



BURKINA FASO
GAZETTED FORESTS PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT PROJECT FOR REDD+ (PGFC/ REDD+)
UK COMMENTS ON PGFC/REDD+

COMMENTS	ANSWERS
<p>1. Component 2 mentions the building of “anchor infrastructure” comprising 2000km of road and 2 eco-lodges, etc. The infrastructure related investments take up a significant part of the budget. It would therefore be helpful to have a fuller description of why and how these infrastructure investments are needed to achieve the improved forest management objective.</p>	<p>Forests have received very little infrastructure investment since they were gazetted during the colonial period.</p> <p>These investments will help sustainable forest management by (i) securing the limits of the forests and (ii) facilitating the exploitation and adding value of forests products.</p> <p>The roads are rather forest (paths) roads built to facilitate the management, maintenance and protection of forest. These forest roads will be maintained by the communities.</p> <p>A paragraph has been added in Annex B2, Section 2.1 to justify the need of building infrastructure in forests for the success of the forest management.</p>
<p>2. A major selling point of the project is that it will contribute to resilience and climate change adaptation as well as mitigation. However, other than “ diversification of income sources” (pg. 6 of Appraisal doc.) there are no further details on how this will be achieved. More detail of how the project interventions will contribute to longer term resilience, how improved management will make forests more resilient to climate change, and how any livelihood diversification interventions will be designed to be</p>	<p>Climate change adaptation capacities will be strengthened through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>An improved resilience of communities</u>: the improved sustainability of forest exploitation will ensure improved communities’ incomes while forest conservation will ensure the sustainability of the ecosystem services provided by the forest such as soil protection and watershed conservation, which are key for the communities to adapt to climate change. In addition, diversification of income sources shall support

<p>“climate smart”, would be helpful.</p>	<p>adaptation to climate change (in particular agricultural resilience) but they will be mainly supported by the World Bank’s project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>An improved resilience of the forest:</u> the project will support the development of new forest exploitation standards adapted to climate change in 4 different agro-ecological zones. The current standards seem to be in fact obsolete, as they no longer reflect the forest's regeneration capacity, which has decreased with climate change. In addition, reforestation activities will use indigenous resilient tree species provided by the National Forest Seed Centre (CNSF). <p>These precisions are added to the appraisal report in 3.2.3.</p>
<p>3. Although the calculation of CO2e savings is very clearly presented, it would generally be helpful to get a breakdown of hectares per project component alongside the CO2e savings in the project summary and/or log frame. Also note below comment on the baseline emissions.</p>	<p>All the CO2e savings are linked to project’s component 2 and thus cannot be broken down per project component.</p> <p>Changes have been done to the log frame to more precisely reflect deforestation and forest degradation rate evolution (baseline and objectives), as well as hectares reforested and generated. The executive summary is limited to one page according to AfDB’s format, so we cannot add a table summarizing data on baseline and objectives regarding carbon and forest areas (hectares). This table has been added to technical annex B6 (Table 7) along with carbon estimates.</p>
<p>4. The proposal claims 4.7mt of CO2e savings which yields a cost/ton of \$2.5/t. Thoroughly applying the 40% discount to be conservative and take into account permanence/leakage as suggested by the proposal itself would reduce the figure to a total of 2.8mt CO2e saved and \$4/t CO2e. The proposal includes an indication of the business as usual scenario and corresponding emissions, <u>this should be included in the log frame</u>. The proposal does not mention the <u>role of carbon markets</u> and it would be good to get clarification whether the project intends to seek carbon finance through the CDM.</p>	<p>As mentioned in the technical annexes, the 4.7MT of CO2e savings already include the 40% discount.</p> <p>Changes have been done to the log frame to more precisely reflect deforestation and forest degradation rate evolution (baseline and objectives), as well as hectares reforested and generated. A table summarizing data on baseline and objectives regarding carbon and forest areas (hectares) has been added to technical annex B6, along with carbon estimates, rather than in the log frame due to presentation constraints.</p> <p>The project does not intend to seek carbon finance through the CDM. It is expected that the carbon will be sold, as part of a national approach to REDD+, for which the country is currently building the necessary systems (MRV, REL...) with the support from the FCPF and the two FIP projects.</p>

	<p>These details are added to the appraisal report in 3.1.2.</p>
<p>5. What drove the assumption of 40% non-permanence/leakage and <u>why</u> was this considered to be a good estimate? The document could have outlined more explicitly how the project intends to mitigate non-permanence and leakage.</p>	<p>The 40% is a common average for that kind of project. We consider this assumption reliable, taking into account that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community’s involvement and firebreaks should reduce the risks of wildfire ; • Leakage mitigation measures will be implemented by the FIP program (World Bank’s and AFDB’s projects), such as tree planting, agricultural intensification and energy efficiency activities (improved stoves...), which should make leakage effects relatively controlled. <p>As the project will not seek carbon finance directly (only through a national approach to REDD+), no specific calculations have been made to estimate precisely this discount.</p>
<p>6. This project has been designed to complement the activities of the World Bank implemented FIP proposal, in the same geographical regions. This makes sense and certain costs will therefore be shared between the two projects. It would be helpful to have some description of how the two projects will account for their impacts given that there is bound to be some overlap in impact areas. For example, how will the projects ensure that there is no double accounting of carbon sequestered?</p>	<p>The country has opted to adopt a programmatic approach in the investment plan that involves the two projects working together to achieve goals. The PGFC / REDD + project will invest in gazetted forests while the project of the World Bank will invest in wooded areas and territories of the neighboring communities to reduce the pressure on gazetted forests through income diversification forests. The two projects will contribute to the achievement of the expected impact of FIP IP in Burkina which is to promote transformational change in the management of gazetted forests and woodlands in Burkina Faso by adopting a landscape approach capable of combining forest management, agroforestry, agriculture, pastoralism, and the enhancement of forest products and services (Annex B1). The PGFC / REDD+ will contribute at the level of gazetted forests while the project of the World Bank will focus on woodlands.</p> <p>While there will be a common MRV system for the two projects, this does not mean the projects will have competing claims on the carbon generated as this carbon will be accounted and sold as part of a national approach to REDD+.</p>
<p>7. There appears to be no baseline or monitoring strategy for</p>	<p>The monitoring of ecosystem services and biodiversity will be part of</p>

<p>ecosystem services or biodiversity – apart from some references to these being improved – it is unclear how this information will be gathered or verified. This is important given the biodiversity dependent interventions being proposed.</p>	<p>the whole M&E system for the project (“external monitoring”). As mentioned in the project appraisal document (paragraph 4.2.1): “An M&E manual identifying the relevant indicators as well as the monitoring procedures to be implemented will be prepared at the start of the project”. It will specify monitoring activities for ecosystem services and biodiversity.</p>
<p>8. . The drivers of diversification are presented in general terms, for the country as a whole, Are there any specific drivers of deforestation that may require site specific measures?</p>	<p>The forests chosen for the project represent a diversity of situations and uses. Table 4 (p 31) of technical annexes presents the “Main deforestation Anthropic Factors” for the different regions of intervention. Table 5 (p 39) presents specific activities by regions, to address specific challenges. For example, overgrazing is the major cause of forest degradation in the eastern region as highlighted in table 4 and a forest and rangeland management approach is proposed for the forest with specific activities (Annex B2 p. 36) while different management options are proposed in the other regions.</p>
<p>9. There is a substantial amount of (labour intensive) construction envisaged within this project. Yet there is no mention of future maintenance strategies. Will the upkeep of the road network for example be the responsibility of local community management groups? Will the state budget allocate resources for the maintenance of the Nazinon training facility?</p>	<p>The forest infrastructures - including the forest roads – maintenance will be the responsibility of communities in return for payments for environmental service (PES) as mentioned in 4.4.2 in the appraisal report. Some details are added to this paragraph to make this point clearer.</p> <p>The Nazinon training facility will have budgetary autonomy and should thus in principle be able to maintain itself based on its own revenues. This will be detailed in its strategic plan that will be prepared, as part of this project, prior to the rehabilitation of the facilities.</p>
<p>10. The construction of eco-lodges is referred to but gets no analysis within the economic appraisal, there is no indication of whether these are to be community managed, if so, how? Or privatised as tourism concessions?</p>	<p>The economic analysis of the construction of eco-lodges will be performed by the consultant to be recruited for feasibility studies and engineering design during the implementation of the project.</p> <p>The project will support a study on the method of co-managing gazetted forests in the context of REDD+ that will provide an assessment of the best management options for gazetted forest oriented towards wildlife conservation. Significant consultation and participation of the communities will anyway be ensured in the management of the eco-tourism activities.</p>
<p>11. Gazetted area hunting concessions are planned in order to generate income from wildlife (pg 36 of technical annex). In light of</p>	<p>The two forests to be developed by the project for their wildlife potentialities are Koulbi and Bontioli in the south - west. Management</p>

<p>absent baselines on wildlife numbers, reproductive rates, habitat status, and sustainable yields this seems to be a high risk strategy encouraging hunting in forests where poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking have already undermined wildlife numbers. This does not seem sustainable – would recommend investigating sustainability of present populations and contribution of these to forest health, wildlife and biodiversity should be considered as part of the REDD+ package and therefore need protecting.</p>	<p>plans in both forests were developed in 2010 by PROGEREF, a project funded by the African Development Bank. The Wildlife-oriented development, particularly the hunting activities proposed, is based on their potential for wildlife due to the inventory of the wildlife population that had been made by the project. It is also planned, as part of the activities funded by PPG, to update the management plans in 2014 including an inventory of wildlife population. The purpose of the update is to set guidelines and rules that ensure sustainability of these forests management and if needed some conservation measures will be proposed. On the other hand it will be necessary, in the management plan, to undertake an annual wildlife inventory to set the hunting rate and to propose conservation measures needed to sustain these activities. It should be noted that the project will before closure, create the conditions necessary for the sustainability of gazetted forests management in Burkina Faso that will focus on the sale of carbon sequestered. The concern of the sustainability of the hunting activities will be integrated in the TOR of the previous study to update management plans.</p>
<p>12. The economic appraisal generally is weak on the co-benefits (e.g. value added activities in NTFP processing, employment and income generation through labour intensive infrastructure investments?)</p>	<p>It should be noted that the economic analysis of the project is based on the direct economic costs and benefits of the project. The financial analysis of revenue can only observe the same rules and with the economic assumptions of the analysis, the project is more than viable as evidenced by the EIRR reported (paragraph 3.1.1). The jobs' benefits have been mentioned in the case of nurseries. The benefits of the jobs created by infrastructure works are added to Annex B6. Employment-related processing of forest products was not taken into account because it will not be done to a major extent (only semi-finished products) by the producers and will probably be done in others countries.</p>
<p>13. It is not clear how communities will make contributions to any of the projects, except perhaps in terms of labour. If entities trading in non-timber forest products for example are to be supported and encouraged to add value, it would be helpful to know how this is going to be done, without undermining market forces and the fledgling private sector referred to in the appraisal report.</p>	<p>The project's approach is to support communities to restore forests and to ensure the responsibility of forests' maintenance and conservation because of the benefits they will have from sustainable forest products exploitation and future payments for environmental services. It is therefore expected during the project implementation phase, that communities will contribute labor to carry out reforestation, maintenance and conservation of forests. After the project closure, this will ensure the maintenance and conservation of forests in return for the payments for environmental services funded by the Forest Management Fund (FAF) and the Fund for Environmental</p>

	Interventions (FIE) to be established by the Government in 2014. It is not intended as part of a project to support the marketing of forest products, that is reserved for wholesalers at the national level. The project's activities will therefore not compete with the emerging private sector in the area. The community contributions to the project is explained more in the report (section 2.6).
14. PES is mentioned (additional to the carbon payments) but not really developed any further. We are not clear on how this will work. The section of the appraisal report that mentions a range of PES schemes being set up by other projects (Forest Development Fund, Environment Intervention Fund) could be further explained in the technical annex.	The project's goal is to bring forest management groups (GGF), under the supervision of the forestry administration, as major players of the management, maintenance and conservation of forests instead of simply exploiting forests. This requires a change in behavior and practices of GGF because they have to adopt self-discipline in the management in addition to assuming responsibility for the maintenance and conservation. For these services to forest conservation, they will receive payments through a PES contract to be signed with the Ministry of Environment during the 3rd year of the project. The mechanism of implementation of this PES mechanism is detailed in Annex B2. The project will therefore provide this payment for environmental services over two years. Thereafter, payments will be provided by the Forest Management Fund (FAF) and the Fund for Environment Intervention (FIE). In the longer term, this PES will rely on resources derived from the sale of carbon after the operationalization of REDD + in Burkina Faso.
15. The reference to improved stoves suggests a distribution rather than support for the establishment of the whole value chain. Is this the case? The technical annex refers to charcoal making as a key driver of deforestation in some of the project areas, but this doesn't seem to be particularly well addressed in the project interventions, other than to suggest that fuelwood production will decrease (we presume as a result of an end to open access and the promotion of more rigorous management).	The project does not provide support for the wood energy process and carbonization activities. These activities are reserved for the World Bank project in the context of income diversification. PGFC/REDD+ envisages <i>the dissemination of improved stoves to household living around forests to reduce fuelwood consumption</i> and thus the pressure on gazetted forests. The production of charcoal is not among the planned forest management activities. Exploitation will be limited to wood for household consumption and the surplus will be sold to wholesalers. This is to reduce wood harvesting in forests to maintain a higher biomass and therefore a greater capacity for carbon sequestration in forests. This is what differentiates the project forest management approach for REDD + with a conventional forest management for timber and –energyneeds . The shortfall is compensated through the PES.
16. The ESMP identifies a range of environmental and social risks but does not provide much information on the mitigation of the risks.	The content of Annex B7 is a brief summary of the ESMP. The full ESMP report of 100 pages, validated by The Government of Burkina Faso and the Bank, is published on the Bank's website and distributed

	in the country. The content of Annex B7 has been strengthened to give more details on mitigation measures (see Annex B7).
17. Although there is much to celebrate with the legal and policy reforms under way in BF, the technical annex does reference the continuing tenure insecurity issues and delays to implementation of reforms as a major driver of deforestation. It would be helpful to have more analysis of why implementation is delayed and what the implications are. This does not appear as a risk which is surprising. Insecure tenure is likely to mean that continued patterns of pressure on forest areas continue and the risk of leakage/displacement will also continue.	The issue of land tenure is covered by the project of the World Bank (WB), the second operation of the Burkina Faso FIP investment plan. This WB project will support the rural municipalities to elaborate their land use plans and for land tenure clarification for a better management of rural land. On the other hand the PGFC/REDD+ project plans, within the framework of the activities funded by the PPG, will support the Ministry of Environment to accelerate the operationalization of the land tenure law. Insecure tenure has therefore not been considered a risk by the project because it is taken into account and managed by the two FIP projects. Furthermore, land tenure is not an issue for gazetted forests as they are recognized by communities as a property of the state.
18. Risk of elite capture of committees etc as well as benefits. Will forest management committees and other joint forest management arrangements ensure that the forest management priorities of the poorest are included in forest management plans? Will the access rights of the poorest be protected?	The risk of elite capture of project benefits has been identified during the project appraisal (see log frame and Table IV-2, section 4.5.1) and a mitigation measure is proposed. At the start, project would recruit at the start an NGO that would identify existing forest groups, associations or vulnerable groups exploiting the forests. Only these groups would then be involved, organized and supported for the management of forests. They would also be represented on the management committees of forests as major players. In this project, priority will be given to vulnerable groups dependent on forests. The project goal is to work with real actors and not opportunists who may disappear after the project completion.
19. We would like more information about the communities that are settled within gazetted areas. We assume that they are NOT to be removed from these areas. pg. 37 of the technical annexes states “Although the law prohibits human occupation of the area gazetted as forest areas of the state, <u>a study conducted by the Forest Department reports that forty administratively recognized villages and hamlets of cultures whose population varies between 200 and 3 200 people are located in gazetted forests</u> (Difor, 2007).” But there is little description of what is going to happen to these communities – pg. 38 discusses compensation for loss of earnings but this does not specifically refer to the populations living within the reference areas and what will happen once they “delineate and demark” the forest areas. What specific measures will be taken to work with them in favour of sustainable forest management, and how will this be	In fact, none of the gazetted forests selected by the project presents this issue of illegal occupation by the communities. This was one of the selection criteria to be eligible for the investment of the project. This is why neither the appraisal report nor the ESMP has reported the case of illegal occupation of forests by the communities and there is also no reference to compensation. The results of the study (Difor, 2007), which is referred to in Annex B2 section 2.1, concerns the 77 gazetted forests of Burkina Faso. We have referred to it simply to illustrate the threat of gazetted management in Burkina Faso. However, we know that the policy of the country in this field is not to remove the communities outside the gazetted forests but rather to delimit the enclaves of their villages inside the forests. Regarding the involvement of all forests riparian communities in the project activities, this is one of the main concerns of the project in achieving the target results. This

<p>negotiated with communities that remained outside the gazetted areas, but are equally dependent upon forest resources for their livelihoods. In general, a bit more analysis of the potential winners and losers from preventing open access and introducing more rigorous management regimes would be beneficial.</p>	<p>is why the project will recruit an NGO responsible for identifying, organizing and supporting the riparian communities in forest management activities and establishing consultative forest management committees involving all stakeholders who will orientate and conduct the management activities and resolve potential conflicts.</p>
<p>20. . How will the gains to be made from improved forest management be protected from the possible negative consequences of increased access from road construction. We were not clear on the plan to mitigate the very likely impact these would have on unregulated hunting and logging. It would be useful to understand clearly how impacts from road construction – long term / short term both social and environmental will be managed and mitigated.</p>	<p>We should clarify that roads constructed by the project are forest (paths) roads constructed around and inside the forests to facilitate management, maintenance and protection activities. The forest roads constructed are not intended to facilitate access to forests from outside or to connect them to the national road network. However, they do facilitate movement within the forests. The project’s strategy is to bring the communities within the PES contracts, to adopt good practice of forest resources exploitation and provide oversight to prevent illegal logging. We believe in the success of this strategy because the communities will be paid on the basis of acres of forest preserved from illegal logging or wildlife poaching. Forest roads will facilitate protection by communities and the forest administration. Generally, illegal loggers tend to avoid the forest roads to avoid detection.</p>
<p>21. There is reference to planting drought resistant trees. Are these going to be indigenous species that are present in the local area already? This decision will have impacts on ecosystems and food webs, but could also be important in terms of survival rates.</p>	<p>The project plans to use drought-resistant native species developed by the National Forest Research Centre. In fact, this center has been working for years to develop improved local species and now have improved suitable seeds available. The project will also support the center to scale-up demonstration plots of resilient species in the country.</p>

BURKINA FASO
GAZETTED FORESTS PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT PROJECT FOR REDD+ (PGFC/ REDD+)
US COMMENTS ON PGFC/REDD+

COMMENTS	ANSWERS
<p>1. In general, what is the exact nature of the interventions to take place under component 2 under the headings “silvopastoral development,” “wildlife oriented development,” and “forestry development.” What is the rationale for these activities – how would they, if implemented successfully, contribute to REDD+ objectives? Please describe the drivers of deforestation relevant to these particular geographic areas, and the barriers to implementation of project activities that need to be overcome. What form would FIP support take, and who would be involved?</p>	<p>The project will support communities to ensure the management and conservation of gazetted forests under the supervision of the forestry administration. The content of component 2 in Annex B2 is reformulated to better explain the approach and management options to be developed by the project, the beneficiaries of the project, how the management options will ensure the preservation of gazetted forests as well as the mechanism to be put in place to ensure the sustainability of the investments. The project’s approach is to promote co - management (community, state, local authorities) of gazetted forests focused on conservation and poverty reduction. The Project will empower communities organized as forest management groups (GGF) to manage forests according to defined standards to be respected. Communities will exploit forest products according to standards which ensure the balance of biomass in forests. Communities derive income from these activities. If the income of a community falls short of previous incomes related to forest activities, due to the management focused on conservation, the community will be compensated through payments for environmental services (PES). To ensure the success of these approaches the project will have to create the conditions for their viability and sustainability. The project will support communities based on a financing agreement fixing the management standards to be met, for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delimitation and demarcation of gazetted forests; - Organization and training of forest management groups on improved techniques for sustainable forest management - Restoring forests through reforestation; - Construction of the infrastructure required for forest management, storage and marketing of products; - Acquisition of equipments required for the exploitation and processing of forest products. <p>The Project proposes three forests management options based on the</p>

	<p>forest potentialities and the degradation factors to control for its preservation. The three management options and the expected results are described in annex B2, section 2.1 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest and Rangeland Management considered for forest of Tapoa Boopo to Matiakoali, in the East region; • Wildlife-oriented development considered for Bontioli and Koulbi gazetted Forests in southwest • Forest-oriented development through second-generation CAF considered for Tiogo, and Nazinon forests in west central and a group of forests in the Mouhoun loop region. <p>The activities previous for each of the forests are summarized in Table 5 of annex B2.</p>
<p>2. With respect to the building of eco-lodges, where would that occur, what entities would FIP support, and on what terms? Has there been any analysis of whether eco-lodges are a viable business strategy in these areas? Please describe how the eco-lodges would lead to reduced deforestation and forest degradation.</p>	<p>The logic of the project is to support community participation in forest management. A community will ensure the restoration, maintenance, and conservation for the counterpart revenue they will receive from ecotourism. Thus, the eco-lodges will be built for the communities that will receive part of the revenues from eco-tourism activities. They can decide to delegate the management of the eco-lodges to another communitarian organization or to a private sector company.</p> <p>There are already eco-tourism activities in these 2 forests. The project will attempt to increase the profitability through the construction of eco-lodges as recommended by the forest management plan. A feasibility study will confirm this need and assess more detailed the profitability of this activity. The investment amount should be quite low (eco-lodges are made with local materials and according to local architectural design and would have each the capacity to accommodate maximum 20 people)</p> <p>A significant eco-tourism potential exists due to exceptional wildlife and landscape with possibilities to go with canoes on the river and to connect with other important touristic sites of the region (like the Loropéni ruins,</p>

	Sanctuary of Gan's kings, Gaoua museum).
<p>3. Re the “forestry development” component, please provide a bit more information on the “planned reduction in the quota of timber.” Please describe the timber harvesting activities that are now taking place, and how they will be reduced. Is this a reduction in firewood production? If so, what alternative energy sources will take its place?</p>	<p>The existing forest exploitation standards allow, on average, to cut, at every rotation (25 years period), 50% of the available timber as a “sanitary cut” (“coupes sanitaires”) in specific areas. These standards have been established more than 30 years ago and do not seem to ensure anymore forest natural regeneration, whose rate has lowered due to climate change. The project approach of forest management is detailed in annex B2.</p> <p>This type of legal harvesting is done in specific areas called CAF (“Chantier d’Aménagement Forestier”) for which forest management plans have been designed and implemented. Only 2 of the 12 forests where the project will be implemented have forest management plans allowing for timber harvesting. In the other forests, timber harvesting is done illegally, notwithstanding the CAF’s having been set up and forest management plans established but not yet implemented.</p> <p>The project will support the revision and implementation of these forest management plans in the 12 forests. Their revision should lead to a lower rate of timber harvesting (not more than 30 %), in order to allow sustainability. In addition, the project will support the development of new forest exploitation standards in 4 different agro-ecological zones, taking into account the current forest regeneration capacity. They will be integrated at the end of the project in the forest management plans.</p> <p>While the project aims at supporting increased legal timber harvesting in 12 forests through reforestation, equipment and infrastructures (e.g. forest roads building that will make new forest areas accessible for sustainable exploitation), implementation of these new standards and the reduction of illegal timber harvesting through improved forest conservation will entail a reduction or firewood production.</p> <p>Alternatives will be supported to cope with this reduction. At the local level, the AfDB FIP project will contribute to reducing firewood demand, by supporting the promotion of improved stoves. At the regional/national levels, the FIP World Bank project should increase sustainable wood production in surrounding areas.</p>

<p>4. The economic and financial analysis of alternative activities is crucial to understanding whether the proposed activities are viable, but the information presented in section B6 is thin. Has additional analysis been done on these activities? Would these activities lead to diversification of income sources, or switching of income sources?</p>	<p>The economic and financial analysis summarized in annex B6 6 is based on global costs and benefits of the project in accordance with the Bank procedures. Assumptions and results of the analysis detailed in annex B6 clearly demonstrate the profitability and economic viability of the project (see annex B6). The economic analysis of each project activity, including alternative activities, will be performed by the consultants in charge of technical studies during the project implementation. During these studies, consultants and NGOs recruited by the project, as indicated in Annex B2, will define the size of the infrastructure and equipments required to ensure the viability of the management of each gazetted forest according to its potential. In general, alternative activities will lead to a diversification of income sources, as new activities will be developed, or to follow the same activities in a sustainable way. Forest exploitation shall be stopped only in Bontoli and Koulbi, where the approach retained “Wildlife-oriented development” does not allow timber exploitation. There, some previous illegal forest exploiters may switch to other income sources (Non-Timber Forest products harvesting, eco-tourism...)</p>
<p>5. . Under section 2.1, we note that among the expected results is construction of 2487 km of forest roads. Can you provide more information on why forest roads are being constructed, and how this will lead to reduced deforestation and forest degradation? What safeguards are in place to mitigate potential negative impacts of additional forest roads?</p>	<p>In fact it is not a construction but an opening of 1287 km device forest track (roads), 900 km of inner forests tracks and 40 km of transhumance routes (see annex B3). No additional work will be done on these tracks. Note that these tracks openings will be made by the communities without any mechanization. The forests roads (tracks) envisaged by the project are open forest tracks around and inside the forests to facilitate transhumance and the management, maintenance and conservation activities. The forests roads are not intended to facilitate access to forests from outside or to connect them to the national road network. However, they will facilitate traffic inside the forests. The project strategy is to bring the communities within the PES contracts, to adopt good practice exploitation of forest resources and provide oversight to prevent illegal logging. We believe in the success of this strategy because the communities will be paid on the basis of acres of preserved from illegal logging or wildlife population according to the vocation of the gazetted forests. Forests roads will then facilitate conservation activities of forests by communities and the forestry administration. Generally illegal operators avoid forest tracks to avoid detection. As for the transhumance routes, they aim to channel the passage</p>

	<p>of cattle through the forests and thus reduce the negative impact of transhumance on forests. In short, the impact of the opening of forest roads on forest conservation will be positive. Appropriate mitigation measures are taken to minimize the impact of the opening track (see annex B7) during the works phase. The negative impact related to the cutting of trees during the opening tracks will be limited by an appropriate choice of plots and tree alignment plantations along the tracks. Additionally an environmental assessment will be conducted before opening tracks work in each forest to provide additional mitigation measures if required.</p>
<p>6. Please provide more information on the 95 basic infrastructures build for exploitation, processing, and marketing of forest products.</p>	<p>These anchor infrastructures for “securing and development of gazetted forests” are presented in table 5 in annex B2. The basic infrastructures to be built in the 12 forests include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of crossing structures in gazetted forests (54) • Construction and/or rehabilitation of living quarters and posts (6) • Construction of 3 eco-lodges • Construction of 2 fish landing quays • Construction of wood markets (9) • Construction of fodder markets (5) • Establishment of water points (16)
<p>7. Re the 18000 ha of reforested or regenerated forests, who will undertake this reforestation activity, and what will the nature of FIP support be?</p>	<p>The reforestation activities will be supported by the project in-kind (plants) and through results-based economic incentives. These are not expected to cover the full costs of communities’ works as they will be the main beneficiaries and are thus expected to provide work. The principle is that the project will provide a support to communities for forests restoration by reforestation.</p>
<p>8. . Similarly, please provide more information on what is being provided, and on what terms, with respect to “providing 180 groups with operating equipment and forest products processing facilities,” “equipment...with 8 warehouses of non-timber forest products, 10 multifunctional platforms, 25 beekeeping kits, 5500 improved stoves,....” etc.</p>	<p>The producers groups will receive equipment for harvesting and transporting timber products, and for producing (beekeeping kits) processing (multifunctional platforms) and stocking (warehouses) Non-Timber Forest products.</p> <p>To receive the equipment, the groups will have to commit themselves to carry out certain activities through a financing convention signed with the project. This convention will define the activities to be undertaken and the</p>

	<p>standards to follow. The convention compliance will be monitored on a yearly basis and non-compliance will lead to ending the supports to the groups.</p> <p>Some households will receive improved stoves and bio - digesters in exchange for works carried out. A GEF funding is expected to increase the outreach of this activity of improved stoves and bio - digesters promotion through a more commercially-oriented approach.</p>
<p>9. We were unsure of what was meant under section 2.3 re compensation to those who will no longer have access to forests after the project is implemented. What groups will be affected, and how? What is the nature of the compensation? Is there any resettlement activity planned in this project?</p>	<p>In principle, the forest resources are for all members of communities. Under the co-management framework, use and conservation of the forest will be assigned to forest management groups (GGF), which are from local communities but cannot include everyone. The GGF members will be the only ones allowed to use the forest products. Other community members will continue to enjoy some forest products including dead wood, wild foods, etc. Given that the forest belongs to the whole community, its management should benefit all. This is why the Forest Code of Burkina Faso indicates that a part of the revenue from the exploitation of forests be used for the development of all villages bordering the forest through the payment of a fee to common infrastructure. This revenue will be used for the construction of community infrastructures.</p> <p>PGFC/REDD+ will provide support mainly to the forest management groups (GGF) the Non-Timber Forest Products groups and the hunters groups.. But the project will also support the surrounding municipalities to build community infrastructures for the benefit of the entire local population. In accordance with the Forest Code, it will compensate for the use of their shared resources by the sole GGFs.</p> <p>There is no displacement in any forest of the project.</p>
<p>10. With respect to the planned gazetted hunting concessions, has there been any analysis of the impacts of such concessions on biodiversity?</p>	<p>The two forests to be developed by the project for their wildlife potential are Koulbi and Bontioli in the south - west. The management approach and the proposed measures for the protection of biodiversity are detailed in Annex B2, section 2.1. These forests are considered to be developed for hunting and ecotourism. Hunting is regulated by Law No.</p>

	<p>2011-006/AN of 5 April 2011 on the Forest Code and others implementing regulations. The law recognizes two forms of hunting in Burkina Faso: sport hunting and village hunting. Hunting activities are subjected to several biodiversity protection measures to be strictly respected that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full protection of rare, vulnerable or endangered species; - Hunting season which usually runs from December to May; - Regular inventory of wildlife resources and the establishment of a system of ecological monitoring; - The principle of setting harvest quotas by species and year according to the principle of maximum sustainable yield - Regular monitoring of hunting pressure on species and natural habitats; - Revenue sharing between the state, communities and local authorities. <p>Management plans of the two forests were developed in 2010 by PROGEREF, a project funded by the African Development Bank. The proposed development in wildlife was made on the basis of their potential for wildlife due to the inventory of the wildlife population that had been made by the project. It is planned as part of the activities funded by PPG, updating of the management plans in 2014 including an inventory of wildlife. The purpose of the update is to set hunting rates that ensure sustainability of the forests' development and if needed conservation measures will be proposed. It is also planned to undertake an annual wildlife inventory to adjust each year the hunting levy and to recommend some conservation measures if needed. It should be noted that the project will work before the end of its' activities to create the conditions for sustainable forest management that will focus on generation of revenue from the carbon sequestered. The biodiversity protection concern will be addressed in the TOR of the updating management studies.</p>
<p>11. We note that reduction of biodiversity loss and reduction in poverty are expected outcomes of the project, but we did not see in the results framework measures that would pertain to these</p>	<p>The poverty index in a rural area is an impact indicator in the log frame while there are two other indicators for the "Riparian populations' income</p>

<p>areas?</p>	<p>from gazetted forests has increased” outcome.</p> <p>No indicator on the reduction of biodiversity loss has been included in the results log frame due to space constraints. Anyway, they are part of the co-benefits the project will be monitoring through its M&E system and communities will even receive ecological monitoring material in two forests.</p>
<p>12. . We had a couple of questions on the policy/regulatory framework as it pertains to activities under this project. On page 6, there is a mention of a levy that is under conditions with respect to community forest management. Could you provide some additional information on what this levy is, and to what extent it is a significant barrier to participatory forest management? Also, we noticed, on page 9, mention of a delay in finalizing the relevant provisions of the Public Policy on land and forest security. Will the FIP project support finalization and implementation of this policy?</p>	<p>The standards of forest logging by communities in Burkina Faso are more than 30 years and had a fixed the rate of timber harvesting to 50% and a rotation cycle of 25 years. This levy rate should be compensated by an equivalent rate of natural forest regeneration. But in the context of the Sahelian climate of Burkina Faso, because of climate change, the rate of natural regeneration can no longer compensate for the levy. The levy rate must be reviewed. The project plans to finance research and development by the National Center of Forest Seed (CNSF) to determine the new standards of forests management in Burkina Faso. The project has already planned to set the levy to a maximum of 30% during the previous updating studies of forest management plans. During the project implementation, the levy rate will be adjusted based on the results of research conducted.</p> <p>Regarding provisions of relevant Public Policy on land and forest security, a project previously included in the activities funded by the PPG, was to support the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development to finalize all required texts to accelerate the implementation of the forest and land tenure laws before end of 2014.</p>