRD3	
Indicator Three: Additional land area under sustainable land and water management (SLWM) or Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) practices (hectares)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hectares	0	0	1 100	5 000	8 000	15000	Twice, at midterm and closing	Collection of data linked to GEF Tracking Tools	MEDD with NCU support	Estimate 13000 ha for SFM and 2000 ha for SLWM
INTERMEDIATE RESULTS												
Intermediate Result (Component 1): Institutional Development and Capacity Building Sub-Component 1A. Capacity Building for Rural Commune institutions Sub-Component 1B. Capacity Building for Regional Councils Sub-Component 1C. Capacity Building for local stakeholders Sub-Component 1D. Dialogue and Communication												
1.1 - Intermediate Result indicator One: Number of beneficiaries trained /training (% of female)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Number	00	150	350	400	450	500 Target Year	Annual	Reports/ registries of communal activities	CBRD	
1.2 - Intermediate Result indicator Two: Number of institutions trained		Number	0	150	350	500	600	650	Annual	Reports/ registries of communal activities	CBRD	650 of which: • 302 rural municipal councils • 13 regional councils • 150 SFR

													<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 150 Technical services • 35 NGOs
1.3 - Intermediate Result indicator Three : Number of training topics delivered in training, of which 20% in NRM	Number	0	7	15	20	25	30	Annual	Reports/registries of communal activities	CBRD			
1.4 - Intermediate Result Indicator four : Number of finalized PCD presented to CVDs	Number	0	150	302	302	302	302		Reports/registries of communal activities	CBRD			
Intermediate Result (Component 2): Implementing rural land tenure law and enhanced local dispute resolution													
2.1 - Intermediate Result indicator One : Rural Land Tenure Units (SFR) are operational at commune level	Number	0	0	50	80	110	150	Annual	Reports/registries of communal activities	CBRD			
2.2 - Intermediate Result indicator Two : Number of APF (Attestations de possession foncière) delivered	Number	0	0	500	3500	6000	7000	Annual	Reports/registries of communal activities	CBRD			
2.3 - Intermediate Result indicator Three : Local Land charters approved	Number	0	0	10	30	40	50	Annual	Reports/registries of communal activities	CBRD			
Intermediate Result (Component 3): Local development investments at the rural commune and region levels													
3.1 - Intermediate Result indicator 1 : % of funding allocated to productive or merchand community microprojects	%	0%	0	0	20%	45%	55%	Twice (2015 and 2017)	Economic analysis of microprojets, CBRD2	CBRD			Major infrastructure investments targeted in year 4 to complete before project end.
3.2 - Intermediate Result indicator 2 : % of microprojects successfully completed	%	0%	0	60%	70%	80%	85%	Twice (2015 and 2017)	Intermediate results survey ; technical evaluations	CBRD			
3.3 - Intermediate Result indicator 3 : SLWM practices disseminated in targeted zones	Number	0	3	6	8	10	5-10	Annual	Activity reports of CBRD3	CBRD			
Intermediate Result (Component 4): Sustainable Land and Forestry Management													
4.1 - Intermediate Result indicator 1 : Update of management plans of select protected areas	Number	0	1	3	5	5	5	Annual		MEDD (OFINAP)			

4.2 - Intermediate Result indicator 4: Participatory management plans developed and implemented in targeted communities shared forests in targeted zones	Number	0	10	15	25	25	25	Annual	Annual activity reports of CBRD3	MEDD (OFINAP)	
Intermediate Result (Component 5): Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation											
Intermediate Result indicator 1: Number of financial audit reports unqualified	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Annual	Audit reports	NCU	
Intermediate Result indicator 2: % of municipal councils financed that submit their quarterly reports in time	%	80%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Annual	Annual activity reports of CBRD3	NCU	
5.3. Intermediate Result indicator 3: Project Steering Committee meetings held annually	Number	100%	2	4	6	8	10	Twice a year	Project records	NCU	Cumulative
5.4 Intermediate Result indicator 4: GEF tracking tools updated	Number	100%			4		4	Twice: At mid-term and closing	Project records <i>Note:</i> Only a small selection of indicators in tracking tools needed.	MEDD (OFINAP) With NCU support	Tracking Tools for SFM, land degradation Biodiversity, climate change

(1) According to Ouaga 2 University study published in March 2012

(2) (302-10)Services Fonciers Ruraux(SFR); (8500-528) Commissions Foncières Villageoises (CFV);8500 Commissions de Conciliations Foncières Villageoises(CCFV); 13 Comités Régionaux de Sécurisation Foncière Rurale (CORESFR); 1Comité National de Sécurisation Foncière Rurale (CONASFR). NB: les structures nationales et régionales sont déjà en place mais doivent devenir fonctionnelles.

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

A. Responses to STAP on the SAWAP Document

Before the Councils' approval in May 2011, detailed responses were provided to address comments on the SAWAP PFD. Some of these responses were to be further developed at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage and are thus addressed below.

STAP comment	Response at PFD stage (April 2011)	Response at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage (October 2012)
<p><i>General comment:</i> Response to the following questions will help the proponent to be clear. Is the development of this PDF based on changes the various stakeholders or the countries would like to see? Are these based on identified gaps in knowledge, new opportunities and/or challenges? What are the theories of change? How can we be sure that any change will lead to better development?</p>	<p>The PFD includes a detailed and updated discussion of the barriers that have prevented an uptake in sustainable land and water management in the past. These barriers inform the design and focus of the program and its investment options that specific discrete individual projects will promote on the ground depending on local circumstances to be further identified and quantified as each individual project gets designed during the next 18 months.</p> <p>As per normal World Bank project preparation procedures and principles, each project under the Program Framework will have a detailed results chain, stakeholder analyses, and investment areas that target specific landscapes/ecosystems in the participating countries, and that include costed management activities.</p>	<p>Comment addressed: The proposed project was developed based on an analysis of local development and NRM challenges, as detailed in a number of national plans and strategies. The project has been designed to address these challenges through investments on the ground in selected areas and through broad technical assistance. The Government is highly supportive of the project which is part of a long-term engagement of the WB to decentralized local development in Burkina Faso, with high-performing support greatly appreciated by local communities and central government.</p>
<p>¹. The scientific rationale of the program is weak. For example, the sustainable land and water management (SLWM) interventions are not well-defined. The proponents also do not define explicitly the rationale for the interventions, or where they will take place, and how will they be delivered. Details on indicators also are needed to justify and assess the scientific rationale of the program, and how it intends to measure and monitor the expected multiple global environment benefits at the country level and across the region.</p>	<p>See comments immediately above on technologies.</p> <p>On targeting, each country project summary is annexed to the PFD. Projects are either beginning preparation or will begin preparation after approval, as per normal World Bank procedures. Given the large amount of baseline co-financing involved, the GEF increment needs to be integrated well, and that means following the World Bank project cycle.</p> <p>The KPIs in the proposed program framework are currently in use in many projects in Africa, many supported by TerrAfrica. The first KPI is explicitly included in the UNCCD's current indicator set. The Bank believes it is too early at pre-PIF stage to articulate the methodologies on how</p>	<p>Comment addressed: The result framework of the proposed project was carefully designed to integrate all key GEF indicators as well as SAWAP KPIs. GEF/ tracking tools will be monitored during the project at start, mid-term and end.</p> <p>A description of indicators is provided in Annex 1 of the PAD. A list of SLWM interventions is described in annex 2; application depends on zones, technical feasibility and needs of beneficiaries. Burkina Faso has access to broad experience in SLWM and has proven successful in integrating latest scientific developments.</p>

² Numbers out of sequence in order to remain consistent with STAP review document

STAP comment	Response at PFD stage (April 2011)	Response at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage (October 2012)
<p>The proposal indicated it will build on TerrAfrica’s monitoring and evaluation indicators, but this is poorly referenced. As such, STAP requests for the proponents to detail how the global environment benefits will be tracked and monitored, and how the program will build on TerrAfrica’s indicators – if at all.</p>	<p>each of the 13 projects will measure global benefits. It is sufficient to include at this point the KPIs, and <u>to work through each project’s preparation process to define the detailed approaches</u>. For example, the GEF is already financing a small number of operations that seek to improve cost-effective tracking of terrestrial carbon benefits. However, at the time of this writing, these tools are not yet available. The PFD notes that projects will avail themselves of these tools once available and if pragmatic and cost-effective for the local circumstances of each project. There is intense interest in tracking terrestrial carbon. On biodiversity and other focal areas, the PFD is clear that the <u>relevant GEF FA tracking tools would be deployed by each discrete project</u>.</p>	<p>Comment addressed: All relevant tracking tools (LD, CCM, BD and SFM) have been completed.</p>
<p>2. Although there are some researchable promising aspects such as integration of solutions, multiple global environment benefits, and several management options at the landscape level that serves all countries, these are poorly developed and the whole the scientific quality of this PDF is disappointing. The inclusion of a section on the scientific approach and methodology might shed light on the thinking of the proponents.</p> <p>4. Research and Development (R&D) efforts on SLWM have long been pursued as separate disciplines. By integrating research across disciplines and across scales from farmer’s field to landscape, we can put the pieces together to achieve the integrated, holistic approach required to synergize investments in water, soil, crops, environment and livelihoods. Often R&D excludes the socio-economic, gender, institutional and policy</p>	<p>This is an umbrella program framework, not a research project. <u>The discrete projects to be developed (or are being developed) under the umbrella will each be informed by specific additional lessons learned from past and on-going investment projects, as well as from investment-oriented research publications</u>. See knowledgebase.terrafrica.org for an extensive library already gathered. Additional specific country level analyses will be done as part of project preparation according to the specific needs of countries and their investment projects.</p> <p>To clarify, this is not a research project, but we agree that <u>trade-offs in the landscape need to be articulated and managed as part of the preparation of individual projects</u> under the Program Framework.</p> <p>We agree that socio-economic variables are critical drivers of land use and management decisions. The PFD’s barrier analysis explicitly recognizes economic and financial barriers to greater adoption of improved land and water management, and includes livelihoods activities and financial innovations to counter these barriers among its eligible activities. This barrier analysis has now been updated. In addition the PFD also summarizes the socio-</p>	<p>Comment addressed: The project was prepared primarily based on the prioritization process related to local development, as well as the NFPD. Burkina Faso has access to broad experience in SLWM which informed the design. In the course of the project, SLWM techniques selection will be further refined in partnership with technical departments and research institutions. Provisions are made to include targeted research in case of local need and demand arising from the local development plans.</p>

STAP comment	Response at PFD stage (April 2011)	Response at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage (October 2012)
<p>dimensions and uptake is not nearly at the pace required for widespread gains. Interventions required to bring this change about are less well understood. Many of the reasons are socio-economic, the very factors that the proposal tends to ignore.</p>	<p>economic pressures at work in the Sahel and southern systems.</p>	
<p>5. Formulating some development and research questions in both physical and socio-economical terms with consideration of livelihood and equity issues, or of power relations and potential conflicts and need for tradeoffs, will be useful and helpful to drive the expected outputs and outcomes from this initiative. These are important if the initiative wants to get its (largely physical) outputs to have positive outcomes and impacts for poverty reduction, improved livelihoods and wellbeing, as well as enhanced ecosystem services and environmental sustainability. There are clearly numerous assumptions underpinning this initiative which are not clearly expressed.</p>	<p>In addition to the comment immediately above on barriers, it is worth noting that the PFD's risk analysis treats socio-economic topics and political economy. Also, normal Bank project preparation includes detailed assessments of these as part of normal project preparation with the client.</p> <p>We agree on the need to address trade-offs within the landscape, and PFD has been updated to include this. <u>Indeed as each discrete project is designed, these trade-offs will be articulated closer to the level of resolution needed</u> that a PFD of this nature is not designed to address. For example, a discrete project might support local communities to carry out natural resource asset mapping and land use planning.</p>	<p>Comment addressed: The project includes socio-economic, gender, and institutional dimensions. The project is particularly targeted to positive outcomes and impacts for poverty reduction, improved livelihoods and wellbeing, while adding enhanced ecosystem services and environmental sustainability.</p> <p>During the design of the project, careful attention has been paid to address both environmental benefits and development needs of the population in targeted areas.</p>
<p>9. On institutional coordination and support- The document indicates that special attention will be given so that the Program will include projects implementing priority activities that have not been sufficiently addressed before and that do not duplicate existing efforts. Nonetheless, these gaps are not well defined, or how will they be addressed by the proposal. Therefore, STAP recommends defining explicitly these gaps, as well as their responses.</p>	<p>These are principles for designing the discrete projects. <u>These gaps will be identified and addressed as each discrete project is prepared</u> under the Program Framework, and following the usual rigorous World Bank project preparation procedures.</p>	<p>Comment addressed: The project contains a large component on institutional support, and is one of the cornerstones in Burkina Faso's rural development. As such, it covers gaps in the entire territory. In this framework, donor support is well coordinated around this project. Synergies with baseline and other projects are explicitly described in PAD and this Memorandum. The project clearly focuses on zones not covered by others in NRM.</p>

STAP comment	Response at PFD stage (April 2011)	Response at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage (October 2012)
<p>17. There are opportunities throughout the proposal to build-in specific gender interventions. For example, the proposal could specify further how land and water use planning and priorities to address livelihoods will take into account gender, given women's significant roles in agriculture, land management, food security, and water resources in the Sahel. STAP recommends that gender related interventions be built better throughout the document.</p>	<p>This is a welcome comment that we believe is addressed in the PFD. Please see the response above on gender in Bank projects (gender must be tracked).</p> <p><u>At the level of individual project development, detailed stakeholder assessments are carried out, and gender dimensions investigated.</u></p>	<p>Comment addressed: Gender targets are explicitly included in the PAD, see Annex 2, and sections B3 and B5 of this CEO Endorsement Memorandum.</p>

B. Responses to GEFSEC comments on the SAWAP Document

Before the Councils' approval in May 2011, detailed responses were provided to address comments on the SAWAP PFD. Some of these responses were to be further developed at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage and are thus addressed below.

GEF Secretariat's comments	Response at PFD stage (April 2011)	Response at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage (October 2011)
<p>Review sheet Q8 Baseline and Targets for LD, BD, CC, and SFM</p>	<p>The team has looked into the feasibility of estimating baselines and targets, [...]</p> <p><u>Thus, quantitative targets and spatial coverage will be provided for each project when it goes for CEO endorsement.</u> Given that the proposed projects are only in the conceptualization stages, it is premature at this stage to define quantitative targets. These will evolved based upon on-going dialogues and preparation activities in countries and will be summed by Project 13 for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>The proposed program integrates FAs and adaptation windows [...]</p>	<p>Comment addressed: Quantitative targets and baselines are available in the Project Results Framework (Annex 1) and in the GEF tracking tools.</p>
<p>Review sheet Q8 Biodiversity: The program identifies two objectives in the GEF biodiversity</p>	<p><u>Biodiversity is a key element of the Program:</u></p> <p>The biodiversity related activities are aiming [...]</p>	<p>Comment addressed. The proposed project target BD-2 to improve mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in selected landscapes, and BD-2 on</p>

GEF Secretariat's comments	Response at PFD stage (April 2011)	Response at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage (October 2011)
<p>strategy. In order to clearly demonstrate use of the focal area resources toward these two objectives, please provide in the Program Framework (Table B) indicative outcomes or outcome targets from the focal area results framework, such as actual estimates of hectares of existing protected areas for improved or effective management. These should also be consistent with the narrative in the PFD and highlighted in the concept note for countries as appropriate.</p>	<p>In line with the integrated ecosystem approach of the Program, [...] <u>The specific areas covered, policies supported and financing mechanisms will be detailed for CEO endorsement.</u></p> <p>[...] <u>Figures unavailable at this stage: Quantitative targets and spatial coverage will be provided for each project when it will be submitted for CEO endorsement.</u> Given that the proposed projects are only in the conceptualization stages, it is premature at this stage to define quantitative targets. These will evolved based upon on-going dialogues and preparation activities in countries.</p>	<p>protected areas.</p> <p>Comment addressed: Quantitative targets and baselines are available in the Project Results Framework (Annex 1) and in the GEF tracking tools.</p>
<p>Review sheet Q8 - For SFM/REDD+, please provide indicative target of forest area and ensure consistency with the PFD narrative and in concept notes for each of the countries.</p>	<p>SFM will complement and be combined with resources from other FA to generate sustainable flow of forest ecosystem services. In some countries, SFM will support expansion or rehabilitation of protected areas. <u>Quantified target will however be provided at the CEO endorsement stage.</u> For the program targets, see also answer to question 8, page 2. The PFD has been adjusted in order to further outline SFM supported activities.</p>	<p>Comment addressed: Please refer to the Project Results Framework (Annex 1) which defines outputs and outcome indicators for the project. Additional specific indicators are also being tracked through the GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools.</p>
<p>Review sheet Q14 a) alignment of baseline investments: please clarify exactly how multiple baseline projects in most of the countries will be integrated or linked to effectively leverage GEF resources for the alternative project.</p>	<p>The program is using as baseline multiple projects, [...]. In particular: [...]</p> <p>Each country description addresses the link with the baseline project(s). <u>Further details will be developed during project preparation.</u></p>	<p>Comment addressed: Please refer to Annex 7 of the PROJECT DOCUMENT and Section B.2. <i>Incremental / Additional Cost Reasoning</i> of this CEO Endorsement Memorandum for a detailed incremental cost and additional cost analysis.</p>
<p>Review sheet Q15 - Annex C country level increment: Incremental activities must be better described, especially for the CC funding as well as SFM funding. <u>In the annex to the Chad project, with the SFM funds, expected carbon benefits should be listed.</u></p>	<p>At CEO endorsement stage, the projects will detail the incremental cost reasoning by country.</p> <p>In Annex C1 on the project detailed description for Chad, section B1 describes the baseline projects and section B2 details the baseline scenario and how the different GEF resources (STAR LD, STAR BD, SFM and LDCF) can contribute to transform the baseline. In particular SFM</p>	<p>Comment addressed: Please refer to Annex 7 of the PROJECT DOCUMENT and Section B.2. <i>Incremental / Additional Cost Reasoning</i> of this CEO Endorsement Memorandum for a detailed incremental cost and additional cost analysis.</p>

GEF Secretariat's comments	Response at PFD stage (April 2011)	Response at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage (October 2011)
	resources (see paragraph on GEF alternative scenario) contribute to carbon sequestration through the rehabilitation of existing Protected Areas under Components 2 and 4. SFM resources add up to BD (improved management of existing Protected Areas) and LD (Integrated landscape management adopted by local communities). <u>Annex C1 has been adjusted to better outline the carbon benefits supported by SFM resources through avoided deforestation and natural regeneration.</u>	
At CEO endorsement please provide the following: - Include Bonn recommendations at project level	Overall, the team has noted the key points for elaboration at the time of CEO endorsement. It should be noted that a lot of these details are also part of the Bank's requirements for project development. (See also specific responses below)	Bonn's recommendations have been taken into account during project preparation.
- Show that recommendations made by partners in the Bonn Declaration at project level are included in the project document	Noted.	Bonn's comments made by partners have also been taken into account. Worth noting, the collaboration with bilaterals and other GEF projects is outlined in this CEO Endorsement Memorandum (Section B6).
- Develop partnerships with bilateral and other GGWI partners (EU, IFAD, FAO, for instance) - additional cofinancing is expected from engagement by potential partners including bilateral agencies who are interested by the programmatic approach (see the Bonn Declaration)	The WB will promote coordination with other agencies working in the countries in similar initiatives such as the African Development Bank (AfDB), bilateral agencies (such as France, European Commission, Norway, Netherlands, Germany, USA) and UN agencies (IFAD, UNEP, UNDP, FAO). The WB will work with these institutions under the TerrAfrica platform for coordination and implementation of the Program. Additional cofinancing for the projects may be explored during preparation based on bilateral discussions with partners and other donors.	Comment addressed: Other donors have been consulted during project preparation. See point just above.
- Confirm cofinancing. Please include cofinancing from bilateral partners who mentioned their interests in the Great Green Wall Initiative (the US, Germany, and France).	Cofinancing will be confirmed. Additional cofinancing for the projects may be explored during preparation based on bilateral discussions with partners and other donors.	Comment addressed: Co-financing identified at PFD stage have been confirmed and increased.
- Provide a clear baseline with quantified indicators. Develop the assumptions and the barriers that the program and its projects will seek to	All projects will develop the results framework which details the baseline with quantified indicators. The points mentioned will be given due consideration.	Comment addressed: Baseline with quantified indicators are available in the Project Results Framework (Annex 1). Other quantitative targets, are also available in the GEF tracking tools.

GEF Secretariat's comments	Response at PFD stage (April 2011)	Response at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage (October 2011)
<p>resolve. It is notably important that this barrier analysis address issues for each focal area. Lessons learned from past investments should underpin assumptions related to linking environment and development goals in such an ambitious program (e.g. alternative livelihood activities, knowledge and institutional barriers, etc.).</p>		
<p>- Provide a comprehensive risk analysis,</p>	<p>The individual project documents will detail the risks analysis, as per the World Bank requirement.</p>	<p>Comment addressed: Refer to the ORAF table in Annex 4 of the PROJECT DOCUMENT and section B.4. of this CEO Endorsement Memorandum.</p>
<p>- Develop a monitoring and evaluation plan with quantified indicators,</p>	<p>The individual project documents will include the results framework with realistic, quantifiable indicators, as per the World Bank requirement.</p>	<p>Comment addressed: Refer to the Project Results Framework in Annex 1 of the PROJECT DOCUMENT which defines outputs and outcome indicators for the project. Additional indicators are also being tracked through the GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools.</p>
<p>- Provide analysis of local stakeholders to justify the selection of beneficiary and targeted communities.</p>	<p>The individual project documents will detail the stakeholder participation analysis.</p>	<p>Several intensive stakeholders consultations have taken place during the project preparation with a combination of consultations organized in the regions and national level consultations.</p>
<p>- We are expecting at CEO endorsement a rationale to use 10 percent of management costs.</p>	<p>At CEO endorsement will provide rationale for 10% management costs.</p>	<p>Based on the blending with IFC Bank operation, the project management costs have been limited to 5% as per GEF requirements.</p>
<p>- SFM: Impacts of SFM activities are expected on the ground. Regardless of whether CC funding is directly involved as a focal area for a country, the SFM project must show carbon benefits.</p>	<p>SFM: Carbon benefit from SFM funds in particular and from other GEF resources in general will be monitored through KPI-4: Change in carbon accumulation rates in biomass and soil, compared to baseline (tC/ha)</p>	<p>Comment addressed: Given the poor availability of data in Burkina Faso on this subject, data is not current. The national Forest Inventory is being updated.</p>
<p>- GEF investments are 4% of the total. Based on past experiences under</p>	<p>The incremental reasoning will be provided for each project and we agree that the projects will have strong baseline</p>	<p>Comment addressed: Refer to Annex 7 of the PROJECT DOCUMENT and sections B.2.2.1 and</p>

GEF Secretariat's comments	Response at PFD stage (April 2011)	Response at CEO Endorsement Memorandum stage (October 2011)
Terrafrica for instance, it is always a case to imagine how the GEF is going to be incremental. Please develop the reasoning at CEO endorsement.	cofinancing and careful attention will be placed on justifying the GEF incrementality.	B.2.4. of this CEO Endorsement Memoandum.
TTs for all relevant focal areas will be required at CEO Endorsement.	TTs will be included at the time of CEO endorsement.	Comment addressed: All relevant tracking tools (LD, CCM, BD and SFM) have been completed for the baseline stage.

C. Responses to Secretariat's comments at CEO Endorsement Level (submitted separately)

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ Person Week*</i>	<i>Estimated Person Weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks To Be Performed</i>
For project management			
Local Consultant			
Project coordination and Environmental Specialist	1500	50	Overall coordination and technical advice
Accountant	1500	35	Overall financial management
M&E specialist	1500	50	Monitoring the implementation of environmental activities/GEF Tracking Tools
International Consultant	0	0	
	<i>\$/ Annual Cost</i>	<i>\$/ Estimated Cost</i>	
Office facilities, equipment and vehicles			
Desktop + Stabilizer (1)		5000	
Vehicle (1)		30,000	
Telephone	500	2,000	
Stationery	750	3,000	
Fuel	5000	20,000	
Intranet	1,000	4,000	
Printing	1000	4,000	
Workshops		37,000	
Total Office facilities etc.		105,000	
Travel			
Missions in the country		55,000	approx 2/year for 2 staff of the PIU
Missions abroad	2,000	8,000	approx 2 for regional experience sharing visits
Total travel		63,000	
Justification for travel, if any:			
For Technical Assistance			
Local	<i>\$/Person Week*</i>	<i>Estimated Person Weeks**</i>	
Forest/Natural Resources Management Specialist	1500	4	Support to national and local teams for the preparation of PONASI sustainable management plans
SLWM Natural Resources Management Specialist	1500	4	Support to national and local teams for the identification and dissemination of appropriate SLM practices/tools
Justification for travel, if any: This activity will require intensive field work (site visits, interaction with stakeholders etc.): See above.			

* Provide dollar rate per person week. ** Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS - NOT APPLICABLE

ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (IF NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT IS USED) - N/A

ANNEX F: Estimation of Carbon Dioxide Balance from SFM and SLM Elements of Project

Under the baseline scenario, the current estimated rates of deforestation and forest degradation would prevail, with a resulting loss in forest areas and reduced forest carbon stocks on the reduced forests. The project is targeted sustainable forest management activities on 15,000 ha of woodland. This woodland is subject to pressure from deforestation (i.e., conversion of forest land to land under other uses) and forest degradation (i.e., reduction of standing stock on remaining forest land). The FAO estimates that current woodlands in Burkina Faso have an average standing stock of carbon of 52 t C/ha (FAO, 2011, Table3). With the current deforestation rate of -1.0% per annum (FAO, 2011, Table 2), over ten years the 15,000 ha targeted under the project would be reduced to 13,982 ha. Using the deforestation rate as the de-stocking or degradation rate, the standing carbon stock on that land after 10 years would be 48.5 t C/ha. Across the remaining forest-land, this would indicate that the total lost carbon would come to 147,234 tonnes or 539,859.18 tonnes of CO₂. (Source: FAO, 2011. *State of the World's Forests, 2011*. Rome: FAO.)

The project scenario seeks to reduce the rate of deforestation and degradation from 1.0% per annum with a third by promoting sustainable forest management practices. Thus, the loss in forest area and in standing stock on that forest area would be reduced. After ten years of these sustainable practices, the total loss of C from the original 15,000 hectares would be 90,490 tonnes of carbon or 331,796 tonnes of CO₂. This improved forest management scenario represents a savings in CO₂ stored in the targeted forest areas of 208,062 tonnes after ten years.

Table: Estimated Carbon and CO₂ Balances from SFM and SLM Activities in Burkina Faso CBRD3

	Targeted Forest Area	Carbon Stock on Targeted Forest Area, Yr 0	Estimated remaining forest Area after 10 years	Estimated Remaining C Stock on that Forest Land	Total Loss of C stock by end of 10 years	Total Loss of CO ₂ in Forest Stock in 10 years
Baseline Scenario: Deforestation rate 1.0% pa and Degradation rate, reduction of standing stock on remaining forests by 0.1% pa	(Ha)	52 t/ha	1%pa * ha*10	52/t/ha		
Risk 1: Loss of Forest area (conversion of existing forests to existing non forest)	15,000	825,000	13,982.47	769,036		
Risk 2: Degradation of Existing Forestland		52	48.5	677,766		
					147,234	539,859.18
Project Scenario: Reduce rate of Deforestation and Forest Degradation from 1.0. pa by third over 10 years						
Risk 1: Loss of Forest area (conversion of existing forests to existing non forest)	15,000	825,000	14,556.03	800,581		
Risk 2: Degradation of Existing Forestland		52	50.5	734,510		
					90,490	331,796.32
					CO ₂ Preserved in Forest Stocks because of Project	208,062.86