

September 20, 2013

**Comments from United Kingdom on Approval by Mail: FIP Burkina Faso: Decentralized Forest and Woodland Management**

Dear Patricia

Further to our email of Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> , please find below our specific comments and questions on the Burkina Faso *Decentralised Forest and Woodland Management Project*.

**Institutional points:**

Is the EU project that is co-mingling funds for most of the components already approved/up and running?

Does the sub component 3.2 also cover coordination of the AfDB project? It isn't that clear how coordination and the sequencing of the interlinked activities is going to take place

We have some concerns about the sustainability of funding for the community development interventions based on the landscape planning. Our understanding is that the resources will come from project funds initially. At what point will this change and where will resources for this activity come from in future? Will the funding source be distinct from that for the PES? What are the implications if funds are no longer available?

**Livelihoods issues and relationship with AfDB project:**

Pg 17 talks generically about the extent of people's dependence on forest based economic activities "up to 25% - but nothing about the specific project areas. It would be helpful to have a better understanding of livelihoods strategies and the extent to which these drive deforestation in the local context. Component 2 that focuses on alternative livelihoods is light on detail, partly because it anticipates responding to demand and does not want to pre-empt what communities identify as priorities. However, an understanding of likely interventions would be helpful, and would also help the project to identify any potential barriers to developing those alternative livelihoods, and to take appropriate measures to try and address them.

Is there any link between the Land use planning and subsequent community development activities, and the PES? Even though the PES is envisaged under the AfDB proposal, it relates to the same populations.

The idea of the independent observer is an interesting one. Could we hear a bit more about their role?

We are not entirely clear on the extent to which local consultations have already taken place. For example, paragraph 115 and 118 suggests consultation is yet to be carried out?

Reference is made to enhanced access to finance. Can you confirm that others are providing financial services, or is this likely to continue to be a barrier?

Are the activities outlined in the annex under component 2.2 only for areas OUTSIDE the gazetted forests? If it does cover gazetted forests as well, how does this link in with the AfDB project?

### **Biodiversity:**

There are references to biodiversity and ecosystem services under threat, and that the project will have a positive impact on them. However, there are no details provided on activities to do this, and no indicators in the logframe. The annex refers to developing an M&E system for biodiversity and ecosystem services and it is acknowledged that the lack of methodologies is a constraint in Burkina Faso. This is very positive. Reference to the development of biodiversity and ecosystem services M&E methodologies could be included in the logframe, and the methods, once developed, could be applied to the project area. This should be made more explicit.

### **Economic analysis/assumptions**

Does the figure used against which to compare income include income from gazetted forests (and therefore illegal/unregulated?). If yes, what proportion?

Does the table on page 85 (assumptions behind GHG calculations) take demographic growth into consideration? Currently it seems to be assumed that a 30% increase in agricultural efficiency will help decrease conversion of degraded forest into crop-land by 30%. .. but won't the increase in agricultural efficiency would need to be much higher to also counter the effect of population growth (unless I'm missing something?). There is no evidence provided about the benefits that accrue from the participatory land-use approach so where does the 30% increase in agricultural efficiency come from?

On page 98 livelihood and environmental benefits are separated out into marketable and non-marketable benefits. Could some of the non-marketable benefits be quantified? There is research that exists in these fields, for example; improved efficiency of forest product value chains, better access to credit, biodiversity conservation (TEEB) and reduced Drivers of Deforestation.

We are not clear on how the figures provided for the CO2 benefits over the 15 year period were arrived at. Related to this, could you confirm that the area being targeted is 34 thousand hectares? On page 83 the estimate is 1,870,093 tons of carbon and assumes 55 tons of carbon per hectare ( $1,870,093 / 55 = 34,000$ ).

The livelihoods improvement is calculated is by looking at three scenarios; recipients of the programme are 1%, 3% or 5% better off than those who don't receive it (page 100). Are these arbitrarily selected percentages, or is there evidence to suggest that these are reasonable assumptions?

Thank you once again for the opportunity to comment and ask questions.

Best wishes  
Gaia Allison  
Forests and Land Use Adviser  
Climate and Environment Department